Docket Nos. UE-220066, UG-220067, and UG-210918 (Consolidated) - Vol. VI

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

January 18, 2024



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

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

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 274		Page 27
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED	
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	2 For The Energy Project:	
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)	3	
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)) DOCKETS UE-220066	Yochanan Zakai (via Zoom) 4 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, LLP	
Complainant,) and UG-220067	396 Hayes Street	
) (Consolidated)	5 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-7272	
v.)	6 Yzakai@smwlaw.com	
PACIFICORP d/b/a PACIFIC POWER)	7	
& LIGHT COMPANY,)	For Joint Environmental Advocates: 8	
Respondent.)	Jan Erik Hasselman (via Zoom)	
In the Matter of the Petition)	9 Earthjustice 810 3rd Avenue, Suite 610	
of:) DOCKÉT UG-210918	10 Seattle, WA 98104	
DLICET SOLIND ENERGY)	(206)343-7340	
PUGET SOUND ENERGY))	11 Jhasselman@earthjustice.org 12	
For an Order Authorizing)	For Puget Sound Energy:	
Deferred Accounting Treatment) for Puget Sound Energy's Share)	Donna L. Barnett	
of Costs Associated with the)	14 Perkins Coie	
Tacoma LNG Facility.	The PSE Building	
EVIDENTIARY HEARING	15 10885 NE 4th Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, WA 98004	
VOLUME VI (PAGES 274 - 413)	16 (425) 635-1419	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES MICHAEL HOWARD and BIJAN HUGHES PRESIDING	DBarnett@perkinscoie.com	
INIO INCL HOVAND AIR DIAM HOUGHES PRESIDING	18 Also present:	
TAKEN AT WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION	Multiple Zoom and in-person participants	
COMMISSION 621 WOODLAND SQUARE LOOP SOUTHEAST	19 20	
LACEY, WA 98503	21	
	* * * * *	
	23	
DATE TAKEN: January 18, 2024 REPORTED BY: Tia B. Reidt, Washington RPR, CSR #2798	24 25	
Page 275		Page 27
APPEARANCES	1 EXAMINATION INDEX	
For the Commission:	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom)	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom)	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Roberson 310	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 322	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Roberson 310	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones 5 Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Zakai 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Doumit 345	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa. Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff:	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones 5 Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 325 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom)	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Roberson 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Doumit 341 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones 5 Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 325 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom)	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa. Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W.	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Zakai 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 14 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commission Chair Danner 359	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 11 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 325 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 14 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commissioner Doumit 363	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 11 Commissioner Rendahl 341 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commissioner Polari Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Chair Danner 359 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 332 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 12 Commissioner Doumit 341 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 14 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commissioner Doumit 363 17 Commission Chair Danner 366	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers:	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 Commissioner Rendahl 295 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Earnet 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 332 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commission Chair Danner 345 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 14 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commission Chair Danner 359 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commissioner Doumit 363 17 Commissioner Doumit 363 18 Closing Statements	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt Dawid W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 332 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 12 Commissioner Doumit 341 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 14 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commission Chair Danner 363 17 Commission Chair Danner 366 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 14 Commission Chair Danner 359 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commissio	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 12 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 12 Commission Chair Danner 345 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Ms. Cakai 355 14 Commission Chair Danner 359 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. G	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 305 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 225 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 347 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 25 14 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Doumit 363 362 Commissioner Doumit 363 362 Commissioner Doumit 363 362 Commissioner Doumit 369 363 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201 (503) 241-7242	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 300 7 Commissioner Rendahl 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 325 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 325 11 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 12 Commission Chair Danner 345 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 14 Commissioner Rendahl 355 14 Commission Chair Danner 359 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commission Chair Danner 366 Commission Chair Danner 36	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attorney General Washington Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201 (503) 241-7242	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 298 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 305 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Roberson 310 Redirect Examination by Mr. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Mr. Barnett 339 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 Commission Chair Danner 345 225 Redirect Examination by Ms. Barnett 339 347 12 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) Direct Examination by Mr. Zakai 355 Commissioner Rendahl 355 Commissioner Doumit 363 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 362 Commissioner Doumit 363 17 Commission	
For the Commission: Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commission Chair David W. Danner Commissioner Milt Doumit For Public Counsel: Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Assistant Attorneys General Washington Attomey General Washington Sifte Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa. Gafken @atg.wa.gov Commission Staff: Jeff Roberson Office of the Attorney General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Jeff.roberson@atg.wa.gov Alliance of Western Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser (via Zoom) Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201 (503) 241-7242	2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 3 Witness: Jackie Hawkins-Jones Direct Examination by Mr. Roberson 290 4 Cross-Examination by Mr. Zakai 291 5 Witness: David Konisky (via Zoom) 6 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Gafken 298 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 305 8 Witness: Carol Wallace Direct Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 309 9 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Barnett 322 11 Commissioner Doumit 341 12 Commissioner Doumit 341 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 14 Commissioner Rendahl 347 13 Witness: Shaylee Stokes (via Zoom) 15 Witness: Corey Dahl (via Zoom) 16 Direct Examination by Ms. Gafken 363 17 Commission Chair Danner 363 18 Commission Chair Danner 366	

1 (Pages 274 to 277)

	Page 278		Page 280
1	Lacey, Washington; Thursday, January 18, 2024	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2	9:00 a.m.	2	Do we have a representative for Walmart with
3	-00o-	3	·
4	-000-	4	us today? (No response.)
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record.	5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
6	Good morning. We are here today for an	6	Hearing none, could we have an appearance for
7	evidentiary hearing in Dockets UE-220066 and UG-220067	7	the Joint Environmental Advocates, Sierra Club, NWEC
8	and UG-210918.	8	and Front and Centered.
9	These consolidated cases are captioned WUTC	9	MR. HASSELMAN: Good morning.
10	versus Puget Sound Energy and In the Matter of the	10	Jan Hasselman with Earthjustice for Joint
11	Petition of Puget Sound Energy for an Order Authorizing	11	Environmental Advocates.
12	Deferred Accounting Treatment.	12	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
13	In these documents, the Commission ruled on	13	Do we have an appearance for Coalition of East
14	PSE's most recent general rate case filing. We are	14	Side Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy?
15	here today following PSE's petition to amend the final	15	(No response.)
16	order requesting to expand the company's credit and	16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
17	collections practices.	17	Hearing no appearance, I will note that Nuccor
18	My name is Michael Howard. I'm an	18	Steel, federal executive agencies, and the Puyallup
19	administrative law judge with the Commission, and I'm	19	Tribe asked to be excused from attending today, and I
20	co-presiding in this matter along with Administrative	20	granted those requests.
21	Law Judge Bijan Hughes and the commissioners, who are	21	Have I overlooked any party that is appearing
22	joining us presently.	22	today?
23	Let's start by taking appearances beginning	23	(No response.)
24	with the Company.	24	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
25	MS. BARNETT: Good morning.	25	Hearing none, let's talk about our plans for
	Page 279		Page 281
1	Page 279 JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some	1	Page 281 the hearing today.
1 2	_	1 2	
	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some		the hearing today.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone.	2	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me?	2	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be
2 3 4	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with	2 3 4	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the
2 3 4 5	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me?	2 3 4 5	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with	2 3 4 5 6	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually.
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the hearing today. First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any other aspects before we turn to the admission of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any other aspects before we turn to the admission of exhibits?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project? MR. ZAKAI: Good morning. Yochanan Zakai	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any other aspects before we turn to the admission of exhibits? (No response.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project? MR. ZAKAI: Good morning. Yochanan Zakai with Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger on behalf of The Energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any other aspects before we turn to the admission of exhibits? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have some assistance for the bench microphone. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The microphones may not be working right now. MS. BARNETT: Can you hear me? Good morning. Donna Barnett for with Perkins Coie representing Puget Sound Energy. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Can we have an appearance for staff? MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Jeff Roberson at AAG, representing staff. JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And Alliance of Western Energy Consumers or AWEC? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. The Energy Project? MR. ZAKAI: Good morning. Yochanan Zakai	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	First, we will turn to the admission of pre-filed exhibits and testimony. We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses following the parties' agreed order of presentation, and we'll be taking all the witnesses individually. We will then end with closing arguments limited to 20 minutes each. We will likely take a midmorning break and a lunch break if needed. I just want to remind the parties again to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also, to only use video for those portions of the hearing when they have a speaking role. If you are having any technical issues or you observe that a party representative who is joining us online today has dropped off the online meeting, please mention that in the chat, which should be reserved for technical issues and requests for breaks only. Are there any questions about logistics or any other aspects before we turn to the admission of exhibits? (No response.)

Page 282 Page 284 admission of exhibits. Of course, we already have the 1 1 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 2 2 record in the general -- in the underlying general rate Any time, let's say, in the next four business 3 case in the same consolidated dockets, and the rulings 3 days --4 on that are made on the record, and those -- that 4 MS. BARNETT: Okay. 5 5 evidence is already admitted. JUDGE HOWARD: -- is suitable. 6 Before our hearing today, I circulated an 6 MS. BARNETT: Thanks. 7 7 exhibit list to the parties that included PSE's JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah. 8 petition to amend the final order filed on August 10th 8 MS. BARNETT: And we also have a -- I do 9 and testimony -- pre-filed testimony and cross-exhibits 9 recognize, yes, there was a lot of last- -- late 10 10 filed since then regarding the petition. And I've discovery going on in the last week. So several of 11 since added the responses to the petition. 11 those echo staff's comments about they have not been 12 Are there -- and I will turn to each of the 12 vetted 13 So -- but one of them -- let's see -- oh, and 13 parties and hear a -- will stipulate to the admission we do have an objection to The Energy Project's 14 of the pre-filed exhibits or whether they have any 14 15 objections. 15 cross-exam exhibit JHJ-6X, and this is a staff response 16 I turn first to the Company. 16 to The Energy Project's data request number 1. And it's unclear, so I'm not quite sure if we need to 17 MS. BARNETT: We have no objection with 17 object at this point. I think it's going to be --18 the exception of -- we're doing cross-exam exhibits 18 19 too; right? I take it this is all exhibits? 19 maybe we can reserve it on how it's going to be used, 20 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. 20 but it definitely appears to be friendly cross, which is inappropriate. There is no -- it doesn't seem 21 21 MS. BARNETT: Okay. 22 The cross-exam exhibit, I just would just like 22 adverse to TEP, and the response does not seem adverse 23 to make sure it's supplemented. It's CLW-39X presented 23 to TEP, so that would be the objection as to friendly 24 by staff. 24 cross. 25 This is also a -- I'll note, I believe, an 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Page 283 Page 285 1 exhibit -- a pre-filed response exhibit from public 1 I have noted the Company's objection. I have 2 2 counsel also, but it was a response to Staff Data also noted staff's objection to the weight of the 3 3 Request Number 3013. And after the cross-exam exhibit evidence for its own exhibit. 4 was submitted, PSE supplemented that, so for 4 And also, going back to the exhibit we were 5 5 discussing, CLW-39X, I would like to walk back my plan completeness, we just ask that it be -- a supplement be 6 included as well with the cross-exam exhibit. 6 for the Company filing within four business days. Do 7 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 7 you have a hard copy today? 8 8 MS. BARNETT: We can have a hard copy Turning to staff? 9 today. I think we just need to take a break to make 9 MR. ROBERSON: Staff has no objection to 10 allowing PSE to supplement that exhibit. 10 copies. 11 11 I do ask the Commission to note that the JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 12 supplement occurred after the close of discovery and 12 A hard copy or a courtesy service email 13 after cross-exhibits had been submitted, which means no 13 directly to me this morning. 14 party has vetted a cross exhibit, and I ask you to 14 MS. BARNETT: Got it. 15 accord it the weight it deserves. 15 Sorry. The paralegal is on top of it. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 16 JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to hand it 16 17 And our bench microphones do have a very short 17 up? 18 range, so I encourage you to lean forward slightly. 18 Thank you. 19 Would the Company then be submitting the 19 And has Mr. Roberson been provided with this? 20 supplemental filing to the Commission? 20 MR. ROBERSON: Staff has a copy, yes. 21 MS. BARNETT: Yes. We can do that. We 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Is it possible for 22 have them electronically. We can either do that today 22 the commissioners to get copies in case there are 23 or we can make a hard copy too, however you prefer. 23 questions on cross? 24 But, yeah, we can file it and provide it however you 24 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have reviewed 25 25 the PSE's supplemental update to the staff cross like.

		Ī	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 286		Page 288
1	exhibit, and I will deem this admitted into the record	1	slipped my mind. We can actually withdraw the cross
2	unless I hear a compelling objection from another	2	exhibits that we identified. They were late discovery
3	party.	3	in the process. On time, but late; right, as the
4	MR. ZAKAI: Your Honor?	4	process goes.
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.	5	We did have responses come in, but frankly,
6	MR. ZAKAI: This is Yochanan Zakai with	6	they're just we got too crunched for time, so we
7	The Energy Project. I would just ask to ensure that	7	have not moved to supplement those placeholder exhibits
8	the original response is still included in that exhibit	8	with the full responses.
9	so that both the original response and the supplement	9	And I guess this might also be a good time to
10	are available. I'm not able to see exactly the format,	10	note that I'm planning on waiving the cross that I had
11	but as long as the original response is there in	11	identified for Witness Wallace. So we can withdraw the
12	addition to the supplement, no objection.	12	cross exhibit.
13	JUDGE HOWARD: That is noted, and the	13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you for
14	we will update the exhibit list to reflect that unless	14	clarifying.
15	there's objection from either the Company or staff.	15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,
16	MS. BARNETT: No, that's fine.	16 17	public counsel.
17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.		Then I'm noting that public counsel is not
18	Let's turn to public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Public counsel has no	18 19	moving CLW-42X into evidence.
19 20		20	So with that, I am admitting all of the pre-filed exhibits and testimony from the petition
	objections to materials being entered in the record.	21	filed on August 10th forward to the cross exhibits with
21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. AWEC?	22	the exceptions of CLW-41X and CLW-42X, and we are
23	MS. MOSER: Thank you.	23	admitting both the original version of CLW-39X and the
24	AWEC has no objection.	24	supplement provided today.
25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	25	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Your Honor, did
23	JODGE HOWARD. All light.	23	INO. BARNETT. THI SOTTY, TOUT HORIOT, did
	Page 287		Page 289
1	The Energy Project?	1	that include JHJ-6X? Did you rule on that objection?
2	MR. ZAKAI: The Energy Project has no	2	Again, we can we can
3	objections, although I would note that we do not at	3	JUDGE HOWARD: No. Thank you for bringing
4	this time plan to offer the exhibit identified as	4	that up again.
5	CLW-41X. So that can be removed.	5	What was The Energy Project's response on
6	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	6	JHJ-6X?
7	That is noted.	7	MR. ZAKAI: Would you like to handle
8	All right. Could I turn to the Joint	8	that I guess I would request that we handle that as
9	Environmental Advocates.	9	the witness is being examined. And I can move after
10	MR. HASSELMAN: No objections.	10	after we lay the foundation and hear and hear some
11	Thank you.	11	of the witness's testimony on that.
12	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	12	JUDGE HOWARD: That sounds appropriate.
13	All right. So that concludes our survey of	13	So we're going to reserve a ruling on JHJ-6X.
14	the parties appearing today.	14	And TEP or The Energy Project can move that
15	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor? Sorry	15	into evidence when it comes up today.
16	to interrupt. In my version of the cross exhibits,	16	With that, let's turn we are foregoing
17	what is marked, I believe, as CLW-42X from public	17	opening statements today, and we are going to be doing
18	counsel, this may be one of those late discovery.	18	closing arguments. So that would mean that we're
	There is no PSE response. There's just the	19	turning to our examination of witnesses.
19		1	-
19 20	Company's the questions to the Company in the	20	And our first witness today is Jackie
		20 21	And our first witness today is Jackie Hawkins-Jones for staff, and she is with us in the
20	Company's the questions to the Company in the		
20 21	Company's the questions to the Company in the exhibit.	21	Hawkins-Jones for staff, and she is with us in the
20 21 22	Company's the questions to the Company in the exhibit. Is that something public counsel can	21 22	Hawkins-Jones for staff, and she is with us in the hearing room.
20 21 22 23	Company's the questions to the Company in the exhibit. Is that something public counsel can distribute? We can make sure copies are made.	21 22 23	Hawkins-Jones for staff, and she is with us in the hearing room. And we I think we need some assistance with

	Page 290		Page 292
1	And is the witness logged into the Zoom	1	A. Could you provide the number again.
2	meeting?	2	Q. JHJ-6X.
3	THE WITNESS: No.	3	A. Okay.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: Would it be possible for	4	Q. Do you recognize this exhibit?
5	you to join the Zoom meeting? We'll give you a moment.	5	A. Yes.
6	And you'll want to mute yourself in the Zoom	6	Q. Did TEP ask you this data request?
7	meeting and turn your volume down.	7	A. Yes.
8	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm in.	8	Q. Is this the response that you provided to TEP?
9	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great.	9	A. Yes.
10	Will you please raise your right hand and I'll	10	Q. Is any of this information in your pre-filed
11	swear you in.	11	testimony?
12		12	A. Yes.
13	JACKIE HAWKINS-JONES,	13	Q. Which part of this information is in your
14	having been first duly sworn,	14	pre-filed testimony?
15	testified as follows:	15	A. Oh, sorry.
16		16	Are you talking about the my answer in
17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	17	general?
18	Could staff please introduce the witness and	18	Q. Yes.
19	ask if there's any updates to the testimony.	19	A. No, it was not in my pre-filed.
20	DIDECT EVANABLATION	20	Q. Why did you not include this information in
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION	21	your pre-filed testimony?
22 23	BY MR. ROBERSON:	22	A. We did not include that in our pre-filed
23	Q. Good morning. Will you state your name and spell your last	24	testimony because that was not staff's position. I don't know how
25	name for the record, please.	25	Can you re ask it another way, I guess?
23	name for the record, please.	23	Call you re ask it allottiel way, I guess?
	Page 291		Page 293
1	A. Yes. My name is Jackie Hawkins-Jones. Last	1	Q. The information found in this cross exhibit
2	name, H-A-W-K-I-N-S hyphen J-O-N-E-S.	2	was not included in staff's testimony. Did it
3	Q. Did you sponsor exhibits JHJ-1T through JHJ-5	3	represent your thinking about the case at the time that
4	in this proceeding?	4	you pre-filed your testimony?
5	A. Yes.	5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And do you have any corrections to your	6	Q. If this cross exhibit represented your
7	testimony?	7	thinking about the case at the time that you pre-filed
8	A. I do not.	8	your testimony, then why was it not included?
9	MR. ROBERSON: Ms. Hawkins-Jones is	9	A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm misunderstanding your
10	available for cross.	10	question. No, that was not our position at the time.
11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	11	After receiving your data request, we did take it into
12	And The Energy Project can do cross.	12	consideration.
13	And you may proceed.	13	Q. Okay. Thank you.
14	ODOGO EVAMINATION	14	MR. ZAKAI: Your Honor, I move to admit
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION	15	this exhibit into evidence.
16 17	BY MR. ZAKAI: Q. Thank you, Your Honor.	16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Any objection?
18	Good morning, Jackie Hawkins-Jones.	18	MS. BARNETT: Yes. I renew my objection
18 19	A. Good morning.	19	to friendly cross. This is a the position stated in the data
20	Q. Please turn to TEP cross exhibit that is	20	request and the response is not adverse to TEP's
21	labeled JHJ-6X.	21	position. In fact, it's the exact opposite. And
22	Do you recognize this exhibit?	22	according to the policy statement, Commission's policy
23	A. You'll have to give me one minute to get	23	statement, friendly cross is not appropriate if it does
24	there.	24	not contradict the position of the questioner, and
25	Q. Oh, yes. I'm sorry.	25	therefore, friendly cross is often attempted and
		1	•

	Page 294		Page 296
1	consistently rejected by the Commission. And I would	1	takes a while.
2	request that the Commission continue that standard.	2	THE WITNESS: And you said it's at
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Do you have a citation for	3	page?
4	that policy statement?	4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Page 34, lines 1
5	MS. BARNETT: Yes. The policy statement	5	through 4 in reference to TEP's proposed term 5.
6	is it's called the Commission's policy statement on	6	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm there.
7	alternative dispute regulatory process and case	7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Great.
8	management, and it is in Docket 9A-940351.	8	So what would this does staff also support
9	And, again, I would also add that it is just	9	this proposed term 5?
10	Commission practice to exclude friendly cross. Number	10	THE WITNESS: Yes, staff does.
11	7 of that policy statement says "Friendly	11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So what would this
12	cross-examination should be limited to matters that	12	process look like from staff's perspective?
13	could adversely affect the questioner's interest to	13	THE WITNESS: In it would look as
14	avoid repetition of direct evidence."	14	though PSE would present evidence to the Commission for
15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	15	review, either at that time or at within a maybe
16	I've considered the objection, but I'm going	16	a period of time to determine that PSE had presented
17	to deny the objection and admit JHJ-6X.	17	sufficient evidence to allow the customer to go into
18	I'm persuaded that TEP is asking is asking	18	disconnection process.
19	cross questions about why staff did not reflect its	19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So is this similar
20	position in a certain manner at the time.	20	to the process we had at the end of the Covid
21	All right. You may proceed, Mr. Zakai.	21	disconnection process where the Commission would
22	MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.	22	essentially have to approve before a disconnection took
23	With the admission of the exhibit, I have no	23	place?
24	further questions, Your Honor.	24	THE WITNESS: Essentially, but with this,
25	Thank you.	25	it would allow a period of time and not have it be as
	Page 295		Page 297
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect?	1	soon as in that previous process that we had in place
2	MR. ROBERSON: None from staff.	2	to allow staff resources, time to go and review the
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any questions	3	data that PSE provides.
4	from the bench for Witness Hawkins-Jones?	4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so what sort
5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning,	5	of what period of time are you envisioning? If the
6	Jackie Hawkins-Jones. How are you?	6	Commission were to adopt this, what would to ensure
7	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	7	we have staff resources and ensure PSE could go through
8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So following up on	8	with this process.
9	that exhibit in which staff indicates its support for	9	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I would say within the
10	the term 4 of TEP's alterative proposal, which provides	10	next billing cycle.
11	for a process of self-declaration for certain	11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And given
12	customers, I don't know if you know that TEP's proposed	12	the self-declaration process and what is currently
13	term 5 states that if PSE presents evidence to the	13	proposed in the currently in place for the bill
14	Commission that a household does not fall within a	14	discount tariff process, would it would the local
			community action agencies be a more appropriate party
15	protected group, the Commission may allow the customer	15	continuinty action agencies be a more appropriate party
15 16	protected group, the Commission may allow the customer to enter the disconnection process.	15 16	to verify this information instead of the Commission?
		l	
16	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony?	16	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be
16 17	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a	16 17	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should
16 17 18	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony?	16 17 18	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to make ourselves available as well.
16 17 18 19	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a reference, that would be great. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It's in Exhibit	16 17 18 19	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to
16 17 18 19 20	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a reference, that would be great. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It's in Exhibit SNS-1T at page 34.	16 17 18 19 20	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to make ourselves available as well. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I appreciate that clarification.
16 17 18 19 20 21	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a reference, that would be great. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It's in Exhibit	16 17 18 19 20 21	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to make ourselves available as well. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I appreciate that clarification. THE WITNESS: Yeah.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a reference, that would be great. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It's in Exhibit SNS-1T at page 34. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Just give me one moment.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to make ourselves available as well. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I appreciate that clarification. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's all I have,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to enter the disconnection process. Is that familiar to you or do you want me to give you a reference to testimony? THE WITNESS: If you could give me a reference, that would be great. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: It's in Exhibit SNS-1T at page 34. THE WITNESS: Sorry. Just give me one	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to verify this information instead of the Commission? THE WITNESS: I do think that they should be a party to it. And if I think it would be staff's preference if another party is that but want to make ourselves available as well. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I appreciate that clarification. THE WITNESS: Yeah.

_	Page 298		Page 300
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions from	1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	the bench?	2	BY MR. ZAKAI:
3	(No response.)	3	Q. Thank you.
4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	4	Good morning, Professor Konisky.
5	Thank you for your testimony today.	5	A. Good morning.
6	You are excused for the remainder of the	6	Q. Does your research discuss the demographic
7	hearing, and I'll turn it over to my colleague now.	7	patterns associated with utility disconnections?
8	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay.	8	A. It does, yes.
9	Our next witness is Professor David Konisky	9	Q. Would you please turn to your testimony,
10	for public counsel.	10	Exhibit DK-1T on page 12.
11	Please turn on your camera and raise your	11	A. Yes. I'm there.
12	right hand.	12	Q. On lines 6 to 13, do you discuss disparities
13		13	in the incidence of disconnections among different
14	DAVID KONISKY,	14	demographic groups?
15	having been first duly sworn,	15	A. Yes, I do.
16	testified as follows:	16	Q. Now, I would like to ask you some questions
17		17	about your opinion on how to define disparate impact.
18	JUDGE HUGHES: Very good.	18	In examining if a disparate impact on a
19	Please introduce the witness and tender them	19	particular demographic group exists, is it appropriate
20	for cross.	20	to compare the percent of people in the demographic
21		21	group at a risk of a particular harm to the percent of
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION	22	people in the demographic group for the entire
23	BY MS. GAFKEN:	23	population?
24	Q. Good morning, David Konisky.	24	A. In general, yes. That's a very standard
25	Could you please state your name for the	25	approach within the social sciences as a way to measure
	Page 299		Page 301
1	record and spell your last name.	1	disparate impact would be to assess the prevalence of
2	A. Yes.	2	an outcome across different population groups.
3	Good morning. David Konisky. Last name is	3	I would note two additional two additional
4	spelled K-O-N-I-S-K-Y.	4	this section at a should that . One is that you have to
5	•	4	things to note about that. One is that you have to
	Q. How are you employed and what is your	5	consider the differences in light of how large the
6	Q. How are you employed and what is your occupation?		= -
		5	consider the differences in light of how large the
6	occupation?	5 6	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking
6 7	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental	5 6 7	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all
6 7 8	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do	5 6 7 8	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying
6 7 8 9	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and	5 6 7 8 9	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real
6 7 8 9 10	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy.	5 6 7 8 9	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the
6 7 8 9 10 11	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size.
6 7 8 9 10 11	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed — or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed — or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of customers in a demographic group for the entire
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: David Konisky is now	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of customers in a demographic group for the entire population, and that difference is statistically
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: David Konisky is now available for cross-examination.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of customers in a demographic group for the entire population, and that difference is statistically significant?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: David Konisky is now available for cross-examination. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. TEP, you indicated cross. You may proceed.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of customers in a demographic group for the entire population, and that difference is statistically significant? MS. BARNETT: Objection. Friendly cross. MR. ZAKAI: I would like the opportunity to respond.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	occupation? A. I'm a professor of public and environmental affairs at Indiana University in Bloomington. So I do research and teaching in the area of energy and environmental policy. I also own a small consulting firm called DMK Consulting. Q. On whose behalf are you testifying today? A. On behalf of public counsel. Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or exhibits that were filed or pre-filed in this docket? A. I do not. Q. Thank you. MS. GAFKEN: David Konisky is now available for cross-examination. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	consider the differences in light of how large the populations are. That's what we refer to as looking for statistical significance; right? Not all differences are meaningful. But when you're studying larger populations, you can get some sense of real differences by taking into account the magnitude of the effects given the population size. The second thing I would say is you want to be careful about what those comparisons look like to make sure that you are meaningful in a substantive way. Q. So in your opinion, is it reasonable to find that a disproportionate impact exists in situations where the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk of harm is 1.5 times more than the percent of customers in a demographic group for the entire population, and that difference is statistically significant? MS. BARNETT: Objection. Friendly cross. MR. ZAKAI: I would like the opportunity

Page 302 Page 304 1 1 MR. ZAKAI: First, this is not friendly impact. 2 2 cross. TEP is not sure if the witness is going to I would argue that in this particular context 3 3 directly support our position. I'm asking clarifying of utility disconnections, 1.5 would certainly be a 4 questions of the witness concerning their testimony and 4 disparate impact, but also, smaller differences would 5 5 research, and the answers are not found within the four be important; right? I think what's really important 6 corners of the witness's testimony or exhibits. 6 here is not focusing solely on statistical significance 7 7 However, if you decide this is friendly or sort of the absolute magnitude of an impact, but 8 cross-examination, Rule of Evidence 611 allows the 8 what that actually means on the ground; right? And, 9 9 you know, additional disconnections, if they're just Court to exercise its discretion to permit inquiry into 10 10 additional matters as if on direct examination. It's even, you know, 1.1 or 1.2, whatever the case might be, 11 appropriate to exercise such discretion here because 11 are still significant; right? We're talking about 12 there's a dispute about the definition of disparate 12 hundreds if not thousands of people who might be 13 impacts, and the record should include the professor's 13 disproportionately affected. 14 definition of disparate impacts. 14 So I think it's very context-specific. 1.5 15 MS. BARNETT: May I respond? 15 would certainly represent a disparate impact, but I 16 JUDGE HUGHES: Certainly. 16 think there's nothing magical about that number. It 17 MS. BARNETT: Thanks. Just quickly, I 17 can be a smaller impact that's also important from a 18 would point -- I would ask where that conflict is that 18 substantive standpoint. 19 it -- that -- the disagreement between TEP and public 19 MR. ZAKAI: Thank you for your time today, 20 20 counsel regarding disparate impacts. Professor Konisky. 21 JUDGE HUGHES: Any response on the specific 21 No further questions, Your Honor. JUDGE HUGHES: Redirect? 22 difference you're trying to get at? 22 23 23 MR. ZAKAI: Well, the specific problem is MS. GAFKEN: No redirect. Thank you. 24 that the testimony does not specifically say what the 24 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. 25 definition is, and so clearly, it's needed to 25 Any questions from the bench? Page 303 Page 305 1 understand if there's even adversity or not. 1 (No response.) 2 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. I'll overrule the 2 JUDGE HUGHES: No? 3 objection, having read the material, and I agree that 3 Okay. Well, thank you --4 there's something useful here. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Actually, I do. 4 5 5 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Yes. Sorry. So please proceed. 6 MR. ZAKAI: Would you like me to ask the 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Professor Konisky, 7 question again? 7 good morning. 8 JUDGE HUGHES: Yes. I've overruled the 8 THE WITNESS: Good morning. 9 objection, so please ask again. 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: In your testimony, 10 BY MR. ZAKAI: 10 DK-1T at page 4, on lines 4 through 7, you reference a 11 Q. In your opinion, is it reasonable to find that 11 number of studies that show that high financial energy 12 a disproportionate impact exists in situations where 12 burdens increase the risk of poverty and that energy 13 the percent of customers in a demographic group at risk 13 insecurity is associated with adverse physical and of a particular harm is 1.5 times more than the percent 14 14 mental health and can force households into difficult 15 of customers in a demographic group for the entire 15 situations such as whether to heat or eat. population, and that difference is statistically 16 16 Do you see that? 17 significant? 17 THE WITNESS: I do, yes. 18 A. Right. 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 19 So the first thing I would say is there's no 19 Well, where PSE in this case is demonstrating 20 single or accepted definition of what a disparate 20 a significant number of customers with arrearages 21 impact is; right? There's not some particular 21 greater than \$1,000, if that amount were to grow 22 numerical threshold of whether it's displacement here 22 without being addressed, doesn't that also create risks 23 or not that would say this is a disparate impact; 23 for customers that are already at risk of poverty and 24 right? It's very context-specific, and there are 24 energy insecurity? 25 25 multiple ways that one could demonstrate a disparate THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think in part, yes;

