B&A LITIGATION SERVICES

2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 425, Seattle, WA 98121 • 206.389.9321 • Toll Free: 855.329.0919
2208 North 30th Street, Suite 202, Tacoma, WA 98403 • 253.627.6401 • Toll Fee: 800.649.2034

ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND
Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions
Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

Transcript of Proceedings

April 03, 2026

PSE GRC v.

s. UE-260005

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR
Vice President

NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS ASSOCIATION
ETHICS FIRST
FIRM

The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lef, mdb accessed via *paperclip* icon

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON

UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, Complainant, v. PUGET SOUND ENERGY, Respondent.	)	Docket Nos. UE-260005 UG-260006

UTC Proceeding

April 3, 2026

Reported via Zoom

Held before

JUDGE HARRY FUKANO

Start Time: 9:31 a.m.
End Time: 10:31 a.m.
Page Nos.: 1-31

Reported by: ANN MARIE G. ALLISON, CCR
Certified Court Reporter #3375

A P P E A R A N C E S

JUDGE HARRY FUKANO

JUDGE BIJAN HUGHES

NASH CALLAGHAN, UTC

JAN HASSELMAN, Joint Environmental Advocates

JIM DENNISON, Joint Environmental Advocates

ROBERT SYKES, Public Counsel

SHEREE STROM CARSON, Puget Sound Energy

SOMMER MOSER, AWEC

YOCHI ZAKAI, The Energy Project

KURT BOEHM, Kroeger

TYLER PEPPLE, Microsoft Corporation

******

Friday, April 3, 2026, 9:30 a.m., via Zoom video conference, the following UTC Proceeding was held before JUDGE HARRY FUKANO:

(All parties present via Zoom)

JUDGE FUKANO: Good morning. My name is Harry Fukano, and I am an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. Co-presiding with me in this matter is Administrative Law Judge Bijan Hughes.

The time is approximately 9:31 a.m. We are here today for a pre-hearing conference in Dockets UE-260005 and UG-260006, which is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Puget Sound Energy.

Let's start by taking brief appearances starting with the company.

MS. STROM CARSON: Good morning, Sheree Strom Carson, with Perkins Coie, representing Puget Sound Energy.

JUDGE FUKANO: And for commission staff.

MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, AAG, on behalf of commission staff.

JUDGE FUKANO: Public counsel.

MR. SYKES: Thank you. Rob Sykes, AAG, on

behalf of public counsel.

JUDGE FUKANO: For AWEC.

MS. MOSER: Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC.

JUDGE FUKANO: For Microsoft Corporation.

MR. PEPPLE: Tyler Pepple on behalf of Microsoft.

JUDGE FUKANO: For Nucor Steel.

MR. ZANOPOLIS: Damon Zanopolis and Laura Baker for Nucor Steel. Thank you.

JUDGE FUKANO: For The Energy Project.

MR. ZAKAI: Yochan Zakai, with Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, for The Energy Project.

JUDGE FUKANO: And for Kroeger.

MR. BOEHM: Kurt Boehm for Kroeger.

JUDGE FUKANO: And for Joint Environmental Advocates or JEA.

MR. HASSELMAN: Good morning, Jan Hasselman and Jim Dennison for Joint Environmental Advocates.

JUDGE FUKANO: This brings us to first two petitions for intervention. The commissioner received six petitions to intervene in this matter. I would like to request whether any party has an objection to any of the individual petitions for intervention starting with the company.

MS. STROM CARSON: PSE has no objection.

JUDGE FUKANO: And commission staff.
MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor.
JUDGE FUKANO: And public counsel.
MR. SYKES: No objection.
JUDGE FUKANO: I have reviewed all of the petitions for intervention, and given my review and the lack of objection from the parties, I will grant the petitions to intervene for AWEC, Microsoft Corporation, Nucor Steel, The Energy Project, Kroeger and JEA. This grant will be reflected in the pre-hearing conference.

Next, let's turn to participatory funding. Section 6.2 of the currently effective funding agreement provides that parties seeking intervenor funding shall file a request for certification and a notice of intent to request funding grant on or before the date of the pre-hearing conference.

The commission has received two requests for case certification from both TEP and AWEC. I would also like to inquire whether JEA intends to seek case certification at this time.

MR. HASSELMAN: We filed ours yesterday evening. Maybe it's just not reflected in the docket.

JUDGE FUKANO: It perhaps has not updated to the commissions docket, but let me check that right now.

I don't see that it has been posted yet, but I

take your representation.

Have the other parties -- just to inquire, have the other parties had an opportunity to review the request for case certification, including the case certification committed by JEA? We'll start with the company.

MS. STROM CARSON: I have not specifically reviewed JEA's request that was filed, I guess, yesterday. I don't think PSE has any objection, however.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Perhaps then, before we proceed, just in the interest of clarifying the record, Mr. Hasselman, would you be able to perhaps orally describe your -- the contents of your certification petition just to touch upon the factors that are listed in the participatory funding agreement?

MR. HASSELMAN: Sure. The JEA have applied for and received funding in the past. We meet the criteria under the agreement of being non-profit organizations that are not -- whose perspectives are not represented by any other party. Somewhat complicatedly, four of the JEA entities are seeking funding under the customer representation subfund. One of them, front and center, meets the criteria for funding under the prioritized organization's subfund.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you. And with that additional explanation, I just wanted to return to the

company, of whether any of that would change your position.

MS. STROM CARSON: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

And turning to commission staff, are there any objections to the request for case certifications including TEP, AWEC and JEA.

MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE FUKANO: And to public counsel.

MR. SYKES: None from public counsel.

JUDGE FUKANO: Do any of the other intervenors wish to voice any objection to the case certification?

MS. MOSER: This is Sommer Moser. Not an objection, I might have missed it; which organizations are seeking funding under the customer representation subfund? I just wasn't clear.

ATTY HASSELMAN: I think that's directed to me. It's Sierra Club, NW Energy Coalition, Climate Solutions, and Washington Conservation Action.

MS. MOSER: All of those organizations would be seeking -- seeking a customer representation, not the public interest organization fund?

MR. HASSELMAN: My recollection is that there's two of them. I don't remember that there's a separate public interest fund.

MS. MOSER: I might be misremembering. Because I deal in the customer representation that's what I'm remembering. I just wasn't sure.

JUDGE FUKANO: You might be referring to the prioritized organization.

MS. MOSER: Prioritized organization. That's the one, yes.

MR. HASSELMAN: Yeah, only one of the JEA groups, front and centered, is seeking funding under the prioritized entity's subfund.

MS. MOSER: Okay. I think AWEC would just like the ability to review before taking a position on that.

MR. HASSELMAN: Did everyone receive it? We did file it and serve it yesterday.

MS. MOSER: I don't -- I don't think I saw it, but I'm going back.

