

Docket No. U-180680 - Vol. II

In the Matter of: Puget Sound Energy Transfer

January 9, 2019



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Joint Application of) DOCKET NO. U-180680)

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, ALBERTA INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,) BRITISH COLUMBIA INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, OMERS ADMINISTRATION CORPORATION, and PGGM VERMOGENSBEHEER B.V.)

For an Order Authorizing Proposed Sales of Indirect Interests in Puget Sound Energy)

STATUS CONFERENCE, VOLUME II Pages 84-116

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES RAYNE PEARSON AND ANDREW O'CONNELL

January 9, 2019

3:05 P.M.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504

REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358

Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066 | Seattle (253) 235-0111 | Tacoma (800) 846-6989 | National www.buellrealtime.com

1 APPEARANCES (Cont.) 2 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: (Via bridge line)

3 SIMON FFITCH 4 Attorney at Law 5 321 High School Road Northeast 6 Suite D3, Box 383 7 Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110 (206) 669-8197 simon@ffitchlaw.com

8 FOR AWEC: (Via bridge line)

9 TYLER PEPPE 10 Davison Van Cleve PC 11 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 12 Portland, Oregon 97201 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com

13 FOR WNIDCL: (Via bridge line)

14 DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE 15 Law Offices of Schwerin Campbell 16 Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP 17 18 W Mercer Street, Suite 400 18 Seattle, Washington 98119 (206) 257-6011 franco@workerlaw.com

19 FOR THE FEA: (Via bridge line)

20 RITA LIOTTA 21 US Navy 22 1 Avenue of the Palms, Suite 161 23 San Francisco, California 94130 (415) 743-4718 rita.liotta@navy.mil

24 FOR NWECC: (Via bridge line)

25 WENDY GERLITZ 26 Northwest Energy Coalition 27 811 - 1st Avenue, Suite 305 28 Seattle, Washington 98104 (503) 449-0009 wendy@nwenergy.org

1 APPEARANCES

2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES:

3 RAYNE PEARSON 4 ANDREW O'CONNELL 5 Washington Utilities and 6 Transportation Commission 7 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW 8 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1160

9 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: (Via bridge line)

10 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 11 Office of the Attorney General 12 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW 13 PO Box 40128 14 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 jcameron@utc.wa.gov

15 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (Via bridge line)

16 LISA GAFKEN 17 Office of the Attorney General 18 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 19 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov

20 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY: (Via bridge line)

21 SHEREE STROM CARSON 22 Perkins Coie LLP 23 10885 NE 4th Street, Suite 700 24 Bellevue, Washington 98004 (425) 635-1422 scarson@perkinscoie.com

1 APPEARANCES (Cont.) 2 FOR PGGM: (Via bridge line)

3 STEVEN GREENWALD 4 CRAIG GANNETT 5 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 6 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200 7 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 757-8048 stevegreenwald@dwt.com craiggannett@dwt.com

8 FOR BCI: (Via bridge line)

9 SCOTT MACCORMACK 10 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 11 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200 12 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 757-8263 scottmaccormack@dwt.com

13 FOR OMERS: (Via bridge line)

14 SHOSHANA BAIRD 15 McDowell Rackner Gibson PC 16 419 SW 11th Avenue, Suite 400 17 Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 290-3625 shoshana@mr-g-law.com

18 FOR AIMCo: (Via bridge line)

19 STAN BERMAN 20 Sidley Austin LLP 21 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200 22 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 321-3221 sberman@sidley.com

23 ALSO PRESENT: CHRIS MCGUIRE

24 ***** 25

Page 88

1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; JANUARY 9, 2019
 2 3:05 P.M.
 3 --o0o--
 4 P R O C E E D I N G S
 5
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record.
 7 Good afternoon. Thank you for all appearing in person
 8 or on the phone. We're here for a status conference in
 9 the matter of the joint application of Puget Sound
 10 Energy, Alberta Investment Management Corporation,
 11 British Columbia Investment Management Corporation,
 12 OMERS Administration Corporation, and PGGM
 13 Vermogensbeheer B.V. for an order authorizing proposed
 14 sale -- sales of indirect interests in Puget Sound
 15 Energy. It's Docket U-180680.
 16 Today is Wednesday, January 9th, 2019, and
 17 the time is approximately 3:05 p.m.
 18 My name is Andrew O'Connell, and sitting
 19 next to me is Rayne Pearson. We're administrative law
 20 judges with the Washington Utilities and Transportation
 21 Commission, and we are co-presiding over this status
 22 conference.
 23 We are holding this conference to resolve
 24 issues regarding the procedural schedule as a result of
 25 several parties to the case indicating that they had

Page 89

1 reached a settlement in principle and wish to modify the
 2 procedural schedule.
 3 First, we will take appearances beginning
 4 with the joint applicants, and a short appearance will
 5 be sufficient.
 6 Ms. Carson?
 7 MS. CARSON: Good afternoon -- yes. Good
 8 afternoon, Your Honors. Sheree Strom Carson with
 9 Perkins Coie representing PSE, one of the joint
 10 applicants. And there are other regulatory counsel on
 11 the line representing other joint applicants.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 13 If those other joint applicants would care
 14 to please identify themselves.
 15 MR. GREENWALD: This is Steven Greenwald,
 16 Davis Wright Tremaine, on behalf of PGGM.
 17 MR. GANNETT: Craig Gannett, also on behalf
 18 of PGGM.
 19 MS. BAIRD: This is Shoshana Baird from
 20 McDowell Rackner Gibson on behalf of OMERS.
 21 MR. BERMAN: This is Stan Berman of Sidley
 22 Austin on behalf of Alberta Investment Management
 23 Corporation, AIMCo.
 24 MR. MACCORMACK: And Scott MacCormack on
 25 behalf of BCI.

Page 90

1 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 2 And for Commission Staff?
 3 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Jennifer
 4 Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf
 5 of Commission Staff.
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And Alliance of Western
 7 Energy Consumers?
 8 MR. PEPPLER: Good afternoon. Tyler Pepple
 9 for AWEC.
 10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: The Energy Project?
 11 MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honors.
 12 Simon ffitich, Attorney at Law, for The Energy Project.
 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: The Northwest Energy
 14 Coalition?
 15 MS. GERLITZ: Northwest Energy Coalition
 16 doesn't have a counsel of record in this case.
 17 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And who is speaking on
 18 behalf of Northwest Energy Coalition?
 19 MS. GERLITZ: This is Wendy Gerlitz with --
 20 I'm the policy director with the Northwest Energy
 21 Coalition.
 22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 23 Public Counsel unit?
 24 MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa
 25 Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf

Page 91

1 of Public Counsel.
 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Medlin?
 3 MR. MEDLIN: Yes, this is Bradley Medlin of
 4 Robblee Detwiler on behalf of IBEW and UA 32.
 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And, Ms. Franco-Malone?
 6 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Yes, Your Honor.
 7 Danielle Franco-Malone of Bernard Iglitzin & Lavitt on
 8 behalf of the Washington and Northern Idaho District
 9 Council of Laborers.
 10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 11 And, Ms. Liotta?
 12 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Rita
 13 Liotta representing the Federal Executive Agency.
 14 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 15 I note that we have representatives from all
 16 parties in the matter, so thank you all for attending on
 17 such short notice.
 18 I want to get straight to addressing a
 19 potential date for a settlement hearing in this matter.
 20 I'd like to first -- so we've received the letter from
 21 settling parties as well as a response from
 22 Ms. Franco-Malone and Mr. Medlin. I'd like to first
 23 hear from the settling parties as to why they believe
 24 the current hearing dates should be moved up. Should I
 25 address my questions to Ms. Carson if that's okay?