Page 306 Page 308 1 right? I mean, obviously, the way I try to think about 1 I have no further questions. 2 material hardship associated with, you know, affording 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 3 energy bills, paying for energy bills or any other 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. essential services; right, they are interactive 4 4 Well, thank you for your time. 5 challenges; right? They're hard to isolate one from 5 You are excused for the remainder of the 6 6 the other. hearing. 7 7 Anytime people are challenged to afford Our next witness is Carol Wallace for PSE. 8 energy, they're likely also to be finding challenges, 8 Can you please turn your camera on. 9 you know, paying for other basic household needs, 9 Oh, she's physical here. 10 whether it be food or medicine. 10 THE WITNESS: I just have a lot of stuff 11 Again, I'm not sure there's a particular 11 to carry. 12 number that represents that. It's very 12 I'm having trouble with the mic. 13 context-specific, but I think it's most important to 13 Oh, there we go. Can you hear me? MS. BARNETT: Before we start, I just want 14 note about this is that there's a lot that we don't 14 15 observe about how people are behaving and how they are 15 to correct for the record because I was fumbling with 16 managing their bills; right? So in some circumstances, 16 the microphone when I did my appearance, but my 17 you know, that's -- owing \$25 may represent a 17 pronouns are she, her and hers, and I have that written 18 significant financial burden. In other cases, it may 18 down. I think that's important to put in the record. 19 be, you know, ten times that or \$1,000, something to 19 So I'll also ask that of Ms. Wallace, please. 20 20 that effect. So, Carol Wallace, please state your name for 21 So there's -- I think the broader point here 21 the record, the pronouns you prefer, your title, and 22 spell your name for the court reporter. 22 is that when people are facing the risk of 23 disconnections; right, because they can't afford to pay 23 JUDGE HUGHES: Can I swear you in first? 24 their energy bills, they have reached a pretty critical 24 MS. BARNETT: Oh, sorry. 25 stage; right, where they probably have already tried to 25 JUDGE HUGHES: Raise your right hand. Page 307 Page 309 cope with that situation in many different ways that 1 1 2 2 CAROL WALLACE, are not observed. And we can't simply look at their 3 3 arrearages to get a sense of exactly what might be having been first duly sworn, 4 testified as follows: 4 going on because the circumstances could be very 5 different across households. 5 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that. 6 JUDGE HUGHES: Very good. 7 But as the arrearage grows, it becomes even harder and 7 Please proceed. 8 8 MS. BARNETT: Thank you. Sorry about harder for those customers. Wouldn't you agree with 9 9 that. 10 THE WITNESS: Certainly; right? I mean, 10 11 the more you owe, the more stress and anxiety and all 11 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 12 of the outcomes that the research shows to be true. 12 BY MS. BARNETT: 13 13 Q. Ms. Wallace, please state your name, your I guess what I want to highlight is that, you 14 14 pronouns you prefer, title, and spell your name for the know, there are cases of much lower arrearage amounts 15 15 in which those same stresses may exist, and maybe the court reporter. 16 16 people have chosen to pay down their energy bill, but A. I'm Carol Wallace, director of customer 17 17 they are sacrificing other kinds of needed, you know -solutions at Puget Sound Energy. My pronouns are she, her, hers, and my name is spelled C-A-R-O-L, 18 needed essentials; right? 18 19 So I'm not disputing what you're saying at 19 W-A-L-L-A-C-E. 20 all. I just think it's hard to put a particular 20 Q. Do you have before you what has been marked 21 numerical threshold on how people are -- what they're 21 for identification as Exhibit Number CLW-13T through 22 experiencing because those experiences really differ 22 CLW-38 in this proceeding? 23 across different populations and different households. 23 A. Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Understood. Thank 24 Q. Do these exhibits constitute your pre-filed 25 testimony and related exhibits in support of PSE's 25 you very much.

Page 310 Page 312 1 petition to amend the final order in this proceeding? 1 proposals that we had discussed with the LIAC. 2 2 Q. Would you say that PSE had decided all parts A. Yes. Q. Were these exhibits prepared under your 3 of the proposed -- all parts of the proposal at that 3 supervision and direction? 4 4 meeting? 5 5 A. No. A. Yes. 6 Q. Do you have any corrections to your testimony 6 Q. Okay. 7 7 on exhibits at this time? A. It was a -- it was a proposal at that point. 8 8 Q. And importantly here, I guess, PSE hadn't A. No. 9 MS. BARNETT: With that, PSE offers Carol 9 decided what it was going to do with low-income 10 customers at that meeting; correct? 10 Wallace for cross-examination. 11 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. 11 A. We had removed known low-income and estimated 12 Staff indicated cross. 12 low-income customers from the first phase of our 13 You may proceed. 13 proposed approach, and we hadn't determined exactly at 14 14 that point what we would do with them. Correct. 15 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** Q. Okav. 15 16 BY MR. ROBERSON: 16 And PSE told the members of the LIAC that it 17 17 planned to go back and have internal discussions about Q. Good morning. 18 Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony 18 how to deal with customers and then present a proposal 19 19 with you? later; correct? 20 20 A. I would have to verify exactly what the A. I do. Q. Can you turn to that? And I'm thinking 21 language was for that. I recall that we were looking 21 22 specifically of page 14. 22 at how to manage the number of customers that would be 23 23 A. Okay. entering dunning because there were well over -- at 24 Q. And on that page, you describe PSE's 24 that point, around 250,000 customers in arrears, and 25 collaboration with its Low Income Advisory Group; 2.5 our call center can't handle that volume. Our field Page 311 Page 313 1 correct? 1 folks can't handle that volume. So the phased approach 2 2 A. Yes. was really about how do we get customers moved through Q. PSE first brought up the proposal at issue 3 3 the dunning process and be able to support them here at the January 11, 2022, LIAC meeting; correct? 4 appropriately. And part of that is known low-income 4 5 5 customers being -- and estimated low-income customers A. Yes. 6 Q. You were not in attendance at that meeting. 6 being allowed time to get assistance, essentially. 7 Am I correct on that? 7 BY MR. ROBERSON: 8 8 Q. Would it help to refresh your memory to look A. Can you repeat the date, please. Q. January 11th, 2022. 9 9 at Exhibit CLW-33? 10 A. I was in attendance at that meeting. 10 A. Sure. Q. You were? 11 Q. Page 7. 11 A. Yes. 12 A. Yes. 12 13 13 Q. So PSE didn't really have a plan for dealing Q. Okay. And you also submitted the meeting notes for 14 14 with low-income customers at this meeting; right? this and all the other relevant LIAC meetings; correct? 15 15 A. And we were going to discuss it, yes. 16 Q. Okay. 16 A. Correct. Q. And that's Exhibit CLW-33. PSE next brought up the plan at the July 12th, 17 17 18 A. Yes. 18 2022, LIAC meeting; correct? 19 Q. Okay. 19 A. Yes. 20 And so at that original LIAC meeting in 20 Q. Were you at that meeting? 21 January, did PSE present the parties with a detailed 21 A. Yes. 22 proposal? 22 Q. Okay. 23 A. We did present a proposal at that meeting, 23 And did PSE present a detailed plan at that 24 yes, of our phased approach for resuming 24 meeting? 25 25 disconnections. It differed slightly from previous A. Let me just review the minutes really quickly.

Page 314 Page 316 1 We discussed it in the context of reporting on 1 chance to offer substantive feedback on the proposal 2 2 collection disconnects that we had been doing that before putting it into place; correct? 3 started in May of 2022 at the request -- Hannah Navarro 3 A. Yes. 4 4 Q. What role does PSE see for its LIAC? asked us to report those in meetings subsequent to our 5 resuming disconnections, so we were discussing the 5 A. We work with the LIAC to collaborate on 6 statistics of disconnections, and we did discuss that 6 different -- different issues that impact our 7 7 we would be lowering the threshold at some point. low-income customer assistance programs. And so we 8 Q. But did PSE present a detailed plan for how 8 have worked with them since the LIAC was formed to 9 9 that was going to happen? implement our PSE Home Energy Lifeline Program, which 10 A. I don't recall. 10 is acronym HELP, and we worked with them -- we were 11 Q. Did the meeting notes reflect that PSE 11 working with them throughout that whole period of the 12 presented a detailed plan? 12 pandemic on potentially implementing arrearage 13 A. No. 13 management plans or a percentage of income assistance 14 Q. Okay. 14 plan. That's the role that we play with the LIAC. PSE presented the plan to the LIAC for a final 15 15 Q. So you see the LIAC serving kind of a 16 time November 8th, 2022; correct? 16 substantive advisory role; correct? 17 A. Correct. 17 A. With regards to our assistance program, Q. Were you at that meeting? 18 18 absolutely. 19 19 Q. Just with the assistance programs or with A. I was not. 20 Q. Okay. 20 low-income issues generally? But you have reviewed the meeting notes? JUDGE HUGHES: I'm sorry, Counsel. Could 21 21 you repeat the question? I couldn't hear you. 22 A. Yes. 22 23 23 Q. Okay. BY MR. ROBERSON: At that LIAC meeting, PSE explained that --24 24 Q. Just with assistance programs or with 25 JUDGE HUGHES: Hold on. 25 low-income issues generally? Page 315 Page 317 Can you -- you're using an acronym. Could you 1 A. At that time, it would have been just 1 2 2 say what the acronym is for the court reporter? assistance programs. I think we have evolved since 3 3 MR. ROBERSON: Indeed I can. that time, and as we have implemented the bill discount 4 4 BY MR. ROBERSON: rate, we have worked in a more consensus kind of 5 5 Q. So at that meeting, Puget Sound Energy, PSE, methodology. I think that at that time, it was still 6 presented to the LIAC, the Low Income Advisory 6 just really a collaborative inform, ask questions, take 7 Committee, something close to a fully detailed plan; 7 feedback, those types of collaborations. 8 correct? 8 Q. Fair enough. 9 9 A. Correct. Okay. 10 Q. And it was at that time that the LIAC members 10 Would you turn to page 2 of your rebuttal were first told that low-income customers would be 11 11 testimony. 12 entering the dunning process; correct? 12 At lines 11 and 12, you speak of PSE's 13 13 commitment to addressing the equitable concerns raised A. I don't know that that was the first time, but 14 14 by this filing; correct? that's not reflected in these minutes. Q. Would you turn to Exhibit CLW-33 at page 26 15 15 A. Correct. Q. Will you now turn to Exhibit CLW-39X. 16 kind of the bottom of the page. So the meeting notes 16 reflect that counsel for The Energy Project was 17 17 JUDGE HUGHES: Are we looking at the describing this as like a first time that anyone was original or the supplemental? 18 18 19 hearing the low-income customers would be entering the 19 MR. ROBERSON: This is the original. 20 dunning process; correct? 20 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. 21 A. It appears that way. 21 Thank you. 2.2 Q. Okay. 22 MR. ROBERSON: If it helps, it is also 23 And in the pages after that, so the minutes 23 Exhibit SMS-9 and Exhibit CJD-10. 24 for CLW pages 27 through 29, many of the other members 24 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. 25 of the LIAC kind of requested that PSE give them the 25 Sorry about that.

Page 318 Page 320 1 MR. ROBERSON: No worries. 1 the last two years, we have formed an energy equity 2 2 BY MR. ROBERSON: team. We have incorporated equity in our Q. Do you recognize this document? 3 3 decision-making process. It's -- it's something that A. Yes. 4 we're doing on a daily basis. So I misspoke. 4 5 Q. Can you identify it? 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. It is PSE's response to Staff Data Request 6 But according to this DR, if I understand 7 7 PSE's position, it wouldn't be looking at the equity Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of the DR 8 impacts of these proposals because those would always 8 9 9 depend on what the Commission orders or what is agreed response? 10 10 A. Yes. upon in settlement; correct? 11 Q. And you are listed as the knowledgeable 11 A. Say that again, please. 12 witness on this DR answer; correct? 12 Q. Ma'am, if I can remember. I'm sorry. 13 If I understand PSE's position from this DR, 13 A. Yes. Q. And in the DR, staff asked PSE if it had 14 it would never look at the equity impacts -- not 14 15 equity, but specifically the equity impacts of its 15 looked at the equity impacts of its proposal; correct? 16 proposals because those would depend on what the 16 17 Q. And PSE's answer was no; correct? 17 Commission ultimately orders or what the parties agree A. Correct. 18 to in settlement; correct? 18 19 Q. Now, PSE has supplemented this answer, and I 19 A. That was the response in this DR, which is why 20 just want to make sure I understand PSE's position: 20 we filed the supplemental response. 21 21 So PSE believes that it has done an equity Q. But the supplemental doesn't change that 22 answer; correct? 22 analysis by looking at the number of customers that 23 would be swept up in each phase of the dunning process 23 A. No. 24 that have certain equity characteristics as compared to 24 Q. All right. 25 the general population; is that correct? 25 Last set of questions. If you could turn to Page 319 Page 321 1 A. Yes. 1 page 30 of your rebuttal testimony. 2 2 Q. Okay. And on lines 9 through 11, you state that Going back to the original answer, which is 3 3 60 percent of customers who are disconnected are Exhibit CLW-39X, PSE explains that it doesn't look at 4 reconnected within one day; correct? 4 equity impacts because that would depend on what the A. I'm almost there. 5 5 6 Commission orders and what the parties offer in 6 Correct. 7 settlement; correct? 7 Q. If my math is correct, that would mean that 8 8 40 percent of customers are not so reconnected; A. Correct. 9 Q. And I guess I'm wondering if that's true here, 9 10 when would that not be true? 10 A. The same day? Yes. The reconnect is dependent upon the customer contacting PSE to 11 A. It wouldn't -- well, it depends. It wouldn't 11 12 be true when we have actual rule-making that requires 12 reconnect. 13 13 us to do specific things. We are doing -- we did do Q. Understood. 14 14 the initial equity analysis that showed that there --Do you know what the average length of outages 15 is for those 40 percent that are not reconnected within 15 that only -- that customers in protected groups were 16 only likely to be more impacted than customers in 16 one day? A. It varies. It varies. 17 non-vulnerable groups and determined that there wasn't 17 Q. Average? 18 a disproportionate impact. 18 19 19 Q. With that understanding, so basically anything A. I don't know an average. 20 that could become an adjudication or is an 20 21 adjudication, PSE would not look at the equity impacts 21 Do you know what percentage of those 22 of its proposals; correct? 2.2 40 percent are known or estimated low-income? 23 A. That's not correct. I misstated. 23 A. I don't. 24 24 Q. And do you know what percentage of that 40 We look at equity in everything we do. We 25 25 percent are members of named communities, meaning those look at equity and how we propose new projects. And in

Page 322 Page 324 who live in highly impacted communities or members of 1 1 and we can also reconnect them remotely. So if a 2 vulnerable populations? 2 customer is disconnected, there are several things that 3 A. I know we have looked at that, but I don't 3 happen. The first thing is their account that holds 4 4 the arrearage that they were disconnected for is have that off the top of my head, no. I'm sorry. 5 Q. That's fine. 5 closed, and that account goes to a prior obligation. 6 MR. ROBERSON: I'm done. Thank you. 6 The customer can then be reconnected by reaching out to 7 7 JUDGE HUGHES: Any redirect? PSE either on the phone with one of our call center 8 agents on our IVR, in our -- sorry, integrated voice 8 MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 9 9 response. It's the telephone computer system when you 10 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION call in -- as well as our website and our mobile app, 11 BY MS. BARNETT: 11 and request a reconnection. There isn't a fee for 12 Q. Ms. Wallace, Mr. Roberson asked you about the 12 reconnection for a remote customer. There isn't a 13 dates of the Low Income Advisory Committee meeting. 13 deposit required right now. They don't have to address When did PSE resume its -- the phased-in 14 14 the arrearage balance because it's going to prior 15 dunning process? 15 obligation, and they can be reconnected sometimes A. In May 2022. 16 within minutes, depending on the -- how the system is 16 17 Q. And had they communicated that they were going 17 operating. And we have a really robust reconnect 18 to be doing that with the -- or at the LIAC committee 18 system with accuracy and reconnects on command over 99 19 meeting? 19 percent of the time. So it's very short. 20 A. Yes. 20 MS. BARNETT: Thank you. 21 Q. So do you -- is it your understanding that the 21 I have no more redirect. LIAC committee understood that you were implementing a JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Thank you. 22 22 23 phased-in process resuming dunning? 23 Any TEP-indicated cross? 24 A. Absolutely. We talked about it in our 24 So please proceed. 25 May 11th, '21, meeting; September 14th, '21, meeting; 25 MR. ZAKAI: Thank you, Your Honor. Page 323 Page 325 October 5th, 2021, meeting that I can specifically find 1 1 2 in our minutes of those conversations that occurred. 2 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 3 3 Q. Thanks. BY MR. ZAKAI: Turning to the cross-exam exhibit, you 4 Q. Good morning, Carol Wallace. 4 discussed it was PSE's response to Staff Data Request 5 5 A. Good morning. Q. I'm going to start by asking you some 6 Number 313, and that's cross-exam Exhibit 39X, CLC-39X. 6 7 I heard you say that they -- the supplemental response 7 questions about the dates in your proposal. 8 doesn't contradict the initial response. Is that my 8 Could you please turn to your direct testimony 9 9 understanding? Exhibit CLW-13T on page 18. 10 I guess my question is why would you file 10 A. Okay. 11 that? Why did you file a supplemental? 11 Q. Do lines 5 to 7 say that you revised the 12 A. We wanted to clarify that we had done an 12 estimated timing of the phases in Table 2? 13 13 equity analysis, which was understanding what 14 14 Q. Did you file this testimony on November 17th, percentages of populations of known low-income, 15 15 estimated low-income, deepest need, and highly impacted 2023? 16 communities were in the population of customers that 16 A. Yes. 17 would go into dunning. And so we felt that that did 17 Q. Thank you. 18 constitute an equity analysis. 18 Please turn to page 19 and review Table 2. 19 Q. Regarding the reconnection for those who do 19 A. Okay. Q. What phase number is PSE in today? 20 get disconnected, could you explain and elaborate on 20 21 that process after a person is disconnected? What 21 A. Phase 1. 22 happens? 22 Q. And according to this table, should PSE be in 23 A. Sure. 23 Phase 1 today, in January 2024? 24 24 So -- almost 99 percent of our electric meters A. According to this table, yes. The dates in 25 25 the table were illustrative. However, to show that are remote-capable, so we can disconnect them remotely

Page 326 Page 328 1 it's a phased approach, it will take several months, if this \$24 million or the line in the table that includes 1 the \$24 million. 2 not longer, to move through each phase because of the 2 So let's -- so in the amounts past due, it 3 volume of customers. Those aren't hard dates. They 3 4 4 looks like there's only one line that includes more were just to illustrate that it's going to take time. 5 Q. So when you said on the previous page that you 5 than \$24 million, and that's line 1; right? 6 revised the estimated timing, you didn't revise it to 6 A. Correct. 7 be anything specific or actionable for the Commission 7 Q. And does line 1 state \$43 million rounded? 8 to work with? 8 A. Correct. 9 9 A. It was purely illustrative to show that Q. Okay. 10 there's a period of time that this is going to take. 10 Let's turn back to your rebuttal testimony, 11 Q. Sorry. Could you answer "yes" or "no"? Is 11 page 2, and look at line 1 there. 12 the proposal in the table designed when you filed it to 12 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat which page. be something specific and actionable for the Commission Q. Yeah, no problem. That's page 17 of your 13 13 14 to adopt? 14 rebuttal testimony --15 A. No. 15 A. Thank you. Q. Thank you. 16 Q. -- page 2. 16 17 I'm going to move on to another set of 17 A. Thank you. Okay. 18 questions. 18 Q. So that line there, does that past-due number 19 Could you please turn to your rebuttal 19 have the \$43 million that matches the past-due amount 20 testimony, CLW-31, and page 17 also has a Table 2 20 in line 1 of Table 2 in your direct testimony? 21 there. 21 A. It does. 22 Q. So would it be fair to say that it's 22 A. Okay. impossible for that \$24 million to be in Table 2 of 23 Q. So the second row of Table 2 identifies 23 24 customers whose income is below 200 percent of the 24 your direct testimony? 25 federal poverty level and past-due amounts above 25 A. Yes. Page 327 Page 329 \$1,000. 1 Q. Thank you. 1 2 I'm now going to ask some questions about 2 How many customers are listed on that line? 3 PSE's arrearage projections. 3 A. 10,658. 4 Could you please turn to your direct testimony 4 Q. And I guess rounded to the nearest million, 5 5 what is the past due amount associated with those on page 8. 6 customers? 6 A. Okay. Q. So page 8 includes Figure 2 with projected 7 A. \$24 million. 7 8 8 arrearage amounts in purple and actual arrearage Q. Thank you. amounts in blue. 9 Now, could we please turn back to your direct 9 10 testimony and Table 2 on page 19 there. 10 Does Figure 2 show that in 2023, PSE's arrearage projections in purple are always higher than 11 11 12 Q. Does Table 2 in your direct testimony include 12 the actuals in blue? That's for the year 2023. 13 the \$24 million in arrearages that you identified in 13 A. Yes. response to my last question? 14 14 Q. Thank you. Now, I'm going to change topics and ask some 15 A. Yes. 15 Q. Please identify the specific line of the table questions about rate impacts. 16 16 Please turn to your rebuttal testimony on 17 that includes the \$24 million. 17 18 A. I don't know. 18 page 26. 19 Q. Okay. 19 A. Okay. 20 Did you prepare this table? 20 Q. Table 5 shows the estimated rate impact of 21 A. I did not. 21 TEP's alternative proposal or term 3 of TEP's 22 Q. But your testimony sponsors it? 22 alternative proposal. 23 23 Do the calculations in Table 5 include A. Correct. 24 Q. Okay. 24 inactive accounts? 25 25 So you can't identify the table that includes A. I would have to look at the original table.

Page 330 Page 332 1 testimony on page 28. Do you know what exhibit? 1 Q. I believe the source of this is Exhibit CLW-35 2 2 A. Okay. 3 3 Q. On line 20 at the bottom and continuing to the if you want to turn to that. 4 A. Thank you. 4 next page, do you estimate annual rate impacts at Q. And once you're there, you could look 5 5 1 percent for electric and 1 percent for gas? specifically at line 3. 6 6 A. Based on the assumptions from the 7 7 A. Yes. It's for active and inactive customers. calculations, yes. 8 Q. Do you agree that if inactive customers were 8 Q. Okay. 9 removed from the calculations, that the rate impact 9 And is that 1 percent rate impact that you describe here smaller than the 3.8 and 4.8 percent that 10 would be lower? 10 11 A. There's a lot of variables to that answer. 11 we just looked at in attachment B? 12 If -- if inactive customers don't pay their 12 A. It is because the 4.8 and the 3.2 percent were 13 arrearage balance, then they will end up going through 13 based on current arrearages, and this is based on the bad debt process and end up in rates. 14 14 arrearages moving forward if we didn't disconnect Q. But for the calculations performed in this 15 15 customers. 16 table, which includes both active and inactive customer 16 Q. Okay. accounts, all else being equal, if you remove inactive 17 17 The footnote in attachment B does discuss, 18 customers, the resulting impact would be lower; 18 quote, "these estimated rate impacts"; correct? 19 19 20 20 Q. And that footnote 2 is placed on the same line A. In that context, yes. and in the same sentence as the 4.8 and 3.2 percent Q. Thank you. 21 21 22 Now, I'm going to address different parts of 22 impacts. 23 PSE's rate impact. 23 A. Correct. 24 I'm going to ask a question, and for one time, 24 Q. Okay. 25 we're going to move away from your testimony and to 25 Now, please turn to the spreadsheet provided Page 331 Page 333 1 PSE's petition itself. 1 as attachment A to Exhibit CLW-36. And so could you please turn to attachment B 2 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excuse me, Your 2 3 of PSE's petition. 3 Honor. I don't have that attachment A. Is it in the 4 exhibit? 4 A. I don't know if I have attachment B. 5 Q. In the document that was filed with the 5 JUDGE HUGHES: I don't believe it is. I'll 6 Commission, they are all on the -- they're all in the 6 send a link in a moment. 7 same PDF. 7 If we could pause for half a moment. 8 8 MR. ZAKAI: Your Honor, may I suggest that A. Gotcha. I have it now. Thanks. 9 9 maybe everybody take a short break now? Would now be 10 Q. Thank you. 10 an appropriate time for a midmorning break? JUDGE HUGHES: Let's take five minutes Could you please turn to page 10 of attachment 11 11 12 B. 12 here. 13 13 Oh, by five, I mean ten. So we'll take two Q. Does footnote 2 at the bottom of this page say 14 14 sets of five-minute breaks back to back. Let's be back that rate impacts would become annual and perpetual? 15 15 here at 10:30. We're going to round it up to a 16 13-minute break. 16 A. If scenarios in 3 to 5 were to become 17 disconnect moratoriums on a permanent basis. 17 So 10:30, people. 18 Q. Thank you. 18 Thank you. 19 And under number 5, does this page show that 19 And we are off the record. 20 PSE estimated the rate impacts at 4.8 for electric and 20 (Pause in the proceedings.) 21 3.8 for natural gas -- sorry, 3.2 for natural gas? I 21 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. I believe our soft 5 22 misspoke there. 22 is done. 23 A. Yes. 23 Let us resume. 24 Q. Thank you. 24 And we are back on the record. 25 25 Now we're going to go back to your rebuttal MR. ZAKAI: Thank you, Your Honor.

Page 334 Page 336 1 1 In contrast to what we just looked at, do you BY MR. ZAKAI: Q. So before we had left, I had asked to turn to 2 agree that these are rounded to the nearest whole 2 the spreadsheet that is provided as attachment A to percent and that no digits follow the decimal point? 3 3 Exhibit CLW-36. This is -- Carol Wallace, is this the 4 4 A. Yes. 5 spreadsheet that includes the support for the 5 Q. Okay. 6 calculations of the rate impacts we were discussing in 6 And if you change the formatting for the 7 7 the first tab, the 4.8 percent and the 3.2 percent, and residential electric rate impact to show two digits 8 then in the second tab, the 1 percent? 8 after the decimal point, would that show a rate impact 9 9 A. This one is for the 1 percent. So the first of 0.73 percent instead of 1 percent? 10 table is the annual impacts based on data through 10 A. I'm sorry, I don't have access to the 11 May 1st, and the second is the 1 percent, yes. 11 spreadsheet to look at that, to confirm it. 12 Q. Okay. Thank you. 12 Q. Could you accept that subject to check? Let's turn to that second tab addressing the 1 13 13 A. Subject to check, ves. 14 percent rate impact. 14 MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, we can provide 15 A. Oh, I'm just looking at the printout. 15 that. 16 BY MR. ZAKAI: 16 Q. Okay. 17 Well, then let's look at the table that shows 17 Q. And subject to check, that if you changed the the 1 percent rate impact. 18 formatting to show the rate impact for all electric 18 19 19 customers, that that would be 0.77 instead of A. Okav. 20 Q. Do you have that in front of you? 20 1 percent? 21 A. I do. 21 A. I just got the spreadsheet, so I'm looking at Q. Okay. Thank you. 22 22 it right now. 23 So 38D shows the commercial and industrial 23 Okay. Can you please repeat what you just 24 impact -- rate impacts for electric. But I guess let 24 said? 25 me clarify. 25 Q. Yes. Page 335 Page 337 1 Should I refer to cell numbers or do you not 1 So if you change the formatting of cell 39D, 2 2 have that cell numbers? which is the estimated rate impact for all electric 3 3 A. I don't have it. customers, to show two digits after the decimal point, do you agree that that would be 0.77 percent instead of 4 Q. Okay. 4 5 5 I'm going to have to change my questioning a 1 percent? 6 little here, but I think we'll be able to get through 6 A. Yes. 7 7 Q. Okav. 8 8 And if you change the formatting of cell 39F So please look at the commercial and 9 industrial rate impacts for electric. 9 to show two digits after the decimal point, does it 10 How many digits are visible after the decimal 10 show an estimated rate impact for all gas customers of point in that cell? 11 0.57 percent instead of 1 percent? 11 12 A. Two. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Now that we have discussed the rounding of the 13 Q. Thank you. 14 14 Now, let's look at the rate impacts for gas estimated rate impacts, I'm going to ask some questions customers under residential and commercial and about the assumptions used to develop the rate impacts. 15 15 16 industrial. 16 Please review line 6. Does line 6 show that PSE calculates the 17 In contrast to what we looked at a moment ago, 17 18 which showed two digits after the decimal point, do you 18 annual rate impact by first determining the increase in 19 agree that these only show one digit after the decimal 19 arrearages from May 2022 to May 2023? 20 point? 20 A. Line 6 of -- I'm sorry. I don't know where 21 A. Yes. 21 you're referring. 2.2 22 Q. Yeah, no problem. Q. Okay. 23 Now, let's turn to the residential and total 23 So the table at the top of that same tab with 24 24 arrearages, does that include arrearages from May 2022 rate impacts for electric as well as the total rate 25 25 and May 2023 as the first step in the calculation? impact for gas.

