## Docket No. TP-220513

## **WUTC v. Puget Sound Pilots**

August 4, 2022



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 1	Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; AUGUST 4, 2022 2 9:30 A.M.
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND )DOCKET TP-220513	3000
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)	4 PROCEEDINGS
Complainant, )	5
vs. )	6 JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning. Let's be on
) PUGET SOUND PILOTS, )	7 the record. We're here today for a prehearing 8 conference in Docket TP-220513. This case is captioned
)	9 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
Respondent. )	10 versus Puget Sound Pilots. This is a general rate case
VIRTUAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I	11 filed by Puget Sound Pilots, or PSP.
Pages 1-53	12 My name is Michael Howard. I'm an
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD	administrative law judge with the Commission, and I'll
	14 be co-presiding in this matter along with the
August 4, 2022 9:30 a.m.	15 Commissioners. The Commissioners will not be joining us
Washington Litilities and Transportation Commission	16 today at this particular conference, though.
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast	17 Let's start by taking appearances starting
Lacey, Washington 98503	18 with Puget Sound Pilots.  19 MR. HAGLUND: Mike Haglund and Eric
	19 MR. HAGLUND: Mike Haglund and Eric 20 Brickenstein on behalf of Puget Sound Pilots.
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	21 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840	22 Could we have an appearance for Staff?
Seattle, Washington 98101	23 MR. FUKANO: Harry Fukano, Assistant
(206) 287-9066   Seattle (360) 534-9066   Olympia	24 Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Commission
(800) 846-6898   National	25 Staff.
www.buellrealtime.com	
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. ILLIDGE:	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD	2 Could we have an appearance for Pacific
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	<ul> <li>Could we have an appearance for Pacific</li> <li>Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?</li> </ul>
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO	2 Could we have an appearance for Pacific 3 Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? 4 MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128	2 Could we have an appearance for Pacific 3 Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? 4 MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle 5 DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504	2 Could we have an appearance for Pacific 3 Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? 4 MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle 5 DeLappe, appearing for PMSA. 6 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov	2 Could we have an appearance for Pacific 3 Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? 4 MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle 5 DeLappe, appearing for PMSA. 6 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 7 Could we have an appearance for TOTE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND	Could we have an appearance for Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle DeLappe, appearing for PMSA. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance for TOTE Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 13 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com 14 ebrickenstein@hk-law.com	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this  time?
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 13 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com 14 ebrickenstein@hk-law.com 15 FOR PMSA:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this  time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 13 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com 14 ebrickenstein@hk-law.com 15 FOR PMSA: 16 MICHELLE DELAPPE	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this  time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 13 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@nk-law.com 14 ebrickenstein@hk-law.com 15 FOR PMSA: 16 MICHELLE DELAPPE 17 Fox Rothschild LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4400	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com  HOMEL HAGLAND  STORM PORT SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND FOR	Could we have an appearance for Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle DeLappe, appearing for PMSA. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance for TOTE Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE? MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Are there any organizations on the call that would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with Northwest Marine Trade Association. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 5 HARRY FUKANO 6 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 7 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 8 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov 9 FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS: 10 MICHAEL HAGLUND 11 ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 12 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 13 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@nk-law.com 14 ebrickenstein@hk-law.com 15 FOR PMSA: 16 MICHELLE DELAPPE Fox Rothschild LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4400 18 Seattle, Washington 98154 (206) 389-1668 19 seasalt@foxrothschild.com	Could we have an appearance for Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA? MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle DeLappe, appearing for PMSA. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an appearance for TOTE Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE? MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Are there any organizations on the call that would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with Northwest Marine Trade Association. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:     MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 2 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com  FOR PMSA:  MICHELLE DELAPPE Fox Rothschild LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4400 Seattle, Washington 98154 (206) 389-1668 seasalt@foxrothschild.com  FOR TOTE:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?  Do you plan on filing a petition to intervene?
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?  Do you plan on filing a petition to intervene?  MR. JENNINGS: We do not at the moment.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MICHAEL HOWARD  FOR COMMISSION STAFF:  HARRY FUKANO Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 995-2818 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov  FOR PUGET SOUND PILOTS:  MICHAEL HAGLUND ERIC BRICKENSTEIN Haglund Kelley LLP 2177 SW Broadway Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 225-0777 mhaglund@hk-law.com  FOR PMSA:  MICHELLE DELAPPE Fox Rothschild LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4400 Seattle, Washington 98154 (206) 389-1668 Seasaalt@foxrothschild.com  FOR TOTE:  STEVE BLOCK Lane Powell PC 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?  Do you plan on filing a petition to intervene?  MR. JENNINGS: We do not at the moment.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Okay. Are you here as an observer essentially?  MR. JENNINGS: Essentially.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?  Do you plan on filing a petition to intervene?  MR. JENNINGS: We do not at the moment.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Okay. Are you here as an observer essentially.  MR. JENNINGS: Essentially.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. In
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	Could we have an appearance for Pacific  Merchant Shipping Association, or PMSA?  MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. Michelle  DeLappe, appearing for PMSA.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Could we have an appearance for TOTE  Maritime Alaska LLC, or TOTE?  MR. BLOCK: Steve Block appearing for TOTE,  Your Honor.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  Are there any organizations on the call that  would like to give a verbal notice of appearance at this time?  MR. JENNINGS: This is Jay Jennings with  Northwest Marine Trade Association.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would you would you mind giving your contact information?  Do you plan on filing a petition to intervene?  MR. JENNINGS: We do not at the moment.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Okay. Are you here as an observer essentially?  MR. JENNINGS: Essentially.

Docket No. TP-220513 - 8/4/2022 Page 5 Page 7 1 1 on those factors in both of -- in all of these filings. be necessary, but thank you. 2 2 So let's move on to petitions for The proposed reply, however, omits any 3 3 intervention. Are there any petitions to intervene mention of this foundational case neither -- it neither 4 other than the ones that have been filed in writing? We 4 presents an argument for why PSP's situation satisfied 5 5 have one from PMSA and one from TOTE. the Pacific Northwest Bell factors nor any argument for 6 All right. Hearing none, we received the 6 not applying those factors to this case. And as such, 7 7 two petitions to intervene from PMSA and TOTE. Are PMSA would submit that it does not therefore contribute 8 there any objections to either of these petitions? 8 to the discussion and that the motion to file the reply 9 MR. HAGLUND: None from PSP, Your Honor. 9 should be denied. Thank you. 10 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 11 MR. FUKANO: None from Staff, Your Honor. 11 Would any other party -- I will turn to PSP 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 12 in a moment, but would any other party like to respond I'm not hearing any further objections. I 13 and give its position on this motion? 13 do see we might have a couple of observers who may need 14 14 MR. FUKANO: Staff would also object to the 15 to mute their lines. So please check, if you are 15 motion for leave to file a reply. Staff believes that 16 observing, that your line is muted. 16 PSP has not necessarily satisfied the standard for good 17 All right. So we have -- next -- I'm sorry. 17 cause. PSP raises numerous specific citations and 18 All right. Hearing no objections to these petitions, I 18 arguments as part of its proposed reply that were not 19 will grant the two petitions to intervene from PMSA and 19 included in its original petition. 20 TOTE as these organizations have a substantial interest 20 The original petition did not contain any 21 in the case and their participation is in the public 21 citations specific -- to specific components of PSP's 22 22 general rate case and only cited the Commission's final interest. 23 23 So moving next to pending motions. So as order in a prior pilotage case once. 24 parties are aware, we have five pending motions or 24 In reply, PSP provides several citations to 25 petitions in this docket. We have PSP's petition for 25 exhibits and develops arguments that could have been Page 6 Page 8 1 interim rate relief, we have PSP's motion for leave to 1 made as part of the original petition. 2 2 file reply in support of that same petition, we have Staff maintains that it's procedurally 3 3 PSP's motion for an expedited schedule, we have PMSA's improper and unfair to allow parties to identify for the 4 motion to dismiss, and we have PSP's motion for leave to 4 first time in reply this specific evidence and arguments 5 5 that it seeks to rely on to justify the requested supplement the record. 6 6 I want to ask the parties if they have inquiries. 7 objections to the two most recently filed motions. I 7 Staff would also like to comment in part 8 emailed the parties yesterday indicating I would be 8 that as to the substance that -- that Staff did oppose 9 asking for oral responses to these two motions in the the inclusion of expenses that were included as part of 9 10 interest of judicial time. 10 the proposed automatic adjuster as part of footnote 3 to 11 11 First -- of these two, first, we have PSP's Staff's response. 12 motion for leave to file reply in support of its 12 Staff has some further commentary on the 13 petition for interim rate relief. PSP filed this motion 13 substance of the reply, but we'll reserve that for later 14 for leave to file reply on August 2nd, 2022. 14 if -- if the Commission desires. 15 Are there any objections from any of the 15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. parties to PSP's motion for leave to file reply? 16 Does -- does TOTE wish to give a position on 16 17 17 MS. DELAPPE: Your Honor, Michelle DeLappe this?

MR. BLOCK: TOTE takes no position on either

MR. HAGLUND: Yes, Your Honor. Our major

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

point would be, as laid out in our reply, that PMSA and

Staff made arguments that were not anticipated in the

Would PSP like to give a brief response to

of the motions, Your Honor.

those comments?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for PMSA. I would like to lodge an objection. PMSA

would oppose the granting of that leave to file a reply.

PMSA and its petition as well as Staff and -- excuse me,

PSP and its petition, as well as Staff and PMSA in their

opposition, cited Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone with

appropriate. And this Commission's Order No. 2 focused

guidance on when interim rate increases might be

As Your Honor knows, all three parties, starting with

Page 9

original motion. And the reply is appropriate in order to respond to the points that they made in their opposition pleadings. It's standard for there to be reply in this sort of setting, and we would urge the Court to allow it, grant it, and give it the weight to which you consider it due.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, everyone, for your comments. I am going to grant PSP's motion for leave to file reply and accept the reply as filed. And I will -- and we will discuss this -- the petition itself in a few minutes from now. I believe PSP has shown good cause for filing a reply. The issue of the merits of the underlying petition, again, we will talk about it in a few moments.

So moving next to PSP's motion for leave to supplement the record. This was also filed two days ago, where PSP seeks leave to file the executive summary of its case. Are there any objections to this motion? I would turn first to Staff.

MR. FUKANO: Staff recommend that the Commission deny the motion to supplement the record. While Staff appreciates the attempt to summarize the extensive amount of material filed by PSP, Staff is concerned that the executive summary filed goes beyond merely summarizing the rate case material by identifying

Page 11

So it definitely seems that either one situation or the other is present and that we would not have both the summary needed, plus an expedited case. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Would PSP like to offer a brief response to
those comments? I have -- I -- I noted that TOTE has no
position on either motion.

MR. BLOCK: That is correct, Your Honor. No position.

MR. HAGLUND: Yes, Your Honor. We think it's clearly public interest to allow the executive summary to be filed.

We would state at the outset that we would have no objection to either Staff or PMSA following a similar approach. We have -- it's been pointed out by the intervenors and Staff that PSP filed testimony, a mound over 500 pages, 22 witnesses, and we have over a thousand pages of exhibits and some 120-plus exhibits.

It's an effort to provide the Court, the Commissioners, and the opposing parties with a roadmap to our case. And in particular, I think -- we know -- we know that this case is going to be of interest to the public. There will be a public hearing component that hopefully gets set today. And if you are a member of

Page 10

witness testimony on particular subjects and instead appears to be advocating for PSP's position similar to a legal brief in advance of the briefing schedule that will be set by the Commission.

To the extent that the arguments are already contained in the witness' testimony, the arguments appear accumulative and duplicative, and Staff believes that the filing is procedurally improper and should be reserved for the briefing stage of this proceeding.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could I hear from PMSA?

MS. DELAPPE: Yes, Your Honor. PMSA also would oppose the proposed supplement in its current form. It's similar concerns to those cited by Staff.

I would also add that if -- to the extent it is testimony of counsel that PSP wishes to introduce, that it should be designated as such. But if it is just an actual executive summary that PSP wishes to submit, it would need to be something that would be concise and highlight the issues in evidence at a very high level and a non-argumentative way and not such lengths.

I would also query to whether any summary is needed if PSP's case is simple. And if PSP's case is complex, then that would seem to indicate that an expedited schedule is not possible. Page 12

the public or even a party and you want to have a sense of -- of -- if you wanted to track our case through the witnesses on an issue-by-issue basis, you're really in no position to do that without the executive summary.

We are not submitting it as evidence. We're submitting it as a supplement to the record that is designed to do exactly what the executive summary says, provide a roadmap to our case in a handy guide. If you want to look at all the witnesses who speak to the diversity, equity, and inclusion issue, they are listed at the end of that brief section with the page ranges by witness.

We think it's a help and we think it's hard to conceive of a public interest against its allowance. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

After considering all of the parties' comments on this, I am denying the motion for leave to supplement the record. I did closely review the proposed executive summary. It seems largely tied -- in large part tied to the testimony that's already been filed, but I am concerned it does contain arguments from counsel which are not sponsored specifically by a witness and is not merely a concise roadmap of the topics discussed in the testimony. And it also tends to

Page 13

depart from Commission practice, something along the lines that's approximately 40 pages filed about one month after the regulated company's initial filing.

