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1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; APRIL 17, 2020

2 9:30 A.M.

3 --o0o--

4 P R O C E E D I N G S

5

6 JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in

7 Docket -- what is the docket -- TG-200083, captioned In

8 the Matter of Determining the Proper Carrier

9 Classification of Ridwell, Inc.

10 I'm Gregory J. Kopta, the administrative law

11 judge who the Commission has assigned to preside in this

12 proceeding, and we're here today for a prehearing

13 conference.

14 We will begin by taking notices of

15 appearance. I notice that we have written notices of

16 appearances, so all we need is the short form of

17 appearance this morning, and we'll begin with the

18 Company.

19 MR. GOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor. This is

20 Jeffrey Goltz with Cascadia Law Group on behalf of

21 Ridwell.

22 JUDGE KOPTA: And on behalf of Commission

23 Staff?

24 MR. CALLAGHAN: This is Nash Callaghan, AAG,

25 on behalf of Commission Staff. I believe Mr. Perkinson
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1 and Ms. McPherson are also on the line.

2 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Anyone else want

3 to make an appearance? Hearing none, we will proceed

4 with our business for today.

5 First issue is intervention. Is there

6 anyone who wishes to intervene in this -- in this

7 proceeding? Hearing none, we will have just the parties

8 of the Company and Commission Staff.

9 The next issue is discovery. Do the parties

10 want to have the Commission's discovery rules available

11 in this proceeding?

12 MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, this is Jeff Goltz

13 on behalf of the Company. When this was scheduled as a

14 brief adjudicatory proceeding, we -- I had discussions

15 with Mr. Callaghan and understood from that conversation

16 that in -- in the context of a BAP, the discovery rules

17 aren't available. I wasn't positive that was the case,

18 so I filed a -- a fin- -- very finite set of -- of data

19 requests, and I also basically just did those in the

20 form of a public records request, and Mr. Callaghan

21 suggested the latter course.

22 Originally, we were to receive a response of

23 public records request on -- a week ago today. Then a

24 week ago or so, we got an email from the records center,

25 Ms. Wyse, and understandably, it's very difficult to
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1 process these things. And she said that she anticipates

2 now a response by April 24. That is fine with us.

3 I guess I would say that so long as we get

4 that public records request response by April 24th,

5 we're fine. On the other hand, if that's not possible,

6 then I guess I would like the data requests to be

7 resuscitated.

8 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Callaghan?

9 MR. CALLAGHAN: I -- that's right, Your

10 Honor. Staff is in favor of having the discovery rules

11 available. We would also ask given -- well, we have

12 proposed dates that I've discussed with Mr. Goltz that

13 work for both the Company and Staff. I don't know if

14 they will work for ALD. But given the short time

15 period, we would ask that the data requests response

16 time be included in the prehearing conference to seven

17 days if -- if that works for the parties. Our dates

18 that work for Staff and the Company were May 12th and

19 15th, but we would like the discovery rules available.

20 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I will make the

21 discovery rules available. Obviously, I will expect the

22 parties to work out among themselves any issues in terms

23 of data requests. I can put in the prehearing

24 conference order a shortened time period for data

25 request responses if that's what both parties want.
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1 Mr. Goltz, is that acceptable to you?

2 MR. GOLTZ: Well, it depends how short

3 obviously. Just as a little bit of -- stepping back a

4 bit, we were fine with this being a brief adjudicatory

5 proceeding. We didn't request that this be converted.

6 It was converted and that's okay too, but I -- I think

7 we're trying to make this look like a brief adjudicatory

8 proceeding in the sense that we don't think this is a

9 massive litigation effort on either side.

10 Staff has filed a complaint with the

11 investigation report, and I -- I take that -- I may be

12 mistaken, but I take that as effectively the -- the --

13 the case of the -- of the Commission Staff, and we would

14 like to then file our responsive case and then have a --

15 then have a one-day or half-day hearing on it.