Page 338 Page 340 1 A. Yes. 1 arrearages. 2 Q. Okay. Thank you. 2 Q. And is that more than you had in any of those Could you please turn to the cross exhibit 3 3 tables? marked CLW-30X. 4 4 A. Oh, absolutely. 5 Sorry, did I say 30? I -- that was a mistake. 5 Q. And going to the rate impacts you were 6 I meant 40X. 6 reviewing with Mr. Zakai, could you -- could you point 7 7 us to an exhibit or anywhere in your testimony where A. Okay. Q. My apologies. 8 you provide the estimated rate increases if the 8 9 9 Commission approves The Energy Project's proposal? A. Okay. 10 10 Q. So on the second page, does this exhibit show A. Yes. 11 arrearages in October 2022 and October 2023 excluding 11 I don't know off the top of my head which one 12 inactive customers? 12 it is, however. A. Yes. 13 13 Q. Do you know off the top of your head 14 approximately the estimated rate increases for 14 Q. Okay. 15 customers if the Commission were to adopt The Energy 15 And do you accept subject to check that if the 16 arrearages shown here are entered into that table we 16 Project's proposal in this proceeding? 17 were just looking at in CLW-36, that, you know, to 17 A. I think it's 4.8 percent, but I would need to 18 replace the arrearages that were there in cells E7 to 18 double-check. 19 F15, that the result is rate impacts of 0.34 percent 19 Q. And that's a 4.8 increase in rates? 20 for residential electric customers and 0.23 percent for 20 A Yes 21 21 residential gas customers? Q. Do you know the estimated rate increase if the 22 Commission approves PSE's proposal in this proceeding? 22 A. Subject to check, I don't know. At this 23 point, I don't know. 23 A. There shouldn't be a rate increase. We 24 Q. But would you accept it subject to check, 24 have -- if we would just go back to our normal process 25 perform the calculations and let the Commission know if 25 where we have assistance that's covered under Schedule Page 339 Page 341 1 that's incorrect? 1 129 that's already in rates, and debt recovery, which 2 2 is already in there. A. Absolutely, yes. 3 3 Q. Okay. MS. BARNETT: Thank you. 4 No more redirect. 4 MR. ZAKAI: Thank you for your time today, 5 Carol Wallace. 5 JUDGE HUGHES: Any questions from the 6 I have no further questions. 6 bench? 7 JUDGE HUGHES: Any redirect? 7 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. 8 8 MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you. Thanks. 9 9 Thank you, Ms. Wallace. 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 10 So on paragraph 10 of the petition to amend 11 BY MS. BARNETT: 11 the settlement -- I'm just quoting here -- "Holding 12 Q. Ms. Wallace, Mr. Zakai walked you through some 12 dunning to phase 1" also means that PSE is able to 13 differences in the arrearage tables. 13 expand its customer and outreach practices aimed at Could you explain why the amounts past due and 14 14 addressing the arrearages. And a couple of the 15 arrearages are different? 15 witnesses, a few of them, actually, make the point 16 16 A. In -- I've looked at a lot of tables, so I that -- and I can point you to, for example, Charlie 17 would like a little more context. 17 Thompson, Joint Environmental Advocates, at page 5 of 18 Q. I guess I'll just -- are those tables accurate 18 her initial testimony basically says the settlement 19 today? 19 doesn't disallow PSE from making direct contact with 20 A. No. 20 21 Q. Why not? 21 So I'm wondering, do you feel that you can 2.2 A. Because they're in the past, and things have 22 make direct contact with customers in the current 23 23 environment, first question? changed. 24 Q. What is the status today of the arrearages? 24 THE WITNESS: Yes. 25 25 A. Currently, we have \$164.9 million in COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Under \$1,000, I'm

Page 342 Page 344 1 1 talking about. what the consequence is of not paying their bill, and 2 2 that consequence is a disconnect. That's not our THE WITNESS: Yeah. That was -- that is 3 3 ultimate goal, but that is a consequence. And so I our position. 4 4 think it's important that because it's a customer's We -- customers that aren't in dunning. 5 5 Dunning is the process that allows us to do direct and responsibility to pay their bill, that they understand 6 targeted outreach, which includes the exact amount of 6 the consequence of not paying their bill. 7 7 arrearage. We have done outreach that includes all of We would have to build another dunning-like 8 the information about assistance available, payment 8 process to handle that outside of the current process, 9 plans, those types of things, but they're more generic 9 and I don't know what type of resources that would 10 10 towards the broad customer base of customers in take. We built the existing process back in 2013 when 11 arrears. To specifically send a document to Mr. Jones 11 we moved into the SAP billing system. So it's been a 12 in Tukwila, we don't have the facility currently to do 12 long time since we created that process, so we would 13 13 that. All of the process for that automated have to do some research and requirements gathering -communication happens through the dunning process. all of that stuff you do for a technical project. 14 14 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So getting back to 15 15 16 Is the ultimate point of the dunning process 16 sort of my second question, the dunning process really, 17 that it puts customers who are in arrears in the 17 in your mind, it sounds like it works because the 18 disconnection queue? Is that kind of what 18 ultimate consequence is disconnection. 19 distinguishes it --19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 20 THE WITNESS: No. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. 21 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: -- from the normal 21 Now, witnesses have made the point that 22 most -- most -- the vast majority of customers in the 22 outreach? THE WITNESS: No. 23 dunning process don't go to disconnection. 23 24 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. 24 THE WITNESS: Correct. 25 THE WITNESS: I think that could be a 25 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Page 343 Page 345 1 result. That's not the intent of putting customers in 1 Does that make a point, then, if you did the 2 2 the dunning process. research you needed to do, change your system, that 3 The dunning process allows for a lot of 3 just by doing the outreach -- I'm asking for your 4 upfront communication before a customer would ever hit 4 opinion now, I guess, if you have it. the disconnection queue. We make at least two phone 5 5 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 6 calls. They get an urgent notice. They get a 72-hour 6 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Just by doing that 7 notice. They get a disconnect notice. We go to the 7 aggressive sort of outreach without that consequence, 8 door and provide them with a 24-hour notice. 8 would you -- could you begin to take down this, you And what we find is during that process, 9 9 know, huge arrearage balance? 10 customers leave the dunning process because they take 10 THE WITNESS: So in my opinion, speaking 11 with my 32 years of experience at Puget Sound Energy, I 11 action. 12 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. 12 don't think it would work. It has not worked in --13 13 when we first stopped disconnecting, we changed our And I don't mean this to be flippant whatsoever. 14 dunning notifications to let customers know they were 14 15 THE WITNESS: No. 15 past due and that there was no -- and removed all the COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Just a semantic 16 information about disconnections. During that period 16 17 17 issue I'm dealing with. of time, we saw payment arrangements decrease 18 Couldn't you just call that process something significantly. We saw applications for energy 18 19 else other than, say, dunning and do that sort of 19 assistance decrease significantly. And so in my 20 outreach independently? Because it seems to work; 20 opinion, no, it doesn't work the same. 21 right? 21 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Thank you. 22 And does that question make sense? 22 Nothing further from me. 23 THE WITNESS: It does. I think that 23 Thank you. 24 there's a few considerations. I think it works because 24 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: And if I may, 25 25 the dunning process allows the customer to understand when -- when was that period? When did you -- what was

Page 346 Page 348 1 1 the period in which you tried that? And we'll prepare that bench question. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Carol Wallace, 2 THE WITNESS: It was between -- it was --2 3 so we stopped disconnecting voluntarily March 6th of 3 if you would turn to your Exhibit CLW-26, which appears 2020, before the moratorium. And we changed the to be a presentation that includes -- it says arrearage 4 4 5 5 notifications between then and June. I'm not exactly data as of May 16, 2021. But it doesn't have any 6 sure on the dates of that. And the process continued 6 indication of where this was present -- who this was 7 7 through the moratorium getting lifted. presented to or the date it was presented. 8 And then we went through the communication 8 Do you know that information of when this was 9 9 prepared and who it was shared with or prepared for? back and forth with the Commission to verify customer 10 10 information, those types of things. And so we actually THE WITNESS: It was shared with the LIAC, 11 went back to the normal noticing process, having 11 I believe. I would have to confirm that. That's what 12 removed a large portion of customers from dunning that 12 it was prepared for. were estimated or known low-income, and went back to COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But there's 13 13 no date on here other than the date of the data. 14 the normal process for the customers in phase 1. 14 15 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I mean, THE WITNESS: True. 15 16 my -- what I'm trying to get a handle on is when you 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 17 tried taking out the references to disconnection, that 17 And if you could turn to -- so I would like you to provide a response in terms of when it was 18 was when people were possibly aware of the moratorium. 18 19 THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Yes. 19 presented to the Low Income Advisory Committee. 20 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: And so, you 20 THE WITNESS: Okay. know, to -- now that we're out of having a legally 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 21 mandated moratorium, you don't have any experience with 22 If you turn to page 5 of the exhibit, which 22 23 23 is -- actually, page 4 of the exhibit, it talks about a trying the softer approach that Commissioner Doumit was 24 talking about without having a backdrop of a 24 presentation of dunning segments. 25 moratorium? 25 So does this represent the -- does this Page 347 Page 349 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's probably true. 1 represent what was the dunning process prior to the 1 2 However, we did -- we did send out 68,000 postcards to 2 Covid disconnects or is this an earlier version of 3 3 customers talking about the assistance that was PSE's now-proposed phased dunning process? 4 THE WITNESS: It's an earlier version of 4 available, all the protections with K cap and those 5 5 types of things. We did that, and we didn't see an the phased approach. 6 uptick in customers applying. 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 7 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: So based on your 7 If you could turn to your rebuttal testimony, 8 experience, without raising the possibility of 8 which is CLW-31TR, and look at page 23. THE WITNESS: Okay. 9 disconnection, you are not going to get the response 9 10 that you feel is necessary to bring these arrearages 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And at the very top, lines 3 through 6, you reference a special 11 down? 11 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 dunning procedure for arrearages over \$1,000, but that 13 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank 13 isn't described in your testimony. 14 14 Can you tell me what a special dunning COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And, Carol Wallace, 15 procedure is? 15 16 16 was that postcard sent during the moratorium or after THE WITNESS: Yes. It's a procedure that 17 17 the moratorium? we can use to move customers in or out of dunning. So 18 THE WITNESS: After. 18 the special dunning procedure that this is in reference 19 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm wondering if we 19 to is the snapshot in time when we removed customers 20 can get a copy of that --20 that were known low-income or estimated to be under 21 THE WITNESS: A copy of it? 21 200 percent of federal poverty level at the beginning 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- with the date 22 of the phased approach. 23 and make it a bench request. 23 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So this is 24 I have some other questions. 24 specifically focused on removing those customers of 25 25 JUDGE HUGHES: Go ahead. high impact or special consideration?

	Page 350		Page 352
1	THE WITNESS: From dunning altogether,	1	Is that is it appropriate to interpret from
2	yes.	2	those two tables that PSE's proposal would move the
3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	3	dunning threshold from \$1,000 to \$150?
4	Do you have Mr. Dahl's testimony and exhibits	4	THE WITNESS: We haven't really set a new
5	in front of you?	5	dunning threshold. Prior to the pandemic, it was \$70.
6	THE WITNESS: I do.	6	And we have been discussing what would be the
7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	7	appropriate level. We haven't determined what that
8	If you could turn to CJD-4, which is PSE's	8	would be.
9	response to public counsel's data request 441.	9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
10	It states it doesn't track or differentiate	10	But the table just goes to 150?
11	between the number of outreach attempts made to	11	THE WITNESS: Right. Right. And that's
12	customers with past-due balances that have active or	12	one of the levels we had discussed. And so that's why
13	closed accounts. Why doesn't PSE differentiate between	13	we included it in the analysis.
14	those types of calls in terms of collecting data?	14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But that's not a
15	THE WITNESS: I don't think we ever had to	15	that dunning threshold is not a specific part of PSE's
16	do that, so it wasn't built into our process.	16	proposal?
17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	17	THE WITNESS: No.
18	And looking at the table that's the table 1	18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have one more
19	at the bottom of the response, is it possible for PSE	19	question.
20	to provide in addition to the calls that were made	20	If you can turn to unless my colleagues
21	there the total number of active and closed accounts	21	have follow-up on it.
22	during those two periods?	22	And Witness Hawkins-Jones Witness
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, we can provide that.	23	Hawkins-Jones' testimony exhibits, if you turn to
24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	24	JHJ-3, which is PSE's response to Staff Data Request
25	That would be another bench request.	25	Number 314.
	Page 351		Page 353
1	Page 351 Okay And then looking at Witness Dahl's	1	Page 353
1	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's	1	Do you have that?
2	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry.	2	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep.
2	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request	2 3	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
2 3 4	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response.	2 3 4	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it
2 3 4 5	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's	2 3 4 5	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with
2 3 4 5 6	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to	2 3 4 5 6	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities
2 3 4 5 6 7	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that	2 3 4 5 6 7	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you. If there's no further questions, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And in the cross-examination that Yochanan Zakai from The Energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you. If there's no further questions, you're excused for the remainder of the hearing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And in the cross-examination that Yochanan Zakai from The Energy Project the questioning with you, there was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you. If there's no further questions, you're excused for the remainder of the hearing. Okay. Well, that brings us to the end of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And in the cross-examination that Yochanan Zakai from The Energy Project the questioning with you, there was a reference to those two tables of the phased approach.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you. If there's no further questions, you're excused for the remainder of the hearing. Okay. Well, that brings us to the end of cross-examinations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Okay. And then looking at Witness Dahl's Exhibit CJD-5, which is public counsel's I'm sorry. It's PSE's response to Public Counsel Data Request Number 431 and the supplemental response. Looking at the supplemental response, there's a reference to PSE conducting some outreach to customers, 68,000 customers in March of 2023. Is that what you were referring to in terms THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: of the postcard? THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So that was the postcard outreach. So PSE hasn't repeated that outreach? THE WITNESS: We haven't. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And why is that? THE WITNESS: Because we didn't get any we didn't get measurable results from it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. THE WITNESS: And it's expensive. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And in the cross-examination that Yochanan Zakai from The Energy Project the questioning with you, there was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Do you have that? THE WITNESS: Yep. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in this table on page 2 of the exhibit, it identifies the number of customers associated with vulnerable populations in highly impacted communities as requested by staff. Can PSE identify the specific customers that are associated with these population categories or is this just an estimate? THE WITNESS: This is an estimate. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And do these categories of high, medium, and low vulnerability line up with the deepest need category, or is this something that's THE WITNESS: It's with the deepest need category. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you. If there's no further questions, you're excused for the remainder of the hearing. Okay. Well, that brings us to the end of

Page 354 Page 356 1 1 don't you turn to that and then look at lines 1 through arguments. 2 2 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor? 3 3 JUDGE HUGHES: Yes. Are you there? 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Actually, I think 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 we have a question or two for Witness Stokes and 5 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And this 6 witness Dahl, if we can -- I'm not sure if that was 6 refers to The Energy Project's proposed term 5, which 7 7 conveyed to the parties, but if those witnesses are states that if PSE presents evidence to the Commission 8 available. 8 that a household does not fall within the protected 9 9 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. I retract the closing group, the Commission may allow the customer to enter 10 of cross-examinations, then. 10 the disconnection process. 11 So, Witness Stokes, can you turn your -- if 11 Do you see that? 12 you're here, can you turn your web cam on? 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 13 There we go. 13 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Actually, that's THE WITNESS: Hello. 14 14 not -- yes, that's exactly what I wanted to say. JUDGE HUGHES: Hi. 15 Could you elaborate on your vision on how the 15 16 Can you please raise your right hand and 16 Commission would review these submissions. 17 repeat after me. Well, not... 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. I would say that our 18 18 vision is flexible on this point. We wanted to 19 SHAYLEE STOKES, 19 demonstrate that there could be instances where people 20 20 in a certain protected group on the whole might not fit having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 21 21 within -- or might have, like, a higher income level --22 22 excuse me. Like, for example, a highly impacted 23 23 JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you. community or one of the self-declaration categories. 24 Okay. Can you please introduce the witness 24 If PSE was -- had reason to believe that that customer 25 and tender them for cross, and please note if there are 25 did not actually meet that criteria, we wanted to put Page 355 Page 357 1 something in there that would allow them to try to 1 any corrections to the pre-filed testimony. 2 2 pursue the disconnection in our alternate proposal, 3 3 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** similar to the -- the disconnection processes during 4 BY MR. ZAKAI: 4 the early exit of the pandemic. So that's a model that 5 Q. Good morning, Shaylee Stokes. 5 was established that we wanted to present as a measure 6 A. Hi. 6 for the Company. 7 Q. Can you please state and spell your name for 7 The burden of proof would be on the Company in 8 the record. 8 those cases. We are certainly willing to be working A. My name is Shaylee Stokes. My first name is 9 9 with the Low Income Advisory Committee or the Company 10 S-H-A-Y-L-E-E, and my last name is S-T-O-K-E-S. 10 in working out exactly how that might look. Like I 11 Pronouns are she/her. said, right now, it's fairly flexible. 11 12 12 Q. Thank you. I would expect that the Company would present 13 And did you pre-file testimony in this case? 13 information that it had that looked contrary to what 14 14 A. Yes. the client declared and that some of the Commission Q. And do you have any corrections or changes to 15 15 would review that for whether it stands up. make to your testimony today? 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I don't 16 17 17 A. No. know if you heard the question I had for Jackie 18 MR. ZAKAI: Thank you. 18 Hawkins-Jones at the beginning of the hearing about 19 Your Honor, the witness is available for 19 this topic. 20 2.0 THE WITNESS: I did. 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And so would 22 Good morning, Shaylee Stokes. Thank you for 22 TEP believe it's beneficial, similar to the bill 23 being available. I just have a couple of questions for 23 discount tariff program, that the community action 24 24 you. agencies would be the ones to essentially verify the 25 25 In your testimony, SNS-1T at page 34, why self-declaration and determine the appropriate

Page 358 Page 360 1 1 treatment for the customer as opposed to the needs for addressing arrearages with protecting 2 2 vulnerable -- the most vulnerable customers. And I Commission? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. Like I said, we are 3 think processes would need to be developed, and there might be trial and error involved. There might be data 4 4 flexible on this point. I would say that putting a 5 5 community action agency in the position where they have sources out there that the Company might want to 6 the authority to say whether someone has -- is --6 research, but I think we're at the beginning stages of 7 7 should be disconnected or not disconnected is something what that might look like. 8 that I can't speak for all of the network in saying 8 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So at 9 they would be comfortable with. The role of community 9 this point, you don't -- you don't know what sources 10 10 action agencies now in relation to, for example, the if -- of information, if any, utility would have to 11 bill discount rate does do verifications of income for 11 contradict a self-declared submission by a customer? 12 the randomly selected portions of people who 12 THE WITNESS: I think for protected 13 13 self-declare that are then selected for post-enrollment classes, medical need for service or people that have verification. And so they're verifying specific 14 14 eviction clauses in their leases. I think it would documentation and then giving that documenta- -- or 15 15 be -- it is appropriate for people to self-declare 16 giving that information back to the utility. So some 16 those specific circumstances, and I think it would be 17 arrangement similar to that might be acceptable to the 17 tough to contest them, especially if we were clear in 18 community action agencies. But asking them to 18 what those protected circumstances or protected groups 19 specifically vet whether or not they should be shut off 19 were. 20 is probably going a step beyond what would be within 20 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank 21 21 their scope. you. 22 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But the 22 JUDGE HUGHES: All right. I believe that's 23 community action agencies may be in a better position 23 all of our questions of this witness. 24 to verify the protected -- or the vulnerable status of 24 Thank you for your time. 25 the customer more than staff at the Commission, who 2.5 MR. ZAKAI: Your Honor? Page 359 Page 361 1 don't have access to all the information the community 1 JUDGE HUGHES: Oh, sorry. 2 action agencies have; correct? 2 Redirect? 3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I could agree with 3 MR. ZAKAI: Yeah, could I have the 4 that. Perhaps there would be a circular process that 4 opportunity for brief redirect? 5 could be developed where there is an attempt at 5 JUDGE HUGHES: Yes. My -- we're a little 6 verification, and then information that was collected 6 off-script. So my apologies. 7 or not collected can be presented to the Commission in 7 Go ahead. 8 that respect. 8 MR. ZAKAI: No problem. 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I 9 MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, I object to 10 10 this. I don't think we usually redirect Commission appreciate --11 Oh, go ahead if you weren't done. 11 questions. 12 THE WITNESS: Excuse me. It was just a 12 JUDGE HUGHES: Oh. Double apologies. 13 13 MR. ZAKAI: This is something that I have suggestion. I'm finished. 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 14 seen before and does occur at the Commission. 15 And that's all the questions I have. I really 15 MS. BARNETT: I disagree. appreciate you being available this morning. 16 16 JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. I'm sorry. We are going to move on, I think. My apologies. 17 COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. I 17 18 So the witness is excused. Thank you for your would like to just follow up. 18 19 Without getting information from another 19 time. 20 source, as a practical matter, how is the utility going 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 to have information that would contradict what a 21 Thank you, Commissioners. 22 customer self-declares? 22 JUDGE HUGHES: And I believe witness Dahl 23 THE WITNESS: I am not sure in that 23 was -- is witness Dahl present? 24 respect. I think this is an alternate proposal that is 24 Okay. Please raise your right hand. 25 new territory in some respects in trying to balance the 25

Page 362 Page 364 1 1 disconnection to achieve positive outcomes. COREY DAHL, 2 2 having been first duly sworn, Did you hear the testimony of witness Carol testified as follows: 3 3 Wallace for PSE? 4 4 THE WITNESS: I did, yes. 5 5 JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Who Please introduce the witness and tender them 6 essentially said that is that consequence, 6 7 7 for cross, and please indicate if there are any disconnection, that is -- was -- that's what makes that 8 corrections to the pre-filed testimony. 8 process work. 9 9 How do you respond to that? MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. 10 10 THE WITNESS: I would respond to that by 11 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 11 noting that the Company has, by their own admission, 12 BY MS. GAFKEN: 12 not conducted direct targeted outreach to customers Q. Good morning. 13 13 without threatening disconnection. So we don't have Would you please state your name for the 14 14 any solid evidence that that type of outreach wouldn't record and spell your last name. 15 15 work. 16 16 And, you know, the Company has said that they A. Yes. 17 My name is Corey Dahl, C-O-R-E-Y; and my last 17 haven't conducted that outreach simply because they do 18 name is Dahl, D-A-H-L. 18 not have the processes to do so. They haven't tried to 19 Q. How are you employed and what is your 19 conduct that outreach. They haven't tried to conduct 20 occupation? 20 that outreach without threatening disconnection. A. I'm employed as a regulatory analyst for the 21 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So under public 21 22 Washington State Office of the Attorney General within 22 counsel's proposal, your proposal, and that's at the 23 23 the public counsel unit. same exhibit, pages 29 through 2, you would under your Q. And are you testifying on behalf of public 24 24 proposal suggest that targeted outreach occur without 25 counsel today? 25 the consequence of disconnection; is that correct? Page 363 Page 365 1 A. I am. 1 THE WITNESS: Correct. 2 Q. Do you have any changes to your testimony or 2 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: What happens if this 3 exhibits? 3 unknown becomes a known, then -- a hypothetical -- and A. Yes, I do have one minor change. It is on 4 your arrearages aren't being taken care of. What 4 5 page 30 of my testimony, Exhibit CJD-1T, page 30 at 5 should the Commission do in that case under your 6 line 11. 6 proposal? 7 I'll give folks a moment to get there if they 7 THE WITNESS: Can you state the question a 8 8 little differently? need to. 9 Where it says 150 percent of the federal 9 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Right. 10 poverty line, I intended to say 200 percent of the 10 Assuming we adopt your proposal --11 federal poverty line. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. Q. And is that the only change that you have to 12 12 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: -- and it is making 13 your testimony or exhibits? 13 minimal impact on the arrearages. Without what is now A. Yes, it is. 14 the consequence of dunning, which is disconnection, 14 15 what should the Commission do in your opinion then? 15 MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. Witness Dahl is available for questioning. 16 THE WITNESS: I guess that question is 16 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you, Your 17 asking me to address a bit of a hypothetical where we 17 18 Honor. 18 don't have a lot of the information. I think, just as 19 Corey Dahl, at your response testimony, CJD-1T 19 we're doing now, assessing a situation with the 20 at page 12, lines 5 through 8. 20 evidence we have with the understanding of the steps 21 THE WITNESS: I'm there. 21 that have or have not been taken by the Company, you 22 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. You note that 22 know, our recommendations are being based on that, and 23 PSE directly targeted communication with customers who 23 the recommendations are also being based on all of the 24 enter dunning appears to work, and that the Company 24 voluminous data, research we have, about the harmful 25 25 impacts of disconnections, particularly on vulnerable does not have to put customers in line for

Page 366

populations. That's what we do know. And that's largely informing our recommendations here.

In terms of a future state where we have to look at potential future outcomes of what may or may not work, you know, I really can't make an assessment without understanding what the situation is actually like and what we're observing. And I don't think it would be appropriate to make recommendations without understanding that.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

One last --

Or did you want to follow up?

COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I did.

Because basically, we are being asked to make a decision to either implement your proposal, which is remove references to disconnections, and we have heard from the Company that if we do that, there's a chance that you won't get the response that the Company needs, and suddenly, we're going up from \$160 million in arrearages up to, you know, whatever it could be, \$200 million. So, I mean, there's a lot riding on this decision.

Why do you believe that your -- that your proposal is more likely to be successful than the

make when they're faced with, you know, really difficult financial decisions. That's what we do know.

Page 368

COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: We also know that if the arrearages go up, we're going to see rate impacts. So, I mean, there are equity considerations in -- you know, in -- different ways of looking at the equity considerations. And so it's -- I hear what you're saying. I just -- I think it's a -- it's a tougher -- it's a tougher decision for us to make because we really have to -- we have to figure out what the contingencies are if either your proposal or Puget's proposal or any other proposal doesn't bring us the results we need.

THE WITNESS: Right. And I definitely appreciate the weight of the decision here. There's a lot of complex factors here.

But we do know that between the time that the settlement agreement in the -- this GRC, I guess this GRC document was reached and the time that the Company filed their petition to amend the settlement, you know, I believe over a year had elapsed, and the Company hadn't conducted or built the process to conduct targeted outreach without the threat of disconnection outside of the dunning process. We know that they didn't do that, and that hasn't been tried up to this

Page 367

current one or are we just -- are we taking that chance? I mean, how do you respond to that? Because there is -- there is a lot riding on this decision if we take your suggestion.

THE WITNESS: Right. I think with any decision that the Commission makes, any decision that the Company makes, there's always a chance that it may not have the intended outcome. However, you've targeted communication with customers to understand their options, to understand that they do indeed have a past-due balance. You know, hopefully, we can get to a place where customers are connected with the resources they do know.

And to my point of understanding potential outcomes, one outcome we do know of a situation where customers are threatened with disconnection or are disconnected, there are disproportional impacts.

That's an outcome we do know based on years of data gathered. And, you know, the Commission has an obligation based on its own orders to make decisions with an equity lens and understand that, you know, no decision, no action that the Commission takes, that a company takes is equity neutral, and we do have an understanding of who is impacted by disconnections, how they're impacted and the types of decisions they do

Page 369

point. So we, you know, can't comfortably speak to the lack of success of that particular process. That hasn't been attempted by the Company. Yeah.

COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you for that.

And thank you for indulging me, Commissioner Doumit.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Of course.

One more question, witness Dahl. Your alternative proposal also restricts the ability of PSE to pursue the dunning process for particular groups of vulnerable customers. Carol Wallace, PSE's witness, has testified that PSE does not retain such data about customers and raises the issue of privacy.

What is your recommendation for how PSE should address this issue if the Commission was to adopt your alternative recommendation?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, as I -- you know, one thing that I do want to drive home, and I understand where your concerns are coming from. In my recommendation, I do maintain that the Company retains the burden of proof in this situation. That's a pretty normal standard that the utility is held to in a variety of functions and decisions that are made before the Commission. So in my view, that's a pretty

24 (Pages 366 to 369)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

Page 370 Page 372

ordinary thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess in terms of specifics of how that's implemented, that's something that the Company should be working out with the Commission staff and the number of other parties that have been involved with this process. Based on what I heard from The Energy Project's witness Shaylee Stokes, I think there are some good ideas there and something to start working with. But, you know, public counsel is committed to working hard and very closely with all the interested parties to figure out a system that does work to make that happen.

> COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Thank you. Nothing further.

JUDGE HUGHES: I actually have a quick clarification.

You stated what the burden of proof is.

18 Are you a lawyer?

> THE WITNESS: Sorry. I couldn't tell who is asking me the question.

JUDGE HUGHES: Sorry. This is Judge Hughes.

23 You stated -- made a statement about the 24 burden of proof. Are you an attorney?

25 THE WITNESS: I am not, no. today, and thank you for setting this important issue for adjudication.

When you issued the notice of intent to amend the final order in this proceeding, you did so because PSE's growing arrearage balances likely constitute a harm that was not fully anticipated at the time of the settlement agreement in this proceeding. Indeed, these growing arrearages are likely to have significant impacts on those customers who are accumulating larger and larger past-due balances, but they also have the potential to harm low- and moderate-income customers other than those if PSE is required to recover the arrearages in rates in the form of bad debt.

I'd like to begin by explaining why we're here today because PSE is not in the practice of requesting the Commission to amend a final order in this way. And so after the disconnection moratorium ended in 2022, PSE developed a gradual, phased-in resumption of field collection operations. They started with a small subset of customers and excluded known and estimated low-income customers and included only customers whose arrearages were over -- were \$1,000 or more. PSE discussed this phased-in approach with the Low Income Advisory Committee at its January 2022 meeting.

And by May 2022, PSE had initiated its return

Page 371

JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Are you an expert in burdens of proof?

> THE WITNESS: No. But, you know, I --JUDGE HUGHES: Just for the record.

THE WITNESS: Right. But I have many years of experience in dealing with processes before the Commission, and I'm very familiar with a wide variety of types of proceedings before the Commission.

So in that sense, I have a lot of knowledge about that.

JUDGE HUGHES: Very good.

Please proceed.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Nothing further.

Thank you.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

You are excused for the remainder of the proceeding.

And now, that brings us to the end of cross-examination. So let's get, I think, a few arguments in before we get to lunch.

So we are going to begin with the Company.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you.