So if -- if PSP is interested in doing something like this in the future, I would encourage PSP to look at testimony filed by lead witnesses by utilities before the Commission, and that would be more consistent with our normal practice here.

So I'm going to move on now to discuss each of the three remaining motions or petitions and provide a brief verbal ruling on each. And there will be more detail for my reasoning in the written prehearing conference order, which will follow our meeting today.

First, I'm going to discuss PMSA's motion to dismiss. This is, of course, a threshold issue. If the Commission granted this motion, the case could not proceed.

The Commission is denying PMSA's motion to dismiss. Although it appears that PSP did not follow the Commission's instructions with regards to hiring a mutually agreeable third party to facilitate discussions around the transitioning of its retirement program, the Commission is not persuaded and it's remedy is to reject PSP's rate case without prejudice.

It is appropriate instead, we believe, to

accompanying reply, which I have accepted at this prehearing conference, cites relatively minimal evidence establishing financial need of hardship -- or hardship, excuse me.

Page 15

I have considered PSP's reply for the petition, and it appears that this reply generally fails to address factors set forth in Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone.

I would also observe briefly that PSP petition and its motion for expedited schedule does not provide any specific procedural deadlines or process that would allow the parties and the Commission to review its request for interim rate relief. There's no separate hearing date earlier in the schedule proposed to review a request for interim rate relief.

While I'm not suggesting this is required for the Commission to -- to move forward and consider such a request, this is a relevant factor from Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone that should be addressed in any request for interim rate relief.

Finally, I'm going to discuss PSP's motion for expedited schedule. This motion is also being denied. PSP has brought forward a general rate case with 22 witnesses and approximately 3,000 pages of testimony, exhibits, and initial filing. This is not a

Page 14

require the parties to engage in a mediated discussion during the pendency of this rate case. And I will address this point later in today's conference.

Next I'm going to discuss PSP's petition for interim rate relief. PSP essentially -- and I am -- I am summarizing here and not saying this exactly -- requesting a 1.4 percent adjustment.

We -- we may want to check our -- that we're muted if you're an observer.

PSP essentially requests -- if someone is calling in as Captain L, you might -- thank you. Thank you. Not a big deal.

PSP essentially requests a 1.4 percent adjustment to its revenue requirement for the addition of removal of licensed pilots. The Commission is denying PSP's petition for interim rate relief.

As a general matter, this petition does not meet the standards discussed by the Commission in Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone. It does not demonstrate an actual emergency, gross hardship, or gross inequity. It does not demonstrate that the failure to provide interim rate relief would cause clear jeopardy to PSP or its member pilots.

In contrast, past cases where the Commission has granted such relief, PSP's petition and the

Page 16

limited issue rate case that would be appropriate for an expedited schedule before the Commission.

I'm also going to observe here that PSP did not fully comply with the Commission's instructions with respect to engaging in mutually agreeable third-party to conduct the workshops around transitioning its retirement plan. The rate of return workshop led by Staff did not happen either, even if that was not necessarily the fault of PSP.

Because these issues have not been discussed and considered by the parties as contemplated by final Order 09 in Docket TP-190976, this is another factor weighing against an expedited schedule.

Therefore, this case is going to proceed on a regular 11-month calendar. For today's purposes, I am calculating a suspension date of May 29th, 2023, which falls 11 months after the filing of PSP's rate case.

The actual statutory suspension date, if you read the statutes that give the Commission its jurisdiction, would be later because it would be based on effective date of the tariffs. But I'm using May 29th, 2023, as the date for today's purposes.

So let's move on to discussing a procedural schedule for the case with those rulings in mind. Since we have disposed of pending motions, we should alter the

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

2

3

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

Page 17

procedural schedule. There are certain standard items that we would expect to see in such schedule. We will need to set deadlines for response testimony, rebuttal testimony, prehearing submissions, and a discovery deadline. We also need to include at least one settlement conference.

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

For the evidentiary hearing in this case, I'm proposing the dates of February 22nd and 23rd, 2023. That is February 22nd, 23rd, 2023. The hearing could also be held on March 1st and 2nd, 2023. Because I'm using May 29th, 2023, as the effective due date for the final order, briefing in this case would need to be completed by March 29th. That means that choosing the later hearing date may limit the parties to one round of post-hearing briefing. Please keep these points in mind as we discuss a procedural schedule.

As I mentioned earlier, I'm also going to propose one more item for the schedule in this case for the issue of transitioning PSP's retirement plan, which I -- which I have referred to earlier.

While PSP states it has the agreement of two stakeholders for its retirement plan, it does not appear that we have a comprehensive stakeholder evaluation or other considerations as contemplated by Final Order 09.

I, therefore, plan to require the parties to

public comment hearing is -- is something I haven't

fully decided on, and I would welcome the parties' thoughts after maybe we go off the record for a bit.

4 And -- and normally Public Counsel is involved in that.

5 Public Counsel has not appeared in this case yet.

So I would encourage PSP to confer with Staff and the other parties, and I would be willing to consider any comments about whether we would have such a thing.

Page 19

Page 20

MR. HAGLUND: Okay. We will do so, but I believe in the order, it -- it stated that it would happen in this next case. So...

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

MR. HAGLUND: We will confer with the other parties. But if the -- we're comfortable with 22, 23, and we understand your -- your rulings. And we would be open to the convening of the ALJ mediated pension-related session at any time. Later this -- I guess we would prefer to see that happen sometime in the fall or early winter of -- of this year rather than have it be anywhere close to the hearing date.

JUDGE HOWARD: I think that is -- that is a likely -- that would be a likely time range for that. Thank you.

Would any other party like to raise any

Page 18

attend a settlement discussion on the transition of its retirement plan mediated by a Commission ALJ other than myself trained in mediation. I would not personally handle mediation, and this could be included in the schedule as a second settlement conference. And then following that mediated settlement discussion, any settlement or partial settlement could be presented to the Commission for consideration.

Would the parties like to respond to any of my points I've made about the procedural schedule or about the mediated discussion on the retirement plan? I'd turn first to PSP.

MR. HAGLUND: Your Honor, we would be open to the February 22, 23 date in order to ensure both simultaneous opening briefs and reply briefs. We would point out that there also needs to be a time frame for public testimony. Did you contemplate that during those two days or on a separate day?

JUDGE HOWARD: Normally we would have the public comment hearing at a -- at an earlier date than the evidentiary hearing. That is certainly something that can be considered. I know it was discussed in PSP's last rate case before the Commission, but I don't believe that they actually proceeded with holding one.

So I think that is -- a possibility of a

concerns or questions about -- about these points or the

mediated discussion? MR. FUKANO: Just a -- oh, please go ahead.

MS. DELAPPE: No, no, I wanted you to go first. Thank you.

MR. FUKANO: I just wanted to confirm, Your Honor, that all the parties would include Staff as well or if that was your intent. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.

MR. FUKANO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DELAPPE: And Michelle DeLappe on behalf of PMSA. I had a couple of questions.

First, we agree with Mr. Haglund that a public comment hearing would be appropriate. It is at -- just for your reference, Your Honor, paragraph 391 of Order 9, and so -- so we hope that that will be included in the scheduling order.

Regarding the proposed hearing dates, the proposed dates are completely acceptable except we do have a concern about whether two days will be sufficient given the volume of evidence with about twice the number of -- actually, exactly twice the number of initial witnesses as in the last PSP rate filing, initial filing and about double the amount of volume of evidence, we're concerned about being able to have sufficient time.

Page 21

However, if there were a way to narrow the evidence, we would very much welcome that.

And I do want to just note that we had some discovery questions with that -- in regard to that too. You know, we'd like to have a discovery conference built into the schedule, ideally with a facilitator, if possible.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And then thank you for that citation.

The -- the -- for a public comment hearing, if that is going to be included, I think we could probably include that as a to be determined date for now in the schedule, and then the parties can work with the Commission to set that up based on what's available on the Commission's calendars. The Commissioners' calendars.

As to whether two days is sufficient, if that is a point to consider, it might be worthwhile to reserve time on the 24th in case we need to go over. I'm -- I'm hopeful that that would not be the case because our hearings are generally limited to just cross, but it -- it might be a good idea to do that.

I should also mention that because -because of the -- the number of issues and the amount of evidence and that this is still only the second rate raised?

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.

MR. HAGLUND: With respect to the 9th or the 11th, it happens that I have family from overseas that will be visiting for Christmas holidays. And so the 11th would be much preferred over the 9th for cross-answering testimony.

Page 23

And then with respect to the nature of the hearing, we have at least one witness who may be aboard a ship with good technical capability during the time of the hearing. I'll need to check with Chief Mate Alysia Johnson. She works 75 days on, 75 days off for Subcom, a cable ship laying vessel. And there's some potential that her on-duty time would coincide with February 22, 23, 24. I'll be checking with her, but we would request virtual opportunity for her if she's in the midst of her at sea on-duty 75 days.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, I can tell you that at this moment, if we do transition from being purely online for our hearings to having an in-person element, that the plan is to also allow witnesses to attend through -- through Zoom or whatever means as assuming -- assuming that that is -- is working and that, you know, we -- there aren't concerns from the other parties. I think it would work -- I think it would work just fine,

Page 22

case for PSP before the Commission, it would be very helpful for the Commission if we were having the hearing on February 22nd and following days if rebuttal and cross-answering testimony was submitted by either January 9th or January 11th because the Commission does carefully review and consider all of the testimony once it's all been submitted before the hearing.

So with that, did TOTE wish to make any comments?

 $\label{eq:MR.BLOCK: No comments or questions, Your Honor. Thank you. } \label{eq:MR.BLOCK: No comments or questions, Your Honor. Thank you. }$ 

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. With that -- sorry.

MR. FUKANO: Pardon me, Your Honor. Do you know if the hearing in this case will be virtual or in person?

JUDGE HOWARD: I do not. I do not. I believe what I would do for the prehearing conference order is -- is punch this question for later, and I'm -- I'm hopeful that we could do maybe a hybrid hearing allowing for virtual attendance of some witnesses. But that depends on -- on certain IT issues being resolved. So I would have a hard time saying right now.

MR. HAGLUND: Your Honor, could I comment on the couple of issues you've -- that have just been

Page 24

it just requires some IT issues to be resolved.
 MR. HAGLUND: Okay. Thank you.
 JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah.

MR. FUKANO: One more question from Staff, Your Honor. Staff, looking at other dockets and schedules for Commission Staff and counsel, there are a number of other proceedings that are ongoing around the holiday period in December and early January. Staff would request that if it was possible to extend out the cross-answering deadline about two weeks from your proposed dates, if that was possible.

JUDGE HOWARD: You know, I think -- I think the parties can discuss that. Staff -- Staff, by all means, can propose that. It's -- it -- this is -- this kind of becomes a -- unfortunately becomes something of a zero-sum game. So I don't -- I don't want to remove too much time from ALD and policy being able to consider all of the evidence and -- and brief the Commissioners appropriately and prepare for the hearing.

So I'm going to -- I recognize -- I recognize that Staff is facing a very large workload in the fall and winter of this year. So I'll consider that. It is -- it is also a workload situation for us too.

Unless there are any other concerns or

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Page 25

questions, I'm going to suggest that we go off the record so that the parties can discuss amongst themselves if they can come to a proposed procedural schedule. And I will -- I will exit the call, and I will ask the attorney for Staff to send me a message when the parties are done conferring.

Any questions or concerns before we go off the record?

MS. DELAPPE: Your Honor -- and, Your Honor, I did just want to note that we'll have questions that are not about scheduling, but rather about handling of evidence, but we can hold those until at the end.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I do plan on discussing discovery issues and a couple of other issues after this.

Mr. Fukano?

MR. FUKANO: Oh, pardon, Your Honor. Just no further issues from Staff.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. All right.

Great. Then we are off the record.

(Recess taken from 10:02 a.m.

22 to 10:47 a.m.)

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's be back on the record. We went -- we had a recess for the parties to confer on the procedural schedule, and I'm informed

appropriate date given the intervening holidays and the press of other work on Commission dockets, as well as the amount of material filed in PSP's initial filing, and that cross-answering testimony would be then due four weeks following that date.

Page 27

Page 28

Staff would also note that the discovery response time or the DR response time would shift from ten business days to seven at the same date of response testimony and that the discovery response time would shift from seven business days to five at filing of cross-answering testimony.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. All right. Could I hear PSP's thought on the schedule?

MR. HAGLUND: Yes, Your Honor. We think that December -- the week after Christmas is just way too long a time frame. There were four months -- there was a four-month response time in the initial rate case, which included more issues than we've got in this case given the resolution of some issues in the first ever rate case that resulted in the December -- or November 25, 2020 order.

And we think that it should be -- four months would take you from June 29 to October 29. We'd be open to a date, you know, anywhere in November so

Page 26

that the parties have a partial agreement.