1 MS. CARSON: That's fine. I'm happy to
 2 respond and then others can join in as well.
 3 So the parties -- I just want to give a
 4 quick backdrop. The parties did have a settlement
 5 conference as scheduled on December 18th. After that
 6 date, negotiations continued with parties where
 7 settlement appeared possible. We did yesterday reach
 8 agreement on a full multiparty settlement in principle
 9 with the joint applicants, Commission Staff, AWEC, The
 10 Energy Project, and the Northwest Energy Coalition. We
 11 were also informed yesterday that Public Counsel may
 12 join in the settlement, but needs to confirm authority.
 13 I have touched base with Ms. Liotta with
 14 FEA, and she has informed me that she does not oppose
 15 the settlement or an expedited hearing date for the
 16 settlement. And Commission Staff reached out to the
 17 other nonsettling parties, WNIDCL, IBEW and UA, who are
 18 not -- who oppose an expedited hearing date and
 19 schedule.
 20 It was a -- it is a common procedure and, in
 21 fact, required by the rules that when a settlement in
 22 principle is reached, that we notify the Commission and
 23 ask for the procedural schedule to be suspended, which
 24 is what we did yesterday when we filed our letter. It
 25 is also a very common procedure when settlement is

1 Judge Pearson and I have discussed the
 2 proposed modifications to the procedural schedule with
 3 the Commissioners. We and the Commissioners believe the
 4 settlement can be addressed in a shorter time frame than
 5 the current schedule, but now I want to turn to the
 6 parties that oppose the settlement, to hear from them
 7 regarding the proposed February 8th date for a
 8 settlement hearing.
 9 Let's start with Ms. Franco-Malone. I read
 10 your response, and I want to give you the opportunity to
 11 explain here what conflict there is with February 8th.
 12 Ms. Franco-Malone?
 13 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank
 14 you. I am currently scheduled to argue a motion to
 15 dismiss in Thurston County Superior Court on February
 16 8th and also the only counsel for the Washington
 17 Northern Idaho District Council of Laborers in this
 18 proceeding. We also have out-of-state witnesses who
 19 have been planning to come into the state for the March
 20 1st hearing date, that all the parties had taken great,
 21 you know, pains to find a date that worked for
 22 everybody.
 23 For the past several months since that date
 24 has been selected, it's been held and people have been
 25 making arrangements to be here in Washington for that

1 reached at a relatively early stage for the procedural
 2 schedule to be modified such that the hearing date is
 3 moved up from -- from the original litigated schedule
 4 hearing date, and that is what we are requesting.
 5 It is an important term of the settlement
 6 from the joint applicants' perspective and agreed to by
 7 other parties that we would seek an expedited hearing
 8 date for this settlement hearing. It's important to PSE
 9 and its board members to -- there's onboarding of new
 10 directors, board members, offboarding of those that are
 11 leaving. It's important to move through this transition
 12 period and get back to business as usual as soon as
 13 possible.
 14 And so for these reasons, we are -- this is
 15 an important term of the settlement, to have an
 16 expedited hearing date, and we request the Commission
 17 follow its frequently used procedure and do so.
 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 19 Let me ask Ms. Liotta really quickly,
 20 Ms. Carson represented that you have no opposition to
 21 the settlement or the proposed schedule by the settling
 22 parties; can you confirm?
 23 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, Your Honor, that's
 24 correct. I informed Ms. Carson today of FEA's position.
 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

1 hearing date. I do not yet know whether the witnesses
 2 who had been planning to come into Washington State for
 3 that hearing date would be available for the dates --
 4 the date that has been apparently agreed upon by the
 5 parties to the settlement. We just learned of it late
 6 yesterday.
 7 But I think our bigger objection goes to,
 8 you know, the lack of any reason that we heard why the
 9 date needs to be accelerated by three weeks. This is
 10 already an accelerated timeline that the parties are
 11 working under. We do acknowledge and recognize that the
 12 WAC provides for the parties to notify the Commission
 13 when a settlement has been reached and allows for the
 14 suspension of the procedural schedule. But I would
 15 submit that that is more appropriate in an instance
 16 where there are -- there is a long period of time
 17 between the date that the settlement has been reached
 18 and the date that a hearing has been set.
 19 In this case, we're talking about a mere
 20 three weeks and I -- I have not heard a significant
 21 reason that would require the parties to amend the
 22 procedural schedule that had been agreed upon just to
 23 move it forward by three weeks. So it seems to me that
 24 there's no good reason to do that, and both -- both
 25 myself and Mr. Medlin in our letters have articulated

Page 96

1 the real prejudice that we believe our clients will
 2 suffer if the accelerated schedule is implemented and
 3 the ways in which that will impede our ability to
 4 present evidence and testimony and argument related to
 5 the settlement agreement.
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I notice that in
 7 your response, you mention that the proposed schedule
 8 does not allow a meaningful opportunity for you to
 9 present evidence opposing the settlement. Will you
 10 please explain?
 11 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Sure, Your Honor. I was
 12 looking -- that comment was based on the proposed
 13 schedule, which involves us seeing the settlement for
 14 the first time, we haven't seen it, on January 15th, of
 15 seeing the testimony in support of that settlement on
 16 January 18th, and then having just over a week in order
 17 to put together our testimony to respond to the
 18 substance of that settlement.
 19 We would contend that that's -- that's not
 20 an adequate amount of time to put together testimony,
 21 assess the terms of the settlement, and put forward our
 22 evidence, testimony, and arguments. In regards to
 23 that -- the proposed terms of the settlement, we think
 24 that keeping the March 1st hearing date would allow a
 25 less compressed schedule that would give us a more

Page 97

1 meaningful opportunity to assess the terms of the
 2 proposed settlement and provide hopefully testimony that
 3 will be of use to the Commissioners and Your Honors in
 4 assessing whether to accept the proposed settlement or
 5 not.
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I'm aware that on
 7 this coming Friday, January 11th, there is a filing
 8 deadline in the current procedural schedule for Staff,
 9 Public Counsel, and intervenor response testimony and
 10 exhibits in response to the joint applicants' filing.
 11 So my understanding is that you and as well as the other
 12 parties are already well on your way to addressing the
 13 joint applicants' filing.
 14 And I'm curious as to your position on being
 15 able to take what you've already done, and then with the
 16 additional time that's been proposed in the proposed
 17 schedule, to address any of the changes or additions
 18 that have been made as a result of the settlement
 19 agreement.
 20 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Sure, Your Honor. So I
 21 certainly hope as well that we will not have to start
 22 from scratch, because we were planning on filing
 23 testimony on Friday and were well on our way to having
 24 that finalized. But that said, without having seen the
 25 terms of the settlement, I am not in a position to

Page 98

1 speculate as to how much additional work or evidence or
 2 information we might want to gather to respond
 3 specifically to the terms of the proposed settlement.
 4 I also don't know whether the terms of the
 5 proposed settlement might yield areas in which we would
 6 want to seek leave to conduct further discovery, which
 7 is also something that the rules contemplate. I'm just
 8 not in a position to address that without having seen
 9 the terms of the settlement yet.
 10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 11 That does bring a question to my mind for
 12 Ms. Carson. Have the terms of the settlement been
 13 shared with the other parties?
 14 MS. CARSON: The terms that were reached
 15 yesterday have not been fully shared; however, I think
 16 it's important to recognize that the terms that were
 17 reached yesterday are very similar to the settlement
 18 proposal that was sent out December 21st after the
 19 settlement conference by the joint applicants. So
 20 everyone has had an opportunity to review those
 21 provisions, those additional commitments, and the
 22 additional commitments that were agreed upon yesterday
 23 are -- are minor additions and revisions to what was
 24 circulated December 21st.
 25 And I -- and I should say that even what has

Page 99

1 been added has -- was all put out during the settlement
 2 pretty much. So this is not a situation where the
 3 nonsettling parties are prejudiced because they're not
 4 going to see the settlement until next week. They're
 5 well aware of what every party's proposal was, and
 6 they've seen a draft of the settlement or of the
 7 settlement commitments. So it's very similar to what
 8 was finally agreed upon. And -- and we're happy to
 9 circulate those to all the parties to see if other
 10 parties are willing to get on board with those terms.
 11 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 12 Well --
 13 MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken, and I just
 14 wanted to -- as it's already been stated, Public Counsel
 15 at this point neither supports nor opposes the
 16 settlement, and it's -- it's possible that we may join
 17 the settlement. We are waiting for final authority on
 18 that, but I'll just note that the -- this argument is
 19 very similar to arguments made in Puget's last rate case
 20 where there was a settlement and Public Counsel was not
 21 a part of that one.
 22 The argument there made -- was made that we
 23 were aware of terms that were being talked about and
 24 that -- that argument was rejected. That you really
 25 don't know what the settlement is until you have a