And good morning again, Chair Danner,

Commissioner Rendahl, Commissioner Doumit, Judge

Hughes, and Judge Howard. Thank you for your attention

Page 373

1 to dunning and provided a report on the progress of 2

that to the Low Income Advisory Committee in its July meeting. You can read all the detailed minutes in

3

4 Exhibit CLW-33, which we already discussed a little bit

5 today. But in August 2022, PSE entered the settlement 6

agreement in the general rate case, and that stated

that PSE agrees to continue its existing credit and collection processes until the conclusion of the

proceeding currently being conducted in Docket 210800.

10 At the Low Income Advisory Committees November

11 meeting, PSE provided an update of the dunning

12 progress, and it was following that meeting that PSE

13 learned that the other parties viewed PSE's dunning to

14 be in conflict with the settlement agreement. PSE did

15 not agree that it was in conflict since the phased-in

16 approach was already in process, but they believed

17 their concerns were in good faith. And so instead of

moving forward, PSE paused the phased return and tried 18 19 to work out a solution. That was unsuccessful, and PSE

filed its petition to amend the final order in August

21 2023.

20

22

23

24

25

So that is why we're here and how we got here, but in the time it's taken us to get here, the arrearages that were already a problem in January 2022 have only grown to over \$164 million. The rulemaking

Page 374

personal visit. No customer will fall through the cracks.

docket is going into its third year with no end in sight.

No one disputes that the growing arrearages are a problem. The longer and the higher they grow, the bigger problem they become for those customers with past-due balances and all other customers in PSE's system. So PSE is requesting to resume its gradual phased return to dunning because it's the most fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient result that will protect vulnerable populations and minimize inequitable impacts.

PSE's dunning process is not intended to disconnect people. In fact, disconnections result in only a small fraction of those who enter the dunning process.

So what really happens in the dunning process? You heard it partly by Carol Wallace today, but when a customer enters dunning, PSE can then engage with that customer one-on-one to try and reduce or eliminate their past-due balance, but also to inform and educate that customer on the many assistance programs that might be available to them. PSE makes several phone calls to reach the customer. If those are unsuccessful, then PSE will mail out an urgent notice, a final notice, and then a disconnect notice.

PSE's dunning system has built-in protections to help those customers who need financial assistance. The dunning process includes getting help to those who need it. If, on the other hand, certain populations are excluded from the dunning process, then those populations are more likely to fall through the cracks because they will never receive that level of engagement. PSE simply does not have the ability (technologically or human resources-wise) to identify or help these customers outside of the dunning process. But excluding certain populations from the dunning process means that their past-due balances only continue to grow.

It is important to remember that PSE's phased-in approach that PSC has, instead of just turning on dunning all at once, this benefits both customers and PSE. The arrearages are so large that PSE simply does not have the staffing available to handle all the past-due balances at once, so the phases allow customers time before they may enter dunning, and it allows PSE time to address the balances gradually. PSE's approach involves no additional costs because it is simply resuming a system that already exists. So

Page 375

If the customer does not take action on the phone or mailed communications, then a disconnect notice is sent. If no action is taken on those, PSE will make a field visit to that customer, and if that customer is not home, a door hanger is left. But if the customer is home, that PSE representative can collect payment or can connect that customer with possible financial assistance or explain how to do that

If the customer -- following all of these communications, if the customer takes no action, then the customer may be disconnected. In that case, they can be reconnected within four hours if they have remote capabilities, as Carol Wallace explained most people do now. And if they don't have remote capabilities, they're reconnected within 24 hours or same-day service if it's shorter.

PSE does not charge disconnection or reconnection fees. In the case of reconnection, a prior obligation is created that essentially provides the customer cannot fear disconnection based on that prior obligations. No customer will be disconnected without understanding that financial assistance may be available to them and understanding how to get that help. No customer will be disconnected without a

Page 377

Page 376

resuming dunning has no rate impacts, but not resuming dunning has significant rate impacts for every PSE customer.

And every alternative proposed by the other parties has a rate impact. I would like to go into those impacts and the other parties' specific proposals in more detail, but at this time, I'll stop and reserve the rest of my time for rebuttal if that's possible.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you.

Staff?

MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, Judges Hughes and Howard.

Before you this morning, as Chair Danner pointed out, is a significant question, which is what to do with PSE's petition.

Before the Commission addresses that question, however, there are two process questions that it needs to think about. The Commission should not discount those questions because they're process questions. Process is intended to guarantee correct and good outcomes.

The first of these process questions is what role does the LIAC serve? It seems unlikely that the Commission would sponsor the creation of a group that

Page 378

was just a rubber stamp for PSE. But the record here, specifically the minutes found in Exhibit CLW-33, show that PSE presented this proposal to the LIAC as a fait accompli. You can read the minutes. The representatives from the parties that were at that meeting that are not PSE expressed repeated dismay about their inability to provide feedback on PSE's proposal.

The second question is what do the public service laws and the guidance offered by the Commission in Cascades' 2021 general rate case about equity mean to utility operations?

The Commission has suggested/stated that companies need to consider the consequences of their actions to ensure that inequities are not perpetuated or worsened. Here, you have -- and granted, it's an equity analysis. I understand PSE's theory, which is that they're looking at the populations swept up in the resumption of dunning. But it's plain as day in Exhibit CLW-39X. I mean, literally, it's a one-word answer: No. They did not consider the equitable impacts of their proposal. So before the Commission is a proposal that's unvetted by the LIAC and for which there is no meaningful equity analysis.

Given those facts, what should the Commission

Page 380

PSE's low-income plans -- the BDR, bill discount rate, the arrearage management program, the NP -- if those don't address the situation, PSE can file another petition. At least we'll know.

Thank you.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you.

7 Public counsel?

MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.

PSE's request to modify its agreement to maintain its credit and collection processes until the Commission concludes its rulemaking demonstrates a lack of imagination and initiative and will place vulnerable customers in harmful situations. This is particularly true in light of PSE's lack of engagement with its Low Income Advisory Group in presenting the issue and discussing solutions.

PSE refuses to acknowledge the harm disconnections cause to the most vulnerable, despite the significant research presented by public counsel witness Professor David Konisky.

While the research is based on national data, Witness Konisky notes that there is no indication that Washington's data would be significantly different than the data he has worked with.

It is important to understand the difference

Page 379

Page 381

```
do? As the Commission has clearly expressed in this hearing, there's a lot of concern about PSE's growing arrearages. How do you balance the need to ensure that PSE is recovering that money with the equitable concerns that are kind of at the forefront of where regulation is going? There are proposals from each of the parties, which staff joins, as you heard from Ms. Hawkins-Jones, which is to allow a resumption of notice, specific outreach to customers to see if that works, and limited resumption of PSE's ability to disconnect customers, namely, customers who do not fall within certain specific categories. And those categories are based on equitable concerns; right?
```

I think -- I shouldn't say "I think."

When the Commission balances those factors and makes its decision, I think -- I said it again. When the Commission balances those factors, it should consider the fact that no party in this proceeding says that this is a problem that you wave a magic wand and it disappears tomorrow. Even PSE is recommending a phased approach. There is no reason not to try a phased approach wherein you accept the proposals from the various parties, the Joint Environmental Advocates, TEP, public counsel, staff, see what happens. And if the Commission finds itself here in a year after all of

between the entire group of customers who fall behind in their bills versus the group of customers who actually get disconnected. Witness Konisky's testimony addresses the segment of customers who actually get disconnected, the impact they experience, and the coping behaviors they engage in to survive. All of this is important context with which to view PSE's request to modify its settlement commitment.

In PSE's last rate case, it agreed to continue its existing credit and collection processes until the conclusion of the proceeding currently being conducted in Docket U-210800. PSE's existing credit and collection processes includes not disconnecting customers with less than \$1,000 in arrearages. This term continues to be in the public interest.

And, frankly, PSE understood the deal it made, and it should maintain its commitment.

Not only should the Commission reject PSE's request to modify its agreement, but the Commission should order PSE to conduct targeted outreach to all past-due customers, regardless of the past-due balances or status in PSE's dunning process.

PSE argues that it could not have known that the rulemaking in Docket U-210800 would still be pending and that the magnitude of arrearages

Page 382

necessitates changes to its settlement commitment. First, rule-makings are often long processes, taking years to complete in many instances. Even when the hope is to quickly move through a rulemaking, they can be time-consuming. PSE filed its petition approximately 16 months after the rulemaking commenced in earnest, which is optimistic and extremely fast under the best of times.

Not only do rulemakings take time and move slower than litigation, but all of the parties practicing before the Commission were aware of the recent struggles the Commission had with staffing and capacity. And given statutory requirements, we knew that litigation would be prioritized over rulemakings if the Commission had to make tough choices about what it could handle when. PSE's argument that it could not have known that the rulemaking would take time to complete is simply not plausible.

Second, while public counsel shares PSE's concern about the growing arrearages, public counsel does not believe that the answer is to allow the Company to disconnect customers. The intention was never to allow people to rack up arrearages such that they would never be able to pay. More precisely, the intention was never to set customers up for failure.

may not be able to easily observe how they're doing that. Some of those behaviors are described in his pre-filed testimony and illustrate risky behavior that people engage in to make their circumstances work. These stressors and risky behaviors can be addressed through proactive, effective communication that does

not threaten disconnection.

Page 384

PSE claims that it could not communicate with customers under the settlement agreement. This argument rings hollow. Essentially, PSE argues that it could not communicate with customers about their accounts unless they also threatened to disconnect. PSE argues that it could not communicate with customers about options to help with arrearages before they were at risk of being cut off from life-sustaining, essential services. Frankly, this does not make sense. PSE can communicate with customers at any time to go over the status of their accounts and offer assistance.

Indeed, the settlement agreement does not address or limit which customers could receive direct, targeted outreach to increase access to assistance programs and reduce arrearages.

PSE Witness Wallace testified this morning that PSE used generic, nontargeted communications with all customers and stated that the Company did not see

Page 383

Customers remain liable for the energy they use, even when they fall behind in their bills, and the goal is to more adequately, efficiently, and equitably address situations where customers are unable to afford their energy bills.

The impact of disconnection is severe on the most vulnerable, as described by Witness Konisky and the research that he presents, and public counsel believes that PSE should have been communicating with all customers in arrears to improve access to comprehensive bill and arrearage management. Instead, PSE only communicated with customers after they reached the \$1,000 threshold and were at risk of disconnection. This, in my mind, is an utter failure. Failure to communicate with customers in a way that did not threaten disconnection but that would improve access to assistance, thus reducing arrearages, was and continues to be needed to prevent mounting arrearages and the harm caused by disconnections.

As Professor Konisky testified this morning, stressors grow as arrearages grow, but lower arrearage amounts can also create stressors, causing customers to forego other essentials.

Professor Konisky also referred to the ways that people may be addressing those stressors that we

Page 385

an uptick to access to assistance. The type of communication that public counsel and others are advocating for is targeted, specific communication, not generic postcard-type communication. Targeted communication is two-way communication with a customer that takes into account what that customer needs. Generic communication can result, as we've seen, in little response.

PSE Witness Wallace also indicated that PSE is unable to communicate with customers outside of its dunning process because PSE lacks an internal process to do so. Witness Dahl also described that when he was questioned earlier.

The Company had more than a year before filing its petition to amend to adjust their processes to create a more inclusive, equitable outreach process without threatening disconnection. In other words, to communicate outside of its dunning process. They chose not to. That PSE could not figure out how to do that communication outside of its dunning process does not mean that the Commission should release the Company from its settlement commitment.

Moreover, even though PSE's per-customer arrearages appear higher than Avista's, Cascade's, and NW Natural's per-customer arrearages, PSE is on par

Page 386

with PacifiCorp. This is despite PacifiCorp having a much lower disconnection threshold of \$50 compared to PSE's \$1,000. This indicates that the ability to threaten disconnections at a lower threshold does not necessarily result in lower past-due balances.

Instead of allowing PSE to modify its settlement, the Commission should deny the request and order PSE to immediately begin communicating with all customers who are in arrears without the threat of disconnection, but with the intention of working with customers to bring them current on their bills. This communication is described by public counsel witness Corey Dahl as targeted outreach to all customers, including those with less than \$1,000 in arrears, without the threat of disconnection.

Thus far, I have been describing public counsel's preferred outcome for this matter. If, however, the Commission decides to modify PSE's agreement, the Commission should establish strong protections for particularly vulnerable customers to mitigate inequities inherent in the disconnection process.

I want to be clear that public counsel is not advocating that the Commission modify the settlement, but in the event that the Commission decides to do so,

under 5 years of age, households with vulnerable adults, renters at risk of becoming homeless, and households with medical need or fragility.

3. These groups of vulnerable customers that I just enumerated could receive additional outreach and referrals. Customers may self-declare their vulnerability, and PSE should be required to inform customers of the process to self-declare.

Page 388

- 4. PSE will provide contact information for the self-declared customers to community action agencies for further outreach.
- 5. Lastly, bad debt will continue to be allocated among customer classes in line with the current allocation methodology.

Disconnections produce inequities. PSE's proposal offers no clear pathway to mitigate or repair inequities resulting from disconnections. Public counsel offers a pathway to protect the most vulnerable customers, reduce existing arrearages, and slow the growth of new arrearages.

Now, I did not cover each point made by public witnesses Corey Dahl or David Konisky in my remarks today. Those testimonies contain a wealth of detail and cover issues that I did not specifically touch upon. Those details and issues remain important to the

Page 387

we have recommendations about the protections that should also be included.

The term that PSE seeks to modify was a key term geared towards protecting PSE's most vulnerable customers from disconnection. As witness Dahl indicated earlier this morning, no action is equity neutral, and the outcome of PSE's desire to modify the settlement term is to move more people into the dunning process, which will undoubtedly push more customers into disconnection.

With that in mind, as described fully in Witness Dahl's testimony, if the Commission modifies the settlement, the Commission should also:

- 1. Require PSE to conduct individual, targeted outreach to all customers, regardless of class, who have past-due balances. This outreach should be done without language that threatens disconnections or that suggests that disconnection is the only alternative to full payment.
- 2. Certain groups are particularly vulnerable and subject to harm. These groups are:

Known low-income customers, estimated low-income customers, customers with the "deepest need" as defined in PSE's 2021 CEIP conditions, households in highly impacted communities, households with children

Page 389

Commission s decision in this case, and I encourage the Commission to closely study the testimonies and exhibits presented not only by public counsel, but also by The Energy Project; the Joint Environmental Advocates, which consists of Front and Centered, Sierra Club, and NWEC: and by Commission staff.

Thank you for your time today.

I also want to take a moment to express my deep gratitude of being able to appear before this body as public counsel. Representing customers has been my deep honor and privilege for the last 12 years, but this will be my last appearance before you in my current role. The next time I appear before you, I will have joined the UTC Division.

And I genuinely and enthusiastically look forward to the next chapter in my career, but I do leave this chapter with great pride and appreciation.

Thank you.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you.

AWEC?

MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor.

AWEC appreciates the opportunity to offer a closing argument. We have been monitoring this proceeding; however, we did not file pre-filed

testimony, and we don't have a recommendation for the

00 / Danier 206 | 1 200

Page 390

Commission at this time. And therefore, I am not offering a substantive closing argument on behalf of 2

AWEC today. Thanks.

JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Thank you.

The Energy Project?

MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, administrative law judges.

PSE's testimony repeatedly states that disconnections are a last resort. Setting aside PSE's words, let's examine the actions PSE proposes to take.

PSE proposes to resume threatening disconnections. PSE does not propose to provide residential customers any additional or incremental protections than is done today, and PSE does not propose any additional outreach to past-due customers. Under PSE's proposal, threatening disconnections is business as usual. And those threats have serious, often disparate consequences on people's lives.

The Commission should reject PSE's proposal as inconsistent with the public interest. Instead, the Commission should adopt TEP's approach of requiring PSE to perform outreach without threatening disconnection, which is shown to be effective.

Page 392

Instead of attempting to challenge TEP's finding of statistical significance, PSE's rebuttal testimony invents their own threshold by which to measure disproportionate impacts. PSE states that it is, quote, "operating on the philosophy," end quote, that a proposal is inequitable if it is twice as likely to threaten disconnection to selected demographic groups. TEP strongly disagrees that PSE's threshold is the appropriate measure of disproportionate impact. PSE's philosophy is arbitrary and not supported with any reference, so the Commission should not use it.

As noted by Professor Konisky, it's reasonable to find that a disproportionate and inequitable impact exists even if the threshold selected by PSE is not met. In sum, the Commission should reject PSE's measure of disproportionate impact and find that PSE's proposal is likely to produce a disproportionate impact on named communities.

In this section of my closing, I want to discuss the problems with PSE's proposal. TEP expected a meticulously crafted proposal from PSE commensurate with the resources of a large utility seeking to break a settlement agreement it signed. Instead, PSE's testimony included a sloppy and an incomplete proposal. There was a limited amount of time for this

Page 391

TEP's testimony describes two types of disproportionate impacts from disconnection. First, the consequences of losing utility service are more severe or longer-lasting for certain groups. No party in this proceeding contests the literature presented that establishes that losing utility service has a more severe impact on people of color, families with young children, low-income customers, renters, the medically fragile, or other named communities.

The second type of impact is the utility subjecting a disproportionate number of customers in certain demographic groups to threats of disconnection. TEP analyzed the customers which PSE proposes to threaten with disconnections and found, on page 18 of Alex Pfeifer-Rosenblum's testimony, that they are statistically more likely to be estimated low-income, energy-burdened, in a highly impacted community, and in a highly vulnerable population. PSE does not dispute TEP's finding of statistical significance because it cannot.

In addition, TEP found that when low-income customers with arrearages of over \$1,000 are included, the inequitable outcomes of PSE's proposal increase beyond those found in the table on page 18 of Pfeifer-Rosenblum's testimony.

Page 393

adjudication, and these problems hindered parties' ability to evaluate and respond to PSE's proposal in a timely manner.

As an initial matter, the dates for PSE's phases are irrational. Following the dates in PSE's proposals would have resumed additional disconnections in November 2023, a month before other parties submitted their testimony and well in advance of today's hearing.

Second, PSE's proposal included arrearage data from all customers, including those which PSE already put in the disconnection queue and those with inactive accounts. If a customer is already in the dunning process and receiving disconnection notices, then PSE is not proposing to change its dunning process for that customer. Similarly, an inactive account, by definition, does not have current service from PSE. Therefore, PSE cannot disconnect those accounts, and it makes no sense for them to be included in the phased dunning proposal at all.

Put simply, PSE does not propose to change its dunning process for inactive customers or customers already in dunning, so accepting PSE's proposal will have no financial impact on those arrearages.

Finally, and most concerning, PSE's proposal

2

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be disconnected.

Page 394

concerning low-income customers with past-due balances over \$1,000 changed in its rebuttal testimony, and PSE did not acknowledge that it was a change. After reading PSE's direct testimony, TEP worked in good faith and asked discovery to determine exactly what PSE proposed. PSE's first response to TEP's discovery, found in Exhibit APR-3, clarified that its proposal would not resume disconnections on these vulnerable customers. Later. PSE contradicted itself without acknowledging a change in position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TEP finds PSE's failure to acknowledge a significant change in its position concerning the most vulnerable low-income customers very concerning. Thus, TEP requests that the Commission's order in this matter reiterate its expectations that a utility's initial testimony include specific, actionable, and complete proposals.

Next, I'd like to address the record concerning a connection between increasing arrears and residential disconnections. PSE's petition is premised on the allegation that there is a link between the dollar threshold for residential disconnections and residential customer arrears. The record does not support PSE's allegation.

First, Pfeifer-Rosenblum demonstrated on page

Page 396

- enhanced energy assistance program, which is finally designed to decrease energy burden to 6 percent of
- 3 household income. However, no permanent arrearage
- 4 management plan exists. TEP looks forward to launching
- 5 one in October. But even after a customer enrolls in
- 6 the arrearage management plan, it will take 12 months
- 7 of on-time payments before that past-due balance is
- 8 forgiven. This means that for the plan to have an
- 9 impact on -- sorry, for the plan to have a full impact

10 on PSE's arrearage levels, low-income customers will 11

need to be enrolled for 12 months, which is not even 12

possible until the fourth quarter of 2025. Thus, it's 13 unreasonable to resume widespread disconnections at

14 this time when customers have only had a few months to

15 sign up for the bill discount rate, and the permanent

16 arrearage management plan will not show results until 17

the fourth quarter of 2025 -- sorry, will not show full 18 results until the fourth quarter of 2025.

> Next, TEP demonstrated that PSE's rate impact calculations are inflated, but we, of course, acknowledge that other customers pay for energy

22 assistance programs and bad debt. As

23 Pfeifer-Rosenblum's testimony shows, PSE's rate impact

24 estimates are not an accurate reflection of failing to 25

implement their proposal. Wallace's rebuttal testimony

Page 395

24 that PSE's arrearage forecast was 15 percent higher than actual arrearages in 2023.

Second, Pfeifer-Rosenblum demonstrates that the utility in the state with the highest per-customer residential arrears is PacifiCorp, not PSE. Yet PacifiCorp is also the utility with the lowest disconnection threshold, currently set at \$50. Put simply, the Commission cannot rely on PSE's arrearage forecast, and the record in this proceeding demonstrates no correlation between a utility's disconnection dollar threshold and its level of residential arrearages.

So if reducing the disconnection threshold is not the solution, then what is? TEP proposes that PSE perform outreach to past-due customers without threatening disconnection and to offer low-income customers a permanent arrearage management plan. Why is this? Because the data shows that the same residential customers have larger past-due balances now than they did before. TEP interprets this data to show that the previous generation of bill assistance programs did not sufficiently reduce low-income customers' energy burden to prevent further accumulation of arrears or reach enough customers. As we know, in October, PSE launched its

in tables 3 through 6 includes updated rate impact estimates. These updated estimates suffer from the same shortcomings as PSE's original estimates by inappropriately including inactive customers who cannot

Page 397

These one-time rate impacts from pandemic-era arrearages becoming uncollectable bad debt -- sorry. Let me restate that.

What we're dealing with here are one-time rate impacts from pandemic-era arrearages becoming uncollectable bad debt. So if the Commission wants to reduce the rate impact on other customers further, it would be appropriate to spread recovery of the costs of pandemic-era arrearages over multiple years.

Next, the ongoing rate impacts alleged in Wallace's rebuttal testimony on pages 28-29 are similarly inflated. PSE's rounded rate impact estimate was 1 percent, but Wallace's testimony describes that 1 percent. But, as I demonstrated in cross-examination, if you show the decimal places, residential rate impacts, which TEP believes is the correct measure, setting aside commercial and industrial, are only 0.74 percent for electric and 0.49 percent for gas.

Next, PSE's rate estimate inappropriately includes inactive customers.

31 (Pages 394 to 397)

Page 398

And, finally, PSE calculated the ongoing rate impact including the arbitrarily selected time period of May 2022 to May 2023. And as TEP showed at hearing, when a different time period is selected and inactive customers are excluded, the residential rate impacts are only 0.34 percent for electric and 0.23 percent for gas. This underscores the arbitrary nature of the time period selected for PSE's calculation.

2.5

So a premise of PSE's petition is that disconnections are necessary to prevent cross-subsidization, yet cross-subsidization is not inherently problematic if the Commission determines that the public interest supports it. And in this case, both the traditional definition of public interest as well as the newer principle of equity clearly justifies such cross-subsidization.

This Commission authorizes many types of cross-subsidization regularly. It occurs both between customer classes that have not achieved parity in a cost-of-service study and within customer classes. For example, the cost-of-service study in this proceeding shows multiple customer classes over-earning by 5 percent and multiple customer classes under-earning by 5 percent.

Now, let s focus on cross-subsidization within

Page 400

a hundred years, justified this Commission allowing urban customers to subsidize rural customers' rates, even the wealthy ones. If the Commission s disconnection policy similarly allows cross-subsidization for some wealthy customers, that is a reasonable outcome because it prevents severe harm on vulnerable neighbors in need.

In furtherance of the public interest in maintaining utility access to service, the Commission has repeatedly affirmed that postage stamp rates are reasonable. And it's in furtherance of this same public interest, maintaining equitable access to utility service for vulnerable customers, that The Energy Project asks the Commission to reject PSE's petition and adopt its recommendations.

Thank you.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you.

Okay. The Joint Environmental Advocates?
MR. HASSELMAN: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. Jan Hasselman on behalf of the Joint Environmental Advocates. Thanks for the opportunity to be here today.

I have two points I'd like to make about the testimony and evidence we've heard today. It's about the process by which this decision is being made and

Page 399

a customer class. A modern example would be net metering, where a state policy promoting distributed generation subsidizes mostly well-resourced homeowners to install solar. The history of cross-subsidization within a customer class is more storied. For over a hundred years, utilities have used postage stamp rates to promote rural electrification, an important public interest. Back then, the state decided that urban customers, who cost less to serve, should pay the same as rural customers, who cost more to serve. This cross-subsidization largely achieved the public interest goal of providing universal access to electric service. Yet even today, the Commission allows rural customers, who cost more to serve, to pay the same rates as urban customers. Why? Because it is in the public interest to keep those customers connected to utility service.

Some rural customers are wealthy and can afford to pay their full cost of their service. But the Commission does not ask those wealthy customers to pay more. I'd like to dwell on this point for a moment. We know with certainty that some rural customers are wealthy, and we know that rural customers cost more to serve than urban customers. Yet the principle of universal access to service has, for over

Page 401

then the substance of what PSE is seeking from this
 Commission.

Before I do, I'd like to say a few words about why the Joint Environmental Advocates are here, why we are using our scarce resources on a ratemaking case about utility disconnections.

Our primary role here is to advocate that communities who historically have been left out of decisions that directly and negatively impact them have a voice.

Chairman Danner, you highlighted that the stakes are high. We agree. The stakes are high because the decisions being made here have real-world impacts on families and individuals, you know, people at risk of homelessness or people who have to choose between utility bills and medicine or whatever. And, as we all know, those people and those communities have been disproportionately impacted by the historically inequitable policies around disconnections, and here, we have the power to either continue or to upend those historic practices.

We have seen and we appreciate the Commission's efforts to center equity and procedural justice in utility proceedings. We see and we appreciate PSE's acknowledgment that these are

Page 402

important values. And our role, as we see it, is to hold everybody accountable to those commitments.

So let me explain briefly why the proposal that PSE has brought to you doesn't pass that test, and I want to channel Mr. Roberson and talk a little bit about the process.

First, this just isn't the appropriate docket in which to be making major changes to ongoing disconnection practices that have such consequential impacts to people's lives. PSE has asked you to upend dunning and disconnection practices that were put in place to protect the most vulnerable customers in the context of backing out of a ratemaking settlement. This is not the kind of open process where all the people potentially impacted could be heard and fully participate, and it does mean that different people will be subject to different standards depending on what utility is serving them.

As we have discussed, there is a docket that is suitable to address these kinds of questions. U-210800 will apply equally to all the utilities so that disconnection practices won't vary by the happenstance of which utility serves you, and it's open to all the stakeholders and impacted people to be heard and considered.

Page 404

I also want to draw the Commission's attention in particular to Ms. Thuraisingham's testimony on this point. Ms. Thuraisingham represents Front and Centered, which is an organization devoted to communities that have historically been harmed by structural racism or excluded from decision-making processes and underserved by the benefits of the clean energy transition. Front and Centered's intervention in PSE's ratemaking case was a first for them. They overcame their hesitation about the burdens of participation because it was important for them to advocate for equitable concerns for disadvantaged communities.

And the outcome, the settlement that Front and Centered and all the other parties worked hard to negotiate and execute was a fair one. They not only got what they wanted, but it felt like there was a shared commitment to centering equity. That's why they were dismayed when PSE returned to the Commission to walk back those commitments without even engaging in any conversation with the settling parties.

Ms. Thuraisingham asks: Why would a group like Front and Centered use its scarce resources to engage and negotiate a settlement when one of the parties can just come back to the Commission and walk

Page 403

So if procedural justice means something, it means ensuring that everyone impacted has an opportunity to be heard and their interests considered. And when we're talking about turning off electricity or the heat, we should tread especially carefully.

Second, we also are troubled by the way that PSE has handled this. The parties came together and negotiated a settlement. This issue was part of that settlement. It was part of the total package of compromise that everyone made to reach a comprehensive deal. And instead of coming back to the parties, PSE has surprised everybody with this filing.

And, as Ms. Thompson lays out in her testimony, PSE implied that the Low Income Advisory Committee had worked collaboratively with the Company on their proposed return to pre-pandemic practices. They didn't. PSE mentioned in a few committee meetings that it was internally discussing options to lower arrearages, then eventually presented a fully-baked plan to the Committee that they had no part in designing and had major concerns with.

Now, even if the Company isn't obligated to seek consensus with the Committee, it has an obligation to bring issues like this before it, seek input, and at least strive for consensus.

Page 405

away from those commitments? Again, to the extent that procedural justice is important to the Commission -- and we know that it is -- it's crucial to create and protect the kind of space where groups like Front and Centered want to participate and have their efforts make a difference.

So, again, the appropriate remedy is not to ignore the concerns that PSE has raised about arrearages. We're not asking for that. It s to resolve these issues in the right forum through a full process, not in the context of amending the settlement here.

So let me just say a few words about the substance. As you've heard in testimony today, utility shutoffs and debt have long been a mostly invisible problem in the communities that we represent. The early pandemic showed how essential and life-saving utilities really are. And it also meant for the first time, we were able to collect data about the scope of the problem and who was most impacted.

The data confirms what everyone long suspected, which is that utility shutoffs and debt are not randomly distributed among Washington citizens. For the most part, they hit the hardest in communities and populations that are already overburdened with

Page 406

pollution, poverty, low life expectancy, and a host of other issues. We know now that the historic status-quo practices are inequitable and making things worse.

And, really, the only difference from the status-quo practice and what PSE has proposed is putting vulnerable communities and families towards the end of the disconnection queue. That s only delaying harm rather than grappling with it.

The past few years have taught us that our usual solutions aren't working, And just going back to the way we used to do things just shouldn't be on the table. There are -- as you have heard today, there are new programs in place to address the arrearage issues: The new bill discount rate program, the arrearage management program. These are big successes for the utility, for the state. They are designed collaboratively to lower longstanding historic barriers to bill assistance. Our representatives participate in the Low Income Advisory Committee, and it was their understanding that these programs would make a significant impact on reducing existing arrearages and making monthly bills more affordable to keep future arrearages at bay. PSE is pretty dismissive of these efforts before they've even had a chance to get meaningfully underway.

