0001			
1			
2	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		
3			
4	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) DOCKET TR-150284		
5	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) Pages 1 - 9		
	Complainant,)		
6	v.)		
7	BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY,)		
8) Respondent.)		
9			
10	PREHEARING CONFERENCE - VOLUME I		
11	PAGES 1 - 9		
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE KOPTA		
13			
14			
15	9:59 A.M.		
	MAY 18, 2015		
16			
17	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 206		
18	Olympia, Washington 98504-7250		
19			
20			
21	REPORTED BY: RYAN ZIEGLER, RPR, CCR #3348		
22	Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue Suite 1840		
23	Seattle, Washington 98101		
24	206.287.9066 Seattle 360.534.9066 Olympia		
25	800.846.6989 National www.buellrealtime.com		

0002		
1		
2		APPEARANCES
3	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW	V JUDGE:
4		GREGORY J. KOPTA Utilities and Transportation Commission
5		PO Box 47250 1300 South Evergreen Drive Southwest
6		Olympia, Washington 98504 360.664.1136
7		300.001.1130
8	FOR COMMISSION STA	AFF:
9		JULIAN BEATTIE Office of the Attorney General
10		Utilities and Transportation Division PO Box 40128
11		1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504
12		360.664.1225 jbeattie@utc.wa.gov
13		
14	FOR BNSF RAILWAY (COMPANY:
15		P. STEPHEN DIJULIO CHRISTOPHER G. EMCH
16		Foster Pepper, PLLC

15	P. STEPHEN DIJULIO CHRISTOPHER G. EMCH
16	Foster Pepper, PLLC 1111 Third Avenue
17	Suite 3400
	Seattle, Washington 98101
18	206.447.8904
	dijup@foster.com
19	emchc@foster.com
20	BROOKE C. KUHL
	General Counsel
21	BNSF Railway Company
	201 West Railroad Street
22	Suite 301
	Missoula, Montana 59802
23	406.543.0019
	brooke.kuhl@bnsf.com

25 * * * * *

24

1	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; MAY 18, 2015
2	9:59 A.M.
3	000
4	
5	PROCEEDINGS
6	THE COURT: Let's be on the record in Docket
7	TR-150284, captioned Washington Utilities and
8	Transportation Commission versus BNSF Railway Company.
9	Gregory J. Kopta, the Administrative Law Judge, will be
10	presiding in this proceeding, and we are here today on
11	March (sic) 18th, at 10 a.m., to discuss scheduling and
12	other issues that we address in a prehearing conference.
13	So let's begin by taking appearances,
14	starting with Staff as the Complainant.
15	MR. BEATTIE: Thank you, Judge Kopta. My
16	name is Julian Beattie. I'm with the Attorney General's
17	office, and I'm appearing on behalf of Commission Staff.
18	My notice of appearance is in the record.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20	And for the Company?
21	MR. DIJULIO: Steve DiJulio, Foster Pepper,
22	for BNSF. With me is Brooke Kuhl, counsel at BNSF, and
23	Chris Emch, also from Foster Pepper. Good morning.
24	THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning.
25	Is there anyone else who wants to make an

- 1 appearance? Hearing none, then we will proceed to our list
- 2 of issues.
- 3 The first is interventions. I have not seen
- 4 any petitions to intervene. Is there anyone who wishes to
- 5 intervene orally? Hearing none, then we will have no
- 6 interventions.
- 7 Second, electronic service. Do the parties
- 8 agree to electronic service? I see nods.
- 9 MR. BEATTIE: Yes. Staff consents to
- 10 electronic service.
- MR. DIJULIO: BNSF agrees to electronic
- 12 service.
- 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- 14 Then discovery. Do the parties want to have
- the Commission's discovery rules available?
- 16 MR. BEATTIE: Staff would request to invoke
- 17 those discovery rules.
- 18 THE COURT: All right. Then we will make
- 19 those available.
- 20 And I believe that takes us to schedule,
- 21 unless there are other issues that anyone else wants to
- 22 address. I have received a proposed schedule from Staff,
- 23 and as we discussed off the record, those dates seem
- 24 acceptable, at least in terms of my availability and the
- 25 Commissioner's availability for the event of evidentiary