Mr. Fukano, would you describe the parties' agreement to the extent there is one?

MR. FUKANO: Yes, Your Honor. The parties have agreed to an initial settlement conference on September 23rd; a mediation on October 10th to address the pension issue identified by the Commission and raised by PSP. The parties have also agreed to a close -- a last day to issue discovery date of February 8th; an exhibit filing deadline of February 15; a hearing to take place on February 22nd, 23rd, and potentially the 24th; simultaneous initial briefing on March 17; and simultaneous reply briefing on March 21st.

The parties have different proposals as to the dates for response testimony and cross-testimony.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you for that.

What -- what -- since I'm already speaking
with Staff's attorney, what is Staff's position for
those two deadlines?

MR. FUKANO: Staff would request that response testimony be due the week of December 26th to the 30th, on a date within that range. I believe the 26th is a holiday, so the latter half of the week would work best for Staff. Staff suggests that this is an

that you got a significant period of time between then and, say, mid January in order to prepare the rebuttal or cross-answering testimony.

The other factor here is that it would be highly prejudicial to PSE to go with the Staff's recommended schedule because I personally have -- both of our daughters live oversees with our six grandchildren. They're all coming a few days before Christmas for two weeks, and that would coincide with a significant chunk of the cross-answering time frame. And we just think it'd be incredibly unfair to give the Staff -- to take that after Christmas time frame and include it within the cross-answering time frame.

The -- the four months is a long period of time. There's three months remaining in that. If you went to mid or late November, they'd get almost five months of time. We think that's enough.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I will take these -- all these points under consideration.

Could I hear --

MS. DELAPPE: Your Honor, may PMSA say -- JUDGE HOWARD: Yes.

MS. DELAPPE: -- just weigh in briefly on

the issue?

PMSA believes it is -- the number one

Page 29

priority for us for -- is to make sure that Staff has adequate time given its workload to prepare for the response testimony. And I would just like to point out for the Commission that the preliminary schedule suggested by PSP in its motion to set an expedited schedule had a shorter time frame, the -- much shorter even given PSP's counsel's concerns about the holiday visits from his family for filing rebuttal and cross-answering testimony.

So we believe that what Staff has proposed is reasonable.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. MR. FUKANO: And while Staff does acknowledge the impact to family matters, Staff also would like to note that based on the Staff proposed schedule, that, you know, the filing deadline will also impact some of Staff's own holiday plans as well.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I recognize that there isn't necessarily an easy answer to some of these questions here.

Could I hear from TOTE?

MR. BLOCK: Well, Judge, because of the narrow issue of TOTE's intervention here and the fact that substantial work on that has actually already been completed, we're -- we don't have any concerns about any

possible or -- could you please enlighten us as to what to do in that circumstance?

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, for the -- from the Commission's perspective, pilotage is kind of a unique industry. We are used to seeing updates to testimony, particularly in the context of power cost updates for electric companies, and those would generally be a mechanical sort of update to the formula in the testimony updating costs in light of forward prices and things like that.

So and that would frequently be included in the schedule frequently agreed to by all the parties that the utility would -- would update its testimony along those lines and provide a power cost update.

In the context of pilotage, I recognize that there are going to be different issues. Are there -- is there a topic that PSP would anticipate filing supplemental testimony on?

MR. HAGLUND: Well, I could give you a couple examples. One is the -- we may -- we include in our record the information regarding compensation of other maritime workers like members of the ILWU. We know that there is a -- there have been negotiations for renewal of that contract. It expired, I believe, June 30. The press is reporting that a settlement sometime

Page 30

of the dates that are proposed by either side. So we will take no position on this as well.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.

Well, I -- I will take the parties' positions into consideration. I have noted the parties' agreement to the extent there is one.

Is there anything -- I know we are going to discuss discovery here a moment. Is there anything about the schedule that we should discuss before we move on?

MR. HAGLUND: Your Honor --

MR. FUKANO: There -- go ahead, please.

MR. HAGLUND: The one question I had, Your Honor, is regardless of what date you pick, if there's a significant period between now and when response testimony will be filed, and it's quite possible that there could be some developments that relates to what PSP has filed that would warrant some supplementing of testimony from one or more witnesses, you know, when those developments occur. We know a few likely ones already.

How does Your Honor wish us to -- to do that? Is it simply by assume that we are aware of the development of significance that warrants a supplement to a witness's testimony that you do it as promptly as

Page 32

Page 31

in September, October is most likely. That would be an example.

We know that there is a barely, we believe, imminent filing of a rate case by another pilot group in the United States. There may be information in that that would be of interest to the Commissioners in -- on the record in this case.

We have a -- we did leave a placeholder a couple of places with a couple of witnesses regarding how a contract might work out that will be known sometime this fall.

Those are the three examples I would -- that I'm able to give you at this time.

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, given those examples -- and I would like to hear from the other parties in a moment, but given those examples, I think it may be best for PSP to move for leave to supplement the record because those -- my impression is those do seem like limited issues and -- and a fairly limited amount of information being added and supplemented in light of new developments.

I'm not necessarily prejudging whether the motion would be granted, I'm just thinking through this. And it would not necessarily need to be included in the schedule as a required supplemental filing date because

Page 33 Page 35 1 we don't know when these events are going to happen. 1 In some of the Commission's cases, the 2 2 Can I hear from Staff? parties find it helpful to identify each data request by 3 3 topic. Would it be helpful -- and the data requests MR. FUKANO: You know, subject to, you know, 4 seeing the actual motion and material, Staff is would then be grouped by subject in that cover letter 4 5 5 concerned that this would provide Staff even less time and the distribution email. The parties could cooperate 6 to review material that PSP would then assert is, you 6 to develop a uniformed list of subjects to keep track of 7 7 know, material and important to their case. the issues in discovery. 8 And so I think Staff would have some 8 Would the parties be interested in such 9 9 concerns about the timing and the scope of those instructions in this case? 10 updates, particularly based on the amount of material 10 MR. FUKANO: Yes, Staff would be agreeable 11 already filed with the Commission. And I believe that 11 to that. 12 PSP has already characterized their filing as containing 12 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. overwhelming evidence. And so I -- I think Staff would 13 13 Would PSP find this helpful or -- or not 14 have some concern there. 14 helpful? 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Could I hear from PMSA? 15 MR. HAGLUND: We're -- we're amenable to it, 16 MS. DELAPPE: Thank you, Your Honor. PMSA 16 Your Honor. 17 has identical concerns about the volume of the evidence 17 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. 18 already filed, about the evidence being -- becoming kind 18 Would any of the other -- intervenors like 19 of a moving target, and about the relevance of the 19 to respond? 20 20 evidence, at least based on the examples provided. MS. DELAPPE: I believe this would also be 21 helpful from PMSA's perspective. Thank you. Though, of course, that could be handled with a motion 21 22 22 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. and a response to the motion. 23 But just for judicial economy and the burden 23 MR. BLOCK: TOTE would find it helpful. 24 on all parties to having to respond to that, we would 24 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. 25 prefer to just move forward with the record as it is. 25 I will plan on including instructions along Page 34 Page 36 1 1 these lines in the prehearing conference order. Thank you. 2 2 And Staff in -- in our discussions a few JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 3 3 moments ago referred to shortening the response time for Does TOTE have a position? 4 MR. BLOCK: No position, Your Honor. 4 data requests. I believe it was from ten days to seven 5 days with filing and response testimony and then from 5 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 6 Well, in this case, I -- I think we should 6 seven days to five days with filing of rebuttal 7 table this issue for now. If PSP would like to move at 7 cross-answering. 8 8 Does any party object the including such an a later date to supplement the record, we will do the 9 motion at that time, and it will depend on the 9 instruction in the prehearing conference order? 10 circumstances, and I don't -- I don't want to prejudge 10 MR. HAGLUND: No, Your Honor. It's fine 11 that without having that before me. 11 with PSP. 12 But I've noted the parties' concerns. And I 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Any other party wish to 13 don't think at this juncture, it would be appropriate to 13 respond? 14 include a supplemental updated testimony filing date in MS. DELAPPE: PMSA does not object. Thank 14 15 the schedule as we would for, say, a power cost update 15 you. and utility case because this isn't -- the scope of this MR. BLOCK: No, objection, Your Honor. 16 16 17 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. update isn't necessarily clear at this juncture, it's 17 And frequently the Commission includes a 18 not necessarily a customary part of the judicial 18 practice. 19 19 requirement that data requests and responses are shared 20 So I'm going to -- unless there's any 20 with every other party to the case, and this would be a

requirement included in the prehearing conference order.

Is there any concern or objection to my

MR. FUKANO: No objection from Staff.

MR. HAGLUND: No, Your Honor. However, I do

including such an instruction in this case?

21

22

23

24

25

21

22

23

24

25

further questions about the schedule, I'm going to move

raise a couple issues here and I will allow them a

couple issues before we reach that.

chance to discuss that. I just wanted to touch on a

on to the issue of discovery. And I know PMSA wanted to

Page 37

note in the rules that to the extent there was the need for a protective order, that could be raised at the time. And if there was dispute over it, it would come before you, I assume. But there's no -- we know there is provisions in the rules where it's appropriate and we don't know whether we're going to be asked to provide anything that would warrant a protective order, but I just wanted to make a note that we would view that as a situation where counsel would work out between counsel,

2.5

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. That -- yeah, discovery disputes would be brought to me as an assigned ALJ.

And by the way, if your phone number ends in 8544, you may want to mute yourself.

and if not, it would be decided by you.

On the issue of a protective order, that's a difficult issue in the context pilotage. As I understand in the last rate case, the assigned ALJ interpreted the statutes as not allowing us to enter a protective order in this context.

I don't necessarily want -- I don't want to answer a question unless it's actually posed right now. But -- but I -- I would -- I would note that that was the Commission's position in the last rate case.

MS. DELAPPE: Your Honor?

MS. DELAPPE: Yes, thank you. We -- we are hopeful that -- the goal, from our perspective, would be to narrow the initial evidence, if possible, based on the relevancy to the actual issues in dispute in this case in order to limit the need for discovery and evidence that may not actually be material to those issues.

Page 39

Page 40

So we were hopeful for a discovery conference under -- with a facilitator under WAC 480-07-415, sub part 4. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And I would imagine that would be sometime in August or September?

MS. DELAPPE: As early as possible would be good. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections to such a conference?

MR. HAGLUND: Not from PSP, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing no objections, thank you.

Would -- did PMSA have any other concerns about discovery or was that -- was that everything at this point?

MS. DELAPPE: That was everything. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right.

Page 38

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes?

MS. DELAPPE: Thank you. Well, PMSA actually had planned to request a standard form of protective order at this prehearing conference. Under WAC 480-07-420(1), sub part 1, this is the first time that I am hearing of there being a potential statutory conflict with that request, even though I was part of the whole proceeding in the prior rate case. So I'd be interested in knowing more if that continues to be the Commission's concern.

But in the last rate case, there -- PSP refused to proffer certain responsive documents to several of the discovery requests citing the lack of a protective order at that time. And so PMSA was hoping that we could prevent this difficulty this time by just putting in place a standard form of protective order and we, of course, favor redaction of all confidential information so...

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I -- I have noted that request and that is something I'll have to take under advisement and -- and consider and address in the prehearing conference order.

Were there any other issues that PMSA wanted to raise? You mentioned a discovery conference with a facilitator?

MS. DELAPPE: On discovery. We have some concerns about some of the evidence labeling, but I will address those after.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

So the next main issue I wanted to address today is the Commission's consultation with the Board of Pilotage Commissioners. As the parties are aware, the statute allows the Commission to request assistance from the board. And in PSP's last rate case, the Commission designated the executive director -- and I may very well not be saying these names correctly -- Jaimie Bever and the chair of the board, Sheri Tonn, as consultants. And we indicated that we expected these two individuals to avoid ex parte communications regarding the rate case.

Do any of the parties object to the Commission designating the same two individuals as consultants in this case? Or do any of the parties wish to raise other concerns regarding the contemplation with the board?

MR. HAGLUND: PSP has no objection and no concerns.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. MR. FUKANO: No objection from Staff. MR. BLOCK: No objection from TOTE. MS. DELAPPE: Same for PMSA.

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

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

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 41

The Commission will therefore designate the board's executive director and chair as consultants. Both the executive director and chair should refrain from ex parte discussions about this pending rate case before the Commission.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great.

I want to briefly take a moment to discuss the parties' responsibilities on this issue. And I very well recognize that PSP, PMSA, and TOTE may need to speak with the board's director or chair about issues subject to the board's regulation and jurisdiction while this case is pending before the Commission.

But the parties should be careful to avoid discussing the merits of this rate case with the executive director or the chair, and I would submit that this likely stands to discussing PSP's revenue requirement because this is an issue within the Commission's jurisdiction under the statutory limits.

I expect the parties' attorneys to instruct their client's witnesses and members of their organizations accordingly.