Page 408

proposals that are in front of the Commission for a decision, they are not as simple as the -- what the other parties have described them. They are not just a direct targeted outreach or increasing more one-on-one. They are -- they include things like cutting out all the estimated, known low-income, approximately half of all of the people that would be in dunning or half of the arrearages that would be addressed. That's the proposal that we have seen, cutting out half of them. And that is ineffective.

But also, the proposals include much more, such as gathering data that is frankly sensitive and personal for which PSE has no way to gather and no way to maintain. There's discussion of bringing in a third party. The parties don't know if their proposals will work. They don't know how long it would take to implement them. They don't even know how PSE will gather the data necessary to adopt them.

I heard a couple times and read in the testimony that they hope that the proposal will result in reduced arrearages, and PSE has shown that without that urgent one-on-one communication with a customer that includes the consequences of nonpayment, that those types of discussions do not -- or targeted outreach, that without that consequence information, it

Page 407

So, in sum, the other parties have put forward to you reasonable compromise proposals. I want to emphasize that's not what we are asking for. What we are asking for is a bolstered approach to PSE's residential customers with less than \$1,000 in arrearages and adherence to the settlement proposal until the other docket is resolved.

But, to the extent that the Commission feels like it needs to address this issue here, there are fair proposals that provide fair outcomes that get PSE making progress on arrearages without putting vulnerable people at excess risk.

So thank you for the opportunity to appear. We are asking you to defer this conversation to the other docket or to adopt The Energy Project's compromise proposal.

JUDGE HUGHES: Thank you. Rebuttal?

MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just a quick summary because I heard some things that I think we need to address.

First, I would like to start by underscoring that Judge -- or I'm sorry. Chair Danner was correct when he said that the Commission needs to decide on a proposal that's in front of them. And though -- the

Page 409

doesn't work. But PSE's proposal, on the other hand, does work. They know this through years of using it and even have the Covid -- the time during Covid to show that without that information, customers don't pay. And with that information, they do. And they are provided financial assistance.

Importantly, the proposals that you've heard today all significantly will raise rates. They will raise rates for all customers, including the customers that the -- that the advocates are attempting to protect.

But I want to just underscore some of the information that the data is -- that the other parties are asking us to gather. These include children's ages, rental status and, in the case of public counsel, even mental and physical health status. This is not -- this information is not necessary to provide power, to provide electrical or gas service, and PSE should not be gathering it. And in the case of public counsel, they even want us to gather information on medical fragility without even defining what medical fragility means. So it's clear that the other proposals are not thought out. They are not vetted. They are based on hope, and they will raise rates.

And PSE is only requesting what every other

	Page 410		Page 412
1	utility in this state is already doing, to resume the	1	COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: Lisa, thank you
2	dunning process and, in this case, in a phased, gradual	2	for all you have done as public counsel for all these
3	way that will protect those most vulnerable.	3	years. I look forward to you coming to UTC (Zoom audio
4	Thank you.	4	feedback).
5	JUDGE HUGHES: All right. Thank you.	5	Thank you for all you do.
6	I have a few other housekeeping items before	6	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: (Zoom audio
7	we adjourn.	7	feedback. Inaudible.)
8	So public comments.	8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And there are many
9	Ms. Gafken, how long does public counsel need	9	comments coming in as well.
10	to compile any public comments received regarding this	10	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you very much.
11	proceeding?	11	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay.
12	MS. GAFKEN: I think one week should be	12	Thank you to all the parties, witnesses, and
13	sufficient to do that. So next Thursday.	13	representatives.
14	JUDGE HUGHES: Okay.	14	We are adjourned.
15	We will designate that as a bench exhibit and	15	Thank you.
16	number it as Bench Exhibit 1, and it will be filed in	16	(The hearing adjourned at 12:22 p.m.)
17	the docket on the 25th. Yeah?	17	
18	MS. GAFKEN: Thank you.	18	
19	JUDGE HUGHES: Otherwise, the record will	19	
20	close at the end of this hearing unless the Commission	20	
21	issues any bench requests, which I believe we have a	21	
22	few forthcoming, or issues a notice that it is	22	
23	reopening the record.	23	
24	Okay. So is there anything else we need to	24	
25	address today?	25	
	Page 411		
	rage fil		Page 413
1	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I	1	Page 413 CERTIFICATE
1 2		2	CERTIFICATE
	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I	2 3	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON
2	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes?	2 3 4	CERTIFICATE
2	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use	2 3 4 5	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE
2 3 4	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing.	2 3 4 5 6	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay.	2 3 4 5	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for all of your years of service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for all of your years of service. COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: That was my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for all of your years of service. COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: That was my point of privilege.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for all of your years of service. COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: That was my point of privilege. MS. GAFKEN: Thank you, Commissioner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BARNETT: I'm sorry, Judge Hughes. I wasn't clear. Is the the ALJ is going to issue those bench requests in writing or should we just use our notes? JUDGE HUGHES: We'll be issuing those in writing. MS. BARNETT: Okay. Thank you. That would be helpful. JUDGE HUGHES: Okay. Nothing else? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just a point of privilege, but I guess I'll COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: I will defer to your point of privilege, and I also have a point of privilege. So go right ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that is to recognize public counsel Ms. Gafken. Thank you for your service in public counsel all these years, and much appreciated. And I have to say, I look forward to having you join the UTC group and stay in this important work that we do. But thank you so much for all of your years of service. COMMISSION CHAIR DANNER: That was my point of privilege.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF PIERCE I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing on January 18, 2024, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of January, 2024. /S/Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires

	achieved 398:19	381:4	280:7,11 287:9	alleged 397:15
A 279.2	399:11	addressing 317:13	341:17 379:23	Alliance 275:18
a.m 278:2	acknowledge	334:13 341:14	389:5 400:18,21	279:17
AAG 279:11	380:17 394:3,11	360:1 383:25	401:4 409:10	allocated 388:13
ability 369:10	396:21	adequately 383:3	advocating 385:3	allocation 388:14
376:10 379:10	acknowledging	adherence 407:6	386:24	allow 295:15
386:3 393:2	394:10	adjourn 410:7	affairs 299:8	296:17,25 297:2
413:10	acknowledgment	adjourned 412:14	affect 294:13	356:9 357:1
able 286:10 313:3	401:25	412:16	affirmed 400:10	376:22 379:8
335:6 341:12	acronym 315:1,2	adjudication	afford 306:7,23	382:21,23
382:24 384:1	316:10		383:4 399:19	allowed 313:6
389:9 405:19		319:20,21 372:2		
absolute 304:7	action 297:15	393:1	affordable 406:22	allowing 283:10
absolutely 316:18	343:11 357:23	adjust 385:15	affording 306:2	386:6 400:1
322:24 339:2	358:5,10,18,23	administrative	afternoon 400:19	allows 302:8 342:5
340:4 346:19	359:2 367:22	274:18 275:3,3	age 388:1	343:3,25 376:23
accept 336:12	375:1,3,11 387:6	278:19,20 390:8	agencies 280:18	399:13 400:4
338:15,24 379:22	388:10	admission 281:2,21	297:15 357:24	alterative 295:10
acceptable 358:17	actionable 326:7,13	282:1,13 294:23	358:10,18,23	alternate 357:2
accepted 303:20	394:16	364:11	359:2 388:11	359:24
accepting 393:23	actions 378:15	admit 293:14	agency 358:5	alternative 294:7
access 336:10 359:1	390:12	294:17	agents 324:8	329:21,22 369:10
383:10,16 384:21	active 330:7,16	admitted 282:5	ages 409:15	369:17 377:4
385:1 399:12,25	350:12,21	286:1	aggressive 345:7	387:19
400:9,12	actual 319:12 329:8	admitting 288:19	ago 335:17	altogether 350:1
accompli 378:4	395:2	288:23	agree 303:3 307:8	amend 278:15
accord 283:15	actuals 329:12	adopt 297:6 326:14	320:17 330:8	282:8 310:1
account 301:10	add 294:9	340:15 365:10	335:19 336:2	341:10 368:20
324:3,5 385:6	added 282:11	369:16 390:23	337:4 359:3	372:3,16 373:20
393:16	addition 286:12	400:15 407:15	373:15 401:12	385:15
accountable 402:2	350:20 391:21	408:18	agreed 281:5 320:9	amending 405:11
Accounting 274:13	additional 301:3,3	adults 388:2	381:9	amount 305:21
278:12	302:10 304:9	advance 393:8	agreement 368:18	327:5 328:19
accounts 329:24	376:24 388:5	adverse 284:22,22	372:7 373:6,14	342:6 392:25
330:17 350:13,21	390:15,17 393:6	293:20 305:13	380:9 381:19	amounts 307:14
384:12,18 393:13	address 281:25	adversely 294:13	384:9,19 386:19	326:25 328:3
393:18	324:13 330:22	adversity 303:1	392:23	329:8,9 339:14
accumulating	365:17 369:16	advisory 310:25	agrees 373:7	383:22
372:9	376:23 380:3	315:6 316:16	ahead 347:25	analysis 318:22
accumulation	383:4 384:20	322:13 348:19	359:11 361:7	319:14 323:13,18
395:24	394:18 402:20	357:9 372:24	411:14	352:13 378:17,24
accuracy 324:18	406:13 407:9,21	373:2,10 380:15	aimed 341:13	analyst 362:21
accurate 318:8	410:25	403:14 406:19	Alex 391:15	analyzed 391:13
339:18 396:24	addressed 305:22	advocate 401:7	ALJ 411:2	Ann 275:4
413:9	384:5 408:8	404:12	allegation 394:21	annual 331:15
achieve 364:1	addresses 377:17	advocates 276:7	394:24	332:4 334:10
delile ve Sur. 1				
	<u> </u>	I	I	I

			1	
337:18	300:19 302:11	338:16,18 339:15	383:17 384:18,21	375:24 376:20
answer 292:16	333:10 352:1,7	339:24 340:1	385:1 395:21	Avenue 275:9
318:12,17,19	357:25 360:15	341:14 347:10	396:1,22 406:18	276:9
319:3 320:22	366:8 392:9	349:12 360:1	409:6	average 321:14,18
326:11 330:11	397:13 402:7	365:4,13 366:21	Assistant 275:8	321:19
378:21 382:21	405:7	368:4 372:8,13,22	279:14	Avista's 385:24
answers 302:5	appropriately	373:24 374:3	associated 274:14	avoid 294:14
anticipated 372:6	313:4	376:19 379:3	300:7 305:13	aware 346:18
anxiety 307:11	approve 296:22	381:14,25 382:20	306:2 327:5 353:5	382:11
Anytime 306:7	approves 340:9,22	382:23 383:17,18	353:9	AWEC 279:18,20
apologies 338:8	approximately	383:21 384:14,22	Assuming 365:10	286:22,24 389:20
361:6,12,17	340:14 382:6	385:24,25 388:19	assumptions 332:6	389:22 390:3
app 324:10	408:6	388:20 391:22	337:15	
appear 385:24	APR-3 394:7	393:24 395:2,12	attachment 331:2,4	<u>B</u>
389:9,13 407:13	arbitrarily 398:2	397:7,10,14	331:11 332:11,17	B 274:25 331:2,4
appearance 279:9	arbitrary 392:10	403:19 405:9	333:1,3 334:3	331:12 332:11,17
280:6,13,17	398:7	406:21,23 407:6	attempt 359:5	413:16,16
308:16 389:12	area 299:9	407:11 408:8,21	attempted 293:25	back 285:4,5
appearances 275:1	argue 304:2	arrears 312:24	369:3	312:17 319:3
276:1 278:23	argues 381:23	342:11,17 383:10	attempting 392:1	327:9 328:10
appearing 279:14	384:10,13	386:9,14 394:19	409:10	331:25 333:14,14
280:21 287:14	argument 382:16	394:23 395:5,24	attempts 350:11	333:14,24 340:24
appears 284:20	384:10 389:23	aside 390:11	attendance 311:6	344:10,15 346:9
315:21 348:3	390:2	397:22	311:10	346:11,13 358:16
363:24	arguments 281:7	asked 280:19 314:4	attending 280:19	399:8 403:11
applications 345:18	289:18 354:1	318:14 322:12	attention 371:25	404:20,25 406:10
apply 402:21	371:20	334:2 366:15	404:1	backdrop 346:24
applying 347:6	arrangement	394:5 402:10	attorney 275:8,14	backing 402:13
appreciate 297:21	358:17	asking 294:18,18	279:14 362:22	bad 330:14 372:13
359:10,16 368:15	arrangements	302:3 325:6 345:3	370:24	388:12 396:22
401:22,25	345:17	358:18 365:17	Attorneys 275:8	397:7,11
appreciated 411:18	_	370:20 405:9	audio 412:3,6	balance 324:14
appreciates 389:22	316:12 324:4,14	407:3,4,14 409:14	August 282:8	330:13 345:9
appreciation	329:3,8,8,11	asks 400:14 404:22	288:21 373:5,20	359:25 367:11
389:17	330:13 339:13	aspects 281:21	authority 358:6	374:20 379:3
approach 300:25	342:7 345:9 348:4	assess 301:1	authorizes 398:17	396:7
311:24 312:13	372:5 380:2	assessing 365:19	Authorizing 274:12	balances 350:12
313:1 326:1	383:11,21 393:10	assessment 366:5	278:11	372:5,10 374:6
346:23 349:5,22	395:1,8,17 396:3	assistance 279:2	automated 342:13	376:14,21,23
351:24 372:23	396:6,10,16	289:23 313:6	available 286:10	379:15,17 381:21 386:5 387:16
373:16 376:17,24	406:13,14	316:7,13,17,19,24	291:10 297:20	394:1 395:19
379:21,22 390:23	arrearages 305:20	317:2 340:25	299:21 342:8	Barnett 276:13
407:4	307:3 327:13	342:8 345:19	347:4 354:8	277:8,9,10,19,21
appropriate 289:12	332:13,14 337:19	347:3 374:21	355:19,23 359:16	278:25 279:5,6
293:23 297:15	337:24,24 338:11	375:8,23 376:4	363:16 374:22	282:17,21 283:21
				202.17,21 203.21

				Tage +10
284:4,6,8 285:8	believes 318:21	392:22	calls 343:6 350:14	cells 338:18
285:14 286:16	383:9 397:21	breaks 281:19	350:20 374:23	center 312:25
288:25 293:17	Bellevue 276:15	333:14	cam 354:12	324:7 401:23
294:5 301:22	bench 279:2 283:17	brief 361:4	camera 298:11	Centered 280:8
302:15,17 308:14	289:24 295:4	briefly 402:3	308:8	389:5 404:4,15,23
308:24 309:8,12	298:2 304:25	bring 347:10	cap 347:4	405:5
310:9 322:8,11	341:6 347:23	368:12 386:11	capabilities 375:14	Centered's 404:8
324:20 336:14	348:1 350:25	403:24	375:16	centering 404:18
339:8,11 341:3	410:15,16,21	bringing 287:25	capacity 382:13	certain 294:20
361:9,15 371:22	411:3	289:3 408:14	captioned 278:9	295:11 318:24
407:19 411:1,7	beneficial 357:22	brings 353:23	care 365:4	356:20 376:6,13
barriers 406:17	benefits 376:18	371:18	career 389:16	379:12 387:20
base 342:10	404:7	broad 342:10	careful 301:13	391:4,12
based 332:6,13,13	best 382:8 413:9	broader 306:21	carefully 403:5	certainly 302:16
334:10 347:7	better 358:23	brought 311:3	Carol 277:8 308:7	304:3,15 307:10
365:22,23 367:18	beyond 358:20	313:17 402:4	308:20 309:2,16	357:8
367:20 370:6	391:24	build 344:7	310:9 325:4 334:4	certainty 399:22
375:21 379:13	big 406:15	Building 276:14	339:5 347:15	Certified 413:6
380:21 409:23	bigger 374:5	built 344:10 350:16	348:2 364:2	certify 413:7
basic 306:9	Bijan 274:18 275:3	368:22	369:12 374:17	Chair 275:4 277:11
basically 319:19	278:21	built-in 376:3	375:14	277:14,17 345:24
341:18 366:15	bill 297:13 307:16	burden 306:18	carry 308:11	346:15,20 347:7
basis 320:4 331:17	317:3 344:1,5,6	357:7 369:22	Cascade's 385:24	347:13 359:17
bay 406:23	357:22 358:11	370:17,24 395:23	Cascades' 378:11	360:8,20 366:14
BDR 380:1	380:1 383:11	396:2	case 278:14 282:3	368:3 369:4
becoming 388:2	395:21 396:15	burdens 305:12	285:22 293:3,7	371:23 377:11,14
397:7,10	406:14,18	371:2 404:10	294:7 304:10	390:7 407:23
beginning 278:23	billing 297:10	business 284:2	305:19 355:13	411:12,22 412:1
349:21 357:18	344:11	285:6 390:19	365:5 373:6	Chairman 401:11
360:6	bills 306:3,3,16,24		375:12,19 378:11	challenge 392:1
behalf 279:14,20,24	381:2 383:2,5	C	381:9 389:1	challenged 306:7
299:13,14 362:24	386:11 401:16	C 413:1,1	398:14 401:5	challenges 306:5,8
390:2 400:20	406:22	C-A-R-O-L 309:18	404:9 409:15,19	chance 316:1
behaving 306:15	bit 365:17 373:4	C-O-R-E-Y 362:17	410:2	366:18 367:2,7
behavior 384:3	402:5	CA 276:5	cases 278:9 306:18	406:24
behaviors 381:6	Bloomington 299:8	calculated 398:1	307:14 357:8	change 320:21
384:2,5	blue 329:9,12	calculates 337:17	categories 353:9,13	329:15 335:5
believe 282:25	body 389:9	calculation 337:25	356:23 379:12,13	336:6 337:1,8
287:17 330:2	bolstered 407:4	398:8	category 353:15,17	345:2 363:4,12
333:5,21 348:11	bottom 315:16	calculations 329:23	cause 380:18	393:15,21 394:3
356:24 357:22	331:14 332:3	330:9,15 332:7	caused 383:19	394:10,12
360:22 361:22	350:19	334:6 338:25	causing 383:22	changed 336:17
366:24 368:21	Box 275:15	396:20	CEIP 387:24	339:23 345:13
382:21 410:21	break 281:9,10	call 312:25 324:7	cell 335:1,2,11	346:4 394:2
believed 373:16	285:9 333:9,10,16	324:10 343:18	337:1,8	changes 299:15
		called 294:6 299:11		
	<u> </u>	1	1	ı

				1 age +17
355:15 363:2	clear 360:17 386:23	collaborate 316:5	346:20 347:7,13	347:15,19,22
382:1 402:8	388:16 409:22	collaboration	356:7,9,16 357:14	348:2,13,16,21
channel 402:5	411:2	310:25	358:2,25 359:7,17	349:6,10,23 350:3
chapter 389:16,17	clearly 302:25	collaborations	360:8,20 361:10	350:7,17,24
characteristics	379:1 398:16	317:7	361:14 365:5,15	351:10,12,16,19
318:24	Cleve 275:20	collaborative 317:6	366:14 367:6,19	351:10,12,10,17
charge 375:18	cleve 273.20 client 357:14	collaboratively	367:22 368:3	351.21 352.9,14
Charlie 341:16	close 283:12 315:7	403:15 406:17	369:4,16,25 370:4	352:18 353:3,12
chat 281:18	410:20	colleague 298:7	371:7,8 372:16	355:21 356:5,13
check 336:12,13,17	closed 324:5 350:13	colleagues 352:20	377:17,19,25	357:16,21 358:22
338:15,22,24	350:21	collect 375:7	377.17,19,23	359:9,14 363:17
children 387:25		405:19		363:22 364:5,21
391:8	closely 370:10 389:2		379:1,15,17,25	
		collected 359:6,7	380:11 381:18,19	365:2,9,12 366:10
children's 409:14	closing 277:18	collecting 350:14	382:11,12,15	369:6,8 370:13
choices 382:15 choose 401:15	281:7 289:18 353:25 354:9	collection 314:2	385:21 386:7,18	371:12,24,24
		372:19 373:8	386:19,24,25	411:10,15,24
chose 385:18	389:23 390:2 392:19	380:10 381:10,13 collections 278:17	387:12,13 389:1,2	412:6,8
chosen 307:16 circular 359:4	Club 280:7 389:6		389:6 390:1,21,23	commissioners
		color 391:7	392:11,15 395:8	278:21 285:22
circulated 282:6	CLW 315:24	come 288:5 404:25	397:11 398:12,17	361:21 377:12
circumstances	CLW-13T 309:21	comes 289:15	399:13,20 400:1,3	390:8 400:20
306:16 307:4	325:9	comfortable 358:9	400:9,14 401:2	commitment
360:16,18 384:4	CLW-26 348:3	comfortably 369:1	404:19,25 405:2	317:13 381:8,17
citation 294:3	CLW-30X 338:4	coming 369:20	407:8,24 408:1	382:1 385:22
citizens 405:23	CLW-31 326:20	403:11 412:3,9	410:20 411:12,22	404:18
CJD-10 317:23	CLW-31TR 349:8	command 324:18	412:1 413:18	commitments
CJD-1T 363:5,19	CLW-33 311:17	commenced 382:6	Commission's	402:2 404:20
CJD-4 350:8	313:9 315:15	commensurate	293:22 294:6	405:1
CJD-5 351:2	373:4 378:2	392:21	394:14 401:23	committed 370:9
claims 384:8	CLW-35 330:2	comments 284:11	404:1	committee 315:7
clarification 297:22	CLW-36 333:1	410:8,10 412:9	Commissioner	322:13,18,22
370:16	334:4 338:17	commercial 334:23	275:4,5 277:4,7	348:19 357:9
clarified 394:7	CLW-38 309:22	335:8,15 397:22	277:11,12,14,16	372:24 373:2
clarify 323:12	CLW-39X 282:23	commission 274:2	277:17 279:3	403:15,17,20,23
334:25	285:5 288:23	274:4,20 275:2,4	285:21 287:15,24	406:19
clarifying 288:14	317:16 319:4	275:12 277:11,14	288:13 295:5,8,21	Committees 373:10
302:3	378:20	277:17 278:13,19	295:25 296:4,7,11	communicate
class 387:16 399:1	CLW-41X 287:5	283:11,20 294:1,2	296:19 297:4,11	383:15 384:8,11
399:5	288:22	294:10 295:14,15	297:21,24 305:4,6	384:13,17 385:10
classes 360:13	CLW-42X 287:17	296:14,21 297:6	305:9,18 307:6,24	385:18
388:13 398:19,20	288:18,22	297:16 319:6	333:2 341:7,25	communicated
398:22,23	co-presiding	320:9,17 326:7,13	342:15,21,24	322:17 383:12
clauses 360:14	278:20	331:6 338:25	343:12,16 344:15	communicating
CLC-39X 323:6	Coalition 280:13	340:9,15,22	344:20,25 345:6	383:9 386:8
clean 404:7	Coie 276:14 279:7	345:24 346:9,15	345:21 346:23	communication

				T ago +10
342:14 343:4	completeness 283:5	391:3 408:23	contradict 293:24	cost 399:9,10,14,19
346:8 363:23	complex 368:16	consequential	323:8 359:21	399:24
367:9 384:6 385:2	comprehensive	402:9	360:11	cost-of-service
385:3,4,5,5,7,20	383:11 403:10	consider 301:5	contradicted 394:9	398:20,21
386:12 408:22	compromise 403:10	378:14,21 379:18	contradicted 394.9	costs 274:14 376:24
communications	407:2,16	consideration	contrary 337.13	397:13
375:2,11 384:24		293:12 349:25	336:1	counsel 275:6,9
communities	computer 324:9 concern 379:2	considerations	conversation	279:12,15 283:2
	382:20		404:21 407:14	*
321:25 322:1		343:24 368:5,7		286:18,19 287:18
323:16 353:6	concerning 302:4	considered 294:16	conversations	287:22 288:16,17
387:25 391:9	393:25 394:1,12	402:25 403:3	323:2	298:10 299:14
392:18 401:8,17	394:13,19	consistently 294:1	conveyed 354:7	302:20 315:17
404:5,13 405:16	concerns 317:13	consists 389:5	cope 307:1	316:21 351:3
405:24 406:6	369:20 373:17	consolidated 274:6	copies 285:10,22	362:23,25 370:9
community 297:15	379:5,13 403:21	278:9 282:3	287:23	379:24 380:7,19
356:23 357:23	404:12 405:8	constitute 309:24	coping 381:6	382:19,20 383:8
358:5,9,18,23	concludes 287:13	323:18 372:5	copy 283:23 285:7	385:2 386:12,23
359:1 388:10	380:11	consulting 299:11	285:8,12,20	388:18 389:3,10
391:17	conclusion 373:8	299:12	310:18 318:8	409:15,19 410:9
companies 378:14	381:11	Consumers 275:18	347:20,21	411:16,17 412:2
company 274:8	conditions 387:24	279:17	Corey 277:15 362:1	counsel's 350:9
278:24 282:16	conduct 364:19,19	contact 341:19,22	362:17 363:19	351:2 364:22
283:19 285:6	368:22 381:20	388:9	386:13 388:22	386:17
286:15 287:20	387:14	contacting 321:11	corners 302:6	COUNTY 413:4
357:6,7,9,12	conducted 364:12	contain 388:23	correct 308:15	couple 341:14
360:5 363:24	364:17 368:22	contest 360:17	311:1,4,7,15,16	355:23 408:19
364:11,16 365:21	373:9 381:11	contests 391:5	312:10,14,19	course 282:1 369:8
366:18,19 367:7	conducting 351:6	context 304:2 314:1	313:18 314:16,17	396:20
367:23 368:19,21	confirm 336:11	330:20 339:17	315:8,9,12,20	court 302:9 308:22
369:3,21 370:3	348:11	381:7 402:13	316:2,16 317:14	309:15 315:2
371:21 382:22	confirms 405:21	405:11	317:15 318:12,15	413:6
384:25 385:14,21	conflict 302:18	context-specific	318:16,17,18,25	courtesy 285:12
403:15,22	373:14,15	303:24 304:14	319:7,8,22,23	cover 388:21,24
company's 278:16	connect 375:7	306:13	320:10,18,22	covered 340:25
285:1 287:20	connected 367:12	contingencies	321:4,6,7,9	Covid 296:20 349:2
compare 300:20	399:16	368:11	327:23 328:6,8	409:3,3
compared 318:24	connection 394:19	continue 294:2	330:19 332:18,19	cracks 376:2,8
386:2	consensus 317:4	373:7 376:15	332:23 344:24	crafted 392:21
comparisons	403:23,25	381:9 388:12	359:2 364:25	create 305:22
301:13	consequence 344:1	401:20	365:1 377:21	383:22 385:16
compelling 286:2	344:2,3,6,18	continued 276:1	397:21 407:23	405:3
compile 410:10	345:7 364:6,25	346:6	corrections 291:6	created 344:12
Complainant 274:5	365:14 408:25	continues 381:15	310:6 355:1,15	375:20
complete 382:3,18	consequences	383:17	362:8	creation 377:25
394:16	378:14 390:20	continuing 332:3	correlation 395:10	credit 278:16 373:7
371.10	370.11370.20	332.3	2011 2111 373.10	270.10 373.7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	20645 20046		200 7 404 44	
criteria 356:25	296:17 309:16	381:1,2,4,14,21	390:7 401:11	decimal 335:10,18
critical 306:24	316:7 321:11	382:22,25 383:1,4	407:23 411:12,22	335:19 336:3,8
cross 283:14 284:20	324:2,6,12 330:16	383:10,12,15,22	412:1	337:3,9 397:20
284:24 285:23,25	341:13 342:10	384:9,11,13,17,20	data 283:2 284:16	decision 366:16,23
287:16 288:1,10	343:4,25 346:9	384:25 385:10	292:6 293:11,19	367:3,6,6,22
288:12,21 291:10	356:9,24 358:1,25	386:9,11,13,20	297:3 318:6 323:5	368:9,15 379:16
291:12,20 293:1,6	359:22 360:11	387:5,9,15,22,23	334:10 348:5,14	389:1 400:25
293:18,23,25	374:18,19,21,23	387:23 388:4,6,8	350:9,14 351:3	408:2
294:10,19 298:20	375:1,4,5,6,7,10	388:10,19 389:10	352:24 360:4	decision-making
299:23 301:22	375:11,12,21,22	390:15,17 391:8	365:24 367:18	320:3 404:6
302:2 310:12	375:25 376:1	391:11,13,22	369:13 380:21,23	decisions 367:20,25
324:23 338:3	377:3 385:5,6	393:11,22,22	380:24 393:10	368:2 369:24
354:25 362:7	388:13 393:13,16	394:1,9,13 395:15	395:18,20 405:19	401:9,13
cross-exam 282:18	394:23 396:5	395:17,19,24	405:21 408:12,18	declared 357:14
282:22 283:3,6	398:19,20,22,23	396:10,14,21	409:13	decrease 345:17,19
284:15 323:4,6	399:1,5 408:22	397:4,12,25 398:5	date 274:24 311:8	396:2
cross-examination	customer's 344:4	399:9,10,14,15,16	347:22 348:7,14	deem 286:1
277:4,6,9,10	customers 295:12	399:18,20,23,23	348:14	deep 389:9,11
281:4 291:15	301:17,19 303:13	399:24 400:2,5,13	dates 322:13 325:7	deepest 323:15
294:12 299:21	303:15 305:20,23	402:12 407:5	325:24 326:3	353:14,16 387:23
300:1 302:8	307:8 312:10,12	409:4,9,9	346:6 393:4,5	defer 407:14
310:10,15 325:2	312:18,22,24	customers' 395:23	David 275:4 277:5	411:12
351:22 371:19	313:2,5,5,14	400:2	298:9,14,24 299:3	Deferred 274:13
397:19	315:11,19 318:22	cut 384:15	299:20 380:20	278:12
cross-examinations	319:15,16 321:3,8	cutting 408:5,9	388:22	define 300:17
353:24 354:10	323:16 326:3,24	cycle 297:10	Davison 275:20	defined 387:24
cross-exhibits	327:2,6 330:7,8		day 321:4,10,16	defining 409:21
282:9 283:13	330:12,18 332:15	D	378:19 413:12	definitely 284:20
cross-subsidization	335:15 336:19	D-A-H-L 362:18	days 284:3 285:6	368:14
398:11,11,16,18	337:3,10 338:12	d/b/a 274:7	DBarnett@perki	definition 302:12
398:25 399:4,11	338:20,21 340:15	Dahl 277:15 354:6	276:16	302:14,25 303:20
400:5	341:20,22 342:4	361:22,23 362:1	deal 312:18 381:16	393:17 398:14
crucial 405:3	342:10,17 343:1	362:17,18 363:16	403:11	delaying 406:7
crunched 288:6	343:10 344:22	363:19 369:9	dealing 313:13	demographic 300:6
CSR 274:25 413:16	345:14 346:12,14	385:12 386:13	343:17 371:6	300:14,19,20,22
current 332:13	347:3,6 349:17,19	387:5 388:22	397:9	301:17,19 303:13
341:22 344:8	349:24 350:12	Dahl's 350:4 351:1	debt 330:14 341:1	303:15 391:12
367:1 386:11	351:7,7 353:5,8	387:12	372:13 388:12	392:7
388:14 389:13	360:2 363:23,25	daily 320:4	396:22 397:7,11	demonstrate
393:17	364:12 367:9,12	Danner 275:4	405:15,22	303:25 356:19
currently 297:12	367:16 369:12,14	277:11,14,17	decide 302:7	demonstrated
297:13 339:25	372:9,11,20,21,21	345:24 346:15,20	407:24	394:25 396:19
342:12 373:9	374:5,6 376:4,12	347:7,13 359:17	decided 312:2,9	397:19
381:11 395:7	376:19,22 379:9	360:8,20 366:14	399:8	demonstrates
customer 295:15	379:11,11 380:13	368:3 369:4	decides 386:18,25	380:11 395:3,10
	517.11,11 500.15	371:23 377:11,14	4001405 500.10,25	300.11 373.3,10
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