16 But as I say, we did want to get some

17 information mainly about some other companies that are

18 either regulated by the Commission or confirmed they're

19 not regulated by the Commission to help us with our

20 case.

21 So if -- you know, I don't know. This is

22 the first I've heard that Commission Staff wants to get

23 more information from Ridwell. They've obviously gotten

24 a lot in the course of the investigation. So it's a --

25 I'm confident Mr. Callaghan and I can work out whatever
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1 issues we have, and if for some reason we can't, we will

2 come back and knock on your door.

3 JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, I have no doubt. I --

4 I -- I guess the question that I have is whether I need

5 to include in the order the shortened time period for

6 data request responses or whether that's something that

7 you will -- the two of you will work out.

8 MR. GOLTZ: Well, a seven-day turnaround

9 time seems fine with me and -- and that would -- now,

10 obviously in part that assumes the rest of the schedule,

11 but I think we can go for that. We were talking about

12 mid May for the -- or the second -- towards the end of

13 the second week of May for a hearing. May 12 or May

14 15th were the dates that -- that Mr. Callaghan

15 suggested, and there were several dates, and those were

16 the two that work best for us.

17 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, for now, I

18 will expect to include in the prehearing conference

19 order a seven-day response -- seven-business-day

20 response to data requests. And since we've been talking

21 about the schedule, let's -- let's talk about it.

22 MR. GOLTZ: Judge Kopta, one more thing on

23 data requests. We have filed data requests. I'm happy

24 to refile them, it just seems like they're already

25 there, and -- and if there's no objection from
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1 Mr. Callaghan, can those just be deemed filed as of

2 today?

3 JUDGE KOPTA: I have no objection to that.

4 I'm not sure that I need to weigh in on that at this

5 point. It seems to me that that's something you can

6 work out with Mr. Callaghan.

7 MR. GOLTZ: Okay.

8 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Mr. Goltz -- sorry.

9 JUDGE KOPTA: Go ahead, Mr. Callaghan.

10 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Mr. Goltz, my

11 understanding was that if the -- that the data requests,

12 if you received the information through the public

13 records request, that -- that essentially you wouldn't

14 be asking for the same information through the data

15 requests. And so I think we can work this out offline,

16 but I --

17 MR. GOLTZ: It was actually the other way

18 around. If we received it from the data requests, we

19 don't need the public records requests, and because

20 there is a tiny bit of information, the substance of

21 which escapes me for the moment, that was in the data

22 request is not the public records request, because I

23 didn't think it -- it was appropriate for a public

24 records request. But it won't -- Your Honor, we will --

25 we'll email and talk offline.
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1 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. That seems to be

2 the best approach is to let you all work that out, and

3 obviously if there are continuing disagreements, I am

4 available to consult.

5 Okay. So then let's go ahead and discuss

6 schedule. You talked about May 12th or 15th for a

7 hearing. You recognize, of course, that that would be a

8 virtual hearing if we have it on those dates, one of

9 those dates?

10 MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, this is Jeff Goltz

11 again. Yes, we understand that. Well, 90 percent -- 95

12 percent positive that's true. I guess we would say that

13 in the chance that there is a -- that the governor's --

14 lifts some of the restrictions and it is possible to

15 have an in-person hearing, that it be an in-person

16 hearing.

17 In lieu of that, we would strongly prefer at

18 least a video hearing of some sort. I thought that when

19 I logged onto Skype this morning, I would see videos of

20 everybody. Apparently, it has that potential. If not,

21 there is other technologies that do, so we would prefer

22 a video proceeding.

23 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. Well, this is -- as I

24 said before we were on the record, this is something the

25 Commission is working through, and I understand. I
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1 mean, my preference as well would be to have this in

2 person. I think it unlikely that that would happen in

3 May, and certainly to the extent possible, I would

4 like -- I would also prefer to have video capability. I

5 believe we do have that, we would just need to work out

6 the logistics.