MR. HASSELMAN: All right. If there was a problem, I think the rules say the day of the hearing, rather than before the hearing. So if there was a hangup with our filing, we'll make sure we get that taken care of by the end of the day.

MS. MOSER: No concerns from AWEC for a little delay in getting it filed, but I think we would like to review.

JUDGE FUKANO: And just to clarify for our

record, are you requesting ability to review the case certification or perhaps the budgeting component that will come following case certification?

MS. MOSER: I think we just -- to be honest with you, I haven't thought about what it is we would be not objecting to. So I think I just want to read it to see. We have just never -- I don't recall that we've seen a budget request for Sierra Club seeking to qualify as a customer -- anyone other than NWEC, actually, seeking to qualify under the customer representation subfund. So I just want to take a look at that and make sure that we don't have any issues.

So I'm not saying that we do, but I just -- I would like the ability to review, and I'm not seeing it in my email.

JUDGE FUKANO: Very good. Then I would like to set a deadline for any response or objection to the JEA's request for case certification. Would a one-week deadline, or perhaps by next Wednesday, the 8th, be a reasonable deadline?

MS. MOSER: That's very reasonable from AWEC's perspective.

JUDGE FUKANO: Very good.

Was there a comment?

MS. STROM CARSON: Yeah. We would like -- PSE would like the opportunity to review it, too, so I think

the 8th is reasonable.

JUDGE FUKANO: Very good. Then I will set a deadline for April 8, 2026, for any response to the JEA's request for case certification.

To clarify then, are there any other objections to the request for case certification from TEP or AWEC at this time?

Hearing nothing, then the commission will grant case certification to TEP and AWEC and we'll reserve ruling on the request for case certification for JEA for the pre-hearing conference order.

This then brings us to the motion for consolidation filed by PSE on March 24, 2026, PSE's motion to consolidate these two dockets with Docket UE-260113, regarding this petition for deferred accounting which requests deferred accounting treatment for interest expense PSE is required to accrue and pay transmission network interconnection customers on deposits received for network upgrades pursuant to PSE's jurisdictional open access transmission tariff until rates to recover this interest are addressed as part of this UFC.

Are there any objections from the parties regarding a request to consolidate Docket UE-260113 with the present dockets?

Hearing nothing, then let the record reflect no

objection -- oh, I see some people coming off camera. Is there discussion on this matter?

Hearing nothing, then the commission will grant the motion for consolidation and will consolidate Docket UE-260133 with these dockets.

Would the parties like to have discovery rules made available? Presumably, yes, but...

MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

During proceedings of the commission, parties often issue a first data request asking that any subsequent data requests and responses are shared with every other party. It would make it easier on the parties if I included this requirement as part of the pre-conference hearing order.

Is there any objection to including this requirement?

Hearing nothing, then I will include this requirement as part of the pre-hearing conference order and discovery will otherwise be conducted in accordance with the commission's procedural rules.

On March 26, 2026, the commission issued a corrected Order 02 protective order with highly confidential provisions. I noted -- I know that public counsel had previously objected to the erroneous version of Order 02

that was previously issued. I wanted to confirm with public counsel whether the objections initially raised in its email are being maintained with respect to corrected Order 2.

MR. SYKES: No, not with corrected Order 2. Corrected Order 2 resolves public counsel's objection.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you for that clarification.

Do any of the other parties have any concerns with Corrected Order 2?

Hearing nothing, then we will proceed.

I have received the two versions of the proposed procedural schedules from the parties. Has there been any further discussion or would it be helpful to perhaps allow the parties some additional time to discuss the two schedules or has that sort of discussion already occurred?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. So we have had some significant back and forth through email communications. I think it would be helpful if we went off the record for the parties to discuss -- looking at the most up-to-date versions now, I see that they're not actually all that different. Um, but, yeah, I think that going off the record could potentially be helpful.

JUDGE FUKANO: Very good. Then let's take about a 10- to 15-minute recess. I will deafen and mute myself and wait to be called. So please message me and

Judge Hughes when the parties are done discussing.

And we are off the record.

(Off record 9:45-10:00 a.m.)

JUDGE FUKANO: The time is approximately 10 a.m. I understand that the parties have had an opportunity to confer about the various procedural schedules and that the parties still are maintaining their respective -- or at least PSE and staff are maintaining their respective proposed schedules subject to modification. Is that correct?

MR. CALLAGHAN: That's correct, Your Honor. So we did work out, as much as we could, whether there is a serious problem with each schedule for any of the parties. I will note the timing of both of the schedules are extremely close, and given that the commission often needs to make modifications based on its own schedule, we felt that either of these, you know, are -- staff would prefer its schedule; the company would prefer its schedule. But given how close they are, we didn't feel that it was worth spending too much time and energy over, although there are some outstanding issues that we'd like to discuss.

First is, of course, the externally indexed revenue cap workshop that staff is proposing and the issue of whether or not to include a reply brief in the proposed schedule. But other than that, I think the general

consensus was that just giving these two options to the commission would be preferable to spending a lot of time just going back and forth on each individual date.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you. You mentioned that there were some issues to discuss about the externally indexed revenue cap workshop and the reply brief. Would now be a reasonable time to take up those issues and hear parties' positions on those?

MR. CALLAGHAN: I believe so, yes.

JUDGE FUKANO: Okay. Would you like --

MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay, thank you.

So first I'll address the reply brief. So given the rest of the schedule, staff felt that it would be more beneficial to devote more time in the schedule to discovery and working on testimony and preparing for the evidentiary hearing. I also will note that reply briefs can -- that decision whether or not to include a reply brief can be re-evaluated, either at the evidentiary hearing or, let's say initial filing -- initial briefs, post-hearing briefs get filed, a party really feels like there's something that they need to respond to, they can move that the commissioner amend the schedule to allow for a reply brief.

So in staff's mind, because the reply brief essentially pushes everything else on the schedule back, we think that it would be more beneficial to just not have

reply briefs, at least at this point in the schedule.

As for the externally indexed revenue cap workshop, so staff is proposing that the commission hold a workshop on externally indexed revenue caps in the performance-based rates policy docket. This would be about a half day, and it would include an impartial informational presentation from Current Energy Group, which is the firm that's advised the Oregon PUC on the same topic.

Just for background, as I stated in my email, this is something that many of the non-company parties are -- intend to either present a specific proposal or to support the general concept of -- within this rate case and my understanding is also the Avista rate case.

So our proposal would be that the commission issue a notice of potential ex parte contacts in this case and -- while I can't speak for the Avista case, I assume that would be necessary in that one as well, and hold a workshop related to this issue because it is something that many of the non-company parties are interested in proposing, and we think that this would be helpful to prepare and just have a general common base of understanding before reviewing and litigating these proposals.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Now I'd like to turn to PSE for a response to both the issue regarding reply briefs and the proposed workshop.