		1	1	<u> </u>
demonstrating	differed 311:25	disconnect 323:25	401:6,19	dispute 294:7
305:19	difference 301:20	331:17 332:14	disconnects 314:2	302:12 391:18
deny 294:17 386:7	302:22 303:16	343:7 344:2	349:2	disputes 374:3
depend 319:5 320:9	380:25 405:6	374:13,25 375:2	discount 297:14	disputing 307:19
320:16	406:4	379:11 382:22	317:3 357:23	distinguishes
dependent 321:11	differences 301:5,8	384:12 393:18	358:11 377:19	342:19
depending 324:16	301:10 304:4	disconnected 321:3	380:1 396:15	distribute 287:23
402:17	339:13	323:20,21 324:2,4	406:14	distributed 399:2
depends 319:11	different 300:13	358:7,7 367:17	discovery 283:12	405:23
deposit 324:13	301:2 307:1,5,23	375:12,22,25	284:10 287:18	Division 275:14
describe 310:24	307:23 316:6,6	381:3,5 397:5	288:2 394:5,6	389:14
332:10	330:22 339:15	disconnecting	discretion 302:9,11	DK-1T 300:10
described 349:13	368:6 380:23	345:13 346:3	discuss 300:6,12	305:10
383:7 384:2	398:4 402:16,17	381:13	313:15 314:6	DMK 299:11
385:12 386:12	differentiate	disconnection	332:17 392:20	docket 274:10
387:11 408:3	350:10,13	295:16 296:18,21	discussed 312:1	294:8 299:17
describes 391:1	differently 365:8	296:22 342:18	314:1 323:5	373:9 374:1
397:18	difficult 305:14	343:5 344:18,23	337:13 352:12	381:12,24 402:7
describing 315:18	368:2	346:17 347:9	372:23 373:4	402:19 407:7,15
386:16	digit 335:19	356:10 357:2,3	402:19	410:17
deserves 283:15	digits 335:10,18	364:1,7,13,20,25	discussing 285:5	dockets 274:5
designate 410:15	336:3,7 337:3,9	365:14 367:16	314:5 334:6 352:6	278:7 282:3
designed 326:12	direct 277:3,6,8,13	368:23 372:17	380:16 403:18	document 318:3
396:2 406:16	277:16 290:21	375:18,21 383:6	discussion 408:14	331:5 342:11
designing 403:21	294:14 298:22	383:13,16 384:7	discussions 312:17	368:19
desire 387:7	302:10 309:11	385:17 386:2,10	408:24	documenta- 358:15
despite 380:18	325:8 327:9,12	386:15,21 387:5	dismay 378:6	documentation
386:1	328:20,24 329:4	387:10,18 390:24	dismayed 404:19	358:15
detail 377:7 388:23	341:19,22 342:5	391:2,12 392:7	dismissive 406:23	documents 278:13
detailed 311:21	355:3 362:11	393:12,14 395:7	disparate 300:17	doing 282:18
313:23 314:8,12	364:12 384:20	395:11,13,16	300:18 301:1	289:17 314:2
315:7 373:3	394:4 408:4	400:4 402:9,11,22	302:12,14,20	319:13 320:4
details 388:25	direction 310:4	406:7	303:20,23,25	322:18 345:3,6
determine 296:16	directly 285:13	disconnections	304:4,15 390:20	365:19 384:1
357:25 394:5	302:3 363:23	300:7,13 304:3,9	disparities 300:12	410:1
determined 312:13	401:9	306:23 311:25	displacement	dollar 394:22
319:17 352:7	director 309:16	314:5,6 345:16	303:22	395:11
determines 398:12	disadvantaged	365:25 366:17	disproportional	Donna 276:13
determining	404:12	367:24 374:13	367:17	279:6
337:18	disagree 361:15	380:18 383:19	disproportionate	door 343:8 375:5
develop 337:15	disagreement	386:4 387:18	301:16 303:12	Double 361:12
developed 359:5	302:19	388:15,17 390:11	319:18 391:2,11	double-check
360:3 372:18	disagrees 392:8	390:14,18 391:14	392:4,9,13,16,17	340:18
devoted 404:4	disallow 341:19	393:6 394:8,20,22	disproportionately	Doumit 275:5
differ 307:22	disappears 379:20	396:13 398:10	304:13 401:18	277:11,16,17
L				

				raye 421
341:7,25 342:15	dwell 399:21	362:19,21	enters 374:18	established 357:5
342:21,24 343:12	u wen 377.41	encourage 283:18	enters 3/4.18 enthusiastically	establishes 391:6
343:16 344:15,20		389:1	389:15	estimate 332:4
344:25 345:6,21	E 413:1,1	ended 372:17	entire 300:22	353:10,11 397:17
346:23 363:17,22	E7 338:18		301:19 303:15	397:24
	earlier 349:2,4	energy 274:11,13		
364:5,21 365:2,9	385:13 387:6	275:18 276:2,12	381:1	estimated 312:11
365:12 366:10	early 357:4 405:17	278:10,11 279:7	enumerated 388:5	313:5 321:22
369:7,8 370:13	earnest 382:7	279:17,22,24	environment	323:15 325:12
371:12,24 377:12	Earthjustice 276:9	280:14 284:14,16	341:23	326:6 329:20
390:8 412:6	280:10	286:7 287:1,2	environmental	331:20 332:18
DR 318:8,12,14		289:5,14 291:12	276:7 280:7,11	337:2,10,14 340:8
320:6,13,19	easily 384:1	299:9 305:11,12	287:9 299:7,10	340:14,21 346:13
draw 404:1	East 280:13	305:24 306:3,3,8	341:17 379:23	349:20 372:20
drive 275:15	eat 305:15	306:24 307:16	389:4 400:18,21	387:22 391:16
369:19	echo 284:11	309:17 315:5,17	401:4	408:6
dropped 281:17	educate 374:20	316:9 320:1 340:9	envisioning 297:5	estimates 396:24
due 327:5 328:3	effect 306:20	340:15 345:11,18	equal 330:17	397:2,2,3
339:14 345:15	effective 384:6	351:22 356:6	equally 402:21	evaluate 393:2
duly 290:14 298:15	390:25	370:6 383:1,5	equitable 317:13	event 386:25
309:3 354:20	effects 301:11	389:4 390:6	378:21 379:4,13	eventually 403:19
362:2	efficiently 383:3	395:23 396:1,2,21	385:16 400:12	Evergreen 275:15
dunning 312:23	efforts 401:23	400:14 404:8	404:12	everybody 333:9
313:3 315:12,20	405:5 406:24	407:15	equitably 383:3	402:2 403:12
318:23 322:15,23	either 283:22	energy-burdened	equity 318:15,21	eviction 360:14
323:17 341:12	286:15 296:15	391:17	318:24 319:5,14	evidence 282:5
342:4,5,14,16	324:7 366:16	engage 374:18	319:21,24,25	285:3 288:18
343:2,3,10,19,25	368:11 401:20	381:6 384:4	320:1,2,7,14,15	289:15 293:15
344:16,23 345:14	elaborate 323:20	404:24	320:15 323:13,18	294:14 295:13
346:12 348:24	356:15	engagement 376:10	367:21,23 368:5,7	296:14,17 302:8
349:1,3,12,14,17	elapsed 368:21	380:14	378:11,17,24	356:7 364:14
349:18 350:1	electric 323:24	engaging 404:20	387:6 398:15	365:20 400:24
352:3,5,15 363:24	331:20 332:5	enhanced 396:1	401:23 404:18	evidentiary 274:16
365:14 368:24	334:24 335:9,24	enrolled 396:11	Erik 276:8	278:7 413:8
369:11 373:1,11	336:7,18 337:2	enrolls 396:5	error 360:4	evolved 317:2
373:13 374:8,12	338:20 397:23	ensure 286:7 297:6	especially 360:17	exact 293:21 342:6
374:14,16,18	398:6 399:12	297:7 378:15	403:5	exactly 286:10
376:3,5,7,12,13	electrical 409:18	379:3	essential 306:4	307:3 312:13,20
376:18,22 377:1,2	electricity 403:4	ensuring 403:2	384:16 405:17	346:5 356:14
378:19 381:22	electrification	enter 295:16 356:9	essentially 296:22	357:10 394:5
385:11,18,20	399:7	363:24 374:14	296:24 313:6	examination 277:1
387:8 393:13,15	electronically	376:22	357:24 364:6	277:2,3,6,8,9,10
393:20,22,23	283:22	entered 286:20	375:20 384:10	277:13,16 289:19
402:11 408:7	eliminate 374:19	338:16 373:5	essentials 307:18	290:21 298:22
410:2	email 285:12	entering 312:23	383:23	302:10 309:11
dunning-like 344:7	emphasize 407:3	315:12,19	establish 386:19	322:10 339:10
dummig-like 544./	employed 299:5	313.14,17	Cotaviion 300.13	344.10 337.10

	I	I	I	I
355:3 362:11	282:1,14,18,19	F 413:1	368:10 370:11	382:2 391:2 394:6
examine 390:12	287:16 288:2,7,20	F15 338:19	385:19	394:25 402:7
examined 289:9	288:21 291:3	faced 368:1	file 283:24 323:10	404:9 405:18
examining 300:18	299:16 302:6	facility 274:14	323:11 325:14	407:22
example 341:16	309:24,25 310:3,7	342:12	380:3 389:24	fit 356:20
356:22 358:10	350:4 352:23	facing 306:22	filed 282:8,10	five 333:11,13
398:21 399:1	363:3,13 389:3	fact 293:21 374:13	288:21 299:16	five-minute 333:14
exception 282:18	exist 307:15	379:18	320:20 326:12	flexible 356:18
exceptions 288:22	existing 344:10	factors 368:16	331:5 368:20	357:11 358:4
excess 407:12	373:7 381:10,12	379:15,17	373:20 382:5	flippant 343:13
exclude 294:10	388:19 406:21	facts 378:25	410:16	focus 398:25
excluded 372:20	exists 300:19	failing 396:24	filing 278:14	focused 349:24
376:7 398:5 404:6	301:16 303:12	failure 382:25	283:20 285:6	focusing 304:6
excluding 338:11	376:25 392:14	383:14,14 394:11	317:14 385:14	folks 313:1 363:7
376:13	396:4	fair 317:8 328:22	403:12	follow 336:3 359:18
excuse 333:2	exit 357:4	366:10 374:8	final 278:15 282:8	366:13
356:22 359:12	expand 278:16	404:16 407:10,10	310:1 314:15	follow-up 352:21
excused 280:19	341:13	fairly 357:11	372:4,16 373:20	following 278:15
298:6 308:5	expect 357:12	fait 378:3	374:25	281:4 295:8
353:22 361:18	expectancy 406:1	faith 373:17 394:5	finally 393:25	373:12 375:10
371:16	expectations	fall 295:14 356:8	396:1 398:1	393:5
execute 404:16	394:15	376:1,8 379:11	financial 305:11	follows 290:15
executive 280:18	expected 392:20	381:1 383:2	306:18 368:2	298:16 309:4
exercise 302:9,11	expensive 351:20	familiar 295:17	375:8,23 376:4	354:21 362:3
exhibit 282:7,22	experience 345:11	371:7	393:24 409:6	food 306:10
283:1,1,3,6,10,14	346:22 347:8	families 391:7	find 301:15 303:11	footnote 331:14
284:15 285:3,4	371:6 381:5	401:14 406:6	323:1 343:9	332:17,20
286:1,8,14 287:4	experiences 307:22	far 386:16	392:13,16	force 305:14
287:21 288:12	experiencing	fast 382:7	finding 306:8	forecast 395:1,9
291:20,22 292:4	307:22	fear 375:21	391:19 392:2	forefront 379:5
293:1,6,15 294:23	expert 371:1	federal 280:18	finds 379:25 394:11	forego 383:23
295:9,21 300:10	expires 413:18	326:25 349:21	fine 286:16 322:5	foregoing 289:16
309:21 311:17	explain 323:20	363:9,11	finished 359:13	413:8
313:9 315:15	339:14 375:8	fee 324:11	firm 299:11	forgiven 396:8
317:16,23,23	402:3	feedback 316:1	first 281:2 282:16	form 372:13
319:4 323:4,6	explained 314:24	317:7 378:7 412:4	289:20 290:14	format 286:10
325:9 330:1,2	375:14	412:7	298:15 302:1	formatting 336:6
333:1,4 334:4	explaining 372:14	feel 341:21 347:10	303:19 308:23	336:18 337:1,8
338:3,10 340:7	explains 319:4	feels 407:8	309:3 311:3	formed 316:8 320:1
348:3,22,23 351:2	express 389:8	fees 375:19	312:12 315:11,13	forth 346:9
353:4 363:5	expressed 378:6	felt 323:17 404:17	315:18 324:3	forthcoming
364:23 373:4	379:1	field 312:25 372:18	334:7,9 337:18,25	410:22
378:2,20 394:7	extent 405:1 407:8	375:4	341:23 345:13	forum 405:10
410:15,16	extremely 382:7	Fifth 275:9	354:20 355:9	forward 283:18
exhibits 281:3,22		figure 329:7,10	362:2 377:23	288:21 332:14

			ı	
373:18 389:16	406:22	308:13 312:17	gradually 376:23	408:9
396:4 407:1		323:17 331:25	granted 280:20	hand 285:16
411:18 412:3	G	340:24 343:7	378:16	290:10 298:12
found 293:1 302:5	Gafken 275:7	344:23 347:25	grappling 406:8	308:25 354:16
378:2 391:14,21	277:6,16,20	354:13 359:11	gratitude 389:9	361:24 376:6
391:24 394:7	279:13,13 286:19	361:7 368:4 377:5	GRC 368:18,19	409:1 413:11
foundation 289:10	287:24 298:23	384:17 411:14	great 290:9 295:20	handle 289:7,8
four 284:2 285:6	299:20 304:23	goal 344:3 383:3	296:7 389:17	312:25 313:1
302:5 375:13	362:9,12 363:15	399:12	greater 305:21	344:8 346:16
fourth 396:12,17	380:8 410:9,12,18	goes 288:4 324:5	ground 304:8	376:21 382:16
396:18	411:16,24 412:10	351:25 352:10	group 295:15	handled 403:7
fraction 374:14	gas 331:21,21	going 284:10,18,19	300:19,21,22	hanger 375:5
fragile 391:9	332:5 335:14,25	285:4 289:13,17	301:17,19 303:13	Hannah 314:3
fragility 388:3	337:10 338:21	294:16 302:2	303:15 310:25	happen 314:9
409:21,21	397:23 398:7	307:4 312:9	356:9,20 377:25	324:3 370:12
Francisco 276:5	409:18	313:15 314:9	380:15 381:1,2	happens 323:22
frankly 288:5	gather 408:13,18	319:3 322:17	404:22 411:19	342:14 365:2
381:16 384:16	409:14,20	324:14 325:6	groups 300:14	374:16 379:24
408:12	gathered 367:19	326:4,10,17 329:2	301:2 319:15,17	happenstance
friendly 284:20,23	gathering 344:13	329:15 330:13,22	360:18 369:11	402:23
293:18,23,25	408:12 409:19	330:24,25 331:25	387:20,21 388:4	Harbor 275:20
294:10,11 301:22	geared 387:4	333:15 335:5	391:4,12 392:8	hard 283:23 285:7
302:1,7	general 275:8,14	337:14 340:5	405:4	285:8,12 306:5
front 280:8 334:20	278:14 279:14	347:9 353:25	grow 305:21 374:4	307:20 326:3
350:5 389:5 404:3	282:2,2 292:17	358:20 359:20	376:15 383:21,21	370:10 404:15
404:8,14,23 405:4	300:24 318:25	361:17 366:20	growing 372:5,8	harder 307:7,8
407:25 408:1	362:22 373:6	368:4 371:21	374:3 379:2	hardest 405:24
full 288:8 387:19	378:11	374:1 379:6	382:20	hardship 306:2
396:9,17 399:19	General's 275:8	406:10 411:2	grown 373:25	harm 300:21
405:10	generally 316:20,25	good 278:6,25	grows 307:7	301:18 303:14
fully 315:7 372:6	generation 395:21	279:6,10,13,19,23	growth 388:20	372:6,11 380:17
387:11 402:15	399:3	280:9 288:9	guarantee 377:21	383:19 387:21
fully-baked 403:19	generic 342:9	290:23 291:18,19	guess 288:9 289:8	400:6 406:8
fumbling 308:15	384:24 385:4,7	295:5,7 298:18,24	292:25 307:13	harmed 404:5
functions 369:24	genuinely 389:15	299:3 300:4,5	312:8 319:9	harmful 365:24
further 294:24	getting 344:15	305:7,8 309:6	323:10 327:4	380:13
298:1 304:21	346:7 359:19	310:17 325:4,5	334:24 339:18	Hasselman 276:8
308:1 339:6	376:5	355:5,22 362:13	345:4 365:16	277:21 280:9,10
345:22 353:19,21	give 290:5 291:23	370:8 371:10,23	368:18 370:2	287:10 400:19,20
370:14 371:12	295:18,19,23	373:17 377:11,21	411:11	Hawkins-Jones
388:11 395:23	315:25 363:7	390:7 394:4	guidance 378:10	277:3 289:21
397:12	given 297:11	400:19		290:13 291:1,9,18
furtherance 400:8	301:11 378:25	Gotcha 331:8	H	295:4,6 352:22
400:11	382:13	gradual 372:18	H-A-W-K-I-N-S	357:18 379:8
future 366:3,4	giving 358:15,16	374:7 410:2	291:2	Hawkins-Jones'
,	go 296:17 297:2,7		half 333:7 408:6,7	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

352:23	highly 322:1	279:1,8,12,16,21	I	331:15,20 332:4
Hayes 276:4	323:15 353:6	280:1,5,12,16,24	ideas 370:8	332:18,22 334:6
head 322:4 340:11	356:22 387:25	281:24 282:20	identification	334:10,24 335:9
340:13	391:17,18	283:7,16 284:1,5	309:21	335:14,24 337:14
health 305:14	hindered 393:1	284:7,25 285:11	identified 287:4	337:15 338:19
409:16	historic 401:21	285:16,24 286:5	288:2,11 327:13	340:5 365:25
hear 279:5 282:13	406:2,17	286:13,17,21,25	identifies 326:23	367:17 368:5
286:2 289:10,10	historically 401:8	287:6,12 288:15	353:5	372:9 374:11
308:13 316:22	401:18 404:5	289:3,12 290:4,9	identify 318:5	377:1,2,6 378:22
364:2 368:7	history 399:4	290:17 291:11	327:16,25 353:8	391:2 392:4 397:6
heard 323:7 357:17	hit 343:4 405:24	293:16 294:3,15	376:11	397:10,15,21
366:17 370:6	hold 314:25 402:2	295:1,3 297:25	ignore 405:8	398:5 401:14
374:17 379:7	Holding 341:11	298:1,4 371:25	illustrate 326:4	402:10
400:24 402:15,24	holds 324:3	377:13	384:3	implement 316:9
403:3 405:14	hollow 384:10	huge 345:9	illustrative 325:25	366:16 396:25
406:12 407:20	home 316:9 369:19	Hughes 274:18	326:9	408:17
408:19 409:7	375:5,6	275:3 278:21	imagination 380:12	implemented 317:3
hearing 274:16	homeless 388:2	298:8,18 299:22	immediately 386:8	370:3
278:7 280:6,17,25	homelessness	301:25 302:16,21	impact 300:17,18	implementing
281:1,13,25 282:6	401:15	303:2,8 304:22,24	301:1,16 303:12	316:12 322:22
289:22 298:7	homeowners 399:3	305:2,5 308:3,23	303:21,23 304:1,4	implied 403:14
308:6 315:19	honor 286:4 287:15	308:25 309:6	304:7,15,17 316:6	important 304:5,5
353:22 357:18	288:25 291:17	310:11 314:25	319:18 329:20	304:17 306:13
379:2 393:9 398:3	293:14 294:24	316:21 317:17,20	330:9,18,23 332:9	308:18 344:4
410:20 412:16	304:21 322:8	322:7 324:22	334:14,18,24	372:1 376:16
413:8	324:25 333:3,8,25	333:5,11,21 339:7	335:25 336:7,8,18	380:25 381:7
heat 305:15 403:5	336:14 341:7	341:5 347:25	337:2,10,18	388:25 399:7
held 369:23	354:2 355:19	353:20 354:3,9,15	349:25 365:13	402:1 404:11
Hello 354:14	360:25 361:9,20	354:23 360:22	377:5 381:5 383:6	405:2 411:20
help 313:8 316:10	363:18 389:11,21	361:1,5,12,16,22	391:7,10 392:9,13	importantly 312:8
375:25 376:4,5,12	407:19	362:5 370:15,21	392:16,17 393:24	409:7
384:14	hope 382:4 408:20	370:22 371:1,4,10	396:9,9,19,23	impossible 328:23
helpful 411:8	409:24	371:14,25 377:9	397:1,12,17 398:2	improve 383:10,16
helps 317:22	hopefully 367:11	377:12 380:6	401:9 406:21	in-person 276:18
hereunto 413:11	host 406:1	389:19 390:5	impacted 319:16	inability 378:7
hesitation 404:10	hours 375:13,16	400:17 407:17	322:1 323:15	inactive 329:24
Hi 354:15 355:6	household 295:14	410:5,14,19 411:1	353:6 356:22	330:7,8,12,16,17
high 305:11 349:25	306:9 356:8 396:3	411:5,9 412:11	367:24,25 387:25	338:12 393:12,16
353:13 401:12,12	households 305:14	human 376:11	391:17 401:18	393:22 397:4,25
higher 329:11	307:5,23 387:24	hundred 399:6	402:15,24 403:2	398:4
356:21 374:4	387:25 388:1,3	400:1	405:20	inappropriate
385:24 395:1	housekeeping	hundreds 304:12	impacts 302:13,14	284:21
highest 395:4	410:6	hyphen 291:2	302:20 318:15	inappropriately
highlight 307:13	Howard 274:18	hypothetical 365:3	319:5,21 320:8,14	397:4,24
highlighted 401:11	275:3 278:5,18	365:17	320:15 329:16	Inaudible 412:7
	ı	Į	ı	ı

	İ	İ	I	İ
incidence 300:13	Indiana 299:8	insecurity 305:13	405:10 406:2,13	284:7,25 285:11
include 289:1	indicate 362:7	305:24	410:21,22	285:16,24 286:5
292:20,22 302:13	indicated 299:23	install 399:4	issuing 411:5	286:13,17,21,25
327:12 329:23	310:12 385:9	instances 356:19	items 410:6	287:6,12 288:15
337:24 394:16	387:6	382:3	IVR 324:8	289:3,12 290:4,9
408:5,11 409:14	indicates 295:9	integrated 324:8		290:17 291:11
included 282:7	386:3	intended 363:10	J	293:16 294:3,15
283:6 286:8 293:2	indication 348:6	367:8 374:12	J-O-N-E-S 291:2	295:1,3 297:25
293:8 352:13	380:22	377:21	Jackie 277:3	298:1,4,8,18
372:21 387:2	individual 387:14	intent 343:1 372:3	289:20 290:13	299:22 301:25
391:22 392:24	individually 281:6	intention 382:22,25	291:1,18 295:6	302:16,21 303:2,8
393:10,19	individuals 401:14	386:10	357:17	304:22,24 305:2,5
includes 327:17,25	indulging 369:6	interactive 306:4	Jan 276:8 280:10	308:3,23,25 309:6
328:1,4 329:7	industrial 334:23	interest 294:13	400:20	310:11 314:25
330:16 334:5	335:9,16 397:22	381:15 390:22	January 274:24	316:21 317:17,20
342:6,7 348:4	ineffective 408:10	398:13,15 399:8	278:1 311:4,9,21	322:7 324:22
376:5 381:13	inequitable 374:10	399:12,16 400:8	325:23 372:24	333:5,11,21 339:7
397:1,25 408:23	391:23 392:6,13	400:12	373:24 413:9,12	341:5 347:25
including 386:14	401:19 406:3	interested 370:10	Jeff 275:13 279:11	353:20 354:3,9,15
393:11 397:4	inequities 378:15	interests 403:3	Jeff.roberson@a	354:23 360:22
398:2 409:9	386:21 388:15,17	internal 312:17	275:17	361:1,5,12,16,22
inclusive 385:16	inflated 396:20	385:11	Jhasselman@ear	362:5 370:15,21
income 310:25	397:17	internally 403:18	276:11	370:21 371:1,4,10
315:6 316:13	inform 317:6	interpret 352:1	JHJ-1T 291:3	371:14,24,25
322:13 326:24	374:20 388:7	interprets 395:20	JHJ-3 352:24	377:9 380:6
348:19 356:21	information 292:10	interrupt 287:16	JHJ-5 291:3	389:19 390:5
357:9 358:11	292:13,20 293:1	intervention 404:8	JHJ-6X 284:15	400:17 407:17,23
372:23 373:2,10	297:16 342:8	introduce 290:18	289:1,6,13 291:21	410:5,14,19 411:1
380:15 396:3	345:16 346:10	298:19 354:24	292:2 294:17	411:5,9 412:11
403:14 406:19	348:8 357:13	362:6	join 290:5 411:19	judges 274:18
incomplete 392:24	358:16 359:1,6,19	invents 392:3	joined 389:14	377:12 390:9
inconsistent 390:22	359:21 360:10	invisible 405:15	joining 278:22	July 313:17 373:2
incorporated 320:2	365:18 388:9	involved 360:4	281:16	June 346:5
incorrect 339:1	408:25 409:4,5,13	370:5	joins 379:7	justice 401:24
increase 305:12	409:17,20	involves 376:24	Joint 276:7 280:7	403:1 405:2
337:18 340:19,21	informing 366:2	irrational 393:5	280:10 287:8	justified 400:1
340:23 384:21	inherent 386:21	isolate 306:5	341:17 379:23	justifies 398:16
391:23	inherently 398:12	issue 311:3 343:17	389:4 400:18,20	
increases 340:8,14	initial 319:14 323:8	369:14,16 372:1	401:4	K
increasing 394:19	341:18 393:4	380:15 403:8	Jones 342:11	K 347:4
408:4	394:15	407:9 411:2	judge 275:3,3	K-O-N-I-S-K-Y
incremental 390:15	initiated 372:25	issued 372:3	278:5,19,21 279:1	299:4
independently	initiative 380:12	issues 281:15,19	279:8,12,16,21	keep 281:11 399:16
343:20	input 403:24	316:6,20,25	280:1,5,12,16,24	406:22
INDEX 277:1	inquiry 302:9	388:24,25 403:24	281:24 282:20	key 387:3
		,	283:7,16 284:1,5	kind 315:16,25
	I	I	l .	I .