Page 100

1 settlement that's filed. I'm not at this point
 2 advocating for any particular procedural schedule, but I
 3 did want to point that out.
 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 5 And from the letter of the settling parties,
 6 I gathered that Public Counsel, even if you do end up
 7 being opposed to the settlement, you are not opposed to
 8 the proposed procedural schedule; is that true?
 9 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I'm not -- well, I'm not
 10 objecting and I'm also not advocating. I was not part
 11 of the discussion that landed on that particular term.
 12 I know that that's an important term to the settling
 13 parties and part of the settlement that if we join,
 14 then, you know, the bed has already been made so to
 15 speak. But I'm not advocating here one way or another.
 16 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Is Public Counsel
 17 available on February 8th?
 18 MS. GAFKEN: I actually don't know for
 19 certain if my witness is available on February 8th.
 20 He's out of the country right now. I've been trying
 21 to -- I've been trying to obtain that information. I am
 22 available and my analyst is available, you know,
 23 internal analyst, but I'm not 100 percent certain if
 24 my -- my expert is available. And, you know, that would
 25 be certainly something to take up if we need to cross

Page 101

1 that bridge in terms of in-person or telephonic
 2 appearance. But he is out of state, and so that's --
 3 that's a -- that's a concern that I have.
 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.
 5 MS. GAFKEN: My hope is that should we have
 6 to cross that bridge, that, you know, we can do so
 7 reasonably.
 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 9 Mr. Medlin, turning to you now. The
 10 settling parties indicated that you did not agree to the
 11 February 8th date or the proposed schedule, and I have
 12 reviewed the response that you filed this afternoon with
 13 the Commission explaining your disagreement. I would
 14 like to offer you the opportunity to explain your
 15 position.
 16 MR. MEDLIN: Thank you. Yeah, that's
 17 correct. The IBEW and UA 32 oppose it. Similar to
 18 Ms. Franco-Malone, we were only made aware of it
 19 yesterday after it was already being filed and
 20 presented. My clients have relied upon the schedule we
 21 already agreed upon with the parties, which is March
 22 1st, which was already on an expedited basis, and that's
 23 what we've been working back from.
 24 As far as availability, I know one of my
 25 witnesses, as of right now, is not available on the 8th.

Page 102

1 I think there's an issue with that we still haven't seen
 2 the settlement agreement, so we don't know what the
 3 precise terms are. I don't want to rehash all of the
 4 things Ms. Franco-Malone said, but I think there should
 5 be some consideration given since the labor unions are
 6 essentially going to be the nonsettling parties, and
 7 Ms. Franco-Malone and I are the two attorneys
 8 representing those parties as to what works for our
 9 schedule as well. I really wish people would have
 10 consulted with us beforehand, but it is what it is, I
 11 guess.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, I am quite
 13 sensitive to Ms. Franco-Malone's conflict with Thurston
 14 County Superior Court and her oral argument, and at this
 15 point, I'm curious if there is another option available
 16 for a settlement hearing date besides the 8th. Because
 17 if we could avoid the situation where a party to the
 18 case and their representative is unavailable due to a
 19 court date, I would prefer to avoid that conflict.
 20 So I'd like to ask Ms. Franco-Malone about
 21 your availability on the day before, on February 7th.
 22 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Let me pull up my
 23 calendar. Just a moment. I am free on February 7th. I
 24 don't know whether any of my witnesses are and I -- I
 25 would contend that moving the date up any earlier than

Page 103

1 what the settling parties had come up with only
 2 exacerbates the prejudice to my client.
 3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I understand.
 4 I'd like to hear from the other parties as
 5 to their availability on February 7th starting with
 6 Mr. Medlin.
 7 MR. MEDLIN: I am currently looking at my
 8 calendar. I am available on February 7th. I don't know
 9 about my potential witnesses. If I just may offer, I
 10 know the following week, the week of February 10th
 11 through 15th, is a little more open for my witnesses who
 12 I've already checked with on the latter part of that
 13 week for availability.
 14 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you for that.
 15 Well, let me hear from the joint applicants,
 16 and we'll go through them in turn.
 17 Ms. Carson, what is availability for you and
 18 your client on February 7th?
 19 MS. CARSON: PSE is available on February
 20 7th.
 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And, Commission
 22 Staff?
 23 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Commission Staff is
 24 available on the 7th.
 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And, Mr. Pepple?

Page 104

1 MR. PEPPL: AWEC is also available on the
2 7th.
3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. ffitch?
4 MR. PEPPL: I received a notice from
5 Mr. ffitch that the power went out in his office, so he
6 may have dropped off.
7 MR. FFITCH: I am -- I am here, Your Honor.
8 This is Simon ffitch. Power is back on. Power company.
9 We have availability on February 7th.
10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And, Ms. Gerlitz?
11 MS. GERLITZ: Yes, we can be available on
12 the 7th.
13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Gafken?
14 MS. GAFKEN: I hate to be the black fly in
15 the ointment, but if it turns out to be the day that is
16 chosen, so be it, I will rearrange my schedule, I am out
17 of the office on the 7th. So at this point, Public
18 Counsel is not available.
19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Medlin
20 mentioned that he had already checked on the following
21 week. Is -- are you still out of the office that
22 following week?
23 MS. GAFKEN: No, I have much, much greater
24 flexibility that following week.
25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Ms. Liotta, what is

Page 105

1 your availability for February 7th?
2 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA is available February
3 7th.
4 MS. GAFKEN: I -- I'm sorry, this is Lisa
5 Gafken. To finish answering your question about the
6 week of February 11th, I am available every day except
7 Thursday.
8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: That would be Thursday,
9 the 14th, I believe?
10 MS. GAFKEN: That's correct.
11 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So in light of the
12 conflicts that several parties have voiced, what about
13 the 15th? What are the parties' availability on the
14 15th? Let's start with the Company. And that would be
15 the afternoon of the 15th because we do have an open
16 meeting that morning.
17 MS. CARSON: PSE and the joint applicants
18 are available on the 15th.
19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And, Commission Staff?
20 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Commission Staff is
21 available the afternoon of the 15th.
22 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Pepple?
23 MR. PEPPL: AWEC is also available on the
24 15th.
25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. ffitch?

Page 106

1 MR. FFITCH: Energy Project is available on
2 the 15th.
3 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Gerlitz?
4 MS. GERLITZ: Yes, we are available on the
5 15th.
6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Gafken, I'm circling
7 back around to you, but I believe you mentioned the 15th
8 you would have more flexibility; is that correct?
9 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I'm available on the 15th.
10 The same caveat applies to the witness availability, and
11 I assume if he's not able to fly out, I would be able to
12 make him available by phone. But I'm hoping that's a
13 bridge that we won't have to cross. But yes, Public
14 Counsel is available on the 15th.
15 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
16 And, Mr. Medlin?
17 MR. MEDLIN: Yes, I am available and my
18 witnesses are available on the 15th.
19 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Franco-Malone, do you
20 have a conflict with the 15th?
21 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: I am available on the
22 15th.
23 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Do you have any
24 information about your witnesses' availability?
25 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: I did get through to one

Page 107

1 of them today and did learn that at least one witness is
2 available on the 15th. I don't know -- I do not know
3 for sure if that works for others.
4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And, Ms. Liotta?
5 MS. LIOTTA: Yes, FEA is available, Your
6 Honor, on the 15th.
7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So I'd note that
8 all the parties appear to have availability on the
9 afternoon of February 15th.
10 I want to ask Mr. Medlin and
11 Ms. Franco-Malone, would that date address or remedy
12 some of your concerns about moving the hearing date
13 forward?
14 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Just speaking for
15 myself, this is Danielle Franco-Malone, it would not.
16 It would lessen the prejudice as compared to February
17 8th. However, without knowing for sure whether my
18 witnesses would be available, and, again, just the even
19 shorter amount of time that we would have to prepare
20 testimony and argument, we still believe that it would
21 not be appropriate, again, particularly in light of the
22 fact that I still have -- am not clear on the need for
23 moving it forward by three weeks. So we would continue
24 to object to change the procedural schedule, although I
25 think it's fair to say that our position is that