> I have a few housekeeping --MS. DELAPPE: Your Honor --

JUDGE HOWARD: -- matters, but yes, did you

have a concern?

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

Page 43

And this, of course, it is a difficult issue to navigate correctly because I recognize the board has jurisdiction over these substantive issues with pilotage, and there still needs to be discussions with these individuals. But I would just -- I wanted to emphasize my expectation that all the parties are mindful of that issue and that we're mindful of not discussing rate case issues and revenue requirement issues around those two members of the board. And I -unless -- unless you were to contact a member of -- one handful of policy advisers and myself and try to ex parte us, I think -- I think there's no -- it's unlikely there will be concerns with the Commission.

Any other questions or concerns? Did that answer your question?

MS. DELAPPE: Yes, thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Before I end with just some standard housekeeping matters, Ms. DeLappe, you've mentioned that PMSA has some other concerns. What were those?

MS. DELAPPE: Thank you, Your Honor. We just -- we had two -- I think two evidentiary questions about items filed by PSP.

First, there are a number of items that have been -- eight -- eight files labeled as work papers.

Page 42

MS. DELAPPE: I just had a question about what you were just discussing regarding the ex parte contacts. And was wondering if -- if you could just clarify who's on which side of the curtain so we can be sure that PMSA knows who to talk to at the Commission. Thank you.

> JUDGE HOWARD: At the Commission? MS. DELAPPE: At UTC.

JUDGE HOWARD: At UTC, all right. The -the -- at the Commission, regulatory staff, the majority of Commission Staff are in regulatory services and other sections, and they would be represented by, in this case, Mr. Fukano. And they would be considered a party to the case, and they are not on the Commissioners' side of the ex parte wall. So they don't have special access to the Commissioners during this case.

The people on the same side of the exparte wall with the Commission would be myself and a -- really a handful of policy advisors who work in the section that we call policy, and they're distinct from regulatory services. And they advise the Commissioners, and the -- the two designees that we're talking about at the board, the executive director and the chair, would then be included as consultants on the Commissioners' side of the ex parte wall.

Page 44

And we have consulted, of course, the definition of work 2 papers under WAC 480-07-525. At least one of those 3 files does not contain financial data, which I believe 4 is part of what is the definition for work papers. And so we would submit that the -- PSP, dash, WPKAE Final Puget Sound Pilots Master Data File is not within that definition, we -- and should be relabeled as an exhibit.

With the other seven work papers, we note that with the way things are currently designated, does make it more difficult for purposes of directing data requests to the correct witness as well as navigating cross-examination for the hearing.

And so we would like -- in the last rate case, PSP submitted all of its work papers as exhibits, and they were referred to in a specific witness's testimony. That was Weldon Burton. Here there seems to be several witnesses for us. They're just by initials in the file names for five of the work papers. Three of them have no witness identification. And we prefer that these be redesignated in the way that they were done in the prior case, if possible, so -- as well as with corrected testimony to include the newly designated exhibits to facilitate handling these in the proceeding.

So that's the first request. And I can pause before I go to the second.

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

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

Page 45

Page 47

JUDGE HOWARD: That's fine. Please continue.

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

MS. DELAPPE: Okay. And so the second one is that, your know, I realize that Mr. Haglund has --PSP's counsel has filed a declaration in support of PSP's opposition to the PMSA motion to dismiss. And we wondered if it might be appropriate for that to be considered supplemental testimony and be relabeled as such if it's going to be looked at or considered at all in PSP's full direct case. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I -- I will give PSP a chance to respond. I am going to -- I am going to go ahead and say, though, with respect to your second question about Haglund's declaration, that it is -- it is common for attorneys to submit these declarations in support of motions, and they would not be considered part of the evidentiary record when we're preparing the final order normally. So that would to me not seem to be an issue.

Would PSP like to respond to these concerns? MR. HAGLUND: Well, as to the declaration, I agree completely with what you've just stated. It was put in to the record specifically with respect to the motion to dismiss and only with respect to that. So I see no reason that it should become part of the

be all parties.

Hearing no further concerns at this time, I'm going to touch on a couple of issues.

I'm just going to remind the parties about electronic filing and electronic service. The Commission requires electronic filing of documents for formal filings. We are continuing to suspend the requirements for paper copies, and this will be memorialized in the prehearing conference order.

The Commission's rules also provide for electronic service of documents. The Commission will serve the parties electronically and the parties will serve each other electronically.

If any party has not yet designated a lead representative for service, please do so via an email to me as soon as possible. I believe all the parties and intervenors have already done so. My email is michael.howard@utc.wa.gov.

Also, if any party would like to add names and email addresses of other representatives or support staff who should receive courtesy copies of all documents filed, please email that to us as well.

And finally, for errata sheets, I don't recall if we addressed this directly earlier. Under our rules, the deadline for filing errata sheets, exhibits

Page 46

evidentiary record.

As to the re-designation of work papers to have them designated for a particular witness in all cases and that corrected testimony be filed that would add those work papers as specific exhibits, we would not have any objection to that. I -- I would leave it to Your Honor if you wish us to do so, we will. And I guess we'd be prepared to get that done in -- you know, in the relatively near future, within a couple of weeks. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.

I'm going to take this issue under consideration, and I want to look at the -- the underlying work papers. I think that to some extent, this difficulty arises just because the Commission uses work papers and not every -- not every court does such a thing. We have -- and that's -- that's not in every case. But I am going to consider this issue and I appreciate PSP's response on designating by witness.

Were there any other concerns before I turn the some housekeeping matters?

MR. FUKANO: Commission Staff does one have follow-up question regarding the proposed discovery conference. Would that conference be limited to PSP and PMSA or would that involve all parties?

JUDGE HOWARD: I would anticipate it would

Page 48 may be established in the prehearing conference order.

Are there any objections to setting this deadline a week prior to the hearing?

MR. FUKANO: No objection.

MR. HAGLUND: Did you say one week prior? JUDGE HOWARD: One week prior. It would coincide with the final prehearing submission.

MR. HAGLUND: No objection from PSP. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing no objections, I will plan on including such requirement.

I wanted to touch on one fairly relatively small issue about correcting tariff sheets filed in initial filing. When I was looking at PSP's initial filing and revised tariff pages themselves, I notice that the sheets 1 through 7 are -- have updated dates, but they're not labeled as the, quote, first revised page, end quote. They're still labeled as original pages but with new effective dates.

Would PSP mind refiling these seven tariff files with that labeling?

MR. HAGLUND: Is that first revised? Is that what you'll wish it to say?

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, first revised page on tariff sheets 1 through 7, as I recall. And -- and submitting that in the next two weeks would be -- let's

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

Page 49 Page 51 1 just say a week. It's a small task. 1 MS. DELAPPE: I have one final item, but 2 2 MR. HAGLUND: No problem. We will do so, it's not about that. 3 Your Honor. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Well, please 4 4 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Thank proceed. 5 5 MS. DELAPPE: I just wanted to note some of you. 6 Is there anything else we should address 6 the language in the pleadings to date has been pretty 7 7 today before we adjourn? aggressive and confrontational. So I just request a 8 MR. HAGLUND: Your Honor, one thing I had 8 reminder to all to maintain civility in these 9 neglected to bring up is with respect to the issue 9 proceedings. Thank you. 10 between PSP and TOTE Maritime. It's a pretty narrow 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I think that is 11 issue. Mr. Block and I have had some discussions about 11 a -- that is a fair point and something that -- that we 12 ways to accelerate it. And looking at your rules, 12 should all strive for at all times. I recognize that 13 strikes me if the parties, PSP and TOTE, can hopefully 13 there is some contention between the parties 14 come to an agreement, that the facts are undisputed and 14 historically. But, you know, I certainly -- I certainly expect professionalism when the parties are here. 15 it's purely a policy, slash, legal question for the 15 16 Commission. 16 All right. Unless there's anything further, 17 17 I will issue an order shortly containing the procedural It appears that the bringing it before the 18 18 schedule and other guidelines for the disposition of Commission on a basis of a motion for summary 19 19 this case. And we are adjourned. Thank you. determination, which is like a motion for summary 20 20 judgment in -- in state or federal court, may be an (Adjourned at 11:25 a.m.) 21 option. And if that proves to be the case and the 21 22 22 desire was to bring it on, say, sometime this fall after 23 TOTE does whatever discovery it wishes to do, does Your 23 24 Honor have any particular constraints on when that might 24 25 be filed and, you know, if we were ready to file it by 25 Page 50 Page 52 1 mid October, would -- would it just be noted up for 1 CERTIFICATE 2 2 decision and argument? And we could -- I'm sure 3 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 Mr. Block and I could work out a briefing schedule on 4 **COUNTY OF THURSTON** 4 it. And I guess we'd like to know -- get some approval 5 5 for that schedule if and when we're ready to present. 6 I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand 6 JUDGE HOWARD: I -- I don't have any 7 Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby 7 particular constraints around this. I would -- I would 8 certify that the foregoing transcript is true and 8 likely suggest that it occur in advance of the hearing, 9 accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. 9 more than -- more than -- probably more than two months 10 10 in advance of the hearing just to allow all of these 11 11 considerations to play out. 12 12 I would be defaulting to the normal 13 13 timelines for responses to dispositive motions. And I 14 14 believe a reply is not by right, but upon a showing of 15 15 good cause, even in that context if I'm recalling 16 correctly. 16 17 So I would just default to the normal rules 17 18 unless the parties prefer something different. 18 19 MR. HAGLUND: Thank you. 19 20 JUDGE HOWARD: But I have no concerns 20 21 with -- with -- with the approach you're suggesting at 21 22 22 23 MR. HAGLUND: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 23 24 24 JUDGE HOWARD: Any concerns from any other 25 25 party?

		I		
A	<b>agree</b> 20:13 45:22	9:1 13:25 16:1	<b>basis</b> 12:3 49:18	37:12
<b>a.m</b> 1:16 3:2 25:21	agreeable 13:21	20:14 27:1 34:13	becoming 33:18	<b>Buell</b> 1:21
25:22 51:20	16:5 35:10	37:5 45:7	<b>behalf</b> 3:20,24	<b>built</b> 21:5
ability 52:9	<b>agreed</b> 26:5,8 31:12	appropriately	20:11	<b>burden</b> 33:23
able 20:25 24:17	agreement 17:21	24:19	<b>believe</b> 9:11 13:25	<b>Burton</b> 44:16
32:13	26:1,3 30:6 49:14	approval 50:4	18:24 19:11 22:18	<b>business</b> 27:8,10
<b>aboard</b> 23:9	ahead 20:3 30:12	approximately 13:2	26:23 29:10 31:24	
accelerate 49:12	45:13	15:24	32:3 33:11 35:20	C
accept 9:9	Alaska 4:8	argument 7:4,5	36:4 44:3 47:16	C 2:1 3:4 52:1,1
acceptable 20:19	<b>ALD</b> 24:17	50:2	50:14	<b>cable</b> 23:13
accepted 15:1	<b>ALJ</b> 18:2 19:17	arguments 7:18,25	<b>believes</b> 7:15 10:7	calculating 16:16
access 42:15	37:13,18	8:4,25 10:5,6	28:25	calendar 16:15
accompanying 15:1	allow 8:3 9:5 11:12	12:22	<b>Bell</b> 6:23 7:5 14:19	<b>calendars</b> 21:15,16
accumulative 10:7	15:12 23:21 34:23	<b>arises</b> 46:14	15:7,19	<b>call</b> 4:12 25:4 42:20
accurate 52:9	50:10	<b>asked</b> 37:6	best 26:25 32:16	calling 14:11
acknowledge 29:14	allowance 12:14	asking 6:9	52:9	capability 23:10
actual 10:18 14:20	allowing 22:21	assert 33:6	<b>Bever</b> 40:11	Captain 14:11
16:18 33:4 39:4	37:19	<b>assigned</b> 37:12,18	beyond 9:24	captioned 3:8
add 10:15 46:5	allows 40:8	assistance 40:8	<b>big</b> 14:12	careful 41:13
47:19	alter 16:25	Assistant 3:23	<b>bit</b> 19:3	carefully 22:6
added 32:20	Alysia 23:11	Association 4:3,16	<b>Block</b> 2:21 4:9,9	case 3:8,10 4:25
addition 14:14	amenable 35:15	assume 30:23 37:4	8:18 11:9 22:10	5:21 7:3,6,22,23
address 14:3 15:7	amount 9:23 20:24	<b>assuming</b> 23:22,23	29:22 34:4 35:23	9:18,25 10:23,23
26:6 38:22 40:3,5	21:24 27:3 32:19	attempt 9:22	36:16 40:24 49:11	11:3,22,23 12:2,8
49:6	33:10	<b>attend</b> 18:1 23:21	50:3	13:16,24 14:2
addressed 15:19	answer 29:19 37:22	attendance 22:21	blocks@lanepow	15:23 16:1,14,17
47:24	43:15	<b>attorney</b> 2:6 3:24	2:24	16:24 17:7,12,18
addresses 47:20	anticipate 31:17	25:5 26:19	<b>board</b> 40:6,9,12,19	18:23 19:5,12
adequate 29:2	46:25	attorneys 41:19	42:23 43:2,9	21:19,20 22:1,15
adjourn 49:7	anticipated 8:25	45:15	<b>board's</b> 41:3,10,11	27:18,19,21 32:4
adjourned 51:19	<b>appear</b> 10:7 17:22	<b>August</b> 1:15 3:1	Box 2:6	32:7 33:7 34:6,16
51:20	appearance 3:22	6:14 39:12	Brickenstein 2:11	35:9 36:20,23
adjuster 8:10	4:2,7,13	automatic 8:10	3:20	37:18,24 38:8,11
adjustment 14:7,14	appearances 3:17	available 21:14	<b>brief</b> 8:21 10:3 11:6	39:5 40:9,14,17
administrative	appeared 19:5	<b>Avenue</b> 1:22 2:17	12:11 13:11 24:18	41:5,12,14 42:13
1:13 2:2 3:13	<b>appearing</b> 3:24 4:5	2:22	briefing 10:3,9	42:14,16 43:8
<b>advance</b> 10:3 50:8	4:9	avoid 40:14 41:13	17:12,15 26:12,13	44:14,21 45:10
50:10	<b>appears</b> 10:2 13:19	aware 5:24 30:23	50:3	46:17 49:21 51:19
advise 42:21	15:6 49:17	40:7	<b>briefly</b> 15:9 28:23	cases 14:24 35:1
advisement 38:21	applying 7:6	B	41:7	46:4
advisers 43:11	appreciate 46:18	back 25:23	briefs 18:15,15	cause 7:17 9:12 14:22 50:15
advisors 42:19	appreciates 9:22	barely 32:3	bring 49:9,22	CCR 1:20 52:15
advocating 10:2	approach 11:16	based 16:20 21:14	bringing 49:17	certain 17:1 22:22
aggressive 51:7	50:21	29:15 33:10,20	Broadway 2:12	38:12
<b>ago</b> 9:17 36:3	appropriate 6:25	39:3	brought 15:23	certainly 18:21
		39.3		Certainly 10.21