		1		
316:15 317:4	380:20,22 383:7	333:11,14 334:13	list 282:7 286:14	looks 289:25 328:4
342:18 379:5	383:20,24 388:22	334:17 335:14,23	listed 318:11 327:2	396:4
402:14 405:4	392:12	371:19 390:12	literally 378:20	LOOP 274:21
kinds 307:17	Konisky's 381:3	level 326:25 349:21	literature 391:5	losing 391:3,6
402:20		352:7 356:21	litigation 382:10,14	lot 284:9 306:14
knew 382:13	L	376:9 395:11	little 335:6 339:17	308:10 330:11
know 292:24	L 276:13	levels 352:12	361:5 365:8 373:4	339:16 343:3
295:12,12 304:9	labeled 291:21	396:10	385:8 402:5	365:18 366:22
304:10 306:2,9,17	Lacey 274:21 278:1	liable 383:1	live 322:1	367:3 368:16
306:19 307:14,17	lack 369:2 380:11	LIAC 311:4,15,20	lives 390:20 402:10	371:9 379:2
315:13 321:14,19	380:14	312:1,16 313:18	LLP 276:4	low 310:25 315:6
321:21,24 322:3	lacks 385:11	314:15,24 315:6	LNG 274:14	322:13 348:19
327:18 330:1	language 312:21	315:10,25 316:4,5	local 297:14	353:14 357:9
331:4 337:20	387:17	316:8,14,15	logged 290:1	372:23 373:2,10
338:17,22,23,25	large 301:5 346:12	322:18,22 348:10	logistics 281:20	380:14 403:14
340:11,13,21	376:19 392:22	377:24 378:3,23	long 286:11 344:12	406:1,19
344:9 345:9,14	largely 366:2	life 406:1	382:2 405:15,21	low- 372:11
346:21 348:8	399:11	life-saving 405:17	408:16 410:9	low-income 312:9
357:17 360:9	larger 301:9 372:9	life-sustaining	longer 326:2 374:4	312:11,12 313:4,5
364:16 365:22	372:10 395:19	384:15	longer-lasting	313:14 315:11,19
366:1,5,21 367:11	last- 284:9	Lifeline 316:9	391:4	316:7,20,25
367:13,15,18,19	Lastly 388:12	lifted 346:7	longstanding	321:22 323:14,15
367:21 368:1,2,3	late 284:9 287:18	light 274:8 301:5	406:17	346:13 349:20
368:6,17,20,24	288:2,3	380:14	look 296:12,13	372:21 380:1
369:1,18 370:9	launched 395:25	limit 384:20	301:13 307:2	387:22,23 391:8
371:3 380:4	launching 396:4	limited 281:8	313:8 319:4,21,24	391:16,21 394:1
395:25 399:22,23	law 274:18 275:3,3	294:12 379:10	319:25 320:14	394:13 395:16,22
401:14,17 405:3	278:19,21 390:8	392:25	328:11 329:25	396:10 408:6
406:2 408:15,16	laws 378:10	line 327:2,16 328:1	330:5 334:17	lower 307:14
408:17 409:2	lawyer 370:18	328:4,5,7,11,18	335:8,14 336:11	330:10,18 383:21
knowledge 371:9	lay 289:10	328:20 330:6	349:8 356:1	386:2,4,5 403:18
413:10	lays 403:13	332:3,20 337:16	357:10 360:7	406:17
knowledgeable	lean 283:18	337:17,20 353:14	366:4 389:15	lowering 314:7
318:11	learned 373:13	363:6,10,11,25	411:18 412:3	lowest 395:6
known 312:11	leases 360:14	388:13	looked 318:15	lunch 281:10
313:4 321:22	leave 343:10	lines 296:4 300:12	322:3 332:11	371:20
323:14 346:13	389:17	305:10 317:12	335:17 336:1	
349:20 365:3	left 334:2 375:5	321:2 325:11	339:16 357:13	<u>M</u>
372:20 381:23	401:8	349:11 356:1	looking 301:6	Ma'am 320:12
382:17 387:22	legally 346:21	363:20	312:21 317:17	magic 379:19
408:6	length 321:14	link 333:6 394:21	318:22 320:7	magical 304:16
Konisky 277:5	lens 367:21	Lisa 275:7 279:13	334:15 336:21	magnitude 301:10
298:9,14,24 299:3	let's 278:5,23	412:1	338:17 350:18	304:7 381:25
299:20 300:4	280:25 281:25	Lisa.Gafken@at	351:1,5 368:6	mail 374:24
304:20 305:6	284:2,13 286:18	275:11	378:18	mailed 375:2
	289:16 328:3,10			maintain 369:21
	•	.	ı	1

		1	1	1
380:10 381:17	304:8 341:12	275:3 278:18	335:17 363:7	name 278:18
408:14	376:14 396:8	microphone 279:2	389:8 399:22	290:24,25 291:1,2
maintaining 400:9	403:1,2 409:22	308:16	money 379:4	298:25 299:1,3
400:12	meant 338:6	microphones 279:3	monitoring 389:23	308:20,22 309:13
major 402:8 403:21	405:18	281:11 283:17	month 393:7	309:14,18 355:7,9
majority 344:22	measurable 351:18	midmorning 281:9	monthly 406:22	355:9,10 362:14
making 341:19	measure 300:25	333:10	months 326:1	362:15,17,18
365:12 402:8	357:5 392:4,9,16	Mihaly 276:4	382:6 396:6,11,14	named 321:25
406:3,22 407:11	397:21	279:24	moratorium 346:4	391:9 392:18
manage 312:22	medical 360:13	million 327:4,7,13	346:7,18,22,25	national 380:21
management 294:8	388:3 409:20,21	327:17 328:1,2,5	347:16,17 372:17	natural 331:21,21
316:13 380:2	medically 391:8	328:7,19,23	moratoriums	Natural's 385:25
383:11 395:17	medicine 306:10	339:25 366:20,22	331:17	nature 398:7
396:4,6,16 406:15	401:16	373:25	morning 278:6,25	Navarro 314:3
managing 306:16	medium 353:13	Milt 275:5	279:6,10,13,19,23	NE 276:15
mandated 346:22	meet 356:25	mind 288:1 344:17	280:9 285:13	nearest 327:4 336:2
manner 294:20	meeting 281:17	383:14 387:11	290:23 291:18,19	necessarily 386:5
393:3	290:2,5,7 311:4,6	minimal 365:13	295:5,7 298:24	necessary 347:10
March 346:3 351:7	311:10,14,20,23	minimize 374:10	299:3 300:4,5	398:10 408:18
marked 287:17	312:4,10 313:14	minor 363:4	305:7,8 310:17	409:17
309:20 338:4	313:18,20,24	minute 291:23	325:4,5 355:5,22	necessitates 382:1
matches 328:19	314:11,18,21,24	minutes 281:8	359:16 362:13	need 284:17 285:9
material 303:3	315:5,16 322:13	313:25 315:14,23	371:23 377:11,14	289:23 323:15
306:2	322:19,25,25	323:2 324:16	383:20 384:23	340:17 353:14,16
materials 286:20	323:1 372:24	333:11 373:3	387:6 390:7	360:3,13 363:8
math 321:7	373:3,11,12 378:6	378:2,4	Moser 275:19	368:13 376:4,6
matter 274:10	meetings 311:15	misspoke 320:4	279:19,19 286:23	378:14 379:3
278:10,20 359:20	314:4 403:17	331:22	389:21	387:23 388:3
386:17 393:4	members 312:16	misstated 319:23	mounting 383:18	396:11 400:7
394:14	315:10,24 321:25	mistake 338:5	move 289:9,14	407:21 410:9,24
matters 294:12	322:1	misunderstanding	293:14 326:2,17	needed 281:10
302:10	memory 313:8	293:9	330:25 349:17	302:25 307:17,18
mean 289:18 306:1	mental 305:14	mitigate 386:21	352:2 361:17	345:2 383:18
307:10 321:7	409:16	388:16	382:4,9 387:8	needs 306:9 360:1
333:13 343:13	mention 281:18	mobile 324:10	moved 288:7 313:2	366:19 377:18
346:15 366:22	mentioned 403:17	model 357:4	344:11	385:6 407:9,24
367:2 368:5	met 392:15	moderate-income	moving 288:18	negatively 401:9
378:11,20 385:21	metering 399:2	372:11	332:14 353:25	negotiate 404:16,24
402:16	meters 323:24	modern 399:1	373:18	negotiated 403:8
meaning 321:25	methodology 317:5	modifies 387:12	multiple 276:18	Neighborhoods
meaningful 301:8	388:14	modify 380:9 381:8	303:25 397:14	280:14
301:14 378:24	meticulously	381:19 386:6,18	398:22,23	neighbors 400:7
meaningfully	392:21	386:24 387:3,7	mute 290:6	net 399:1
406:25	mic 289:24 308:12	moment 290:5	muted 281:11	network 358:8
means 283:13	Michael 274:18	295:24 333:6,7	N	neutral 367:23

				<u> </u>
387:7	284:16 292:1	338:11,11 395:25	348:20,21 349:6,9	order 274:12
never 320:14 376:9	294:10 304:16	396:5	349:10,23 350:3,7	278:11,16 281:5
382:23,24,25	305:11,20 306:12	off-script 361:6	350:17,24 351:1	282:8 310:1 372:4
new 319:25 352:4	309:21 312:22	offer 287:4 316:1	351:12,19 352:9	372:16 373:20
359:25 388:20	318:22 323:6	319:6 384:18	353:3,12,18,23	381:20 386:8
406:13,14	325:20 328:18	389:22 395:16	354:9,24 356:5	394:14
newer 398:15	331:19 350:11,21	offered 378:10	357:16,21 358:22	orders 319:6 320:9
non-vulnerable	351:4 352:25	offering 390:2	359:9,14 360:8,20	320:17 367:20
319:17	353:5 370:4	offers 310:9 388:16	361:16,24 363:22	ordinary 370:1
nonpayment	391:11 410:16	388:18	364:5 366:10	organization 404:4
408:23	numbers 335:1,2	Office 275:8,14	370:13 371:1	original 286:8,9,11
nontargeted 384:24	numerical 303:22	362:22	390:5 400:18	288:23 311:20
normal 340:24	307:21	oh 284:13 289:25	410:14,24 411:7,9	317:18,19 319:3
342:21 346:11,14	NW 385:25	291:25 292:15	412:11	329:25 397:3
369:23	NWEC 280:7 389:6	293:9 308:9,13,24	Olympia 275:16	outages 321:14
NOTARY 413:17		317:24 333:13	on-time 396:7	outcome 301:2
note 280:17 282:25	0	334:15 340:4	once 330:5 376:18	367:8,15,18
283:11 287:3	o0o- 278:3	359:11 361:1,12	376:21	386:17 387:7
288:10 301:3,4	object 284:18 361:9	okay 282:21 284:4	one-on-one 374:19	400:6 404:14
306:14 354:25	objection 282:17	290:8 292:3	408:4,22	outcomes 307:12
363:22	283:9 284:14,23	293:13 295:25	one-time 397:6,9	364:1 366:4
noted 285:1,2	285:1,2 286:2,12	296:6,7 297:11,21	one-word 378:20	367:15 377:22
286:13 287:7	286:15,24 289:1	298:8 299:22	ones 357:24 400:3	391:23 407:10
392:12	293:16,17 294:16	301:25 303:2	ongoing 397:15	outreach 341:13
notes 311:14	294:17 301:22	304:24 305:3,5,18	398:1 402:8	342:6,7,22 343:20
314:11,21 315:16	303:3,9	308:3 310:11,23	online 281:17,17	345:3,7 350:11
380:22 411:4	objections 282:15	311:13,19 312:6	open 402:14,23	351:6,13,14
notice 343:6,7,7,8	286:20 287:3,10	312:15 313:16,22	opening 289:17	364:12,14,17,19
372:3 374:24,25	obligated 403:22	314:14,20,23	operating 324:17	364:20,24 368:23
374:25 375:3	obligation 324:5,15	315:22 317:9,20	392:5	379:9 381:20
379:9 410:22	367:20 375:20	317:24 319:2	operations 372:19	384:21 385:16
notices 393:14	403:23	320:5 321:20	378:12	386:13 387:15,16
noticing 346:11	obligations 375:22	324:22 325:10,19	opinion 300:17	388:5,11 390:17
notifications	observe 281:16	326:22 327:11,19	301:15 303:11	390:24 395:15
345:14 346:5	306:15 384:1	327:24 328:9,17	345:4,10,20	408:4,25
noting 288:17	observed 307:2	329:6,19 331:13	365:15	outside 344:8
364:11	observing 366:7	332:2,8,16,24	opportunity 301:23	368:24 376:12
November 314:16	obviously 306:1	333:21 334:12,16	361:4 389:22	385:10,18,20
325:14 373:10	occupation 299:6	334:19,22 335:4	400:21 403:3	over-earning
393:7	362:20	335:22 336:5,23	407:13	398:22
now-proposed	occur 361:14	337:7 338:2,7,9	opposed 358:1	overburdened
349:3	364:24	338:14 339:3	opposite 293:21	405:25
NP 380:2	occurred 283:12	342:15,24 343:12	optimistic 382:7	overcame 404:10
Nuccor 280:17	323:2	344:25 345:21	options 367:10	overlooked 280:21
number 283:3	occurs 398:18	347:13 348:13,16	384:14 403:18	overrule 303:2
	October 323:1			
	•	•	•	•

1 1000 0		220 12 244 5	202.11	200 00 070 10 00
overruled 303:8	participation	330:12 344:5	percentages 323:14	322:23 372:18,23
owe 307:11	404:11	382:24 396:21	perform 338:25	373:15 376:17
owing 306:17	particular 300:19	399:9,14,19,21	390:24 395:15	phases 325:12
P	300:21 303:14,21	409:5	performed 330:15	376:21 393:5
<u> </u>	304:2 306:11	paying 306:3,9	period 296:16,25	philosophy 392:5
P.C 275:20	307:20 369:2,11	344:1,6	297:5 316:11	392:10
p.m 412:16	404:2	payment 342:8	326:10 345:16,25	phone 324:7 343:5
P.O 275:15	particularly 365:25	345:17 375:7	346:1 398:2,4,8	374:22 375:2
PACIFIC 274:7	380:13 386:20	387:19	periods 350:22	physical 305:13
PacifiCorp 274:7	387:20	payments 396:7	Perkins 276:14	308:9 409:16
386:1,1 395:5,6	parties 281:11	PDF 331:7	279:7	PIERCE 413:4
package 403:9	282:7,13 287:14	pending 381:25	permanent 331:17	place 296:23 297:1
page 277:2 295:22	311:21 319:6	people 300:20,22	395:17 396:3,15	297:13 316:2
296:3,4 300:10	320:17 354:7	304:12 306:7,15	permit 302:9	367:12 380:12
305:10 310:22,24	370:5,11 373:13	306:22 307:16,21	perpetual 331:15	402:12 406:13
313:11 315:15,16	377:5 378:5 379:7	333:17 346:18	perpetuated 378:15	placed 332:20
317:10 321:1	379:23 382:10	356:19 358:12	person 323:21	placeholder 288:7
325:9,18 326:5,20	393:7 403:7,11	360:13,15 374:13	personal 376:1	places 397:20
327:10 328:11,12	404:15,21,25	375:15 382:23	408:13	plain 378:19
328:13,16 329:5,7	407:1 408:3,15	383:25 384:4	perspective 296:12	plan 285:5 287:4
329:18 331:11,14	409:13 412:12	387:8 391:7	persuaded 294:18	313:13,17,23
331:19 332:1,4	parties' 281:5	401:14,15,17	petition 274:10	314:8,12,15 315:7
338:10 341:17	377:6 393:1	402:15,16,24	278:11,15 282:8	316:14 395:17
348:22,23 349:8	partly 374:17	407:12 408:7	282:10,11 288:20	396:4,6,8,9,16
353:4 355:25	parts 312:2,3	people's 390:20	310:1 331:1,3	403:20
363:5,5,20 391:14	330:22	402:10	341:10 368:20	planned 312:17
391:24 394:25	party 280:21	per-customer	373:20 377:16	planning 288:10
pages 274:17	281:16 283:14	385:23,25 395:4	380:4 382:5	plans 280:25
315:23,24 364:23	286:3 297:15,18	percent 300:20,21	385:15 394:20	316:13 342:9
397:16	297:19 379:18	301:17,18 303:13	398:9 400:15	380:1
pandemic 316:12	391:4 408:15	303:14 321:3,8,15	Pfeifer-Rosenblum	plausible 382:18
352:5 357:4	pass 402:4	321:22,25 323:24	394:25 395:3	play 316:14
405:17	past-due 326:25	324:19 326:24	Pfeifer-Rosenblu	please 281:17
pandemic-era	328:18,19 350:12	332:5,5,9,10,12	391:15,25 396:23	290:10,18,25
397:6,10,14	367:11 372:10	332:21 334:7,7,8	phase 312:12	291:20 298:11,19
par 385:25	374:6,20 376:14	334:9,11,14,18	318:23 325:20,21	298:25 300:9
paragraph 341:10	376:21 381:21,21	336:3,9,9,20	325:23 326:2	301:25 303:5,9
paralegal 285:15	386:5 387:16	337:4,5,11,11	341:12 346:14	308:8,19,20 309:7
parity 398:19	390:17 394:1	338:19,20 340:17	phased 311:24	309:13 311:8
Park 275:15	395:15,19 396:7	349:21 363:9,10	313:1 326:1 349:3	320:11 324:24
part 292:13 305:25	pathway 388:16,18	395:1 396:2	349:5,22 351:24	325:8,18 326:19
313:4 352:15	patterns 300:7	397:18,19,23,23	373:18 374:8	327:9,16 329:4,17
403:8,9,20 405:24	pause 333:7,20	398:6,6,23,24	379:21,22 393:19	331:2,11 332:25
participants 276:18	paused 373:18	percentage 316:13	410:2	335:8 336:23
participate 402:16	pay 306:23 307:16	321:21,24	phased-in 322:14	337:16 338:3
405:5 406:18	Pay 300.23 307.10	321.21,27	Phaseu-III 322.14	337.10 330.3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	Ì	1	Ì	 I
354:16,24,25	positive 364:1	prefer 283:23	375:20,22	343:25 344:8,8,10
355:7 361:24	possibility 347:8	308:21 309:14	prioritized 382:14	344:12,16,23
362:6,7,14 371:11	possible 285:21	preference 297:19	privacy 369:14	346:6,11,14 349:1
point 284:18	290:4 350:19	preferred 386:17	privilege 389:11	349:3 350:16
302:18 306:21	375:8 377:8	premise 398:9	411:11,13,14,23	356:10 359:4
312:7,14,24 314:7	396:12	premised 394:20	proactive 384:6	364:8 368:22,24
335:11,18,20	possibly 346:18	prepare 327:20	probably 306:25	369:2,11 370:6
336:3,8 337:3,9	post-enrollment	348:1	347:1 358:20	373:16 374:12,15
338:23 340:6	358:13	prepared 310:3	problem 302:23	374:16 376:5,7,12
341:15,16 342:16	postage 399:6	348:9,9,12	328:13 337:22	376:14 377:18,20
344:21 345:1	400:10	present 276:18	361:8 373:24	377:21,23 381:22
356:18 358:4	postcard 347:16	296:14 311:21,23	374:4,5 379:19	385:11,11,16,18
360:9 367:14	351:10,13	312:18 313:23	405:16,20	385:20 386:22
369:1 388:21	postcard-type	314:8 348:6 357:5	problematic 398:12	387:9 388:8
399:21 404:3	385:4	357:12 361:23	problems 392:20	393:14,15,22
411:10,13,13,23	postcards 347:2	presentation 281:5	393:1	400:25 402:6,14
pointed 377:15	potential 366:4	348:4,24	procedural 401:23	405:11 410:2
points 400:23	367:14 372:11	presented 282:23	403:1 405:2	processes 357:3
policies 401:19	potentially 316:12	296:16 314:12,15	procedure 349:12	360:3 364:18
policy 293:22,22	402:15	315:6 348:7,7,19	349:15,16,18	371:6 373:8
294:4,5,6,11	poverty 305:12,23	359:7 378:3	proceed 291:13	380:10 381:10,13
299:10 399:2	326:25 349:21	380:19 389:3	294:21 299:23	382:2 385:15
400:4	363:10,11 406:1	391:5 403:19	303:5 309:7	404:7
pollution 406:1	power 274:7	presenting 380:15	310:13 324:24	produce 388:15
population 300:23	401:20 409:17	presently 278:22	371:11	392:17
301:2,11,20	practical 359:20	presents 295:13	proceeding 291:4	professor 298:9
303:16 318:25	practice 294:10	356:7 383:8	309:22 310:1	299:7 300:4
323:16 353:9	372:15 406:5	PRESIDING	340:16,22 371:17	304:20 305:6
391:18	practices 278:17	274:18	372:4,7 373:9	380:20 383:20,24
populations 301:6	341:13 401:21	pretty 306:24	379:18 381:11	392:12
301:9 307:23	402:9,11,22	369:22,25 406:23	389:24 391:5	professor's 302:13
322:2 323:14	403:16 406:3	prevalence 301:1	395:9 398:21	program 316:9,17
353:6 366:1	practicing 382:11	prevent 383:18	410:11	357:23 380:2
374:10 376:6,8,13	pre-file 355:13	395:23 398:10	proceedings 333:20	396:1 406:14,15
378:18 405:25	pre-filed 281:3	prevents 400:6	371:8 401:24	programs 316:7,19
portion 346:12	282:9,14 283:1	previous 297:1	process 288:3,4	316:24 317:2
portions 281:13	288:20 292:10,14	311:25 326:5	294:7 295:11,16	374:21 384:22
358:12	292:19,21,22	395:21	296:12,18,20,21	395:22 396:22
Portland 275:21	293:4,7 299:16	pride 389:17	297:1,8,12,14	406:13,20
position 292:23	309:24 355:1	primary 401:7	313:3 315:12,20	progress 373:1,12
293:10,19,21,24	362:8 384:3	principle 398:15	318:23 320:3	407:11
294:20 302:3	389:24	399:25	322:15,23 323:21	project 276:2
318:20 320:7,13	pre-pandemic	printout 334:15	330:14 340:24	279:22,25 286:7
342:3 358:5,23	403:16	prior 324:5,14	342:5,13,14,16	287:1,2 289:14
394:10,12	precisely 382:24	349:1 352:5	343:2,3,9,10,18	291:12 315:17
	-			
	I	1	1	1

344:14 351:23 proposed 295:12 389:4 390:6 296:5,9 297:13 400:14 312:3,13 356:6	319:4,21 321:11	352:15,24 369:12 372:5 373:13	Puget's 368:12
,	,	372.5 373.13	O .
400:14 312:3.13 356:6	200 14 204 7	372.3 373.13	purely 326:9
	322:14 324:7	374:6,12 376:3,16	purple 329:8,11
Project's 284:14,16 377:4 394:6	325:20,22 331:20	376:24 377:16	pursue 357:2
289:5 340:9,16 403:16 406:5	337:17 341:12,19	378:7,17 379:2,10	369:11
356:6 370:7 proposes 390:12	,13 350:13,19 351:6	380:1,9,14 381:7	push 387:9
407:15 391:13 395:14	351:14 353:8	381:9,12,18,22	put 307:20 308:18
projected 329:7 proposing 393:1	5 356:7,24 363:23	382:16,19 385:23	356:25 363:25
projections 329:3 protect 374:10	364:3 369:10,13	386:3,18 387:4,7	393:12,21 395:7
329:11 388:18 402:12	369:15 372:12,15	387:24 388:15	402:11 407:1
projects 319:25 405:4 409:11	372:18,22,25	390:10,11,18,21	puts 342:17
promote 399:7 410:3	373:5,7,11,12,14	391:23 392:2,8,10	putting 316:2
promoting 399:2 protected 295:1		392:15,16,20,23	343:1 358:4 406:6
pronouns 308:17 319:15 356:8,2		393:2,4,5,10,23	407:11
308:21 309:14,17 358:24 360:12			Puyallup 280:18
355:11 360:18	376:19,20,23	394:20,24 395:1,8	
proof 357:7 369:22 protecting 360:1	, ,	396:10,19,23	Q
370:17,24 371:2 387:4	379:4,20 380:3,17	397:3,17,24 398:8	quarter 396:12,17
proposal 295:10 protections 347:		398:9 400:14	396:18
311:3,22,23 312:3 376:3 386:20	382:5 383:9,12	401:25 404:9	question 293:10
312:7,18 316:1 387:1 390:16	384:8,10,13,17,23	407:4 409:1	303:7 316:22
318:15 325:7 provide 283:24	384:24 385:9,9,11	public 275:6,9	323:10 327:14
326:12 329:21,22 292:1 336:14	385:19,25 386:6,8	279:12,15 283:1	330:24 341:23
340:9,16,22 352:2 340:8 343:8	387:3,14 388:7,9	286:18,19 287:17	343:22 344:16
352:16 357:2 348:18 350:20		287:22 288:16,17	348:1 352:19
359:24 364:22,22 378:7 388:9	390:23 391:13,18	298:10 299:7,14	354:5 357:17
364:24 365:6,10 390:14 407:10	392:4,14,21	302:19 350:9	365:7,16 369:9
366:16,25 368:11 409:17,18	393:11,14,17,18	351:2,3 362:23,24	370:20 377:15,17
368:12,12 369:10 provided 285:19		364:21 370:9	378:9
378:3,8,22,23 288:24 292:8	395:5,14,25 398:1	378:9 379:24	questioned 385:13
388:16 390:18,21 332:25 334:3	401:1 402:4,10	380:7,19 381:15	questioner 293:24
391:23 392:6,17 373:1,11 409:6	•	382:19,20 383:8	questioner's 294:13
392:20,21,24 provides 295:10		385:2 386:12,16	questioning 335:5
393:2,10,20,23,25 297:3 375:20	406:5,23 407:10	386:23 388:17,21	351:23 363:16
394:7 396:25 providing 399:1	,	389:3,10 390:22	questions 281:20
402:3 407:6,16,25 PSC 376:17	409:18,25	398:13,14 399:7	281:25 285:23
408:9,20 409:1 PSE 276:14 283	,	399:11,16 400:8	287:20 294:19,24
proposals 312:1 283:10 287:19	282:7 285:25	400:12 409:15,19	295:3 298:1
319:22 320:8,16 295:13 296:14		410:8,9,10 411:16	300:16 302:4
377:6 379:6,22 297:3,7 305:19		411:17 412:2	304:21,25 308:1
393:6 394:17 308:7 310:9 31	*	413:17	317:6 320:25
407:2,10 408:1,11 311:21 312:2,8	,	Puget 274:11,13	325:7 326:18
408:15 409:7,22 313:13,17,23	330:23 331:1,3	276:12 278:10,11	329:2,16 337:14
propose 319:25 314:8,11,15,24	*	279:7 309:17	339:6 341:5
390:14,17 393:21 315:5,25 316:4			347:24 353:19,21
	,		355:20,23 359:15
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>

	-	-	-	
360:23 361:11	rates 330:14 340:19	318:3 411:16	305:10 349:11,18	remember 320:12
377:18,20,20,23	341:1 372:13	recommendation	351:6,24 392:11	376:16
402:20	399:6,15 400:2,10	369:15,17,21	references 346:17	remind 281:10
queue 342:18 343:5	409:8,9,24	389:25	366:17	remote 324:12
393:12 406:7	re- 292:25	recommendations	referrals 388:6	375:14,15
quick 370:15	reach 374:23	365:22,23 366:2,8	referred 383:24	remote-capable
407:20	395:24 403:10	387:1 400:15	referring 337:21	323:25
quickly 302:17	reached 306:24	recommending	351:8	remotely 323:25
313:25 382:4	368:19 383:12	379:20	refers 356:6	324:1
quite 284:17	reaching 324:6	reconnect 321:10	reflect 286:14	remove 330:17
quote 332:18 392:5	read 303:3 373:3	321:12 324:1,17	294:19 314:11	366:17
392:5	378:4 408:19	reconnected 321:4	315:17	removed 287:5
quoting 341:11	reading 394:4	321:8,15 324:6,15	reflected 315:14	312:11 330:9
	real 301:9	375:13,16	reflection 396:24	345:15 346:12
R	real-world 401:13	reconnection	refresh 313:8	349:19
R 413:1	really 304:5 307:22	323:19 324:11,12	refuses 380:17	removing 349:24
racism 404:6	313:2,13,25 317:6	375:19,19	regarding 282:10	Rendahl 275:4
rack 382:23	324:17 344:16	reconnects 324:18	302:20 323:19	277:4,7,12,14
raise 290:10 298:11	352:4 359:15	record 278:5 282:2	410:10	279:3 285:21
308:25 354:16	366:5 368:1,10	282:4 286:1,20	regardless 381:21	287:15,24 288:13
361:24 409:8,9,24	374:16 405:18	290:25 299:1	387:15	295:5,8,21,25
raised 317:13 405:8	406:4	302:13 308:15,18	regards 316:17	296:4,7,11,19
raises 369:14	reason 356:24	308:21 333:19,24	regularly 398:18	297:4,11,21,24
raising 347:8	379:21	355:8 362:15	regulation 379:6	305:4,6,9,18
randomly 358:12	reasonable 301:15	371:4 378:1	regulatory 294:7	307:6,24 333:2
405:23	303:11 374:9	394:18,23 395:9	362:21	347:15,19,22
range 283:18	392:12 400:6,11	410:19,23	Reidt 274:25 413:6	348:2,13,16,21
rate 278:14 282:2	407:2	recover 372:12	413:16,16	349:6,10,23 350:3
317:4 329:16,20	rebuttal 277:21	recovering 379:4	reiterate 394:15	350:7,17,24
330:9,23 331:15	310:18 317:10	recovery 341:1	reject 381:18	351:10,12,16,19
331:20 332:4,9,18	321:1 326:19	397:13	390:21 392:15	351:21 352:9,14
334:6,14,18,24	328:10,14 329:17	redirect 277:9,10	400:14	352:18 353:3,12
335:9,14,24,24	331:25 349:7	295:1 304:22,23	rejected 294:1	353:18 354:2,4
336:7,8,18 337:2	377:8 392:2 394:2	322:7,10 324:21	related 309:25	355:21 356:5,13
337:10,14,15,18	396:25 397:16	339:7,10 341:4	relation 358:10	357:16,21 358:22
338:19 340:5,8,14	407:18	361:2,4,10	release 385:21	359:9,14 371:24
340:21,23 358:11	recall 312:21	reduce 374:19	relevant 311:15	377:12 390:8
368:4 373:6 377:1	314:10	384:22 388:19	rely 395:8	411:10,15,25
377:2,5 378:11	receive 376:9	395:22 397:12	remain 383:1	412:8
380:1 381:9	384:20 388:5	reduced 408:21	388:25	renew 293:17
396:15,19,23	received 410:10	reducing 383:17	remainder 298:6	rental 409:15
397:1,6,9,12,15	receiving 293:11	395:13 406:21	308:5 353:22	renters 388:2 391:8
397:17,20,24	393:14	refer 301:6 335:1	371:16	reopening 410:23
398:1,5 406:14	recognize 284:9	reference 295:18	remarks 388:22	repair 388:16
ratemaking 401:5	291:22 292:4	295:20 296:5	remedy 405:7	repeat 311:8
402:13 404:9				
	1	1	1	1