MS. STROM CARSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Regarding staff schedule and the lack of a reply brief, I think, first of all, it's important to note that there is actually the usual amount of time between rebuttal testimony and the evidentiary hearing. I think there's something like -- there's more than a month; there's 40 days or so. So with PSE's schedule, there is adequate time for the parties to review rebuttal, prepare for hearing, consistent with other cases.

It's also interesting that with PSE's proposed schedule, which has been endorsed by others as well, we do have a reply brief and yet the reply brief gives plenty of time for the commission -- the evidentiary hearing, as well as the reply brief, give the commission plenty of time before the suspension date and, in fact, are earlier -- the reply brief in PSE's schedule is earlier than the initial briefing and staff schedule, which cuts it really close. Staff schedule cuts it really close. I think it leaves less than six weeks between briefing and the suspension date; whereas, PSE's is closer to two months between the reply brief and the suspension date.

So, you know, we think our schedule is consistent with past schedules in terms of the time frames. It gives the commission more time between the evidentiary hearing and the suspension date and the briefing and the suspension

date. And it's just been in past bench bar conferences we've heard that the commission finds reply briefs helpful in terms of clarifying issues that arise in initial brief, so we think there's enough time in this schedule; there's no reason not to have the reply brief.

In terms of -- in terms of the workshop, we do have concerns with this. As we understand staff's proposal, it seeks to lift the ex parte wall in this case and in Avista's case to hold the workshop in a policy docket.

From a legal perspective, rule-makings and policy statements are intended to be forward-looking, provide rules or a policy statement which governs future cases. That would not be the case here. These attempts to shoehorn this policy workshop into two ongoing adjudications, PSE's and Avista's, is an improper use of a policy docket and it threatens the integrity of litigated proceedings.

And let's be clear. There will be no policy statement issued on externally indexed revenue cap proposals before response or rebuttal testimony. Under staff's procedural schedule what we'll have is a workshop.

So what does a workshop get us? Well, it simply gives parties an opportunity to preview their litigated positions before the commission in advance of filing their litigated position and preview PSE's response to their litigated positions in advance of filing. It gives them a

second bite at the apple, and, ultimately, whatever policy statement the commission may issue could be very different than whatever the results of the workshop are. Having this workshop leaves PSE with the potential to be saddled with something very different from what the commission ultimately provides in its policy statement.

And we have concerns with lifting the ex parte wall in terms of the unwieldy evidentiary record filings from the policy docket becoming part of the litigated proceedings, and your workshop will turn into, instead of a collaborative workshop, it will be a litigated workshop with attorneys actively participating. So -- and ultimately, with no policy statement being issued before filing testimony, it's just not clear what -- how this benefits the record and the adjudication.

And a better approach is to do one of two things. Allow the commission to consider these proposals in a litigated proceeding, and then based on what we all learn, consider the matter later in the policy docket or hold off on proposals for externally indexed rate caps in this GRC and wait for the commission to issue a policy statement.

So that is PSE's position, and we respectfully request that this workshop not be held during the course of the case and the ex parte wall not be lifted.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

I see that commissioner staff has raised their hand, so go ahead, Mr. Callaghan.

MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Just briefly to respond, so just to be clear, the workshop that's being proposed would not be a presentation of staff or any other party's litigated position. It would be a presentation, an educational presentation on the general concept of externally indexed revenue caps, a review of what they look like in other jurisdictions. It would not be presenting anything that would violate ex parte. This is just a presentation on the general concept.

We believe that's in the public interest, because as I've stated, all party -- many non-company parties are intending to make proposals in these GRCs. And just to be clear, this is something that the commission has done before. Last year, while litigated cases, water rate cases were going on, the commission was reviewing cost of capital in, I believe, a rule-making, and they, out of an abundance of caution, even though they weren't discussing the specific facts of any individual case, they issued a notice of potential ex parte context for a workshop like this.

So there is commission precedent for this kind of arrangement. I can send a copy of that notice to Your Honors, if you'd like, but there is precedent for this. This is not -- the workshop is not intended to be something

that would be included in the record in the litigated cases. This is just so that all the parties have a common base of understanding before these -- before the non-company parties file their response testimony.

We think that that's extremely beneficial, because under both proposed schedules, response testimony does not -- wouldn't be filed in this case until the -- about the end of July, and at that point the procedural schedule really picks up. And we're just cognizant of the fact that the commission and all parties have a very busy schedule this year, and so we think it would be beneficial to have a common base of understanding about these concepts prior to having this litigated in these general rate cases.

Thank you.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

And I am familiar with the water workshop that you referenced, as far as the workshop regarding cost of capital.

I see that Mr. Zakai has his hand up. Before I turn to you, I just wanted to turn quickly to the company to see if there's any further response regarding staff's, kind of, additional clarification.

MS. STROM CARSON: Well, that's helpful. I think it's a great suggestion for a policy docket to have that. It just doesn't really fit with a litigated

proceeding where you have an external person coming in to get -- to some degree, I guess, advocate for externally indexed revenue cap, which the company opposes, is my understanding.

And so, you know, it's fine. It's something that we can look at in terms of a policy docket outside of a general rate case, but it's not appropriate for a general rate case where the parties are going to take what this person says and build on it in their litigated case. So we continue to object.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

And, Mr. Zakai.

MR. ZAKAI: Thank you. Yochi Zakai for The Energy Project.

I just want to reiterate that the proposal is not intended to present a litigated position. Um, from my perspective, um, the goal is really to develop a common baseline for terminology, um, and understanding so that parties are not -- and the parties and the commissioner are not talking past each other, um, in terms of the presentation of concepts.

Um, and I would add there are multiple examples, you know. Mr. Callaghan brought up, um, some concerns -- you know, where something similar has happened, and in particular, in the current, um, performance-based

rate-making policy docket there were just comments recently due on, um, return on PPAs within the past week. And while this is -- and that is a topic that ratepayer advocates have opposed, but there has been active policy, um, docket activity concerning that during these litigated cases.

So similarly, we think, you know, even though we understand, we didn't object to the fact that there was policy docket activity going on there. We submitted our comments and, um, you know are going to let that run its course. And similarly, we think it would be appropriate, um, to have activity concerning, you know, developing a baseline of common understanding for externally indexed revenue caps as well.

Um, moving on to the other schedule issues, I would note The Energy Project generally supports staff's proposal to use the, kind of, two to three weeks that were currently reserved for reply briefs earlier in the schedule. We think that that is a better place for the development of the record and the presentation of a full case.

And then, finally, I'd just like to discuss the case date of proposed budgets. I brought this up while we were offline. I think it makes sense because we are not going to have a decision on the JEA's petition for case certification until after this conference, that the proposed budgets be due 30 days after we have a decision on the JEA's

petition for case certification so that parties have sufficient time to confer after that decision is issued. It's my understanding that that would be consistent with the participatory funding agreement, and when I brought that up earlier, no party objected.