Page 108

1 February 15th would prejudice us less than February 8th.
 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And, Mr. Medlin, do you
 3 have a position?
 4 MR. MEDLIN: Yeah, I mean, obviously I'm a
 5 little concerned if Ms. Franco-Malone's witness isn't
 6 available. They're an important, interested party as
 7 well. The 15th does work better than the 8th. Again,
 8 my preference is still that the hearing remain on the
 9 already expedited date, which is March 1st, which we'd
 10 already agreed to and everyone has been working back
 11 from, and now we're kind of having to do cartwheels to
 12 get everyone available. That's my response.
 13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 14 Ms. Carson, let me circle around back to
 15 you. What is PSE's opinion on holding the hearing on
 16 February 15th? And I do recall that in your letter, you
 17 emphasized that the settling parties had agreed to seek
 18 an earlier settlement hearing date, but I would like to
 19 hear what you think about the 15th.
 20 MS. CARSON: Thank you, Your Honor. If the
 21 15th is the earliest possible date that will work for
 22 the Commission and the parties, we're agreeable to it.
 23 It did sound like there was a potential for February
 24 7th. Ms. Gafken wasn't clear. It sounds like she could
 25 be -- she could be available potentially on the 7th,

Page 109

1 although she's currently scheduled to be out of the
 2 office. So I would think that's still a possibility.
 3 But, you know, we -- if that is not a possibility and if
 4 February 15th is the earliest possible date, then we're
 5 agreeable to that.
 6 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. That
 7 did remind me that I did want to ask Ms. Gafken a little
 8 bit more, but I forgot. Thank you.
 9 Ms. Gafken, I'm curious on the availability
 10 on February 7th if -- what kind of conflict that is and
 11 is there another attorney on the case that is
 12 sufficiently apprised of all the issues to be available
 13 to attend on February 7th if you are not?
 14 MS. GAFKEN: There is not another attorney
 15 on the case. I am sole counsel on this matter. On the
 16 7th I have a family obligation that I'm taking a
 17 personal holiday for that. My son's 11th birthday.
 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 19 MS. GAFKEN: And so quite frankly, I would
 20 advocate for the 15th being the date since everybody is
 21 available, and I didn't hear any objections to that
 22 date. I think the 15th is -- is the date that we should
 23 go with.
 24 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. What I'm hearing
 25 from all the parties is that there is still not

Page 110

1 agreement on the hearing date for the 15th, although
 2 that would lessen the asserted prejudice by
 3 Ms. Franco-Malone and Mr. Medlin. We are going to take
 4 everything that the parties have said in writing and
 5 here at the hearing into consideration, and we're going
 6 to issue a decision in the coming days.
 7 Is there anything else we should discuss
 8 regarding the schedule, particularly timing for
 9 responding to the settlement? And I'm --
 10 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: This is Jennifer --
 11 oh, sorry.
 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please go ahead,
 13 Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski.
 14 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: This is Jennifer
 15 Cameron-Rulkowski, and of immediate concern is the
 16 testimony, the response testimony, due date on Friday.
 17 Can the parties consider that to be suspended?
 18 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes.
 19 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your
 20 Honor. That was the pressing question that I had.
 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And I'd like to hear from
 22 Ms. Gafken from Public Counsel briefly about the amount
 23 of time between the filing of the settlement and
 24 potential opposing testimony. As my understanding is
 25 that you're not opposing the schedule at this time, the

Page 111

1 proposed schedule?
 2 MS. GAFKEN: Yeah, I -- I guess I'm -- I'm
 3 not sure -- this is Lisa Gafken. I'm not sure that I'm
 4 the most appropriate party to address when the
 5 opposition testimony should come in. On the -- on the
 6 schedule that's proposed, Public Counsel's testimony, if
 7 we do join the settlement, it comes in a little bit I
 8 guess a step after everyone else's testimony, and that
 9 just reflects the later joining of the settlement
 10 itself.
 11 So I still think that that's an appropriate
 12 way to -- to fashion it. I don't think that I would be
 13 able to at the time that we have knowing, you know -- I
 14 need to wait to see what my authority is and know
 15 whether we are joining or not joining the settlement
 16 before I can really start finalizing things.
 17 So I do think that -- that stutter step
 18 testimony on the supporting end is appropriate. I don't
 19 think that I'm the most appropriate party to address
 20 when opposition testimony would come in. I think
 21 with -- with a February 15th hearing date, that does
 22 allow for -- for more time in the process and, you know,
 23 under -- under the WAC, there is the opportunity for
 24 opposing parties to provide their point of view and
 25 their evidence. So there does need to be some time for

Page 112

1 that to happen, but I think Mr. Medlin and
 2 Ms. Franco-Malone could address their needs a bit better
 3 than I could.
 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I want to turn to
 5 Mr. Medlin and Ms. Franco-Malone now. And my question
 6 is regarding time necessary to respond to the filing of
 7 testimony in the settlement agreement. And I'm asking,
 8 in light of my understanding that you've been preparing
 9 testimony that's due this Friday, that date is no longer
 10 going to be imposed on you for the filing deadline, and
 11 having already done that background work, how much time
 12 do you believe is necessary for you to form a response
 13 to a settlement?
 14 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: This is
 15 Ms. Franco-Malone, and what I would propose is that
 16 if -- assuming for the purposes of this call, if the
 17 hearing were to be scheduled for February 15th, what I
 18 would suggest is using the same time frame that the
 19 settling parties proposed in the letter from yesterday,
 20 which included a deadline of testimony opposing the
 21 settlement being filed seven days before the hearing
 22 date. I think that allowing the parties opposing the
 23 settlement as much time as possible to prepare their
 24 testimony and argument in relation to the settlement
 25 would be appropriate. And given that the settling

Page 113

1 parties apparently believed that seven days before the
 2 hearing date would be sufficient, I would think that
 3 that would be a logical point of reference for whenever
 4 the hearing is rescheduled.
 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
 6 Mr. Medlin?
 7 MR. MEDLIN: Yeah, I would -- I was going to
 8 say, I was also going to propose February 8th, which
 9 would be a week before the 15th hearing date that we're
 10 sort of working back from. That I think would give us
 11 sufficient time. Again, we haven't seen the settlement
 12 agreement, so I don't know precisely what is in there
 13 and what has changed.
 14 So I'm kind of having to speculate on how
 15 much time is necessary when I haven't seen the document
 16 at issue that you're kind of asking us to give our
 17 opinion on. But my proposal would be if they said
 18 before, it should be one week before the hearing, then
 19 we should do that on February 8th.
 20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
 21 Ms. Carson, I am aware that gathering all of
 22 the necessary language and information for a settlement
 23 agreement is quite involved and takes some time, but
 24 would I be correct in assuming if the settlement
 25 agreement is ready to be submitted sooner than your

Page 114

1 proposed filing date for the settlement, that the
 2 party -- the joint -- sorry, the settling parties would
 3 do so?
 4 MS. CARSON: I'm sorry, was the question if
 5 the settlement agreement is -- is finalized before the
 6 15th, can -- will we file it sooner; was that the
 7 question?
 8 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes.
 9 MS. CARSON: Sheree Carson. Yeah, it is a
 10 pretty short time to finalize it given, you know, the
 11 several joint applicants as well as settling parties,
 12 but we are willing to circulate the commitment list that
 13 we've agreed to. I mean, it's still undergoing some
 14 editing, but the substance is there, and we're willing
 15 to circulate that to the nonsettling parties so they can
 16 see in essence the substance of the settlement, which as
 17 I said before, is not much different than what they saw
 18 three weeks ago. But we're happy to circulate that
 19 today or tomorrow.
 20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm not going to require
 21 that, but I do think that would be a good practice, and
 22 you need not include Judge Pearson and I on that. We
 23 will wait for the full settlement to be filed.
 24 MS. CARSON: Okay.
 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So is there

Page 115

1 anything else that we should discuss at this conference?
 2 Hearing nothing, thank you all for your
 3 attendance on such short notice. Both Judge Pearson and
 4 I appreciate it very much. And with that, we will be
 5 off the record. Thank you.
 6 (Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF THURSTON

I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.