23:2 25:13 37:11	11:7 12:18 19:8	conceive 12:14	constraints 49:24	<b>couple</b> 5:14 20:12
51:14,14	22:9,10	concern 20:20	50:7	22:25 25:14 31:20
Certified 52:6	Commission 1:2,4	33:14 36:22 38:10	consultants 40:12	32:9,9 34:23,25
certify 52:8	1:17 2:4 3:9,13,24	41:25	40:17 41:3 42:24	46:9 47:3
<b>chair</b> 40:12 41:3,4	8:14 9:21 10:4	concerned 9:24	consultation 40:6	<b>course</b> 13:15 33:21
41:10,15 42:23	13:1,7,16,18,23	12:22 20:25 33:5	consulted 44:1	38:17 43:1 44:1
<b>chance</b> 34:24 45:12	14:15,18,24 15:12	concerns 10:14	contact 4:18,25	<b>court</b> 9:5 11:20
characterized	15:17 16:2,19	20:1 23:24 24:25	43:10	46:15 49:20
33:12	18:2,8,23 21:14	25:7 29:7,25 33:9	contacts 42:3	courtesy 47:21
check 5:15 14:8	22:1,2,5 24:6 26:7	33:17 34:12 39:20	contain 7:20 12:22	cover 35:4
23:11	27:2 29:4 33:11	40:2,18,21 43:13	44:3	cross 21:22
checking 23:15	36:18 40:8,9,16	43:14,19 45:20	contained 10:6	cross-answering
<b>Chief</b> 23:11	41:2,6,12 42:5,7	46:19 47:2 50:20	containing 33:12	22:4 23:7 24:10
choosing 17:13	42:10,11,18 43:13	50:24	51:17	27:4,11 28:3,10
Christmas 23:5	46:14,21 47:6,11	<b>concise</b> 10:19 12:24	contemplate 18:17	28:13 29:9 36:7
27:16 28:9,12	49:16,18	conduct 16:6	contemplated	cross-examination
<b>chunk</b> 28:10	Commission's 6:25	<b>confer</b> 19:6,14	16:11 17:24	44:12
circumstance 31:2	7:22 13:20 16:4	25:25	contemplation	cross-testimony
circumstances	21:15 31:4 35:1	conference 1:11 3:8	40:18	26:15
34:10	37:24 38:10 40:6	3:16 13:13 14:3	contention 51:13	current 10:13
citation 21:9	41:18 47:10	15:2 17:6 18:5	<b>context</b> 31:6,15	currently 44:9
<b>citations</b> 7:17,21,24	Commissioners	21:5 22:18 26:5	37:17,20 50:15	curtain 42:4
cited 6:23 7:22	3:15,15 11:21	36:1,9,21 38:4,22	continue 45:2	customary 34:18
10:14	24:18 32:6 40:7	38:24 39:9,16	continues 38:9	
<b>cites</b> 15:2	42:16,21	46:23,23 47:9	continuing 47:7	D
<b>citing</b> 38:13	Commissioners'	48:1	contract 31:24	<b>D</b> 3:4
civility 51:8	21:15 42:14,24	conferring 25:6	32:10	dash 44:5
clarify 42:4	<b>common</b> 45:15	confidential 38:17	contrast 14:24	data 35:2,3 36:4,19
clear 14:22 34:17	communications	confirm 20:6	contribute 7:7	44:3,6,10
clearly 11:12	40:14	conflict 38:7	convening 19:17	date 15:14 16:16,18
<b>client's</b> 41:20	companies 31:7	confrontational	cooperate 35:5	16:21,22 17:11,14
<b>close</b> 19:21 26:9	company's 13:3	51:7	<b>copies</b> 47:8,21	18:14,20 19:21
closely 12:19	compensation	<b>consider</b> 9:6 15:17	<b>correct</b> 11:9 44:11	21:12 26:9,23
co-presiding 3:14	31:21	19:8 21:18 22:6	corrected 44:22	27:1,5,8,25 30:14
<b>coincide</b> 23:14 28:9	Complainant 1:5	24:17,22 38:21	46:4	32:25 34:8,14
48:7	completed 17:13	46:17	correcting 48:12	51:6
come 25:3 37:3	29:25	consideration 18:8	correctly 40:11	dates 17:8 20:18,19
49:14	completely 20:19	28:19 30:5 46:12	43:2 50:16	24:11 26:15 30:1
comfortable 19:15	45:22	considerations	<b>cost</b> 31:6,14 34:15	48:15,18
coming 28:8	complex 10:24	17:24 50:11	<b>costs</b> 31:9	daughters 28:7
<b>comment</b> 8:7 18:20	comply 16:4	considered 15:5	counsel 10:16	day 18:18 26:9
19:1 20:14 21:10	component 11:24	16:11 18:22 42:13	12:23 19:4,5 24:6	days 9:16 18:18
22:24	components 7:21	45:8,9,17	37:9,9 45:5	20:20 21:17 22:3
commentary 8:12	comprehensive	considering 12:17	counsel's 29:7	23:12,12,17 27:8
<b>comments</b> 8:22 9:8	17:23	consistent 13:8	<b>COUNTY</b> 52:4	27:10 28:8 36:4,5
				36:6,6
	•	•	•	•

				l
<b>deadline</b> 17:5 24:10	desires 8:14	disposition 51:18	emphasize 43:6	51:15
26:10 29:16 47:25	detail 13:12	dispositive 50:13	encourage 13:5	expectation 43:6
48:2	detailed 4:25	<b>dispute</b> 37:3 39:4	19:6	expected 40:13
deadlines 15:11	determination	disputes 37:12	ends 37:14	<b>expedited</b> 6:3 10:25
17:3 26:20	49:19	distinct 42:20	engage 14:1	11:3 15:10,22
deal 14:12	determined 21:12	distribution 35:5	engaging 16:5	16:2,13 29:5
December 24:8	develop 35:6	diversity 12:10	enlighten 31:1	expenses 8:9
26:22 27:16,21	development 30:24	<b>docket</b> 1:4 3:8 5:25	ensure 18:14	expired 31:24
<b>decided</b> 19:2 37:10	developments	16:12	<b>enter</b> 37:19	extend 24:9
decision 50:2	30:17,20 32:21	<b>dockets</b> 24:5 27:2	equity 12:10	extensive 9:23
declaration 45:5,15	develops 7:25	documents 38:12	<b>Eric</b> 2:11 3:19	<b>extent</b> 10:5,15 26:3
45:21	different 26:14	47:6,11,22	errata 47:23,25	30:6 37:1 46:13
declarations 45:16	31:16 50:18	doing 13:4	essentially 4:22,23	
default 50:17	<b>difficult</b> 37:17 43:1	<b>double</b> 20:24	14:5,10,13	<u>F</u>
defaulting 50:12	44:10	<b>DR</b> 27:7	established 48:1	F 52:1
definitely 11:1	difficulty 38:15	<b>due</b> 9:6 17:11 26:22	establishing 15:3	facilitate 13:21
definition 44:1,4,7	46:14	27:4	evaluation 17:23	44:23
<b>DeLappe</b> 2:16 4:4	<b>direct</b> 45:10	duplicative 10:7	events 33:1	facilitator 21:6
4:5 6:17,17 10:12	directing 44:10		<b>evidence</b> 8:4 10:20	38:25 39:9
20:4,11,11 25:9	directly 47:24		12:5 15:2 20:21	facing 24:21
28:21,23 33:16	<b>director</b> 40:10 41:3	<b>E</b> 2:1,1 3:4,4 52:1,1	20:24 21:1,25	fact 29:23
35:20 36:14 37:25	41:4,10,15 42:23	earlier 15:14 17:17	24:18 25:12 33:13	<b>factor</b> 15:18 16:12
38:2 39:1,13,23	<b>discovery</b> 17:4 21:4	17:20 18:20 47:24	33:17,18,20 39:3	28:4
40:1,25 41:23	21:5 25:14 26:9	early 19:20 24:8	39:6 40:2	<b>factors</b> 7:1,5,6 15:7
42:1,8 43:16,18	27:6,9 30:8 34:22	39:13	evidentiary 17:7	facts 49:14
43:21 45:3 51:1,5	35:7 37:12 38:13	easy 29:19	18:21 43:22 45:17	<b>fails</b> 15:6
demonstrate 14:20	38:24 39:5,8,21	ebrickenstein@h	46:1	failure 14:22
14:21	40:1 46:22 49:23	2:14	ex 40:14 41:5 42:2	fair 51:11
<b>denied</b> 7:9 15:23	<b>discuss</b> 9:10 13:9	economy 33:23	42:15,17,25 43:11	fairly 32:19 48:11
deny 9:21	13:14 14:4 15:21	effective 16:21	<b>exactly</b> 12:7 14:6	fall 19:20 24:22
denying 12:18	17:16 24:13 25:2	17:11 48:18	20:22	32:11 49:22
13:18 14:16	30:8,9 34:24 41:7	effort 11:20	example 32:2	<b>falls</b> 16:17
depart 13:1	discussed 12:25	eight 43:25,25	examples 31:20	<b>family</b> 23:4 29:8,14
depend 34:9	14:18 16:10 18:22	either 5:8 8:18 11:1	32:12,14,16 33:20	<b>fault</b> 16:9
depends 22:22	discussing 16:23	11:8,15 16:8 22:4	excuse 6:21 15:4	<b>favor</b> 38:17
describe 26:2	25:14 41:14,16	30:1	executive 9:17,24	<b>February</b> 17:8,9
designate 41:2	42:2 43:8	electric 31:7	10:18 11:12 12:4	18:14 22:3 23:14
designated 10:17	discussion 7:8 14:1	<b>electronic</b> 47:5,5,6	12:7,20 40:10	26:9,10,11
40:10 44:9,22	18:1,6,11 20:2	47:11	41:3,4,15 42:23	federal 49:20
46:3 47:14	discussions 13:21	electronically 47:12	<b>exhibit</b> 26:10 44:7	Fifth 2:22
designating 40:16	36:2 41:5 43:4	47:13	<b>exhibits</b> 7:25 11:19	<b>file</b> 6:2,12,14,16,19
46:18	49:11	element 23:20	11:19 15:25 44:14	7:8,15 9:9,17 44:6
designed 12:7	<b>dismiss</b> 6:4 13:15	email 35:5 47:15,17	44:23 46:5 47:25	44:18 49:25
designees 42:22	13:19 45:6,24	47:20,22	exit 25:4	<b>filed</b> 3:11 5:4 6:7
desire 49:22	disposed 16:25	emailed 6:8	<b>expect</b> 17:2 41:19	6:13 9:10,16,23
		emergency 14:20		9:24 11:13,17
		•	•	•