Thank you.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

And that does seem reasonable to allow for as much time as possible for case-certified parties to discuss potential budgeting. Given the lack of other -- objection from other parties, I will include that requirement to that deadline -- or rather, modify that deadline in the pre-hearing conference order.

Ms. Moser.

MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I thought I would just jump in briefly. AWEC is also supportive of having a workshop on externally indexed revenue caps. We agree with, you know, the sentiments and the arguments that have been made by staff and by TEP, so I won't belabor those points here.

I'll just say, I think there are a number of examples where issues are being considered in a policy docket. They ultimately get addressed ahead of policy dockets in contested case proceedings. I think PSE has been an advocate of several of those circumstances, so I think we

just don't view this as particularly different from the status quo in that regard.

And again, just want to reiterate that the idea of the workshop is to just provide a baseline level of education. It's not to advocate in any way; it's not my understanding that this third-party that would be presenting would be advocating in any way.

I think parties are going to raise issues and make -- take positions and testimony that they're going to take. It's not -- I think we either are or getting very educated on this concept, so I don't think it's going to change anything in a contested case. I think it's just what's going to be beneficial perhaps for the commission and others. So I just wanted to state that.

And then I'll just say briefly, AWEC does support the reply brief. There are a number of policy issues that are in this case. We only have one round of testimony that allows the ability to respond to PSE on those policy issues, so I think, you know, having a reply brief just allows at least some of those policy arguments to be rounded out.

So for that reason we feel fairly strongly about a reply brief and are supportive of PSE's schedule, with the exception of adding that workshop the staff has proposed.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Mr. Sykes.

MR. SYKES: Thank you, Your Honor.

The public counsel does not -- I think it's generally supportive of the company's schedule. We do not feel strongly about a reply brief. So if there's consensus towards striking that, then we would have no problem stretching the schedule out.

Public counsel does support, um, having a workshop on the externally indexed revenue caps. I think it's -- from my understanding, it's more than one party is going to propose them in response testimony, and I think it is helpful to the commission and other parties if all of us understand them before we actually see the testimony.

It's not going to be -- it's going to be a workshop; it's not going to be a hearing. We're not going to be discussing our respective positions. I think that is a totally -- I think that's entirely appropriate, so public counsel would support that.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Mr. Hasselman.

MR. HASSELMAN: Yes. Joint Environment Advocates want to weight in, as well, in favor of the revenue cap discussion. We did sponsor testimony on this specific issue in the '22 rate case and have thoughts to add to it. So we're in favor of that. That's all.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Would any other party like to make a comment or response to two proposals that have been under discussion or any other matter related to the proposed procedural schedules?

MS. STROM CARSON: Yes, I would like to briefly respond.

I guess, you know, if there is no advocacy going on here and it's strictly informational, I guess I'm not understanding why the ex parte wall needs to be removed. So that's one thought.

I do think, though, that it will make your workshop less collaborative than it would be if it's in a separate policy docket not tied in with these rate cases. So I think that's something to keep in mind as well.

One other point that I raised with the parties when we had had our break was that it is important to PSE to have a date certain for the public comment hearing, and we've proposed that. I don't think anybody opposes it. We're not definitely tied to the date that we have there, but we would like the commission to set the date in the schedule, preferably fairly close to the evidentiary hearing.

It's just, it's a long process to give all the customers notice and meet all the requirements, and so the sooner we know the date, the sooner we can get started on

that. So that is an additional request that we have.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

And to verify, you said that none of the other parties had an objection to the proposed October 6, 2026, date?

MS. STROM CARSON: That's my understanding.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Are there any other responses or comments regarding matters concerning the procedural schedule from any party?

Hearing nothing, I did have one question. In the two proposed procedural schedules I noted there are different suspension dates in each proposed procedural schedule. Could the parties explain why -- is there disagreement about what the suspension date is?

MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, my understanding of the statutory deadline is that it is, in essence, 11 months from the date of the initial filing. In this case that was February 27th. So I had just included that as January 27th. Obviously, it's the company's date to waive, if they would like, but I just wanted to include what I believe to be the correct statutory date.

MS. STROM CARSON: We have no objection to January 27th for suspension date.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you for that

clarification. Then I will take the proposed procedural schedules under advisement and subject to further check with the commission's calendars, thank you for the proposals.

I would like to remind the parties that the document should be filed online through the electronic filing link on the commission's web page. If parties intend to submit exhibits, there will be requirements for filing exhibits and an exhibit list in advance of the hearing, which will also be done only electronically. I will enter a pre-hearing order with details on this topic.

Also, the commission's rules provide for electronic service of documents. The commission will serve the parties electronically and the parties will serve each other electronically. If you have any corrections or updates to our main service list in this docket, please file a written notice of appearance or email Judge Hughes and myself.

Judge Hughes' email is Bijan.Hughes@UTC.wa.gov and my email is Harry.O.Fukano@UTC.wa.gov.

I am aware that in the Avista GRC docket, the commission has suspended or otherwise not required paper filings to be filed in that docket, subject to its discretion to modify the requirement at a later date, should the commission determine that papers copies are necessary.

Does any party have an objection to suspending the

requirement for paper copies in the GRC?

MS. STROM CARSON: PSE has no objection and would, in fact, encourage that. If there is a later determination that paper copies are needed, we would request that they not be due the next business day after the filing. It's quite an expensive process and timely. It takes a lot of time to prepare the confidential, highly confidential redacted versions and get them printed.

So we would -- if, at a later time, paper copies are required, we would ask for, you know, maybe five days to provide them, as opposed to the next business day.

JUDGE FUKANO: Understood. Any other position or response from the parties?

Hearing nothing -- just one moment, please -- then I will -- the commission intends to waive the requirement for the filing of paper copies in this docket. If that modification changes, it will be subject to further notice to the parties.

If any party has not yet designated a lead representative for service, please do so via email to Judge Hughes and myself as soon as possible. Again, Judge Hughes' email is Bijan.Hughes@UTC.wa.gov and my email is Harry.O.Fukano@UTC.wa.gov.

Also, if anyone would like to add the names and email addresses of other representatives or support staff

who should receive electronic courtesy copies of all documents filed in this proceeding, please email them to us as well.

Under WAC 480-07-461B, the deadline for filing errata sheets to exhibits may be established in the pre-hearing conference order. Does any party have an objection to setting that deadline a week prior to the evidentiary hearing?

Hearing none, we will incorporate that date into the pre-hearing conference order.

And I wanted to just address the other matter that staff raised in its March 31st email. Has staff and the company reached an understanding with respect to access to the modeling software?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, Your Honor. I apologize for neglecting to mention that. We have been able to secure a contract for those -- for at least the general rate case. If the rest of that isn't resolved by the end of this case, then we will renew the request, but at this point we have no request for the pre-hearing conference order.