Tayler Garlinghouse
Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358

A	114:5	argument 96:4 99:18,22,24 102:14 107:20 112:24	108:6,12,25 109:12,21	board 93:9,10 99:10
ability 96:3 116:9	ahead 110:12	arguments 96:22 99:19	Avenue 84:22 85:15 86:18,23 87:4,9,14,18	Box 85:10 86:4
able 97:15 106:11 106:11 111:13	AIMCo 87:16 89:23	arrangements 94:25	avoid 102:17,19	Bradley 91:3
accelerated 95:9,10 96:2	Alberta 84:5 88:10 89:22	articulated 95:25	aware 97:6 99:5,23 101:18 113:21	bridge 85:8,13,18 86:2,7,12,17,21 87:2,8,12,17 101:1,6 106:13
accept 97:4	Alliance 90:6	asking 112:7 113:16	AWEC 86:7 90:9 92:9 104:1 105:23	briefly 110:22
accurate 116:9	allow 96:8,24 111:22	asserted 110:2	B	bring 98:11
acknowledge 95:11	allowing 112:22	assess 96:21 97:1	B.V 84:8 88:13	British 84:6 88:11
added 99:1	allows 95:13	assessing 97:4	back 93:12 101:23 104:8 106:7	Buell 84:21
additional 97:16 98:1,21,22	amend 95:21	Assistant 90:4,25	108:10,14 113:10	business 93:12
additions 97:17 98:23	amount 96:20 107:19 110:22	assume 106:11	backdrop 92:4	C
address 91:25 97:17 98:8 107:11 111:4,19 112:2	analyst 100:22,23	assuming 112:16 113:24	background 112:11	C 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:4 116:1,1
addressed 94:4	Andrew 84:14 85:4 88:18	attend 109:13	Bainbridge 86:5	calendar 102:23 103:8
addressing 91:18 97:12	answering 105:5	attendance 115:3	Baird 87:13 89:19 89:19	California 86:19
adequate 96:20	apparently 95:4 113:1	attending 91:16	Barnard 86:13	call 112:16
Adjourned 115:6	appear 107:8	attorney 85:9,14 86:3 90:4,12,25 109:11,14	base 92:13	Cameron-Rulko... 85:9 90:3,4 103:23 105:20 110:10,13,14,15 110:19
Administration 84:7 88:12	appearance 89:4 101:2	attorneys 102:7	based 96:12	Campbell 86:13
administrative 84:14 85:2 88:19	appearances 89:3	Austin 87:18 89:22	basis 101:22	care 89:13
advocate 109:20	appeared 92:7	authority 92:12 99:17 111:14	BCI 87:7 89:25	Carson 85:18 89:6 89:7,8 91:25 92:1 93:20,24 98:12,14 103:17,19 105:17 108:14,20 113:21 114:4,9,9,24
advocating 100:2 100:10,15	appearing 88:7 90:25	authorizing 84:9 88:13	bed 100:14	Cartwheels 108:11
afternoon 88:7 89:7,8 90:8,11,24 101:12 105:15,21 107:9	applicants 89:4,10 89:11,13 92:9 98:19 103:15 105:17 114:11	availability 101:24 102:21 103:5,13 103:17 104:9 105:1,13 106:10 106:24 107:8 109:9	beginning 89:3	case 88:25 90:16 95:19 99:19 102:18 109:11,15
Agency 91:13	applicants' 93:6 97:10,13	authorizing 84:9 88:13	behalf 89:16,17,20 89:22,25 90:4,18 90:25 91:4,8	caveat 106:10
ago 114:18	application 84:4 88:9	available 95:3 100:17,19,22,22 100:24 101:25 102:15 103:8,19 103:24 104:1,11 104:18 105:2,6,18 105:21,23 106:1,4 106:9,12,14,17,18 106:21 107:2,5,18	believe 91:23 94:3 96:1 105:9 106:7 107:20 112:12	CCR 84:20 116:13
agree 101:10	applies 106:10		believed 113:1	certain 100:19,23
agreeable 108:22 109:5	appreciate 115:4		Bellevue 85:20	certainly 97:21 100:25
agreed 93:6 95:4,22 98:22 99:8 101:21 108:10,17 114:13	apprised 109:12		Berman 87:17 89:21,21	Certified 116:6
agreement 92:8 96:5 97:19 102:2 110:1 112:7 113:12,23,25	appropriate 95:15 107:21 111:4,11 111:18,19 112:25		Bernard 91:7	certify 116:8
	approximately 88:17		best 116:9	change 107:24
	areas 98:5		better 108:7 112:2	
	argue 94:14		bigger 95:7	
			birthday 109:17	
			bit 109:8 111:7 112:2	
			black 104:14	

changed 113:13	concern 101:3 110:15	Craig 87:3 89:17	101:13	expert 100:24
changes 97:17	concerned 108:5	craiggannett@d...	discovery 98:6	explain 94:11 96:10
checked 103:12 104:20	concerns 107:12	87:6	discuss 110:7 115:1	101:14
chosen 104:16	conduct 98:6	cross 100:25 101:6 106:13	discussed 94:1	explaining 101:13
CHRIS 87:22	conference 84:12	curious 97:14	discussion 100:11	
circle 108:14	88:8,22,23 92:5	102:15 109:9	dismiss 94:15	F
circling 106:6	98:19 115:1	current 91:24 94:5	District 91:8 94:17	F 116:1
circulate 99:9 114:12,15,18	confirm 92:12	97:8	Docket 84:4 88:15	fact 92:21 107:22
circulated 98:24	93:22	currently 94:14	document 113:15	fair 107:25
clear 107:22 108:24	conflict 94:11	103:7 109:1	draft 99:6	family 109:16
Cleve 86:8	102:13,19 106:20		Drive 84:19 85:5,10	far 101:24
client 103:2,18	109:10	D	dropped 104:6	fashion 111:12
clients 96:1 101:20	conflicts 105:12	D 88:4	due 102:18 110:16	FEA 86:16 92:14
co-presiding 88:21	consider 110:17	D3 86:4	112:9	105:2 107:5
Coalition 86:22	consideration	Danielle 86:12 91:7	E	FEA's 93:24
90:14,15,18,21	102:5 110:5	107:15	E 85:1,1 86:1,1	February 94:7,11
92:10	consulted 102:10	date 91:19 92:6,15	87:1,1 88:4,4	94:15 100:17,19
Coie 85:19 89:9	Consumers 90:7	92:18 93:2,4,8,16	116:1,1	101:11 102:21,23
Columbia 84:6	Cont 86:1 87:1	94:7,20,21,23	earlier 102:25	103:5,8,10,18,19
88:11	contemplate 98:7	95:1,3,4,9,17,18	108:18	104:9 105:1,2,6
come 94:19 95:2	contend 96:19	96:24 101:11	earliest 108:21	107:9,16 108:1,1
103:1 111:5,20	102:25	102:16,19,25	109:4	108:16,23 109:4
comes 111:7	continue 107:23	107:11,12 108:9	early 93:1	109:10,13 111:21
coming 97:7 110:6	continued 92:6	108:18,21 109:4	editing 114:14	112:17 113:8,19
comment 96:12	Corporation 84:6,7	109:20,22,22	else's 111:8	Federal 91:13
Commission 84:2	84:7 88:10,11,12	110:1,16 111:21	emphasized 108:17	ffitch 86:3 90:11,12
84:18 85:5,8	89:23	112:9,22 113:2,9	Energy 84:5,10	104:3,5,7,8
88:21 90:2,5 92:9	correct 93:24	114:1	85:17 86:2,22	105:25 106:1
92:16,22 93:16	101:17 105:10	dates 91:24 95:3	88:10,15 90:7,10	Fifth 87:18
95:12 101:13	106:8 113:24	Davis 87:4,9 89:16	90:12,13,15,18,20	file 114:6
103:21,23 105:19	Council 91:9 94:17	Davison 86:8	92:10,10 106:1	filed 92:24 100:1
105:20 108:22	counsel 85:13	day 102:21 104:15	essence 114:16	101:12,19 112:21
Commissioners	89:10 90:16,23	105:6	essentially 102:6	114:23
94:3,3 97:3	91:1 92:11 94:16	days 110:6 112:21	Evergreen 84:19	filing 97:7,10,13,22
commitment	97:9 99:14,20	113:1	85:5,10	110:23 112:6,10
114:12	100:6,16 104:18	deadline 97:8	everybody 94:22	114:1
commitments	106:14 109:15	112:10,20	109:20	final 99:17
98:21,22 99:7	110:22	December 92:5	evidence 96:4,9,22	finalize 114:10
common 92:20,25	Counsel's 111:6	98:18,24	98:1 111:25	finalized 97:24
company 104:8	country 100:20	decision 110:6	exacerbates 103:2	114:5
105:14	County 94:15	Detwiler 91:4	Executive 91:13	finalizing 111:16
compared 107:16	102:14 116:4	different 114:17	exhibits 97:10	finally 99:8
compressed 96:25	court 94:15 102:14	director 90:20	expedited 92:15,18	find 94:21
	102:19	directors 93:10	93:7,16 101:22	fine 92:1
		disagreement	108:9	finish 105:5
				first 89:3 91:20,22