				1 age 50
12:22 13:2,6 27:3	28:14	15:21 16:3,14	happen 16:8 19:12	34:4 35:16 36:10
30:16,18 33:11,18	four-month 27:18	17:17 21:11 24:20	19:19 33:1	36:16,25 37:25
43:23 45:5 46:4	Fourth 1:22 2:17	25:1 30:7 31:16	happens 23:4	39:17 41:23 43:21
47:22 48:12 49:25	Fox 2:17	33:1 34:20,21	hard 12:13 22:23	46:7 49:3,8,24
files 43:25 44:3	frame 18:16 27:17	37:6 45:9,13,13	hardship 14:20	50:23
48:20	28:10,12,13 29:6	46:11,17 47:3,4	15:3,3	hope 20:16
filing 4:19 9:12	frequently 31:11,12	<b>good</b> 3:6 7:16 9:12	Harry 2:5 3:23	hopeful 21:20
10:8 13:3 15:25	36:18	21:22 23:10 39:14	harry.fukano@u	22:20 39:2,8
16:17 20:23,23	Fukano 2:5 3:23,23	50:15	2:8	hopefully 11:25
26:10 27:3,10	5:11 7:14 9:20	grandchildren 28:8	hear 10:11 27:13	49:13
29:8,16 31:17	20:3,6,10 22:14	grant 5:19 9:5,8	28:20 29:21 32:15	hoping 38:14
32:4,25 33:12	24:4 25:16,17	granted 13:16	33:2,15	housekeeping
34:14 36:5,6 47:5	26:2,4,21 29:13	14:25 32:23	hearing 5:6,13,18	41:22 43:18 46:20
47:6,25 48:13,14	30:12 33:3 35:10	granting 6:19	11:24 15:14 17:7	Howard 1:13 2:3
filings 7:1 47:7	36:24 40:23 42:13	Great 25:20 26:16	17:9,14 18:20,21	3:6,12,21 4:1,6,11
final 7:22 16:11	46:21 48:4	35:17,22,24 41:1	19:1,21 20:14,18	4:17,21,24 5:10
17:12,24 44:5	full 45:10	49:4	21:10 22:2,7,15	5:12 7:10 8:15,20
45:18 48:7 51:1	<b>fully</b> 16:4 19:2	gross 14:20,21	22:20 23:9,11	9:7 10:10 11:5
finally 15:21 47:23	further 5:13 8:12	group 32:4	24:19 26:11 38:6	12:16 18:19 19:13
financial 15:3 44:3	25:18 34:21 47:2	grouped 35:4	39:18 44:12 47:2	19:22 20:9 21:8
find 35:2,13,23	51:16	guess 19:19 46:8	48:3,9 50:8,10	22:12,17 23:2,18
fine 23:25 36:10	<b>future</b> 13:5 46:9	50:4	hearings 21:21	24:3,12 25:13,19
45:1	10.7	guidance 6:24	23:20	25:23 26:16 27:12
first 6:11,11 8:4	G	guide 12:8	held 17:10	28:18,22 29:12,18
9:19 13:14 18:12	<b>G</b> 3:4	guidelines 51:18	help 12:13	30:3 31:3 32:14
20:5,13 27:20	game 24:16	guidennes 31.10	helpful 22:2 35:2,3	33:15 34:2,5
38:5 43:24 44:24	Garlinghouse 1:20	H	35:13,14,21,23	35:12,17,22,24
48:16,21,23	52:6,15	<b>Haglund</b> 2:10,11	high 10:20	36:12,17 37:11
five 5:24 27:10	general 2:6 3:10,24	3:19,19 5:9 8:23	highlight 10:20	38:1,19 39:11,15
28:16 36:6 44:18	7:22 14:17 15:23	11:11 18:13 19:10	highly 28:5	39:18,25 40:4,22
focused 6:25	generally 15:6	19:14 20:13 22:24	hiring 13:20	41:1,24 42:7,9
<b>follow</b> 13:13,19	21:21 31:7	23:3 24:2 27:15	historically 51:14	43:17 45:1,11
<b>follow-up</b> 46:22	give 4:13 7:13 8:16	30:11,13 31:19	hold 25:12	46:10,25 48:6,9
following 11:15	8:21 9:5 16:19	35:15 36:10,25	holding 18:24	48:23 49:4 50:6
18:6 22:3 27:5	28:11 31:19 32:13	39:17 40:20 45:4	holiday 24:8 26:24	50:20,24 51:3,10
footnote 8:10	45:12	45:21 48:5,8,21	29:7,17	hybrid 22:20
foregoing 52:8	given 20:21 27:1,20	49:2,8 50:19,23	holidays 23:5 27:1	
form 10:14 38:3,16	29:2,7 32:14,16	Haglund's 45:14	<b>Honor</b> 4:4,10 5:9	I
<b>formal</b> 47:7	giving 4:18	half 26:24	5:11 6:17,20 8:19	idea 21:22
formula 31:8	<b>go</b> 19:3 20:3,4	<b>handful</b> 42:19	8:23 10:12 11:9	ideally 21:6
forth 15:7	21:19 25:1,7 28:5	43:11	11:11 18:13 20:7	identical 33:17
forward 15:17,23	30:12 44:25 45:13	handle 18:4	20:15 22:11,14,24	identification
31:9 33:25	<b>goal</b> 39:2	handled 33:21	24:5 25:9,9,17	44:19
foundational 7:3	goes 9:24	handling 25:11	26:4 27:15 28:21	identified 26:7
four 27:5,17,23	<b>going</b> 9:8 11:23	44:23	30:11,14,22 33:16	<b>identify</b> 8:3 35:2
, , -	13:9,14 14:4	<b>handy</b> 12:8	, , , , , ,	identifying 9:25
L	I	<u> </u>	I	I

	İ	I	İ	i
ILWU 31:22	12:14 32:6	jeopardy 14:23	37:6 45:4 46:8	<b>LLC</b> 1:21 4:8
imagine 39:12	interested 13:4	Johnson 23:12	49:25 50:4 51:14	<b>LLP</b> 2:11,17
imminent 32:4	35:8 38:9	joining 3:15	knowing 38:9	<b>lodge</b> 6:18
<b>impact</b> 29:14,17	interim 6:1,13,24	judge 1:13 2:2 3:6	knowledge 52:9	long 27:17 28:14
important 33:7	14:5,16,22 15:13	3:13,21 4:1,6,11	known 32:10	look 12:9 13:6
impression 32:18	15:15,20	4:17,21,24 5:10	knows 6:20 42:5	46:12
<b>improper</b> 8:3 10:8	interpreted 37:19	5:12 7:10 8:15,20		looked 45:9
in-person 23:20	<b>intervene</b> 4:19 5:3	9:7 10:10 11:5	L	<b>looking</b> 24:5 48:13
<b>include</b> 17:5 20:7	5:7,19	12:16 18:19 19:13	<b>L</b> 14:11	49:12
21:12 28:13 31:20	intervening 27:1	19:22 20:9 21:8	<b>labeled</b> 43:25 48:16	<b>Loop</b> 1:18
34:14 44:22	intervenors 11:17	22:12,17 23:2,18	48:17	
<b>included</b> 7:19 8:9	35:18 47:17	24:3,12 25:13,19	<b>labeling</b> 40:2 48:20	M
18:4 20:17 21:11	intervention 5:3	25:23 26:16 27:12	Lacey 1:18 3:1	main 40:5
27:19 31:11 32:24	29:23	28:18,22 29:12,18	lack 38:13	maintain 51:8
36:21 42:24	introduce 10:16	29:22 30:3 31:3	laid 8:24	maintains 8:2
includes 36:18	<b>involve</b> 46:24	32:14 33:15 34:2	<b>Lane</b> 2:22	<b>major</b> 8:23
including 35:25	involved 19:4	34:5 35:12,17,22	language 51:6	majority 42:10
36:8,23 48:10	issue 9:12 12:10	35:24 36:12,17	large 12:21 24:21	<b>March</b> 17:10,13
<b>inclusion</b> 8:9 12:10	13:15 16:1 17:19	37:11 38:1,19	largely 12:20	26:13,13
increases 6:24	26:7,9 28:24	39:11,15,18,25	late 28:16	Marine 4:16
incredibly 28:11	29:23 34:7,22	40:4,22 41:1,24	law 1:13 2:2 3:13	<b>maritime</b> 4:8 31:22
indicate 10:24	37:16,17 40:5	42:7,9 43:17 45:1	<b>laying</b> 23:13	49:10
indicated 40:13	41:8,17 43:1,7	45:11 46:10,25	<b>lead</b> 13:6 47:14	Master 44:6
indicating 6:8	45:19 46:11,17	48:6,9,23 49:4	leave 6:1,4,12,14	<b>Mate</b> 23:11
individuals 40:13	48:12 49:9,11	50:6,20,24 51:3	6:16,19 7:15 9:9	<b>material</b> 9:23,25
40:16 43:5	51:17	51:10	9:15,17 12:18	27:3 33:4,6,7,10
industry 31:5	issue-by-issue 12:3	judgment 49:20	32:8,17 46:6	39:6
inequity 14:21	issues 10:20 16:10	judicial 6:10 33:23	<b>led</b> 16:7	<b>matter</b> 3:14 14:17
information 4:18	21:24 22:22,25	34:18	<b>legal</b> 10:3 49:15	matters 29:14
4:25 31:21 32:5	24:1 25:14,14,18	<b>juncture</b> 34:13,17	lengths 10:21	41:24 43:18 46:20
32:20 38:18	27:19,20 31:16	<b>June</b> 27:24 31:24	<b>let's</b> 3:6,17 5:2	means 17:13 23:22
informed 25:25	32:19 34:23,25	jurisdiction 16:20	16:23 25:23 48:25	24:14
<b>initial</b> 13:3 15:25	35:7 38:23 39:4,7	41:11,18 43:3	letter 35:4	mechanical 31:8
20:22,23 26:5,12	41:10 43:3,8,9	justify 8:5	level 10:20	mediated 14:1 18:2
27:3,18 39:3	47:3		licensed 14:15	18:6,11 19:17
48:13,13	it'd 28:11	<u>K</u>	<b>light</b> 31:9 32:20	20:2
initials 44:17	item 17:18 51:1	keep 17:15 35:6	<b>limit</b> 17:14 39:5	mediation 18:3,4
inquiries 8:6	items 17:1 43:23,24	Kelley 2:11	<b>limited</b> 16:1 21:21	26:6
instruct 41:19		kind 24:15 31:4	32:19,19 46:23	meet 14:18
instruction 36:9,23	<u>J</u>	33:18	limits 41:18	meeting 13:13
instructions 13:20	<b>Jaimie</b> 40:11	know 11:22,23	line 5:16	member 11:25
16:4 35:9,25	<b>January</b> 22:5,5	18:22 21:5 22:15	lines 5:15 13:2	14:23 43:10
intent 20:8	24:8 28:2	23:23 24:12 27:25	31:14 36:1	members 31:22
<b>interest</b> 5:20,22	Jay 4:15	29:16 30:7,19,20	list 35:6	41:20 43:9
6:10 11:12,23	Jennings 4:15,15	31:23 32:3 33:1,3	listed 12:10	memorialized 47:9
	4:20,23	33:3,7 34:22 37:4	live 28:7	mention 7:3 21:23
	1	<u>'</u>	1	<u>'</u>