Thank you.

JUDGE FUKANO: Thank you.

Is there any other matter that we should discuss before we adjourn today?

Hearing nothing, thank you very much for your

participation. We will issue an order, shortly, containing the procedural schedule and other guidelines for the disposition of this case.

We are adjourned and off the record.

(Proceedings concluded 10:31 a.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss
COUNTY OF PIERCE)

I, Ann Marie G. Allison, CCR, certified court reporter, State of Washington, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceeding was taken before me and completed on April 3, 2026, and thereafter transcribed by me;

That the foregoing proceeding is a full, true and complete transcript of all questions, answers, objections, motions and exceptions;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action, or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on April 16, 2026.

/s/Ann Marie G. Allison, CCR
Certified Court Reporter #3375

0

02 11:23,25

1

10 13:5
10- 12:24
10:31 31:5
11 27:18
15-minute 12:24

2

2 12:3,4,5,9
2026 3:2 10:3,13 11:22 27:4
22 25:23
24 10:13
26 11:22
27th 27:19,20,24

3

3 3:2
30 22:25
31st 30:12

4

40 16:6
480-07-461B 30:4

6

6 27:4
6.2 5:12

8

8 10:3
8th 9:18 10:1

9

9:30 3:2
9:31 3:13
9:45-10:00 13:3

A

a.m. 3:2,13 13:3,5 31:5
AAG 3:23,25
ability 8:12 9:1,13 24:18
abundance 19:18
access 10:19 30:13
accordance 11:20
accounting 10:15,16
accrue 10:17
Action 7:19
active 22:4
actively 18:12
activity 22:5,8,11
add 21:22 25:23 29:24
adding 24:23
additional 6:25 12:14 20:22 27:1
address 14:12 30:11
addressed 10:21 23:23
addresses 29:25
adequate 16:7
adjourn 30:24
adjourned 31:4
adjudication 18:15
adjudications 17:14
administrative 3:9,11
advance 17:23,25 28:8
advised 15:8
advisement 28:2
advocacy 26:7
advocate 21:2 23:25 24:5
advocates 4:16,18 22:3 25:21
advocating 24:7
agree 23:18
agreement 5:12 6:14,17 23:4
ahead 19:2 23:23
amend 14:22
amount 16:4
apologize 30:15
appearance 28:16
appearances 3:17
apple 18:1
applied 6:15
approach 18:16
approximately 3:13 13:4
April 3:2 10:3
arguments 23:19 24:20
arise 17:3
arrangement 19:23
assume 15:16
attempts 17:13
attorneys 18:12
ATTY 7:17
Avista 15:13,16 28:20
Avista's 17:9,15
aware 28:20
AWEC 4:2,3 5:8,18 7:6 8:11,22 10:6, 9 23:16 24:15
AWEC's 9:21

B

back 8:16 12:17 14:3,24
background 15:9
Baker 4:9
bar 17:1
base 15:21 20:2,12
based 13:16 18:18
baseline 21:18 22:12 24:4

behalf 3:23 4:1,3,5
belabor 23:20
bench 17:1
beneficial 14:14,25 20:5,11 24:13
benefits 18:14
Bijan 3:12
Bijan.hughes@utc.wa.gov 28:18 29:22
bite 18:1
Boehm 4:14
break 26:16
briefing 16:17,19,25
briefly 19:4 23:16 24:15 26:6
briefs 14:16,19 15:1,25 17:2 22:17
brings 4:19 10:12
brought 21:23 22:21 23:4
budget 9:7
budgeting 9:2 23:10
budgets 22:21,25
build 21:9
business 29:5,11
busy 20:10

C

calendars 28:3
Callaghan 3:22,23 5:2 7:7 11:8 12:16 13:11 14:9,11 19:2,3 21:23 27:16 30:15
called 12:25
camera 11:1
cap 13:23 14:6 15:2 17:18 21:3 25:22
capital 19:17 20:18
caps 15:4 18:20 19:8 22:13 23:18 25:8
captioned 3:15
care 8:20
Carson 3:19,20 4:25 6:6 7:2 9:24 16:1 20:23 26:5 27:6,23 29:2
case 5:17,19 6:4 7:5,11 9:1,3,17 10:4,6,9,10 15:12,13,15,16 17:8,9, 13 18:24 19:20 20:7 21:7,8,9 22:19, 21,23 23:1,24 24:12,17 25:23 27:19 30:17,18 31:3
case-certified 23:9
cases 16:9 17:12 19:16 20:1,13 22:5 26:13
caution 19:19
center 6:21
centered 8:9
certification 5:14,18,19 6:4,13 7:12 9:2,3,17 10:4,6,9,10 22:24 23:1
certifications 7:5
change 7:1 24:12
check 5:24 28:2
circumstances 23:25
clarification 12:7 20:22 28:1
clarify 8:25 10:5
clarifying 6:11 17:3
clear 7:16 17:17 18:14 19:4,15
Climate 7:18
close 13:15,19 16:17,18 26:21
closer 16:20
Club 7:18 9:8
Co-presiding 3:11
Coalition 7:18
cognizant 20:9
Coie 3:20
collaborative 18:11 26:12
comment 9:23 26:1,17
comments 22:1,9 27:8
commission 3:10,16,21,23 5:1,17 7:4 10:8 11:3,10,22 13:15 14:2 15:3, 14 16:13,14,24 17:2,23 18:2,5,17,21 19:15,17,22 20:10 24:13 25:11 26:20 28:12,21,24 29:15
commission's 11:21 28:3,6,11
commissioner 4:20 14:21 19:1 21:19
commissions 5:24
committed 6:5
common 15:21 20:2,12 21:17 22:12
communications 12:18
company 3:18 4:24 6:5 7:1 13:18 20:20 21:3 30:13
company's 25:3 27:20
complicatedly 6:19
component 9:2
concept 15:12 19:8,11 24:11
concepts 20:12 21:21
concerns 8:22 12:8 17:7 18:7 21:23
concluded 31:5
conducted 11:20
confer 13:6 23:2
conference 3:3,14 5:10,16 10:11 11:19 22:24 23:13 30:6,10,20
conferences 17:1
confidential 11:23 29:7
confirm 12:1
consensus 14:1 25:4
Conservation 7:19
considered 23:22
consistent 16:9,22 23:3
consolidate 10:14,23 11:4
consolidation 10:13 11:4
contacts 15:15
contents 6:12
contested 23:24 24:12
context 19:21
continue 21:10
contract 30:17
copies 28:24 29:1,4,9,16 30:1
copy 19:23
Corporation 4:4 5:8
correct 13:10,11 27:22
corrected 11:23 12:3,4,5,9

corrections 28:14
cost 19:17 20:17
counsel 3:24 4:1 5:3 7:8,9 11:24 12:2 25:2,7,17
counsel's 12:5
courtesy 30:1
criteria 6:16,22
current 15:7 21:25
customer 6:20 7:15,21 8:2 9:8,10
customers 10:18 26:24
cuts 16:17,18