<p>96:14 flexibility 104:24 106:8 fly 104:14 106:11 follow 93:17 following 103:10 104:20,22,24 foregoing 116:8 forgot 109:8 form 112:12 forward 95:23 96:21 107:13,23 Fourth 84:22 frame 94:4 112:18 Francisco 86:19 Franco-Malone 86:12 91:5,6,7,22 94:9,12,13 96:11 97:20 101:18 102:4,7,20,22 106:19,21,25 107:11,14,15 110:3 112:2,5,14 112:15 Franco-Malone's 102:13 108:5 franco@workerl... 86:15 frankly 109:19 free 102:23 frequently 93:17 Friday 97:7,23 110:16 112:9 full 92:8 114:23 fully 98:15 further 98:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 88:4 Gafken 85:14 90:24,25 99:13,13 100:9,18 101:5 104:13,14,23 105:4,5,10 106:6 106:9 108:24 109:7,9,14,19</p>	<p>110:22 111:2,3 Gannett 87:3 89:17 89:17 Garlinghouse 84:20 116:6,13 gather 98:2 gathered 100:6 gathering 113:21 General 85:9,14 90:4,25 Gerlitz 86:22 90:15 90:19,19 104:10 104:11 106:3,4 Gibson 87:13 89:20 give 92:3 94:10 96:25 113:10,16 given 102:5 112:25 114:10 go 103:16 109:23 110:12 goes 95:7 going 99:4 102:6 110:3,5 112:10 113:7,8 114:20 good 88:7 89:7,7 90:8,11,24 95:24 114:21 great 94:20 greater 104:23 Greenwald 87:3 89:15,15 guess 102:11 111:2 111:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>happen 112:1 happy 92:1 99:8 114:18 Harbor 86:9 hate 104:14 hear 91:23 94:6 103:4,15 108:19 109:21 110:21 heard 95:8,20 hearing 91:19,24 92:15,18 93:2,4,7</p>	<p>93:8,16 94:8,20 95:1,3,18 96:24 102:16 107:12 108:8,15,18 109:24 110:1,5 111:21 112:17,21 113:2,4,9,18 115:2 held 94:24 High 86:4 holding 88:23 108:15 holiday 109:17 Honor 91:6,12 93:23 94:13 96:11 97:20 104:7 107:6 108:20 110:20 Honors 89:8 90:11 97:3 hope 97:21 101:5 hopefully 97:2 hoping 106:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>IBEW 91:4 92:17 101:17 Idaho 91:8 94:17 identify 89:14 Iglitzin 86:13 91:7 II 84:12 immediate 110:15 impede 96:3 implemented 96:2 important 93:5,8 93:11,15 98:16 100:12 108:6 imposed 112:10 in-person 101:1 include 114:22 included 112:20 indicated 101:10 indicating 88:25 indirect 84:9 88:14 information 98:2 100:21 106:24 113:22</p>	<p>informed 92:11,14 93:24 instance 95:15 interested 108:6 interests 84:10 88:14 internal 100:23 intervenor 97:9 Investment 84:6,6 88:10,11 89:22 involved 113:23 involves 96:13 Island 86:5 issue 102:1 110:6 113:16 issues 88:24 109:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>January 84:16 88:1 88:16 96:14,16 97:7 jcameron@utc.w... 85:12 Jennifer 85:9 90:3 110:10,14 join 92:2,12 99:16 100:13 111:7 joining 111:9,15,15 joint 84:4 88:9 89:4 89:9,11,13 92:9 93:6 97:10,13 98:19 103:15 105:17 114:2,11 Judge 88:6 89:12 90:1,6,10,13,17 90:22 91:2,5,10 91:14 93:18,25 94:1 96:6 97:6 98:10 99:11 100:4 100:16 101:4,8 102:12 103:3,14 103:21,25 104:3 104:10,13,19,25 105:8,11,19,22,25 106:3,6,15,19,23 107:4,7 108:2,13</p>	<p>109:6,18,24 110:12,18,21 112:4 113:5,20 114:8,20,22,25 115:3 judges 84:14 85:2 88:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>keeping 96:24 kind 108:11 109:10 113:14,16 know 94:21 95:1,8 98:4 99:25 100:12 100:14,18,22,24 101:6,24 102:2,24 103:8,10 107:2,2 109:3 111:13,14 111:22 113:12 114:10 knowing 107:17 111:13 knowledge 116:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>labor 102:5 Laborers 91:9 94:17 lack 95:8 landed 100:11 language 113:22 late 95:5 Lavitt 86:13 91:7 law 84:14 85:2 86:3 86:13 88:19 90:12 learn 107:1 learned 95:5 leave 98:6 leaving 93:11 lessen 107:16 110:2 Let's 88:6 94:9 105:14 letter 91:20 92:24 100:5 108:16 112:19 letters 95:25</p>
---	---	---	---	---