		1		
mentioned 17:17	32:17 33:25 34:7	<b>note</b> 21:3 25:10	open 18:13 19:17	part 7:18 8:1,7,9,10
38:24 43:19	34:21	27:6 29:15 37:1,8	27:25	12:21 34:18 38:5
Merchant 4:3	moving 5:23 9:15	37:23 44:8 51:5	opening 18:15	38:7 39:10 44:4
merely 9:25 12:24	33:19	<b>noted</b> 11:7 30:5	opportunity 23:16	45:17,25
merits 9:13 41:14	<b>mute</b> 5:15 37:15	34:12 38:20 50:1	<b>oppose</b> 6:19 8:8	parte 40:14 41:5
message 25:5	<b>muted</b> 5:16 14:9	<b>notice</b> 4:13 48:14	10:13	42:2,15,17,25
mhaglund@hk-l	mutually 13:21	<b>November</b> 27:22,25	opposing 11:21	43:12
2:13	16:5	28:16	<b>opposition</b> 6:23 9:3	<b>partial</b> 18:7 26:1
<b>Michael</b> 1:13 2:3		number 20:21,22	45:6	participation 5:21
2:10 3:12	N	21:24 24:7 28:25	<b>option</b> 49:21	particular 3:16
michael.howard	N 2:1 3:4	37:14 43:24	<b>oral</b> 6:9	10:1 11:22 46:3
47:18	name 3:12	numerous 7:17	<b>order</b> 6:25 7:23 9:1	49:24 50:7
<b>Michelle</b> 2:16 4:4	names 40:11 44:18		13:13 16:12 17:12	particularly 31:6
6:17 20:11	47:19	0	17:24 18:14 19:11	33:10
mid 28:2,16 50:1	narrow 21:1 29:23	O 3:4	20:16,17 22:19	parties 5:24 6:6,8
midst 23:16	39:3 49:10	<b>000</b> 3:3	27:22 28:2 36:1,9	6:16,20 8:3 11:21
<b>Mike</b> 3:19	National 1:24	<b>object</b> 7:14 36:8,14	36:21 37:2,7,16	14:1 15:12 16:11
mind 4:18 16:24	nature 23:8	40:15	37:20 38:4,14,16	17:14,25 18:9
17:15 48:19	navigate 43:2	<b>objection</b> 6:18	38:22 39:5 45:18	19:7,15 20:7
mindful 43:7,7	navigating 44:11	11:15 36:16,22,24	47:9 48:1 51:17	21:13 23:24 24:13
minimal 15:2	near 46:9	40:20,23,24 46:6	Oregon 2:12	25:2,6,24 26:1,4,8
minutes 9:11	necessarily 7:16 16:9 29:19 32:22	48:4,8	organizations 4:12	26:14 31:12 32:15
moment 4:20 7:12		<b>objections</b> 5:8,13	5:20 41:21	33:24 35:2,5,8
23:19 30:8 32:16	32:24 34:17,18 37:21	5:18 6:7,15 9:18	original 7:19,20 8:1	40:7,15,17 41:13
41:7		39:15,19 48:2,10 <b>observe</b> 15:9 16:3	9:1 48:17	43:6 46:24 47:1,4
moments 9:14 36:3	necessary 5:1 need 5:14 10:19	observer 4:22 14:9	outset 11:14	47:12,12,16 49:13
month 13:3	15:3 17:3,5,12	observers 5:14	overseas 23:4	50:18 51:13,15
months 16:17	21:19 23:11 32:24	observing 5:16	oversees 28:7	parties' 12:17 19:2
27:17,24 28:14,15	37:1 39:5 41:9	occur 30:20 50:8	overwhelming	26:2 30:4,5 34:12
28:17 50:9	needed 10:23 11:3	October 26:6 27:24	33:13	41:8,19
morning 3:6	needs 18:16 43:4	32:1 50:1	P	party 7:11,12 12:1
motion 6:1,3,4,4,12	neglected 49:9	offer 11:6	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:4	13:21 19:25 36:8
6:13,16 7:8,13,15	negotiations 31:23	Office 2:6	Pacific 4:2 6:23 7:5	36:12,20 42:13
9:1,9,15,18,21	neither 7:3,3	oh 20:3 25:17	14:19 15:7,18	47:14,19 50:25
11:8 12:18 13:14	new 32:20 48:18	Okay 4:21 19:10,13	page 12:11 48:17	pause 44:25 PC 2:22
13:16,18 15:10,21 15:22 29:5 32:23	newly 44:22	20:10 24:2 26:16	48:23	pendency 14:2
33:4,21,22 34:9	non-argumentati	30:3 35:22 45:3	pages 1:12 11:18	pending 5:23,24
45:6,24 49:18,19	10:21	50:23	11:19 13:2 15:24	16:25 41:5,12
motions 5:23,24	normal 13:8 50:12	<b>Olympia</b> 1:23 2:7	48:14,18	pension 26:7
6:7,9 8:19 13:10	50:17	omits 7:2	paper 47:8	pension-related
16:25 45:16 50:13	normally 18:19	on-duty 23:14,17	papers 43:25 44:2,4	19:18
mound 11:18	19:4 45:18	once 7:23 22:6	44:8,14,18 46:2,5	people 42:17
move 5:2 13:9	Northwest 4:16	ones 5:4 30:20	46:13,15	percent 14:7,13
15:17 16:23 30:9	6:23 7:5 14:19	ongoing 24:7	paragraph 20:15	period 24:8 28:1,14
15.17 10.23 50.7	15:7,19	<b>online</b> 23:20	pardon 22:14 25:17	P 2 2 1 2 2 0 1 1 1 T
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

20.15	26.14.20.2.14.22		15.14.20.10.10	20.14.21.10
30:15	36:14 38:2,14,23	prejudging 32:22	15:14 20:18,19	20:14 21:10 Puget 1:7 2:0 3:10
person 22:16	39:20 40:25 41:9	prejudice 13:24	24:11 25:3 29:10 29:15 30:1 46:22	Puget 1:7 2:9 3:10
personally 18:3	42:5 43:19 45:6	prejudicial 28:5		3:11,18,20 44:6
28:6	46:24	preliminary 29:4	proposing 17:8	punch 22:19
perspective 31:4	PMSA's 6:3 13:14	<b>prepare</b> 24:19 28:2	protective 37:2,7	purely 23:19 49:15
35:21 39:2	13:18 35:21	29:2	37:16,20 38:4,14	purposes 16:15,22
persuaded 13:23	PO 2:6	prepared 46:8	38:16	44:10
petition 4:19 5:25	point 8:24 14:3	preparing 45:18	proves 49:21	put 45:23
6:2,13,21,22 7:19	18:16 21:18 29:3	present 11:2 50:5	provide 11:20 12:8	putting 38:16
7:20 8:1 9:11,13	39:22 50:22 51:11	presented 18:7	13:10 14:22 15:11	0
14:4,16,17,25	pointed 11:16	presents 7:4	31:14 33:5 37:6	query 10:22
15:6,10	points 9:2 17:15	press 27:2 31:25	47:10	question 22:19 24:4
petitions 5:2,3,7,8	18:10 20:1 28:19	pretty 49:10 51:6	provided 33:20	30:13 37:22 42:1
5:18,19,25 13:10	policy 24:17 42:19	prevent 38:15	provides 7:24	43:15 45:14 46:22
<b>phone</b> 37:14	42:20 43:11 49:15	prices 31:9	provisions 37:5	49:15
pick 30:14	Portland 2:12	prior 7:23 38:8	PSE 28:5	questions 20:1,12
pilot 32:4	posed 37:22	44:21 48:3,5,6	<b>PSP</b> 3:11 5:9 6:13	21:4 22:10 25:1,7
pilotage 7:23 31:4	<b>position</b> 7:13 8:16	priority 29:1	6:22 7:11,16,17	25:10 29:20 34:21
31:15 37:17 40:7	8:18 10:2 11:8,10	probably 21:12	7:24 8:21 9:12,17	43:14,22
43:4	12:4 26:19 30:2	50:9	9:23 10:16,18	quite 30:16
pilots 1:7 2:9 3:10	34:3,4 37:24	problem 49:2	11:6,17 13:4,5,19	quote 48:16,17
3:11,18,20 14:15	positions 30:5	procedural 15:11	14:5,10,13,23	quote 48.10,17
14:23 44:6	possibility 18:25	16:23 17:1,16	15:9,23 16:3,9	R
place 26:11 38:16	possible 10:25 21:7	18:10 25:3,25	17:21 18:12 19:6	<b>R</b> 2:1 3:4 52:1
placeholder 32:8	24:9,11 30:16	51:17	20:23 22:1 26:8	raise 19:25 34:23
places 32:9	31:1 39:3,13	procedurally 8:2	29:5 30:18 31:17	38:24 40:18
plan 4:19 16:7	44:21 47:16	10:8	32:17 33:6,12	raised 23:1 26:8
17:19,22,25 18:2	post-hearing 17:15	<b>proceed</b> 13:17	34:7 35:13 36:11	37:2
18:11 23:21 25:13	potential 23:13	16:14 51:4	38:11 39:17 40:20	raises 7:17
35:25 48:10	38:6	proceeded 18:24	41:9 43:23 44:5	range 19:23 26:23
planned 38:3	potentially 26:12	proceeding 10:9	44:14 45:12,20	ranges 12:11
plans 29:17	Powell 2:22	38:8 44:23	46:23 48:8,19	rate 3:10 6:1,13,24
play 50:11	power 31:6,14	proceedings 24:7	49:10,13	7:22 9:25 13:24
pleadings 9:3 51:6	34:15	51:9	<b>PSP's</b> 5:25 6:1,3,4	14:2,5,16,22
please 5:15 17:15	<b>practice</b> 13:1,8	process 15:11	6:11,16 7:4,21 9:8	15:13,15,20,23
20:3 30:12 31:1	34:19	professionalism	9:15 10:2,23,23	16:1,7,17 18:23
45:1 47:15,22	prefer 19:19 33:25	51:15	13:24 14:4,16,25	20:23 21:25 27:18
51:3	44:19 50:18	proffer 38:12	15:5,21 16:17	27:21 32:4 37:18
plus 11:3	preferred 23:6	program 13:22	17:19 18:23 27:3	37:24 38:8,11
PMSA 2:15 4:3,5	prehearing 1:11	promptly 30:25	27:13 29:7 40:9	40:9,14 41:5,14
5:5,7,19 6:18,18	3:7 13:12 15:2	proposals 26:14	41:16 45:5,6,10	43:8 44:13
6:21,22 7:7 8:24	17:4 22:18 36:1,9	propose 17:18	46:18 48:13	re-designation 46:2
10:11,12 11:15	36:21 38:4,22	24:14	<b>public</b> 5:21 11:12	reach 34:25
20:12 28:21,25	47:9 48:1,7	proposed 7:2,18	11:24,24 12:1,14	read 16:19
33:15,16 34:22	prejudge 34:10	8:10 10:13 12:20	18:17,20 19:1,4,5	ready 49:25 50:5
				10009 17.23 30.3

	1	1	1	_
realize 45:4	relates 30:17	32:25	36:17 37:22 38:19	send 25:5
really 12:3 42:18	<b>relatively</b> 15:2 46:9	requirement 14:14	39:18,25 40:4,22	sense 12:1
Realtime 1:21	48:11	36:19,21 41:17	41:1 42:9 45:11	separate 15:14
reason 45:25	relevance 33:19	43:8 48:10	46:10 48:9 49:4	18:18
reasonable 29:11	relevancy 39:4	requirements 47:8	50:14 51:3,16	September 26:6
reasoning 13:12	relevant 15:18	requires 24:1 47:6	roadmap 11:21	32:1 39:12
rebuttal 17:3 22:3	<b>relief</b> 6:1,13 14:5	reserve 8:13 21:19	12:8,24	serve 47:12,13
28:2 29:8 36:6	14:16,22,25 15:13	reserved 10:9	Rothschild 2:17	service 47:5,11,15
recall 47:24 48:24	15:15,20	resolution 27:20	round 17:14	services 42:11,21
recalling 50:15	<b>rely</b> 8:5	resolved 22:22 24:1	rules 37:1,5 47:10	session 19:18
receive 47:21	remaining 13:10	respect 16:5 23:3,8	47:25 49:12 50:17	set 10:4 11:25 15:7
received 5:6	28:15	45:14,23,24 49:9	<b>ruling</b> 13:11	17:3 21:14 29:5
recess 25:21,24	<b>remedy</b> 13:23	<b>respond</b> 7:12 9:2	<b>rulings</b> 16:24 19:16	<b>setting</b> 9:4 48:2
recognize 24:20,21	remind 47:4	18:9 33:24 35:19		settlement 17:6
29:19 31:15 41:9	reminder 51:8	36:13 45:12,20	S	18:1,5,6,7,7 26:5
43:2 51:12	removal 14:15	Respondent 1:9	S 2:1 3:4	31:25
recommend 9:20	<b>remove</b> 24:16	response 8:11,21	satisfied 7:4,16	seven 27:8,10 36:4
recommended 28:6	renewal 31:24	11:6 17:3 26:15	saying 14:6 22:23	36:6 44:8 48:19
record 3:7 6:5 9:16	<b>reply</b> 6:2,12,14,16	26:22 27:7,7,8,9	40:11	<b>shared</b> 36:19
9:21 12:6,19 19:3	6:19 7:2,8,15,18	27:18 29:3 30:15	says 12:7	sheets 47:23,25
25:2,8,20,24	7:24 8:4,13,24 9:1	33:22 36:3,5	<b>schedule</b> 6:3 10:3	48:12,15,24
31:21 32:7,17	9:4,9,9,12 15:1,5	46:18	10:25 15:10,14,22	<b>Sheri</b> 40:12
33:25 34:8 45:18	15:6 18:15 26:13	<b>responses</b> 6:9 36:19	16:2,13,24 17:1,2	<b>shift</b> 27:7,10
45:23 46:1	50:14	50:13	17:16,18 18:5,10	<b>ship</b> 23:10,13
redaction 38:17	REPORTED 1:20	responsibilities	21:6,13 25:4,25	Shipping 4:3
redesignated 44:20	Reporter 52:7	41:8	27:14 28:6 29:4,6	shortening 36:3
reference 20:15	reporting 1:21	responsive 38:12	29:16 30:9 31:12	<b>shorter</b> 29:6,6
<b>referred</b> 17:20 36:3	31:25	resulted 27:21	32:25 34:15,21	Shorthand 52:6
44:15	representative	retirement 13:22	50:3,5 51:18	shortly 51:17
refiling 48:19	47:15	16:7 17:19,22	schedules 24:6	showing 50:14
refrain 41:4	representatives	18:2,11	scheduling 20:17	<b>shown</b> 9:12
refused 38:12	47:20	return 16:7	25:11	side 30:1 42:4,14
regard 21:4	represented 42:12	revenue 14:14	scope 33:9 34:16	42:17,25
regarding 20:18	request 15:13,15,18		sea 23:17	significance 30:24
31:21 32:9 40:14	15:20 23:15 24:9	review 12:19 15:13	seasalt@foxroths	significant 28:1,10
40:18 42:2 46:22	26:21 35:2 38:3,7	15:15 22:6 33:6	2:19	30:15
regardless 30:14	38:20 40:8 44:24	revised 48:14,16,21	Seattle 1:22,23	similar 10:2,14
regards 13:20	51:7	48:23	2:18,23	11:16
regular 16:15	requested 8:5	right 3:21 4:17,21	second 18:5 21:25	<b>simple</b> 10:23
regulated 13:3	requesting 14:7	4:24 5:6,12,17,18	44:25 45:3,14	simply 30:23
regulation 41:11	requests 14:10,13	8:15,20 9:7 11:5	section 12:11 42:19	simultaneous 18:15
regulatory 42:10	35:3 36:4,19	12:16 21:8 22:12	sections 42:12	26:12,13
42:11,21	38:13 44:11	22:23 25:19,19,23	see 5:14 17:2 19:19	situation 7:4 11:2
reject 13:23	require 14:1 17:25	27:12,13 29:12,18	45:25	24:23 37:9
<b>relabeled</b> 44:7 45:8	required 15:16	34:5 35:12,17,24	seeing 31:5 33:4	six 28:7
			seeks 8:5 9:17	