D

Damon 4:8
data 11:11,12
date 5:15 14:3 16:15,19,21,25 17:1 22:21 26:17,19,20,25 27:5,15,18,20, 22,24 28:23 30:9
dates 27:13
day 8:18,21 15:6 29:5,11
days 16:6 22:25 29:10
deadline 9:16,17,19 10:3 23:12 27:17 30:4,7
deafen 12:24
deal 8:2
decision 14:17 22:23,25 23:2
deferred 10:15,16
degree 21:2
delay 8:23
Dennison 4:18
deposits 10:18
describe 6:12
designated 29:19
details 28:10
determination 29:4
determine 28:24
develop 21:17
developing 22:11
development 22:18
devote 14:14
directed 7:17
disagreement 27:15
discovery 11:6,20 14:14
discretion 28:23
discuss 12:14,19 13:21 14:5 22:20 23:9 30:23
discussing 13:1 19:19 25:15
discussion 11:2 12:13,15 25:22 26:2
disposition 31:3
docket 5:22,24 10:14,23 11:4 15:5 17:9,15 18:9,19 20:24 21:6 22:1,4,8 23:23 26:13 28:15,20,22 29:16
dockets 3:14 10:14,24 11:5 23:24
document 28:5
documents 28:12 30:2
due 22:2,25 29:5

E

earlier 16:15,16 22:17 23:5
easier 11:13
educated 24:11
education 24:5
educational 19:7
effective 5:12
electronic 28:5,12 30:1
electronically 28:9,13,14
email 9:14 12:2,17 15:9 28:16,18,19 29:20,22,25 30:2,12
encourage 29:3
end 8:21 20:8 30:18
endorsed 16:11
energy 3:16,20 4:10,12 5:9 7:18 13:20 15:7 21:14 22:15
enter 28:9
entities 6:20
entity's 8:10
Environment 25:20
Environmental 4:15,18
errata 30:5
erroneous 11:25
essence 27:18
essentially 14:24
established 30:5
evening 5:22
evidentiary 14:15,18 16:5,13,24 18:8 26:21 30:8
examples 21:22 23:22
exception 24:23
exhibit 28:8
exhibits 28:7,8 30:5
expense 10:16
expensive 29:6
explain 27:14
explanation 6:25
external 21:1
externally 13:22 14:5 15:2,4 17:18 18:20 19:8 21:2 22:12 23:17 25:8
extremely 13:15 20:5

F

fact 16:15 20:9 22:7 29:3
factors 6:13
facts 19:20
fairly 24:21 26:21
familiar 20:16
favor 25:21,24
February 27:19
feel 13:19 24:21 25:4
feels 14:20
felt 13:16 14:13
file 5:13 8:14 20:4 28:15
filed 5:21 6:7 8:23 10:13 14:20 20:7 28:5,22 30:2
filing 8:20 14:19 17:23,25 18:13

27:18 28:6,7 29:5,16 30:4

filings 18:8 28:22

finally 22:20

finds 17:2

fine 21:5

firm 15:7

fit 20:25

forward-looking 17:11

frames 16:23

Friday 3:2

front 6:21 8:9

Fukano 3:4,8,9,21,24 4:2,4,7,10,13, 15,19 5:1,3,5,23 6:9,24 7:3,8,10 8:4, 25 9:15,22 10:2 11:9 12:6,23 13:4 14:4,10 15:23 18:25 20:15 21:11 23:7 24:24 25:18,25 27:2,7,25 29:12 30:22

full 22:19

fund 7:22,25

funding 5:11,12,13,15 6:14,16,20, 22 7:15 8:9 23:4

future 17:12

G

general 13:25 15:12,21 19:8,11 20:13 21:7 30:17

generally 22:15 25:3

give 16:14 26:23

giving 14:1

goal 21:17

good 3:8,19 4:17 9:15,22 10:2 12:23

governs 17:12

grant 5:7,9,15 10:8 11:3

GRC 18:20 28:20 29:1

GRCS 19:14

great 20:24

Group 15:7

groups 8:9

guess 6:7 21:2 26:7,8

guidelines 31:2

H

half 15:6

hand 19:2 20:19

hangup 8:19

happened 21:24

Harry 3:4,9

Harry.o.fukano@utc.wa.gov. 28:19 29:23

Hasselman 4:17 5:21 6:11,15 7:17, 23 8:8,13,17 25:19,20

hear 14:7

heard 17:2

hearing 8:18,19 10:8,25 11:3,14,18 12:10 14:16,18 16:5,8,13,24 25:14 26:17,22 27:11 28:8 29:14 30:8,9,25

held 3:3 18:23

helpful 12:13,18,22 15:20 17:2 20:23 25:11

highly 11:23 29:7

hold 15:3,17 17:9 18:19

honest 9:4

Honor 3:22 5:2 7:2,7 11:8 12:16 13:11 16:1 19:3 23:15 25:1 27:16 30:15

Honors 19:24

Hughes 3:12 13:1 28:16 29:21

Hughes' 28:18 29:21

I

idea 24:3

impartial 15:6

important 16:3 26:16

improper 17:15

include 11:18 13:24 14:17 15:6 23:11 27:21

included 11:13 20:1 27:19

including 6:4 7:5 11:16

incorporate 30:9

indexed 13:22 14:6 15:2,4 17:18 18:20 19:8 21:3 22:12 23:17 25:8

individual 4:23 14:3 19:20

informational 15:6 26:8

initial 14:19 16:16 17:3 27:18

initially 12:2

inquire 5:19 6:2

integrity 17:16

intend 15:11 28:6

intended 17:11 19:25 21:16

intending 19:14

intends 5:19 29:15

intent 5:14

interconnection 10:18

interest 6:11 7:22,25 10:16,20 19:12

interested 15:19

interesting 16:10

intervene 4:21 5:8

intervenor 5:13

intervenors 7:11

intervention 4:20,23 5:6

issue 11:11 13:23 15:14,18,25 18:2, 21 25:23 31:1

issued 11:22 12:1 17:18 18:13 19:20 23:2

issues 9:11 13:21 14:5,7 17:3 22:14 23:22 24:8,16,18

J

Jan 4:17

January 27:20,24

JEA 4:16 5:9,19 6:5,15,19 7:6 8:8 10:10

JEA's 6:7 9:16 10:3 22:23,25

Jim 4:18

Joint 4:15,18 25:20

judge 3:4,8,9,12,21,24 4:2,4,7,10,

13,15,19 5:1,3,5,23 6:9,24 7:3,8,10 8:4,25 9:15,22 10:2 11:9 12:6,23 13:1,4 14:4,10 15:23 18:25 20:15 21:11 23:7 24:24 25:18,25 27:2,7,25 28:16,18 29:12,20,21 30:22