light 105:11 107:21 112:8	103:6,7 104:19 106:16,17 107:10	94:17	okay 89:12 90:1 91:14,25 93:18,25	Park 84:19 85:5,10
line 85:8,13,18 86:2 86:7,12,17,21 87:2,8,12,17 89:11	108:2,4 110:3 112:1,5 113:6,7	Northwest 86:22 90:13,15,18,20 92:10	96:6 97:6 99:11 100:4 101:4,8 102:12 103:14,21 104:10,19,25 105:11 106:15 107:4,7 108:13 109:6,18,24 113:20 114:24,25	part 99:21 100:10 100:13 103:12
Liotta 86:17 91:11 91:12,13 92:13 93:19,23 104:25 105:2 107:4,5	meeting 105:16	note 91:15 99:18 107:7	Olympia 84:19 85:6,11 88:1	particular 100:2,11
Lisa 85:14 90:24 99:13 105:4 111:3	members 93:9,10	notice 91:17 96:6 104:4 115:3	OMERS 84:7 87:12 88:12 89:20	particularly 107:21 110:8
lisa.gafken@atg... 85:16	mention 96:7	notify 92:22 95:12	onboarding 93:9	parties 88:25 91:16 91:21,23 92:3,4,6 92:17 93:7,22 94:6,20 95:5,10 95:12,21 97:12 98:13 99:3,9,10 100:5,13 101:10 101:21 102:6,8 103:1,4 105:12 107:8 108:17,22 109:25 110:4,17 111:24 112:19,22 113:1 114:2,11,15
list 114:12	mentioned 104:20 106:7	NWEC 86:21	open 103:11 105:15	parties' 105:13
litigated 93:3	Mercer 86:14	<hr/> O <hr/>	opinion 108:15 113:17	party 102:17 108:6 111:4,19 114:2
little 103:11 108:5 109:7 111:7	mere 95:19	O 88:4	opportunity 94:10 96:8 97:1 98:20 101:14 111:23	party's 99:5
LLC 84:21	mind 98:11	O'Connell 84:14 85:4 88:6,18 89:12 90:1,6,10 90:13,17,22 91:2 91:5,10,14 93:18 93:25 96:6 97:6 98:10 99:11 100:4 100:16 101:4,8 102:12 103:3,14 103:21,25 104:3 104:10,13,19,25 105:8,19,22,25 106:3,6,15,19,23 107:4,7 108:2,13 109:6,18,24 110:12,18,21 112:4 113:5,20 114:8,20,25	oppose 92:14,18 94:6 101:17	PC 86:8 87:13
LLP 85:19 86:13 87:4,9,18	modifications 94:2	o0o-- 88:3	opposed 100:7,7	Pearson 84:14 85:3 88:19 94:1 105:11 114:22 115:3
logical 113:3	modified 93:2	object 107:24	opposes 99:15	people 94:24 102:9
long 95:16	modify 89:1	objecting 100:10	opposing 96:9 110:24,25 111:24 112:20,22	Pepple 86:8 90:8,8 103:25 104:1,4 105:22,23
longer 112:9	moment 102:23	objection 95:7	opposition 93:20 111:5,20	percent 100:23
looking 96:12 103:7	months 94:23	objections 109:21	option 102:15	period 93:12 95:16
<hr/> M <hr/>	morning 105:16	obligation 109:16	oral 102:14	Perkins 85:19 89:9
MacCormack 87:8 89:24,24	motion 94:14	obtain 100:21	order 84:9 88:13 96:16	person 88:7
making 94:25	move 93:11 95:23	obviously 108:4	Oregon 86:9 87:14	personal 109:17
Management 84:6 84:7 88:10,11 89:22	moved 91:24 93:3 107:12,23	offboarding 93:10	original 93:3	perspective 93:6
March 94:19 96:24 101:21 108:9	moving 102:25	offer 101:14 103:9	out-of-state 94:18	PGGM 84:8 87:2 88:12 89:16,18
matter 84:4 88:9 91:16,19 109:15	multiparty 92:8	office 85:9,14 104:5 104:17,21 109:2	<hr/> P <hr/>	phone 88:8 106:12
McDowell 87:13 89:20	<hr/> N <hr/>	Offices 86:13	P 85:1,1 86:1,1 87:1,1 88:4	planning 94:19 95:2 97:22
MCGUIRE 87:22	N 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:4	oh 110:11	p.m 84:17 88:2,17 115:6	please 89:14 96:10 110:12
mean 108:4 114:13	National 84:24	ointment 104:15	Pages 84:13	PO 85:10
meaningful 96:8 97:1	Navy 86:18		pains 94:21	
Medlin 91:2,3,3,22 95:25 101:9,16	NE 85:19		Palms 86:18	
	necessary 112:6,12 113:15,22			
	need 100:25 107:22 111:14,25 114:22			
	needs 92:12 95:9 112:2			
	negotiations 92:6			
	neither 99:15			
	new 93:9			
	nonsettling 92:17 99:3 102:6 114:15			
	Northeast 86:4			
	Northern 91:8			

<p>point 99:15 100:1,3 102:15 104:17 111:24 113:3 policy 90:20 Portland 86:9 87:14 position 93:24 97:14,25 98:8 101:15 107:25 108:3 possibility 109:2,3 possible 92:7 93:13 99:16 108:21 109:4 112:23 potential 91:19 103:9 108:23 110:24 potentially 108:25 power 104:5,8,8 practice 114:21 precise 102:3 precisely 113:12 prefer 102:19 preference 108:8 prejudice 96:1 103:2 107:16 108:1 110:2 prejudiced 99:3 prepare 107:19 112:23 preparing 112:8 present 87:21 96:4 96:9 presented 101:20 pressing 110:20 pretty 99:2 114:10 principle 89:1 92:8 92:22 procedural 88:24 89:2 92:23 93:1 94:2 95:14,22 97:8 100:2,8 107:24 procedure 92:20,25 93:17</p>	<p>proceeding 94:18 process 111:22 Project 86:2 90:10 90:12 92:10 106:1 proposal 98:18 99:5 113:17 propose 112:15 113:8 proposed 84:9 88:13 93:21 94:2 94:7 96:7,12,23 97:2,4,16,16 98:3 98:5 100:8 101:11 111:1,6 112:19 114:1 provide 97:2 111:24 provides 95:12 provisions 98:21 PSE 89:9 93:8 103:19 105:17 PSE's 108:15 Public 85:13 90:23 91:1 92:11 97:9 99:14,20 100:6,16 104:17 106:13 110:22 111:6 Puget 84:5,10 85:17 88:9,14 Puget's 99:19 pull 102:22 purposes 112:16 put 96:17,20,21 99:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>question 98:11 105:5 110:20 112:5 114:4,7 questions 91:25 quick 92:4 quickly 93:19 quite 102:12 109:19 113:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/>	<p>R 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:4 116:1 Rackner 87:13 89:20 rate 99:19 Rayne 84:14 85:3 88:19 reach 92:7 reached 89:1 92:16 92:22 93:1 95:13 95:17 98:14,17 read 94:9 ready 113:25 real 96:1 really 93:19 99:24 102:9 111:16 Realtime 84:21 rearrange 104:16 reason 95:8,21,24 reasonably 101:7 reasons 93:14 recall 108:16 received 91:20 104:4 recognize 95:11 98:16 record 88:6 90:16 115:5 reference 113:3 reflects 111:9 regarding 88:24 94:7 110:8 112:6 regards 96:22 regulatory 89:10 rehash 102:3 rejected 99:24 related 96:4 relation 112:24 relatively 93:1 relied 101:20 remain 108:8 remedy 107:11 remind 109:7 REPORTED 84:20 Reporter 116:7</p>	<p>Reporting 84:21 representative 102:18 representatives 91:15 represented 93:20 representing 89:9 89:11 91:13 102:8 request 93:16 requesting 93:4 require 95:21 114:20 required 92:21 rescheduled 113:4 resolve 88:23 respond 92:2 96:17 98:2 112:6 responding 110:9 response 91:21 94:10 96:7 97:9 97:10 101:12 108:12 110:16 112:12 result 88:24 97:18 review 98:20 reviewed 101:12 revisions 98:23 right 100:20 101:25 Rita 86:17 91:12 rita.liotta@navy.... 86:20 Road 86:4 Robblee 91:4 rules 92:21 98:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:4 sale 88:14 sales 84:9 88:14 San 86:19 saw 114:17 sberman@sidley.... 87:20 scarson@perkins... 85:21</p>	<p>schedule 88:24 89:2 92:19,23 93:2,3,21 94:2,5 95:14,22 96:2,7 96:13,25 97:8,17 100:2,8 101:11,20 102:9 104:16 107:24 110:8,25 111:1,6 scheduled 92:5 94:14 109:1 112:17 School 86:4 Schwerin 86:13 Scott 87:8 89:24 scottmaccormac... 87:11 scratch 97:22 Seattle 84:22,23 85:15 86:14,23 87:5,10,19 see 99:4,9 111:14 114:16 seeing 96:13,15 seek 93:7 98:6 108:17 seen 96:14 97:24 98:8 99:6 102:1 113:11,15 selected 94:24 sensitive 102:13 sent 98:18 set 95:18 settlement 89:1 91:19 92:4,7,8,12 92:15,16,21,25 93:5,8,15,21 94:4 94:6,8 95:5,13,17 96:5,9,13,15,18 96:21,23 97:2,4 97:18,25 98:3,5,9 98:12,17,19 99:1 99:4,6,7,16,17,20 99:25 100:1,7,13 102:2,16 108:18</p>
---	--	--	---	--