7 Fortunately, I think this is a small enough

8 group of people that we should be able to do that, but I

9 would need to check with our folks to see how that would

10 happen. I can certainly put in the prehearing

11 conference order a preference for an in-person hearing

12 and a preference for video, but, you know, as I say, it

13 will depend on our capabilities. There are bandwidth

14 concerns that we have considering how many people would

15 be involved, so these are all things that we would have

16 to work out.

17 MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, this is Jeff Goltz

18 again. I'm sorry to -- to weigh in yet more on this

19 issue, but -- but I -- I do know, our firm does have a

20 Zoom account and has been doing Zoom meetings with a

21 number of people, up to 15 or 20, that I've been on. I

22 have also done personal Zoom meetings with -- with a

23 home account with way more than that and without any

24 noticeable glitches. So -- and I -- I've heard that

25 Zoom is not favored by the State of Washington for some
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1 reason, but that is an -- if that's an option, we'd be

2 happy to -- to -- to provide the technology for that.

3 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, thank you. I -- I

4 personally have had some experience with Zoom; although

5 as you suggest, I think the Commission's preference

6 would be to use the UTC Skype, and I believe we can work

7 things out. We appreciate the offer, but at this point,

8 I think if we were going to do it -- I mean, if we need

9 to do it virtually, then I think we want to use the

10 Skype account that we have for the Commission. And

11 we'll just confirm that we can do that, but I -- I'm

12 relatively confident that we can.

13 So if we have a hearing on the 12th or the

14 15th, what other deadlines do we need to have in the

15 schedule? I'm assuming testimony?

16 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yeah -- this is Nash

17 Callaghan, Your Honor. My experience is that usually a

18 week before the hearing is scheduled, the parties will

19 file a witness list, exhibits, and exhibit lists.

20 Mr. Goltz and I spoke previously, and we both agreed

21 that in addition to the exhibit list, that we would send

22 the actual exhibits at that time. I think that would

23 still be Staff's preference.

24 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. There was some

25 discussion, I thought, about prefiled testimony. Is
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1 that no longer something that the parties are

2 requesting?

3 MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, this is Jeff Goltz.

4 No, I -- I think what I -- what I would envision -- now,

5 it's a little bit based on trust here. I'm envisioning

6 that -- that the -- that -- in fact, we've already seen

7 the Staff case with the investigation report. If I'm

8 wrong on that and there's going to be a flood of -- of

9 additional evidence besides that, then -- then I think

10 we ought to see that ahead of time and then we can

11 respond to it.

12 And I -- my preference would be that -- that

13 we would file our response -- our -- our case a -- on a

14 week before the hearing, and if -- and if the Commission

15 Staff has more than what they've already put on the

16 table, if they would file that at least a week

17 beforehand and preferably before that so we can at least

18 respond to it. And then we make everybody available for

19 cross-examination, possibly redirect-examination on the

20 hearing date, and then of course examination from the

21 administrative law judge.

22 JUDGE KOPTA: And by your case, do you mean

23 prefiled testimony or simply exhibits and a witness list

24 with a brief summary of what each of your witnesses

25 intends to testify to?
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1 MR. GOLTZ: Well, I -- I think I'm -- I'm

2 fine if -- if we have it both ways, that we would have

3 prefiled testimony and exhibits. So that would be

4 somewhat of a variant from the -- the brief adjudicatory

5 proceeding, but that's the way that we were headed even

6 if we had a brief adjudicatory proceeding.

7 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, I -- you know,

8 we're kind of thinking this up procedurally as we go,

9 which is fine, but I just want to know what to expect I

10 guess is my concern.

11 MR. CALLAGHAN: And this is Nash Callaghan.

12 I would -- I -- I agree with Mr. Goltz. Staff doesn't

13 have a current intention of submitting any prefiled

14 testimony. If that changes, it would certainly be

15 narrow and most likely based on any -- the responses we

16 received from data requests, but we don't have a current

17 intention of writing any prefiled testimony. The

18 investigation report and the complaint filed is mostly

19 what we would be relying on.

20 So I would be in agreement with -- with

21 having the prefiled testimony due a week before the

22 hearing.