July 20:8

jump 23:16

jurisdictional 10:19

jurisdictions 19:9

K

kind 19:22 20:21 22:16

Kroeger 4:13,14 5:9

Kurt 4:14

L

lack 5:6 16:2 23:10

Laura 4:8

law 3:9,11

lead 29:19

learn 18:18

leaves 16:18 18:4

legal 17:10

level 24:4

lift 17:8

lifted 18:24

lifting 18:7

link 28:6

list 28:8,15

listed 6:14

litigated 17:16,22,24,25 18:9,11,18 19:6,16 20:1,13,25 21:9,16 22:5

litigating 15:22

long 26:23

lot 14:2 29:6

M

made 11:7 23:19

main 28:15

maintained 12:3

maintaining 13:7,8

make 8:20 9:11 11:13 13:16 19:14 24:9 26:1,11

makes 22:22

March 10:13 11:22 30:12

matter 3:11 4:21 11:2 18:19 26:3 30:11,23

matters 27:9

meet 6:16

meet all 26:24

meets 6:22

mention 30:16

mentioned 14:4

message 12:25

Microsoft 4:4,6 5:8

Mihaly 4:12

mind 14:23 26:14

misremembering 8:1

missed 7:14

modeling 30:14

modification 13:9 29:17

modifications 13:16

modify 23:12 28:23

moment 29:14

month 16:6

months 16:20 27:18

morning 3:8,19 4:17

Moser 4:3 7:13,20 8:1,6,11,15,22 9:4,20 23:14,15

motion 10:12,13 11:4

move 14:21

moving 22:14

multiple 21:22

mute 12:24

N

names 29:24

Nash 3:22

needed 29:4

neglecting 30:16

network 10:17,18

non-company 15:10,19 19:13 20:3

non-profit 6:17

note 13:14 14:16 16:3 22:15

noted 11:24 27:12

notice 5:14 15:15 19:20,23 26:24 28:16 29:17

Nucor 4:7,9 5:8

number 23:21 24:16

NW 7:18

NWEC 9:9

O

object 21:10 22:7

objected 11:25 23:5

objecting 9:6

objection 4:22,25 5:2,4,7 6:8 7:11, 14 9:16 11:1,16 12:5 23:10 27:4,23 28:25 29:2 30:7

objections 7:5 10:5,22 12:2

occurred 12:15

October 27:4

offline 22:22

one-week 9:17

ongoing 17:14

online 28:5

open 10:19

opportunity 6:3 9:25 13:6 17:22

opposed 22:4 29:11

opposes 21:3 26:18

options 14:1

orally 6:12

order 10:11 11:15,19,23,25 12:3,4,5, 9 23:13 28:10 30:6,10,20 31:1

Oregon 15:8

organization 7:22 8:5,6

organization's 6:23

organizations 6:17 7:14,20

outstanding 13:21

P

paper 28:21 29:1,4,9,16

papers 28:24

part 10:21 11:14,19 18:9

parte 15:15 17:8 18:7,24 19:10,21 26:9

participating 18:12

participation 31:1

participatory 5:11 6:14 23:4

parties 3:6 5:7,13 6:2,3 10:22 11:6, 10,13 12:8,12,14,19 13:1,5,7,13 15:10,19 16:8 17:22 19:13 20:2,3,10 21:8,19 23:1,9,11 24:8 25:11 26:15 27:4,14 28:4,6,13 29:13,18

parties' 14:8

party 4:22 6:19 11:13 14:20 19:13 23:5 25:9 26:1 27:10 28:25 29:19 30:6

party's 19:6

past 6:16 16:23 17:1 21:20 22:2

pay 10:17

people 11:1

Pepple 4:5

performance-based 15:5 21:25

Perkins 3:20

person 21:1,9

perspective 9:21 17:10 21:17

perspectives 6:18

petition 6:13 10:15 22:23 23:1

petitions 4:20,21,23 5:6,7

picks 20:9

place 22:18

plenty 16:12,14

point 15:1 20:8 26:15 30:19

points 23:20

policy 15:5 17:9,10,12,14,15,17 18:1,6,9,13,19,21 20:24 21:6 22:1,4, 8 23:22,23 24:16,18,20 26:13

position 7:1 8:12 17:24 18:22 19:6 21:16 29:13

positions 14:8 17:23,25 24:9 25:15

post-hearing 14:19

posted 5:25

potential 15:15 18:4 19:21 23:10

potentially 12:22

PPAS 22:2

pre-conference 11:14

pre-hearing 3:14 5:10,16 10:11 11:19 23:13 28:10 30:6,10,20

precedent 19:22,24

prefer 13:17,18

preferable 14:2

preferably 26:21

prepare 15:20 16:8 29:7

preparing 14:15

present 3:6 10:24 15:11 21:16

presentation 15:7 19:5,7,11 21:21 22:19

presenting 19:10 24:6

preview 17:22,24

previously 11:25 12:1

printed 29:8

prior 20:12 30:7

prioritized 6:22 8:5,6,10

problem 8:18 13:13 25:5

procedural 11:21 12:12 13:6 17:20 20:8 26:3 27:9,12,13 28:1 31:2

proceed 6:10 12:10

proceeding 3:3 18:18 21:1 30:2

proceedings 11:10 17:16 18:10 23:24 31:5

process 26:23 29:6

Project 4:10,12 5:9 21:14 22:15

proposal 15:11,14 17:7 21:15 22:16

proposals 15:22 17:18 18:17,20 19:14 26:2 28:3

propose 25:10

proposed 12:11 13:9,24 15:25 16:10 19:5 20:6 22:21,24 24:23 26:3,18 27:4,12,13 28:1