- 1 hearing.
- 2 My only concern is that it's a rather
- 3 extended schedule, with hearings not until the middle of
- 4 January of next year, so I'm wondering if there's a reason
- 5 why we need to take that long.
- 6 Generally, at least under the statute, the
- 7 Commission is directed to complete complaint proceedings
- 8 within ten months. This would take us well beyond ten
- 9 months, so I'm -- would like to have some discussion about
- 10 why the time is needed. I know you all -- Staff is not
- 11 filing testimony until mid September, so three months. Is
- 12 it really going to take that long?
- MR. BEATTIE: Thank you, Judge Kopta.
- 14 Staff believes that discussions will be
- 15 productive with the Company, but may take some time, and
- 16 given that the summer months are coming up and vacations
- 17 to -- you know, will be occurring, we just wanted to build
- in plenty of time for settlement discussions.
- 19 I will note that we did not actually reserve
- 20 any dates because we haven't had a time -- any time to
- 21 discuss with the Company, you know, actually get some of
- 22 those dates on the calendar. But I think that that would
- 23 be the main reason from Staff is just building in extra
- 24 time, I guess, for settlement discussions.
- 25 I'm going to look at my client over here and

- 1 see if they have anything to add for whether that was the
- 2 main driving factor. I believe that was the main driving
- 3 factor.
- 4 THE COURT: Okay. And is that Company's
- 5 understanding as well?
- 6 MR. DIJULIO: Yes. We were responding -- we
- 7 believe, first of all, in response to Mr. Beattie's
- 8 comment, that the case is --
- 9 THE COURT: Is your microphone on, Mr. -- the
- 10 red light should be -- there you go.
- 11 MR. DIJULIO: For the Company, BNSF does
- 12 believe that this case is readily susceptible to
- 13 settlement, and we do expect that there may be some time
- 14 involved with that. We'd comment that we believe that that
- 15 would happen with or without mediation, but we're certainly
- 16 willing to participate in mediation if that becomes
- 17 necessary as well.
- 18 And in responding to the Staff-proposed
- 19 schedule, we believe it's an appropriate schedule and
- 20 provides sufficient time for settlement discussions or, if
- 21 necessary, then, full hearing preparation.
- 22 THE COURT: All right. And so the Company is
- 23 willing to waive that ten-month target deadline for
- 24 resolution of the complaint?
- MR. DIJULIO: Company so waives.

- 1 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a date for an
- 2 initial settlement conference? We usually like to put that
- 3 in our schedule, and right now, the schedule that you
- 4 provided to me just has a "to be determined" slot next to
- 5 the settlement conference.
- 6 MR. BEATTIE: Judge Kopta, we do not have a
- 7 date. We are planning to meet after this -- after this
- 8 hearing, so I suppose in some ways, that could be
- 9 considered our -- you know, our first -- our first meeting,
- 10 but we don't have any formal settlement dates proposed.
- 11 Maybe that is something we will discuss at -- at today's
- 12 informal meeting.
- 13 THE COURT: Well, I think the main reason
- 14 that we have that in there is just to hold people's feet to
- 15 the fire, and it sounds to me like, based on our
- 16 discussion, given that we are establishing a schedule that
- 17 allows for settlement, that that is already something
- 18 that's well within the contemplation of the parties and not
- 19 something that the Commission needs to give any further
- 20 encouragement to.
- 21 So I don't -- I don't need to have a date,
- 22 but I was just curious if, in subsequent discussions,
- 23 whether you had come up with any dates.
- 24 MR. BEATTIE: And -- and we do not have any
- 25 formal dates at this point.

8000

24

```
1
                   THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Well,
 2
     then I will include that schedule in the prehearing
 3
     conference order.
 4
                   Is there anything else that we need to talk
 5
     about while we're here this morning?
 6
                   MR. BEATTIE: Nothing from Staff.
 7
                   MR. DIJULIO: The only thing that we could
     think of is whether or not you wanted to address mediation
 8
 9
     in the prehearing statement, or if we cannot resolve the
10
     matter, that we bring that back before the administrative
11
     law judge. It doesn't matter one way or the other. It's
12
     just a practicality and expediency.
13
                   THE COURT: And that's a good question. We
14
     generally include in our prehearing conference order the
15
     invitation to engage in alternative dispute resolution,
16
     including mediation, and it talks about the availability of
17
     mediation. So it seems to me, at this point, we're -- it's
18
     a little premature to talk about mediation, but certainly
19
     to the extent that the parties find themselves in need of
20
     that particular service, then you can request it, and we
21
     will make arrangements to have someone available to assist.
22
                   All right. With that, then, I believe we're
     adjourned. Thank you.
23
```

(Proceedings concluded at 10:07 a.m.)

25 * * * * *

0009	
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	COUNTY OF KING
5	
6	I, Ryan Ziegler, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in
7	and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the
8	foregoing transcript of the proceedings held May 18, 2015,
9	is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill, and
10	ability.
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
12	and seal this May 27, 2015.
13	
14	
15	
16	
	RYAN ZIEGLER, RPR, CCR
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	