23 MR. GOLTZ: And can -- this is Jeff Goltz

24 again. Is it possible to have -- if Staff does decide

25 to file more than that, have that at least a few days
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1 before ours?

2 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Callaghan, is that

3 acceptable to you?

4 MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, I would have no

5 objection to that.

6 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, that sounds

7 like a rather simple schedule, then.

8 MR. GOLTZ: Judge Kopta, this is Jeff Goltz

9 again. One more thing that I would like to build in,

10 and I don't think this would be a burdensome thing, is

11 to have a time set for a settlement conference with the

12 parties. Obviously that would be telephonic or Skype,

13 and just to give the Staff one opportunity to perhaps --

14 that perhaps may result in either hearing the issues or,

15 you know, in the best of all possible worlds some sort

16 of agreement.

17 JUDGE KOPTA: And that's a good reminder,

18 Mr. Goltz. The Commission in these -- in any kind of

19 adjudication customarily, if not obligatorily, if that's

20 a word, includes a settlement conference date in the

21 schedule. Obviously we're dealing with a little bit

22 different kinds of circumstance here than we do in the

23 normal adjudication, but I think it makes sense to

24 include a settlement conference date so that the parties

25 have an opportunity to discuss whether it is possible to
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1 settle this short of a hearing.

2 Do you have a proposed date for a

3 settlement?

4 MR. GOLTZ: I -- I -- this is Jeff Goltz

5 again. I -- I have a proposed -- there's one conflict.

6 April 30th is the one date we could not do it. I would

7 suggest it be working backwards prior to the filing

8 of -- of testimony, just in case we'd actually come to

9 an agreement, it's possible to adapt at that point. So

10 I -- so I think, you know, obviously we're in [sic] the

11 hearing date yet, so I would look back and have it, you

12 know, a week or so before the -- before the filing of

13 testimony. So if the testimony was going to be May 5 or

14 so, I would move it back to the last week in April.

15 Again, as I say, the -- but not April 30th. But that's

16 coming right up, but...

17 JUDGE KOPTA: Right, that is the concern. I

18 have no problem with saying, you know, a settlement

19 conference sometime during the week of April 27th, for

20 example, and allowing you all to -- to actually

21 determine what the -- what the date is. It would just

22 be a placeholder in the schedule to remind the parties

23 that there is that obligation. Would that be

24 acceptable?

25 MR. GOLTZ: That's fine with me. This is
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1 Jeff Goltz.

2 MR. CALLAGHAN: I -- so, Your Honor, this is

3 Nash Callaghan. I had not anticipated a settlement

4 conference, and this actually brings up a good point

5 that I wanted to clarify, that this hearing is still

6 just as to the classification of Ridwell. And that we

7 had initially discussed with ALD and with the previous

8 attorney, Jay Derr, that the best way to proceed forward

9 with this case would be to have a classification hearing

10 and then deal with the applications for certificate and

11 the other requests for exemption that was in Ridwell's

12 petition after that hearing. Because depending on how

13 the classification hearing went, answering those

14 questions may not be necessary.

15 And because the hearing is with respect to

16 classification, assuming that that's still the case,

17 Staff -- I don't see a whole lot of room for -- for

18 reaching a settlement with respect to interpreting the

19 Commission's -- whether or not the Commission has

20 jurisdiction over the Company. Staff is certainly

21 willing to and wants to have a settlement conference

22 after the classification hearing to discuss issues

23 within the application and the exemption. We're

24 certainly willing to have a meeting to discuss those

25 issues with the Company, but I just don't see a lot of
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1 room for potential settlement in terms of the

2 classification of the Company.

3 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Goltz?

4 MR. GOLTZ: Yeah, yeah, Your Honor, this is

5 Jeff Goltz. If that's true, it will be a very brief

6 settlement conference. So I don't think it's very

7 burdensome to have, but -- but I -- and Mr. Callaghan is

8 correct, that -- and I wanted to confirm this. The

9 Company -- although I was not involved in the filing of

10 them, the Company has filed alternate applications for a

11 common carrier permit, waste permit, and a petition for

12 the exemptions for various rules associated with those,

13 and a petition that was designed to -- to get at what is

14 the proper classification of that.