proposing 13:23 15:3,19

protective 11:23

provide 17:11 24:4 28:11 29:11

provisions 11:24

PSE 4:25 6:8 9:25 10:13,17 13:8 15:24 18:4 23:24 24:18 26:16 29:2

PSE's 10:13,19 16:7,10,16,20 17:14,24 18:22 24:22

public 3:24 4:1 5:3 7:8,9,22,25 11:24 12:1,5 19:12 25:2,7,16 26:17

PUC 15:8

Puget 3:16,20

pursuant 10:19

pushes 14:24

Q

qualify 9:8,9

question 27:11

quickly 20:20

quo 24:2

R

raise 24:8

raised 12:2 19:1 26:15 30:12

rate 15:12,13 18:20 19:16 20:13 21:7,8 25:23 26:13 30:17

rate-making 22:1

ratepayer 22:3

rates 10:20 15:5
re-evaluated 14:18
reached 30:13
read 9:6
reason 17:5 24:21
reasonable 9:18,20 10:1 14:7 23:8
rebuttal 16:4,8 17:19
recall 9:7
receive 8:13 30:1
received 4:20 5:17 6:16 10:18 12:11
recently 22:1
recess 12:24
recollection 7:23
record 6:11 9:1 10:25 12:19,22 13:2,3 18:8,15 20:1 22:19 31:4
recover 10:20
redacted 29:8
referenced 20:17
referring 8:4
reflect 10:25
reflected 5:10,22
regard 24:2
reiterate 21:15 24:3
related 15:18 26:3
remember 7:24
remembering 8:3
remind 28:4
removed 26:9
renew 30:19
reply 13:24 14:6,12,16,17,22,23 15:1,25 16:2,12,14,16,20 17:2,5 22:17 24:16,19,22 25:4
representation 6:1,21 7:15,21 8:2 9:10
representative 29:20
representatives 29:25
represented 6:18
representing 3:20
request 4:22 5:14,15 6:3,7 7:5 9:8, 17 10:4,6,10,23 11:11 18:23 27:1 29:4 30:19,20
requesting 9:1
requests 5:17 10:16 11:12
required 10:17 28:21 29:10
requirement 11:14,17,19 23:11 28:23 29:1,15
requirements 26:24 28:7
reserve 10:9
reserved 22:17
resolved 30:18
resolves 12:5
respect 12:3 30:13
respectfully 18:22
respective 13:8,9 25:15
respond 14:21 19:4 24:18 26:6
response 9:16 10:3 15:24 17:19,24 20:4,6,21 25:10 26:2 29:13
responses 11:12 27:8
rest 14:13 30:18
results 18:3
return 6:25 22:2
revenue 13:23 14:6 15:2,4 17:18 19:8 21:3 22:13 23:18 25:8,22
review 5:6 6:3 8:12,24 9:1,13,25 16:8 19:8
reviewed 5:5 6:7
reviewing 15:21 19:17
Rob 3:25
round 24:17
rounded 24:20
rule-making 19:18
rule-makings 17:10
rules 8:18 11:6,21 17:11 28:11
ruling 10:9
run 22:9

S

saddled 18:4
schedule 13:13,16,18,25 14:13,14, 22,24 15:1 16:2,7,11,16,17,18,22 17:4,20 20:8,10 22:14,17 24:22 25:3,6 26:21 27:9,14 31:2
schedules 12:12,15 13:6,9,14 16:23 20:6 26:4 27:12 28:2
Section 5:12
secure 30:16
seek 5:19
seeking 5:13 6:20 7:15,21 8:9 9:8,9
seeks 17:8
send 19:23
sense 22:22
sentiments 23:18
separate 7:25 26:13
serve 8:14 28:12,13
service 28:12,15 29:20
set 9:16 10:2 26:20
setting 30:7
shared 11:12
sheets 30:5
Sheree 3:19
shoehorn 17:13
shortly 31:1
Shute 4:11
Sierra 7:18 9:8
significant 12:17
similar 21:24
similarly 22:6,10
simply 17:21
software 30:14
Solutions 7:19
Sommer 4:3 7:13
sooner 26:25
sort 12:15

Sound 3:16,20
speak 15:16
specific 15:11 19:19 25:23
specifically 6:6
spending 13:20 14:2
sponsor 25:22
staff 3:21,23 5:1 7:4 13:8,17,23 14:13 15:3 16:2,17,18 19:1,6 23:19 24:23 29:25 30:12
staff's 14:23 17:7,19 20:21 22:15
start 3:17 6:5
started 26:25
starting 3:17 4:23
state 24:14
stated 15:9 19:13
statement 17:12,18 18:2,6,13,21
statements 17:11
status 24:2
statutory 27:17,22
Steel 4:7,9 5:8
stretching 25:6
strictly 26:8
striking 25:5
Strom 3:19 4:25 6:6 7:2 9:24 16:1 20:23 26:5 27:6,23 29:2
strongly 24:21 25:4
subfund 6:21,23 7:15 8:10 9:10
subject 13:9 28:2,22 29:17
submit 28:7
submitted 22:8
subsequent 11:11
sufficient 23:2
suggestion 20:24
support 15:11 24:15 25:7,17 29:25
supportive 23:17 24:22 25:3
supports 22:15
suspended 28:21
suspending 28:25
suspension 16:15,19,21,25 27:13, 15,24
Sykes 3:25 5:4 7:9 12:4 24:25 25:1

T

takes 29:6
taking 3:17 8:12
talking 21:20
tariff 10:20
TEP 5:18 7:6 10:6,9 23:19
terminology 21:18
terms 16:23 17:3,6 18:8 21:6,20
testimony 14:15 16:5 17:19 18:14 20:4,6 24:9,17 25:10,12,22
things 18:16
third-party 24:6
thought 9:5 23:16 26:10
thoughts 25:23
threatens 17:16
tied 26:13,19
time 3:13 5:20 10:7 12:14 13:4,20 14:2,7,14 16:4,7,13,14,23,24 17:4 23:2,9 29:7,9
timely 29:6
timing 13:14
today 3:14 30:24
topic 15:8 22:3 28:10
totally 25:16
touch 6:13
transmission 10:17,20
Transportation 3:10,16
treatment 10:16
turn 5:11 15:24 18:10 20:20
turning 7:4
Tyler 4:5

U

UE-260005 3:14
UE-260113 10:14,23
UE-260133 11:5
UFC 10:21
UG-260006 3:15
ultimately 18:1,5,12 23:23
understand 13:5 17:7 22:7 25:12
understanding 15:13,21 20:3,12 21:4,18 22:12 23:3 24:6 25:9 26:9 27:6,17 30:13
Understood 29:12
unwieldy 18:8
up-to-date 12:20
updated 5:23
updates 28:15
upgrades 10:19
usual 16:4
UTC 3:3
Utilities 3:10,15

V

verify 27:3
version 11:25
versions 12:11,20 29:8
video 3:2
view 24:1
violate 19:10
voice 7:11

W

WAC 30:4
wait 12:25 18:21
waive 27:21 29:15
wall 17:8 18:8,24 26:9
wanted 6:25 12:1 20:20 24:14 27:21 30:11
Washington 3:10,15 7:19
water 19:16 20:16

web 28:6

Wednesday 9:18

week 22:2 30:7

weeks 16:19 22:16

weight 25:21

Weinberger 4:12

work 13:12

working 14:15

workshop 13:23 14:6 15:3,4,17,25 17:6,9,14,20,21 18:3,4,10,11,23 19:5,21,25 20:16,17 23:17 24:4,23 25:7,14 26:12

worth 13:19

written 28:16

Y

year 19:16 20:11

yesterday 5:21 6:7 8:14

Yochan 4:11

Yochi 21:13

Z

Zakai 4:11 20:19 21:12,13

Zanopolis 4:8

Zoom 3:2,6