<b>skill</b> 52:9	<b>starting</b> 3:17 6:20	supplement 6:5	26:22 27:4,9,11	THURSTON 52:4
slash 49:15	state 11:14 49:20	9:16,21 10:13	28:3 29:3,9 30:16	tied 12:20,21
small 48:12 49:1	52:3,7	12:6,19 30:24	30:19,25 31:5,9	time 4:14 6:10 8:4
soon 47:16	stated 19:11 45:22	32:17 34:8	31:13,18 34:14	18:16 19:18,23
sorry 5:17 22:13	states 17:21 32:5	supplemental	36:5 44:16,22	20:25 21:19 22:23
sort 9:4 31:8	statute 40:8	31:18 32:25 34:14	45:8 46:4	23:10,14 24:17
<b>Sound</b> 1:7 2:9 3:10	statutes 16:19	45:8	thank 3:21 4:1,6,11	27:7,7,9,17,18
3:11,18,20 44:6	37:19	supplemented	4:17,24 5:1,10,12	28:1,10,12,13,15
Southeast 1:18	statutory 16:18	32:20	7:9,10 8:15,20 9:7	28:17 29:2,6
speak 12:9 41:10	38:6 41:18	supplementing	10:10 11:4,5	32:13 33:5 34:9
speaking 26:18	<b>Steve</b> 2:21 4:9	30:18	12:15,16 14:11,11	36:3 37:3 38:5,14
special 42:15	strikes 49:13	<b>support</b> 6:2,12 45:5	19:24 20:5,8,10	38:15 47:2
<b>specific</b> 7:17,21,21	strive 51:12	45:16 47:20	21:8,9 22:11,12	timelines 50:13
8:4 15:11 44:15	<b>sub</b> 38:5 39:10	<b>sure</b> 29:1 42:5 50:2	24:2 26:16 27:12	times 51:12
46:5	<b>Subcom</b> 23:12	suspend 47:7	28:18 29:12,18	<b>timing</b> 33:9
specifically 12:23	<b>subject</b> 33:3 35:4	suspension 16:16	30:3 33:16 34:1,2	today 3:7,16 11:25
45:23	41:11	16:18	34:5 35:12,21	13:13 40:6 49:7
sponsored 12:23	<b>subjects</b> 10:1 35:6	SW 2:12	36:14,17 38:2,19	today's 14:3 16:15
Square 1:18	submission 48:7		39:1,10,11,14,19	16:22
staff 2:4 3:22,25	submissions 17:4	-	39:23 40:4,22	<b>Tonn</b> 40:12
5:11 6:21,22 7:14	<b>submit</b> 7:7 10:18	T 52:1,1	42:6 43:16,21	topic 31:17 35:3
7:15 8:2,7,8,12,25	41:15 44:5 45:16	table 34:7	45:10,11 46:10	topics 12:25
9:19,20,22,23	submitted 22:4,7	take 26:11 27:24	49:4 50:19,23	<b>TOTE</b> 2:20 4:7,8,9
10:7,14 11:15,17	44:14	28:12,18 30:2,4	51:9,10,19	5:5,7,20 8:16,18
16:8 19:7 20:7	submitting 12:5,6	38:21 41:7 46:11	they'd 28:16	11:7 22:8 29:21
24:4,5,6,8,13,13	48:25	taken 25:21	thing 19:9 46:16	34:3 35:23 40:24
24:21 25:5,18	substance 8:8,13	takes 8:18 talk 9:14 42:5	49:8	41:9 49:10,13,23
26:21,25,25 27:6	substantial 5:20		things 31:10 44:9	TOTE's 29:23
28:12 29:1,10,13	29:24	talking 42:22 target 33:19	think 11:11,22	touch 34:24 47:3
29:14,15 33:2,4,5	substantive 43:3	tariff 48:12,14,19	12:13,13 18:25	48:11
33:8,13 35:10	sufficient 20:20,25	48:24	19:22 21:11 23:25	<b>TP-190976</b> 16:12
36:2,24 40:23	21:17	tariffs 16:21	23:25 24:12,12	<b>TP-220513</b> 1:4 3:8
42:10,11 46:21	suggest 25:1 50:8	task 49:1	27:15,23 28:11,17	track 12:2 35:6
47:21	suggested 29:5	<b>Tayler</b> 1:20 52:6,15	32:16 33:8,13	Trade 4:16
Staff's 8:11 26:19	suggesting 15:16	technical 23:10	34:6,13 43:12,12	trained 18:3
26:19 28:5 29:17	50:21	Telephone 6:23	43:22 46:13 51:10	transcript 52:8
stage 10:9 stakeholder 17:23	suggests 26:25	14:19 15:8,19	thinking 32:23 third 13:21	<b>transition</b> 18:1 23:19
stakeholders 17:22	<b>Suite</b> 1:22 2:17,22 <b>summarize</b> 9:22	tell 23:18		
standard 7:16 9:3		ten 27:8 36:4	third-party 16:5	<b>transitioning</b> 13:22 16:6 17:19
17:1 38:3,16	summarizing 9:25	tends 12:25	thought 27:13 thoughts 19:3	Transportation 1:2
43:18	summary 9:17,24	testimony 10:1,6	thousand 11:19	1:4,17 3:9
standards 14:18	10:18,22 11:3,13	10:16 11:17 12:21	three 6:20 13:10	true 52:8
standards 14.16	12:4,7,20 49:18	12:25 13:6 15:25	28:15 32:12 44:18	try 43:11
start 3:17	49:19	17:3,4 18:17 22:4	threshold 13:15	turn 7:11 9:19
State 3.17	17,17	22:6 23:7 26:15		V /
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 62
10.10 46.10	20.24.22.17	20.22 26.12 40.17	24.16	25 27.22
18:12 46:19	20:24 33:17	30:22 36:12 40:17	zero-sum 24:16	<b>25</b> 27:22
twice 20:21,22	vs 1:6	46:7 48:22	<b>Zoom</b> 23:22	26th 26:22,24
two 5:7,19 6:7,9,11	$\mathbf{W}$	wishes 10:16,18	0	<b>287-9066</b> 1:23
9:16 17:21 18:18	WAC 38:5 39:9	49:23	<b>09</b> 16:12 17:24	<b>29</b> 27:24,24
20:20 21:17 24:10	44:2	witness 10:1 12:12	07 10.12 17.24	<b>29th</b> 16:16,22
26:20 28:9 40:13	wall 42:15,18,25	12:24 23:9 44:11	1	17:11,13
40:16 42:22 43:9	want 6:6 12:1,9	44:19 46:3,18	<b>1</b> 38:5 48:15,24	<b>2nd</b> 6:14 17:10
43:22,22 48:25	14:8 21:3 24:16	witness' 10:6	<b>1-53</b> 1:12	3
50:9	25:10 34:10 37:15	witness's 30:25	<b>1.4</b> 14:7,13	$\frac{3}{38:10}$
U	37:21,21 41:7	44:15	<b>10:02</b> 25:21	<b>3,000</b> 15:24
	46:12	witnesses 11:18	<b>10:47</b> 25:22	<b>30</b> 31:25
<b>underlying</b> 9:13 46:13		12:3,9 13:6 15:24	<b>10.4</b> 7 23.22 <b>1001</b> 2:17	
	wanted 12:2 20:4,6	20:23 22:21 23:21	10th 26:6	30th 26:23
understand 19:16	34:22,24 37:8	30:19 32:9 41:20	<b>11</b> 16:17	<b>3358</b> 1:20 52:15
37:18	38:23 40:5 43:5	44:17	11-month 16:15	<b>360</b> 1:23 2:7
undisputed 49:14	48:11 51:5	wondered 45:7	<b>11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:</b>	<b>389-1668</b> 2:18
unfair 8:3 28:11	warrant 30:18 37:7	wondering 42:3	11.23 31.20 11th 22:5 23:4,6	<b>391</b> 20:15
unfortunately	warrants 30:24	Woodland 1:18	<b>120-plus</b> 11:19	4
24:15	Washington 1:1,4	work 21:13 23:25	<b>1325</b> 1:22	<b>4</b> 1:15 3:1 39:10
uniformed 35:6	1:17,18,22 2:7,18	23:25 26:25 27:2	1325 1:22 1420 2:22	<b>40</b> 13:2
unique 31:4	2:23 3:1,9 52:3,7	29:24 32:10 37:9		
United 32:5	way 10:21 21:1	42:19 43:25 44:1	<b>15</b> 26:10	<b>40128</b> 2:6
<b>update</b> 31:8,13,14	27:16 37:14 44:9	44:4,8,14,18 46:2	<b>17</b> 26:13	<b>4200</b> 2:22
34:15,17	44:20	46:5,13,15 50:3	<b>1840</b> 1:22	<b>4400</b> 2:17
updated 34:14	ways 49:12	workers 31:22	<b>1st</b> 17:10	<b>480-07-415</b> 39:10
48:15	we'll 8:13 25:10	working 23:23	2	<b>480-07-420(1)</b> 38:5
<b>updates</b> 31:5,6	we're 3:7 12:5 14:8	workload 24:21,23	$\frac{2}{26:25}$	<b>480-07-525</b> 44:2
33:10	19:15 20:24 29:25	29:2	<b>20.</b> 23 <b>2020</b> 27:22	5
updating 31:9	35:15,15 37:6	works 23:12	<b>2020</b> 27:22 <b>2022</b> 1:15 3:1 6:14	<b>500</b> 11:18
<b>urge</b> 9:4	42:22 43:7 45:18	workshop 16:7		<b>500</b> 11:18 <b>503</b> 2:13
uses 46:14	50:5	workshops 16:6	<b>2023</b> 16:16,22 17:8	
UTC 42:8,9	<b>we've</b> 27:19	worthwhile 21:18	17:9,10,11	<b>534-9066</b> 1:23
<b>utilities</b> 1:2,4,17	week 26:22,24	<b>WPKAE</b> 44:5	<b>206</b> 1:23 2:18,23	6
3:9 13:7	27:16 48:2,5,6	writing 5:4	<b>2177</b> 2:12	<b>621</b> 1:18
<b>utility</b> 31:13 34:16	49:1	written 13:12	<b>21st</b> 26:13	021 1.10
	weeks 24:10 27:5	www.buellrealti	<b>22</b> 11:18 15:24	7
V	28:9 46:9 48:25	1:25	18:14 19:15 23:14	<b>7</b> 48:15,24
verbal 4:13 13:11	weigh 28:23		<b>223-7000</b> 2:23	<b>75</b> 23:12,12,17
versus 3:10	weighing 16:13	X	<b>225-0777</b> 2:13	
<b>vessel</b> 23:13	weight 9:5		<b>22nd</b> 17:8,9 22:3	8
<b>view</b> 37:8	<b>welcome</b> 19:2 21:2	Y	26:11	<b>800</b> 1:24
<b>virtual</b> 1:11 22:15	<b>Weldon</b> 44:16	<b>yeah</b> 24:3 37:11	<b>23</b> 18:14 19:15	<b>846-6898</b> 1:24
22:21 23:16	went 25:24 28:16	<b>year</b> 19:20 24:22	23:15	<b>8544</b> 37:15
visiting 23:5	willing 19:7	yesterday 6:8	<b>23rd</b> 17:8,9 26:6,11	8th 26:10
visits 29:8	winter 19:20 24:22		<b>24</b> 23:15	
<b>volume</b> 1:11 20:21	wish 8:16 22:8	Z	<b>24th</b> 21:19 26:12	9

Page 63

		Fage 03
9 20:16 9:30 1:16 3:2 97201 2:12 98101 1:22 98111 2:23 98154 2:18 98503 1:18 98504 2:7 995-2818 2:7 9th 22:5 23:3,6		