110:9,23 111:7,9 111:15 112:7,13 112:21,23,24 113:11,22,24 114:1,5,16,23 settling 91:21,23 93:21 100:5,12 101:10 103:1 108:17 112:19,25 114:2,11 seven 112:21 113:1 shared 98:13,15 Sheree 85:18 89:8 114:9 short 89:4 91:17 114:10 115:3 shorter 94:4 107:19 Shorthand 116:6 Shoshana 87:13 89:19 shoshana@mrg-l... 87:15 Sidley 87:18 89:21 significant 95:20 similar 98:17 99:7 99:19 101:17 Simon 86:3 90:12 104:8 simon@ffitchlaw... 86:6 sitting 88:18 situation 99:2 102:17 skill 116:9 sole 109:15 son's 109:17 soon 93:12 sooner 113:25 114:6 sorry 105:4 110:11 114:2,4 sort 113:10 sound 84:5,10 85:17 88:9,14 108:23	sounds 108:24 South 84:19 85:5 85:10 speak 100:15 speaking 90:17 107:14 specifically 98:3 speculate 98:1 113:14 Staff 85:8 90:2,5 92:9,16 97:8 103:22,23 105:19 105:20 stage 93:1 Stan 87:17 89:21 start 94:9 97:21 105:14 111:16 starting 103:5 state 94:19 95:2 101:2 116:3,7 stated 99:14 status 84:12 88:8 88:21 step 111:8,17 stevegreenwald... 87:6 Steven 87:3 89:15 straight 91:18 Street 85:19 86:14 Strom 85:18 89:8 stutter 111:17 submit 95:15 submitted 113:25 substance 96:18 114:14,16 suffer 96:2 sufficient 89:5 113:2,11 sufficiently 109:12 suggest 112:18 Suite 84:22 85:15 85:19 86:4,9,14 86:18,23 87:4,9 87:14,18 Superior 94:15	102:14 support 96:15 supporting 111:18 supports 99:15 sure 96:11 97:20 107:3,17 111:3,3 suspended 92:23 110:17 suspension 95:14 SW 84:19 85:5,10 86:9 87:14	113:5,20 115:2,5 things 102:4 111:16 think 95:7 96:23 98:15 102:1,4 107:25 108:19 109:2,22 111:11 111:12,17,19,20 112:1,22 113:2,10 114:21 Third 87:4,9 three 95:9,20,23 107:23 114:18 Thursday 105:7,8 Thurston 94:15 102:13 116:4 time 88:17 94:4 95:16 96:14,20 97:16 107:19 110:23,25 111:13 111:22,25 112:6 112:11,18,23 113:11,15,23 114:10 timeline 95:10 timing 110:8 today 88:16 93:24 107:1 114:19 tomorrow 114:19 touched 92:13 transcript 116:8 transition 93:11 Transportation 84:2,18 85:5 88:20 Tremaine 87:4,9 89:16 true 100:8 116:8 trying 100:20,21 turn 94:5 103:16 112:4 turning 101:9 turns 104:15 two 102:7 Tyler 86:8 90:8	U-180680 84:4 88:15 UA 91:4 92:17 101:17 unavailable 102:18 undergoing 114:13 understand 103:3 understanding 97:11 110:24 112:8 unions 102:5 unit 90:23 use 97:3 usual 93:12 Utilities 84:2,18 85:4 88:20
T				
T 116:1,1 Tacoma 84:23 take 89:3 97:15 100:25 110:3 taken 94:20 takes 113:23 talked 99:23 talking 95:19 Taylor 84:20 116:6 116:13 tcp@dvclaw.com 86:10 telephonic 101:1 term 93:5,15 100:11,12 terms 96:21,23 97:1,25 98:3,4,9 98:12,14,16 99:10 99:23 101:1 102:3 testimony 96:4,15 96:17,20,22 97:2 97:9,23 107:20 110:16,16,24 111:5,6,8,18,20 112:7,9,20,24 thank 88:7 89:12 90:1,22 91:10,14 91:16 93:18,25 94:13 98:10 99:11 100:4 101:8,16 103:14 106:15 108:13,20 109:6,8 109:18 110:19				
U				
U-180680 84:4 88:15 UA 91:4 92:17 101:17 unavailable 102:18 undergoing 114:13 understand 103:3 understanding 97:11 110:24 112:8 unions 102:5 unit 90:23 use 97:3 usual 93:12 Utilities 84:2,18 85:4 88:20				
V				
Van 86:8 Vermogensbeheer 84:8 88:13 view 111:24 voiced 105:12 VOLUME 84:12				
W				
W 86:14 WAC 95:12 111:23 wait 111:14 114:23 waiting 99:17 want 91:18 92:3 94:5,10 98:2,6 100:3 102:3 107:10 109:7 112:4 wanted 99:14 Washington 84:1 84:18,19,22 85:4 85:6,11,15,20 86:5,14,23 87:5 87:10,19 88:1,20 91:8 94:16,25 95:2 116:3,7 wasn't 108:24 way 86:9 97:12,23 100:15 111:12				

<p>ways 96:3 we'll 103:16 we're 88:8,19 95:19 99:8 108:11,22 109:4 110:5 113:9 114:14,18 we've 91:20 101:23 114:13 Wednesday 88:16 week 96:16 99:4 103:10,10,13 104:21,22,24 105:6 113:9,18 weeks 95:9,20,23 107:23 114:18 Wendy 86:22 90:19 wendy@nwener... 86:24 went 104:5 Western 90:6 willing 99:10 114:12,14 wish 89:1 102:9 witness 100:19 106:10 107:1 108:5 witnesses 94:18 95:1 101:25 102:24 103:9,11 106:18 107:18 witnesses' 106:24 WNIDCL 86:11 92:17 work 98:1 108:7,21 112:11 worked 94:21 working 95:11 101:23 108:10 113:10 works 102:8 107:3 Wright 87:4,9 89:16 writing 110:4 www.buellrealti... 84:25</p>	<hr/> <p>X</p> <hr/> <p>Y</p> <hr/> <p>Yeah 101:16 108:4 111:2 113:7 114:9 yesterday 92:7,11 92:24 95:6 98:15 98:17,22 101:19 112:19 yield 98:5</p> <hr/> <p>Z</p> <hr/> <p>0</p> <hr/> <p>1</p> <hr/> <p>1 86:18 100 100:23 10885 85:19 10th 103:10 11th 87:14 97:7 105:6 109:17 1201 87:4,9 1300 84:19 85:5 1325 84:22 1400 85:10 14th 105:9 15th 96:14 103:11 105:13,14,15,18 105:21,24 106:2,5 106:7,9,14,18,20 106:22 107:2,6,9 108:1,7,16,19,21 109:4,20,22 110:1 111:21 112:17 113:9 114:6 161 86:18 1750 86:9 18 86:14 1840 84:22 18th 92:5 96:16 1st 86:23 94:20 96:24 101:22 108:9</p> <hr/> <p>2</p> <hr/>	<p>2000 85:15 2019 84:16 88:1,16 206 84:23 85:16 86:5,15 87:5,10 87:19 21st 98:18,24 2200 87:4,9 235-0111 84:23 241-7242 86:10 253 84:23 257-6011 86:15 287-9066 84:23 290-3625 87:15</p> <hr/> <p>3</p> <hr/> <p>3:05 84:17 88:2,17 3:45 115:6 305 86:23 32 91:4 101:17 321 86:4 321-3221 87:19 3358 84:20 116:13 360 85:6,11 383 86:4</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <hr/> <p>400 86:14 87:14 40128 85:10 415 86:19 419 87:14 4200 87:18 425 85:20 449-0009 86:24 450 86:9 464-6595 85:16 4th 85:19</p> <hr/> <p>5</p> <hr/> <p>503 86:10,24 87:15 5th 85:15</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <hr/> <p>635-1422 85:20 664-1160 85:6 664-1186 85:11 669-8197 86:5</p>	<hr/> <p>7</p> <hr/> <p>700 85:19 701 87:18 743-4718 86:19 757-8048 87:5 757-8263 87:10 7th 102:21,23 103:5,8,18,20,24 104:2,9,12,17 105:1,3 108:24,25 109:10,13,16</p> <hr/> <p>8</p> <hr/> <p>800 84:24 85:15 811 86:23 84-116 84:13 846-6989 84:24 8th 94:7,11,16 100:17,19 101:11 101:25 102:16 107:17 108:1,7 113:8,19</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <hr/> <p>9 84:16 88:1 94130 86:19 97201 86:9 97205 87:14 98004 85:20 98101 84:22 87:5 87:10 98104 85:15 86:23 87:19 98110 86:5 98119 86:14 98504 84:19 85:6 85:11 9th 88:16</p>
--	--	---	---