				<u> </u>
316:22 328:12	281:19 394:14	293:20 298:3	314:21	315:3,4 316:23
336:23 354:17	410:21 411:3	302:21 305:1	reviewing 340:6	317:19,22 318:1,2
repeated 351:14	Require 387:14	318:6,9 320:19,20	revise 326:6	322:6,12 377:11
378:6	required 324:13	323:5,7,8 324:9	revised 325:11	402:5
repeatedly 390:10	372:12 388:7	327:14 347:9	326:6	robust 324:17
400:10	requirements	348:18 350:9,19	riding 366:22 367:3	role 281:14 316:4
repetition 294:14	344:13 382:13	351:3,4,5 352:24	right 279:4 280:5	316:14,16 358:9
replace 338:18	requires 319:12	363:19 366:19	280:16,24 281:24	377:24 389:13
report 314:4 373:1	requiring 390:23	385:8 394:6	282:19 283:7,16	401:7 402:1
REPORTED	research 299:9	responses 282:11	284:1,25 285:11	room 289:22
274:25	300:6 302:5	288:5,8	285:24 286:17,21	round 333:15
reporter 308:22	307:12 344:13	responsibility	286:25 287:6,8,13	rounded 327:4
309:15 315:2	345:2 360:6	344:5	288:3,15 290:9,10	328:7 336:2
413:6	365:24 380:19,21	rest 377:8	290:17 291:11	397:17
reporting 314:1	383:8	restate 397:8	294:15,21 298:4	rounding 337:13
represent 293:3	reserve 284:19	restricts 369:10	298:12 301:7	row 326:23
304:15 306:17	289:13 377:7	result 338:19 343:1	303:18,21,24	RPR 274:25 413:16
348:25 349:1	reserved 281:18	374:9,13 385:7	304:5,8,11 306:1	rubber 378:1
405:16	residential 335:15	386:5 408:20	306:4,5,16,23,25	rule 289:1 302:8
representative	335:23 336:7	resulting 330:18	307:10,18 308:25	rule-making
280:2 281:16	338:20,21 390:15	388:17	313:14 320:24	319:12
375:6	394:20,22,23	results 351:18	324:13 328:5	rule-makings 382:2
representatives	395:5,12,19	368:13 396:16,18	336:22 343:21	ruled 278:13
378:5 406:18	397:20 398:5	resume 322:14	344:20 352:11,11	rulemaking 373:25
412:13	407:5	333:23 374:7	353:20 354:16	380:11 381:24
represented 293:6	resolve 405:10	390:13 394:8	357:11 360:22	382:4,6,17
representing 279:7	resolved 407:7	396:13 410:1	361:24 365:9	rulemakings 382:9
279:11 389:10	resort 390:11	resumed 393:6	367:5 368:14	382:14
represents 306:12	resources 297:2,7	resuming 311:24	369:4 371:5	ruling 289:13
404:3	344:9 367:12	314:5 322:23	379:13 405:10	rulings 282:3
request 283:3	392:22 401:5	376:25 377:1,1	410:5 411:14	rural 399:7,10,13
284:16 289:8	404:23	resumption 372:18	rings 384:10	399:18,22,23
292:6 293:11,20	resources-wise	378:19 379:8,10	risk 300:21 301:18	400:2
294:2 314:3 318:6	376:11	retain 369:13	303:13 305:12,23	<u> </u>
323:5 324:11	respect 359:8,24	retains 369:21	306:22 383:13	s 274:13 389:1
347:23 350:9,25	respects 359:25	retract 354:9	384:15 388:2	393:9 394:6
351:3 352:24	respond 301:24,25	return 372:25	401:15 407:12	393:9 394:6 398:25 400:3
380:9 381:8,19	302:15 364:9,10	373:18 374:8	risks 305:22	405:9 406:7
386:7	367:2 393:2	403:16	risky 384:3,5	S-H-A-Y-L-E-E
requested 315:25	Respondent 274:9	returned 404:19	Roberson 275:13	355:10
353:7	response 280:4,15	review 296:15	277:3,9,19 279:10	S-T-O-K-E-S
requesting 278:16	280:23 281:23	297:2 313:25	279:11 283:9	355:10
372:15 374:7	283:1,2 284:15,22	325:18 337:16	285:19,20 290:22	S.W 275:15
409:25	286:8,9,11 287:19	356:16 357:15	291:9 295:2	S/413:16
requests 280:20	289:5 292:8	reviewed 285:24	310:16 313:7	sacrificing 307:17
				July July

				1 age 404
same-day 375:17	356:23 357:25	386:7,24 387:8,13	significance 301:7	SNS-1T 295:22
San 276:5	self-declare 358:13	392:23 402:13	304:6 391:19	355:25
SAP 344:11	360:15 388:6,8	403:8,9 404:14,24	392:2	social 300:25
saw 345:17,18	self-declared	405:11 407:6	significant 301:21	soft 333:21
saying 307:19	360:11 388:10	settling 404:21	303:17 304:11	softer 346:23
358:8 368:8	self-declares	severe 383:6 391:4	305:20 306:18	solar 399:4
says 294:11 341:18	359:22	391:7 400:6	372:8 377:2,15	solal 399.4 solely 304:6
•			,	
348:4 363:9 379:18	semantic 343:16	Share 274:13	380:19 394:12	solid 364:14
	send 333:6 342:11	shared 348:9,10	406:21	solution 373:19
scarce 401:5 404:23	347:2	404:18	significantly	395:14
scenarios 331:16	sense 301:9 307:3	shares 382:19	345:18,19 380:23	solutions 309:17
Schedule 340:25	343:22 371:9	Shaylee 277:13	409:8	380:16 406:10
sciences 300:25	384:16 393:19	354:19 355:5,9,22	similar 296:19	Sommer 275:19
scope 358:21	Sensible 280:14	370:7	357:3,22 358:17	279:19
405:19	sensitive 408:12	she/her 355:11	similarly 393:16	soon 297:1
seal 413:12	sent 347:16 375:3	short 283:17	397:17 400:4	sorry 285:15
Seattle 275:10	sentence 332:21	324:19 333:9	simple 408:2	287:15 288:25
276:10	September 322:25	shortcomings	simply 307:2	291:25 292:15
second 301:12	serious 390:19	397:3	364:17 376:10,20	293:9 295:23
326:23 334:8,11	serve 377:24 399:9	shorter 375:17	376:25 382:18	305:5 308:24
334:13 338:10	399:10,14,24	show 305:11	393:21 395:8	309:8 316:21
344:16 378:9	serves 402:23	325:25 326:9	single 303:20	317:25 320:12
382:19 391:10	service 285:12	329:10 331:19	situation 307:1	322:4 324:8
393:10 395:3	360:13 375:17	335:19 336:7,8,18	365:19 366:6	326:11 328:12
403:6	378:10 391:3,6	337:3,9,10,17	367:15 369:22	331:21 336:10
section 392:19	393:17 399:13,17	338:10 378:2	380:3	337:20 338:5
see 284:13 286:10	399:19,25 400:9	395:20 396:16,17	situations 301:16	351:2 361:1,16
305:16 316:4,15	400:13 409:18	397:20 409:4	303:12 305:15	370:19,21 396:9
347:5 356:11	411:17,21	showed 319:14	380:13 383:4	396:17 397:7
368:4 379:9,24	services 306:4	335:18 398:3	size 301:11	407:23 411:1
384:25 401:24	384:16	405:17	Sjm@dvclaw.com	sort 297:4 304:7
402:1	serving 316:15	shown 338:16	275:22	343:19 344:16
seek 403:23,24	402:18	390:25 408:21	skill 413:10	345:7
,	set 320:25 326:17	shows 307:12		Sound 274:11,13
seeking 392:22			slightly 283:18	
401:1	352:4 382:25	329:20 334:17,23	311:25	276:12 278:10,11
seeks 387:3	395:7 413:11	395:18 396:23	slipped 288:1	279:7 309:17
seen 361:14 385:7	sets 333:14	398:22	sloppy 392:24	315:5 345:11
401:22 408:9	setting 372:1	shut 358:19	slow 388:19	sounds 289:12
segment 381:4	390:11 397:22	Shute 276:4 279:24	slower 382:10	344:17
segments 348:24	settlement 319:7	shutoffs 405:15,22	small 299:11	source 330:2
selected 358:12,13	320:10,18 341:11	Side 280:14	372:19 374:14	359:20
392:7,14 398:2,4	341:18 368:18,20	Sierra 280:7 389:5	smaller 304:4,17	sources 360:5,9
398:8	372:7 373:5,14	sight 374:2	332:10	South 275:15,20
self-declaration	381:8 382:1 384:9	sign 396:15	SMS-9 317:23	SOUTHEAST
295:11 297:12	384:19 385:22	signed 392:23	snapshot 349:19	274:21
	<u> </u>	I	I	1

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	
space 405:4	staff's 284:11 285:2	statistics 314:6	subsidize 400:2	sure 282:23 284:17
speak 317:12 358:8	292:23 293:2	status 339:24	subsidizes 399:3	287:23 301:14
369:1	296:12 297:19	358:24 381:22	substance 401:1	302:2 306:11
speaking 281:12,13	staffing 376:20	384:18 409:15,16	405:14	313:10 318:20
345:10	382:12	status-quo 406:2,5	substantive 301:14	323:23 346:6
special 349:11,14	stage 306:25	statutory 382:13	304:18 316:1,16	354:6 359:23
349:18,25	stages 360:6	stay 411:19	390:2	surprised 403:12
specific 302:21,23	stakeholders	Steel 280:18	success 369:2	survey 287:13
319:13 326:7,13	402:24	step 337:25 358:20	successes 406:15	survive 381:6
327:16 352:15	stakes 401:12,12	steps 365:20	successful 366:25	suspected 405:22
353:8 358:14	stamp 378:1 399:6	stipulate 282:13	suddenly 366:20	swear 290:11
360:16 377:6	400:10	Stokes 277:13	suffer 397:2	308:23
379:9,12 385:3	standard 294:2	354:5,11,19 355:5	sufficient 296:17	swept 318:23
394:16	300:24 369:23	355:9,22 370:7	374:9 410:13	378:18
specifically 302:24	standards 402:17	stop 377:7	sufficiently 395:22	sworn 290:14
310:22 320:15	standpoint 304:18	stopped 345:13	suggest 333:8	298:15 309:3
323:1 330:6	stands 357:15	346:3	364:24	354:20 362:2
342:11 349:24	start 278:23 308:14	storied 399:5	suggested/stated	system 324:9,16,18
358:19 378:2	325:6 370:8	Street 276:4,15	378:13	344:11 345:2
388:24	407:22	stress 307:11	suggestion 359:13	370:11 374:7
specifics 370:2	started 314:3	stresses 307:15	367:4	376:3,25
spell 290:24 299:1	372:19	stressors 383:21,22	suggests 387:18	
308:22 309:14	state 290:24 298:25	383:25 384:5	suitable 284:5	T
355:7 362:15	308:20 309:13	strive 403:25	402:20	T 413:1,1
spelled 299:4	321:2 328:7 355:7	strong 386:19	Suite 275:9,20	tab 334:7,8,13
309:18	362:14,22 365:7	strongly 392:8	276:9,15	337:23
sponsor 291:3	366:3 395:4 399:2	structural 404:6	sum 392:15 407:1	table 325:12,18,22
377:25	399:8 406:16	struggles 382:12	summary 407:20	325:24,25 326:12
sponsors 327:22	410:1 413:3,7,17	studies 305:11	supervision 310:4	326:20,23 327:10
spread 397:13	stated 293:19	study 389:2 398:20	supplement 283:5	327:12,16,20,25
spreadsheet 332:25	370:17,23 373:6	398:21	283:10,12 286:9	328:1,20,23
334:3,5 336:11,21	384:25	studying 301:8	286:12 288:7,24	329:20,23,25
SQUARE 274:21	statement 293:22	stuff 308:10 344:14	supplemental	330:16 334:10,17
staff 275:12 279:9	293:23 294:4,5,6	subject 336:12,13	283:20 285:25	337:23 338:16
279:11 282:24	294:11 370:23	336:17 338:15,22	317:18 320:20,21	350:18,18 352:10
283:2,8,9 284:15	statements 277:18	338:24 387:21	323:7,11 351:4,5	353:4 391:24
285:20,25 286:15	289:17	402:17	supplemented	406:12
289:21 290:18	states 295:13	subjecting 391:11	282:23 283:4	tables 339:13,16,18
294:19 295:2,9	350:10 356:7	submission 360:11	318:19	340:3 351:24,25
296:8,10 297:2,7	390:10 392:4	submissions 356:16	support 295:9	352:2 397:1
310:12 318:6,14	statistical 301:7	submitted 283:4,13	296:8 302:3	Tacoma 274:14
323:5 352:24	304:6 391:19	311:14 393:8	309:25 313:3	take 281:9 282:19
353:7 358:25	392:2	submitting 283:19	334:5 394:24	285:9 293:11
370:4 377:10	statistically 301:20	subsequent 314:4	supported 392:10	317:6 326:1,4,10
379:7,24 389:6	303:16 391:16	subset 372:20	supports 398:13	333:9,11,13
3,7,7,2,7,20,7,0	300.10 371.10		PF 02-10 0 7 0 1 1 0	343:10 344:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 400
345:8 367:4 375:1	396:4,19 397:21	362:8 363:2,5,13	407:13,17,19	384:7 386:4
382:9,17 389:8	398:3	363:19 364:2	410:4,5,18 411:8	391:14 392:7
390:12 396:6	TEP's 293:20	381:3 384:3	411:16,20,24	threatened 367:16
408:16	295:10,12 296:5	387:12 389:25	412:1,5,10,12,15	384:12
taken 274:20,24	329:21,21 390:23	390:10 391:1,15	Thanks 284:6	threatening 364:13
365:4,21 373:23	391:1,19 392:1	391:25 392:3,24	302:17 323:3	364:20 385:17
375:3	TEP-indicated	393:8 394:2,4,16	331:9 341:8 390:4	390:13,18,24
takes 296:1 367:22	324:23	396:23,25 397:16	400:21	395:16
367:23 375:11	term 295:10,13	397:18 400:24	theory 378:17	threatens 387:17
385:6	296:5,9 329:21	403:14 404:2	thing 301:12	threats 390:19
talk 280:25 402:5	356:6 381:15	405:14 408:20	303:19 324:3	391:12
talked 322:24	387:3,4,8	thank 279:8,16,21	369:19 370:1	threshold 303:22
talking 292:16	terms 348:18	280:1,12 283:16	things 301:4 319:13	307:21 314:7
304:11 342:1	350:14 351:8	284:25 285:18	324:2 339:22	352:3,5,15 383:13
346:24 347:3	366:3 370:2	286:21,23 287:6	342:9 346:10	386:2,4 392:3,8
403:4	territory 359:25	287:11,12,24	347:5 406:3,11	392:14 394:22
talks 348:23	test 402:4	288:13,15 289:3	407:21 408:5	395:7,11,13
targeted 342:6	testified 290:15	290:17 291:17	think 284:18 285:9	Thuraisingham
363:23 364:12,24	298:16 309:4	293:13 294:22,25	289:23 297:17,18	404:3,22
367:9 368:23	354:21 362:3	298:5 299:19	304:5,14,16	Thuraisingham's
381:20 384:21	369:13 383:20	300:3 304:19,23	305:25 306:1,13	404:2
385:3,4 386:13	384:23	305:3 307:24	306:21 307:20	Thursday 278:1
387:15 408:4,24	testifying 299:13	308:2,4 309:8	308:18 317:2,5	410:13
tariff 297:14	362:24	317:21 322:6,8	335:6 340:17	Tia 274:25 413:6
357:23	testimonies 388:23	324:20,22,25	342:25 343:23,24	413:16,16
taught 406:9	389:2	325:17 326:16	344:4 345:12	time 284:2 287:4
teaching 299:9	testimony 281:3	327:8 328:15,17	350:15 354:4	288:3,6,9 293:3,7
team 320:2	282:9,9 288:20	329:1,14 330:4,21	359:24 360:3,6,12	293:10 294:20
technical 281:15,19	289:11 290:19	331:10,18,24	360:14,16 361:10	296:15,16,25
344:14	291:7 292:11,14	333:18,25 334:12	361:17 365:18	297:2,5 304:19
technologically	292:21,23 293:2,4	334:22 335:13	366:7 367:5 368:8	308:4 310:7 313:6
376:11	293:8 295:18	338:2 339:4,8	370:7 371:19	314:16 315:10,13
telephone 324:9	298:5 299:15	341:3,9 345:21,23	377:19 379:14,14	315:18 317:1,3,5
tell 349:14 370:19	300:9 302:4,6,24	347:13 353:18,20	379:16 407:21	324:19 326:4,10
ten 306:19 333:13	305:9 309:25	354:23 355:12,18	410:12	330:24 333:10
tender 298:19	310:6,18 317:11	355:21,22 359:17	thinking 293:3,7	339:4 344:12
354:25 362:6	321:1 325:8,14	360:20,24 361:18	310:21	345:17 349:19
TEP 284:22,23	326:20 327:10,12	361:20,21 362:5,9	third 374:1 408:14	360:24 361:19
289:14 291:20	327:22 328:10,14	363:15,17 366:11	Thompson 341:17	368:17,19 371:15
292:6,8 294:18	328:20,24 329:4	369:5,6 370:13	403:13	372:6 373:23
299:23 302:2,19	329:17 330:25	371:13,14,14,22	thought 409:23	376:22,23 377:7,8
357:22 379:24	332:1 340:7	371:25 372:1	thousands 304:12	382:9,17 384:17
391:13,21 392:8	341:18 349:7,13	377:9 380:5,6,8	threat 368:23 386:9	389:7,13 390:1
392:20 394:4,6,11	350:4 352:23	389:7,18,19,21	386:15	392:25 396:14
394:14 395:14,20	355:1,13,16,25	390:5 400:16,17	threaten 383:16	398:2,4,7 405:19
L	1	1	1	1

400.0				101 11101
409:3	274:2,4,20 275:14	354:5 377:18	375:23,24 406:20	401:6,16,24
time-consuming	tread 403:5	391:1 400:23	understood 307:24	402:18,23 405:14
382:5	treatment 274:13	two-way 385:5	321:13 322:22	405:22 406:16
timely 393:3	278:12 358:1	type 344:9 364:14	381:16	410:1
times 301:18	trial 360:4	385:1 391:10	underway 406:25	utility's 394:15
303:14 306:19	Tribe 280:19	types 317:7 342:9	undoubtedly 387:9	395:10
382:8 408:19	tried 306:25 346:1	346:10 347:5	unit 275:9 362:23	utter 383:14
timing 325:12	346:17 364:18,19	350:14 367:25	universal 399:12,25	
326:6	368:25 373:18	371:8 391:1	University 299:8	V
title 308:21 309:14	trouble 308:12	398:17 408:24	unknown 365:3	v 274:6
today 278:6,15	troubled 403:6		unreasonable	values 402:1
280:3,19,22 281:1	true 307:12 318:8	<u>U</u>	396:13	Van 275:20
281:17 282:6	319:9,10,12 347:1	U-210800 381:12	unsuccessful	variables 330:11
283:22 285:7,9	348:15 380:14	381:24 402:21	373:19 374:24	varies 321:17,17
287:14 288:24	413:9	UE-220066 274:5	unvetted 378:23	variety 369:24
289:15,17,20	try 306:1 357:1	278:7	update 285:25	371:8
298:5 299:13	374:19 379:21	UG-210918 274:10	286:14 373:11	various 379:23
304:19 325:20,23	trying 302:22	278:8	updated 397:1,2	vary 402:22
339:4,19,24	346:16,23 359:25	UG-220067 274:5	updates 290:19	vast 344:22
355:16 362:25	Tukwila 342:12	278:7	upend 401:20	verification 358:14
372:1,15 373:5	turn 281:2,3,21	ultimate 342:16	402:10	359:6
374:17 388:23	282:12,16 286:18	344:3,18	upfront 343:4	verifications
389:7 390:3,16	287:8 289:16	ultimately 320:17	uptick 347:6 385:1	358:11
393:9 399:13	290:7 291:20	unable 383:4	urban 399:8,15,24	verify 297:16
400:22,24 405:14	298:7,11 300:9	385:10	400:2	312:20 346:9
406:12 409:8	308:8 310:21	unclear 284:17	urgent 343:6	357:24 358:24
410:25	315:15 317:10,16	uncollectable 397:7	374:24 408:22	verifying 358:14
told 312:16 315:11	320:25 325:8,18	397:11	use 281:12 349:17	version 287:16
tomorrow 379:20	326:19 327:9	under-earning	383:2 392:11	288:23 349:2,4
top 285:15 322:4	328:10 329:4,17	398:23	404:23 411:3	versus 278:10
337:23 340:11,13	330:3 331:2,11	underlying 282:2	useful 303:4	381:2
349:11	332:25 334:2,13	underscore 409:12	usual 390:19	vet 358:19
topic 357:19	335:23 338:3	underscores 398:7	406:10	vetted 283:14
topics 329:15	348:3,17,22 349:7	underscoring	usually 361:10	284:12 409:23
total 335:23,24	350:8 352:20,23	407:22	UTC 389:14 411:19	VI 274:17
350:21 403:9	354:11,12 356:1	underserved 404:7	412:3	video 281:12
touch 388:24	turning 283:8	understand 303:1	utilities 274:2,4,20	view 369:25 381:7
tough 360:17	289:19 323:4	307:6 318:20	275:14 399:6	viewed 373:13
382:15	376:18 403:4	320:6,13 343:25	402:21 405:18	visible 335:10
tougher 368:9,9	twice 392:6	344:5 367:9,10,21	utility 300:7 304:3	vision 356:15,18
track 350:10	two 301:3,3 320:1	369:19 378:17	358:16 359:20	visit 375:4 376:1
traditional 398:14	333:13 335:12,18	380:25	360:10 369:23	voice 324:8 401:10
transcript 413:8	336:7 337:3,9	understanding	378:12 391:3,6,10	volume 274:17
transition 404:8	343:5 350:22	319:19 322:21	392:22 395:4,6	290:7 312:25
Transportation	351:24 352:2	323:9,13 365:20	399:17 400:9,13	313:1 326:3
		366:6,9 367:14,24		voluminous 365:24
	<u>I</u>	Į	Į	1

	1	1	1	
voluntarily 346:3	392:19 402:5	weight 283:15	362:6 363:16,21	319:11,11 320:7
vulnerability	404:1 405:5 407:2	285:2 368:15	364:2,4,10 365:1	364:14
353:14 388:7	409:12,20	Weinberger 276:4	365:7,11,16 367:5	writing 411:3,6
vulnerable 322:2	wanted 323:12	279:24	368:14 369:9,12	written 308:17
353:6 358:24	356:14,18,25	well-resourced	369:18 370:7,19	WUTC 278:9
360:2,2 365:25	357:5 404:17	399:3	370:25 371:3,5	
369:12 374:10	wants 397:11	went 346:8,11,13	380:20,22 381:3	X
380:12,18 383:7	Washington 274:1	weren't 359:11	383:7 384:23	<u> </u>
386:20 387:4,20	274:4,20,25 275:8	Western 275:18	385:9,12 386:12	
388:1,4,18 391:18	278:1 362:22	279:17	387:5,12 413:11	yeah 283:24 284:7
394:8,13 400:7,13	405:23 413:3,7,17	whatsoever 343:14	witness's 289:11	297:9,23 305:25
402:12 406:6	Washington's	WHEREOF	302:6	328:13 337:22
407:12 410:3	380:23	413:11	witnesses 281:4,6	342:2 345:5
	wasn't 319:17	wide 371:7	289:19 341:15	346:15 347:1
W	350:16 411:2	widespread 396:13	344:21 354:7	359:3 361:3 369:3
W 275:4	wave 379:19	willing 357:8	388:22 412:12	369:18 410:17
W-A-L-L-A-C-E	way 275:20 292:25	withdraw 288:1,11	wondering 319:9	year 329:12 368:21
309:19	300:25 301:14	witness 277:3,5,8	341:21 347:19	374:1 379:25
WA 274:21 275:10	306:1 315:21	277:13,15 288:11	WOODLAND	385:14
275:16 276:10,15	372:16 383:15	289:9,20 290:1,3	274:21	years 320:1 345:11
waiving 288:10	403:6 406:11	290:8,18 295:4,7	words 385:17	367:18 371:6
walk 285:5 404:20	408:13,13 410:3	295:19,23 296:2,6	390:12 401:3	382:3 388:1
404:25	ways 303:25 307:1	296:10,13,24	405:13	389:11 397:14
walked 339:12	368:6 383:24	297:9,17,23 298:9	work 316:5 326:8	399:6 400:1 406:9
Wallace 277:8	we'll 281:3,5 290:5	298:19 302:2,4	343:20 345:12,20	409:2 411:17,21
288:11 308:7,19	333:13 335:6	305:8,17,25	363:24 364:8,15	412:3 Von 252:2
308:20 309:2,13	348:1 380:4 411:5	307:10 308:2,7,10	366:5 370:11	Yep 353:2 Yochanan 276:3
309:16 310:10	we're 282:18	317:24 318:12	373:19 384:4	
322:12 325:4	289:13,18 304:11	341:24 342:2,20	408:16 409:1,2	279:23 286:6 351:22
334:4 339:5,12	320:4 330:25	342:23,25 343:15	411:20	young 391:7
341:9 347:15	331:25 333:15	343:23 344:19,24	worked 316:8,10	Yzakai@smwlaw
348:2 364:3	346:21 353:25	345:5,10 346:2,19	317:4 345:12	276:6
369:12 374:17	360:6 361:5	347:1,12,18,21	380:24 394:4	270.0
375:14 384:23	365:19 366:7,20	348:10,15,20	403:15 404:15	\mathbf{Z}
385:9	368:4 372:14	349:4,9,16 350:1	working 279:4	Zakai 276:3 277:4
Wallace's 396:25	373:22 397:9	350:6,15,23 351:1	289:25 316:11	277:6,10,13,20
397:16,18	403:4 405:9	351:9,11,15,17,20	357:8,10 370:4,8	279:23,23 286:4,6
Walmart 280:2	we've 385:7 400:24	352:4,11,17,22,22	370:10 386:10	286:6 287:2 289:7
wand 379:19	wealth 388:23	353:2,11,16 354:5	406:10	291:16 293:14
want 281:10 290:6	wealthy 399:18,20	354:6,11,14,24	works 343:24	294:21,22 300:2
295:17 297:19	399:23 400:3,5	355:19 356:4,12	344:17 379:10	301:23 302:1,23
301:12 307:13	web 354:12	356:17 357:20	worries 318:1	303:6,10 304:19
308:14 318:20	website 324:10	358:3 359:3,12,23	worse 406:3	324:25 325:3
330:3 360:5	week 284:10	360:12,23 361:18	worsened 378:16	333:8,25 334:1
366:13 369:19	410:12	361:20,22,23	wouldn't 307:8	336:16 339:4,12
386:23 389:8				
	•	•	•	-

				Tage 400
340:6 351:22	11th 311:9 322:25	322:16 337:19,24	30 321:1 338:5	407 277:21
355:4,18 360:25	12 300:10 317:12	338:11 372:17,24	363:5,5	40X 338:6
361:3,8,13 390:7	363:20 389:11	372:25 373:5,24	300 277:6	413 274:17
Zoom 275:7,19	396:6,11	398:3	3013 283:3	415 276:5
276:3,8,18 277:5	12:22 412:16	2023 325:15 329:10	305 277:7	425 276:16
277:13,15 290:1,5	129 341:1	329:12 337:19,25	309 277:8	43 328:7,19
290:6 412:3,6	12th 313:17	338:11 351:7	310 277:9	431 351:4
	13 300:12	373:21 393:7	313 318:7 323:6	441 350:9
0	13-minute 333:16	395:2 398:3	314 352:25	450 275:20
0.23 338:20 398:6	14 310:22	2024 274:24 278:1	32 345:11	464-6595 275:10
0.34 338:19 398:6	1400 275:15	325:23 413:9,12	322 277:9	4th 276:15
0.49 397:23	14th 322:25	2025 396:12,17,18	325 277:10	
0.57 337:11	15 395:1	206 275:10	339 277:10	5
0.73 336:9	150 351:25 352:3	206)343-7340	34 295:22 296:4	5 295:13 296:5,9
0.74 397:23	352:10 363:9	276:10	355:25	325:11 329:20,23
0.77 336:19 337:4	16 348:5 382:6	21 322:25,25	341 277:11	331:16,19 333:21
	160 366:20	210800 373:9	345 277:11	341:17 348:22
1	164 373:25	23 349:8	347 277:12	356:6 363:20
1 284:16 296:4	164.9 339:25	24 327:7,13,17	355 277:13,14	388:1,12 398:22
325:21,23 328:5,7	17 326:20 328:13	328:1,2,5,23	359 277:14	398:24
328:11,20 332:5,5	1750 275:20	375:16 395:1	360 275:16	5/15/2026 413:18
332:9 334:8,9,11	17th 325:14	24-hour 343:8	362 277:16	50 386:2 395:7
334:13,18 336:9	18 274:24 278:1	241-7242 275:21	363 277:16	503 275:21
336:20 337:5,11	325:9 391:14,24	25 306:17	366 277:17	552-7272 276:5
341:12 346:14	413:9	250,000 312:24	369 277:17	586-7777 275:16
350:18 356:1	19 325:18 327:10	25th 410:17	371 277:19	5th 323:1
387:14 397:18,18	1st 334:11	26 315:15 329:18	377 277:19	
410:16		26th 413:12	380 277:20	6
1,000 305:21	2	27 315:24	38D 334:23	6 300:12 337:16,17
306:19 327:1	2 317:10 325:12,18	274 274:17	390 277:20	337:20 349:11
341:25 349:12	326:20,23 327:10	2798 274:25 413:16	396 276:4	396:2 397:1
352:3 372:22	327:12 328:11,16	28 332:1	39D 337:1	60 321:3
381:14 383:13	328:20,23 329:7	28-29 397:16	39F 337:8	610 276:9
386:3,14 391:22	329:10 331:14	29 315:24 364:23	39X 323:6	611 302:8
394:2 407:5	332:20 353:4	290 277:3	3rd 276:9	621 274:21
1.1 304:10	364:23 387:20	291 277:4		635-1419 276:16
1.2 304:10	20 281:8 332:3	295 277:4	4	68,000 347:2 351:7
1.5 301:18 303:14	200 326:24 349:21	298 277:6	4 295:10 296:5	6th 346:3
304:3,14	363:10 366:21		305:10,10 348:23	7
10 331:11 341:10	2000 275:9	3	356:2 388:9	
10,658 327:3	2013 344:10	3 329:21 330:6	4.8 331:20 332:10	7 294:11 305:10
10:30 333:15,17	2020 346:4	331:16 349:11	332:12,21 334:7	313:11 325:11 70 352:5
10885 276:15	2021 323:1 348:5	388:4 397:1	340:17,19	70 352:5 700 276:15
10th 282:8 288:21	378:11 387:24	3.2 331:21 332:12	40 321:8,15,22,24	
11 311:4 317:12	2022 311:4,9	332:21 334:7	400 277:21	72-hour 343:6
321:2 363:6	313:18 314:3,16	3.8 331:21 332:10	40128 275:15	
	I	I	I	I

			Page 440
8			
8 329:5,7 363:20			
800 275:9			
810 276:9 8th 314:16			
9			
9 321:2 9:00 278:2			
94102 276:5			
97201 275:21			
98004 276:15 98104 275:10			
276:10			
98503 274:21			
98504 275:16 99 323:24 324:18			
9A-940351 294:8			
	l		