15 And -- and this -- I mean, this

16 classification proceeding that was commenced by

17 Commission Staff to basically be the first step -- one

18 step of that while the Company's pending applications

19 are on -- on hold. But they are there, and -- and --

20 and I would view that a -- it -- it is true that what's

21 before us right now is simply our -- is Ridwell -- does

22 it need to be regulated under RCW 81.77.

23 But it may be that the concerns of the

24 Commission Staff with regard to Ridwell's operations can

25 be accommodated under 81.80, thereby eliminating the
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1 need for this. But that's just one possibility, and --

2 and obviously I don't know everything that the

3 Commission Staff -- I think I know everything Commission

4 Staff has in mind because it's in the -- the

5 investigation report. I'm not sure they know everything

6 that we have in mind. We can talk about some of that,

7 and maybe we'll come to some sort of an accommodation or

8 further stipulation of facts or something else. So I --

9 I think it's at least worth a conference call.

10 JUDGE KOPTA: I -- I agree, Mr. Goltz, and

11 the Commission strongly encourages the parties to have

12 discussions to see what can be resolved. It may be that

13 you can't resolve the whole case, but there are some

14 other issues or stipulations that the parties can agree

15 to that will shorten this or at least streamline the

16 hearing, particularly given that we are making this up

17 as we go.

18 So I will include in the prehearing

19 conference order a general date for settlement. It

20 would be during the week of April 27th, and I will leave

21 it to the parties to set whatever date and time makes

22 the most sense for them to have that conversation. My

23 preference would be to have the hearing on May 12th. So

24 if we had a hearing on May 12th, then exhibits and any

25 prefiled testimony from the Company would be due on May
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1 5th, and if we're going to have any prefiled testimony

2 from Staff in advance of that, what date shall we say,

3 April 30th?

4 Mr. Callaghan --

5 MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, I believe that

6 would -- that would work.

7 JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Goltz?

8 MR. GOLTZ: That's fine with me. And I may

9 add to that, if -- if all that Commission Staff wants to

10 do is say we're resting on the investigation report and

11 the complaint, I -- I don't feel the need that they have

12 to kind of convert that into some sort of formal

13 testimony. Or if they wanted to just have the

14 investigation report and they want to add a couple of

15 documents as exhibits, I'm fine with that too.

16 As I say, you know, I wasn't -- we weren't

17 opposed to a brief adjudicatory proceeding and the

18 informality that it brings, but -- we're beyond that,

19 but we kind of want to make this look somewhat like that

20 providing various protections.

21 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, I will put

22 something in the schedule that acknowledges that if

23 there's substantial prefiled testimony from Staff, that

24 it would need to be filed by April 30th, otherwise both

25 parties will file their respective documents on May 5th.
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1 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I think that takes

3 care of everything. Is there anything further that we

4 need to discuss at this point?

5 MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, one -- one more

6 thing. I -- I guess maybe this is something that you

7 would normally -- we normally do at the hearing. I know

8 it is in a lot of past cases, but we would like the

9 opportunity -- and, again, in relatively short order

10 after the hearing to file a brief on this, and if -- if

11 so, on the week or two after the hearing to file

12 concurrent briefs.

13 JUDGE KOPTA: I would be fine with having

14 post-hearing briefs filed. We can schedule that now or

15 we can schedule them at the hearing. I don't have a

16 strong preference.

17 Mr. Callaghan, do -- do you have a druther?

18 MR. CALLAGHAN: So, Your Honor, I would

19 prefer that -- that ALD decide after the hearing

20 whether -- whether post-hearing briefs -- whether they

21 would like post-hearing briefs and schedule them at that

22 point.

23 JUDGE KOPTA: Is that fine with you,

24 Mr. Goltz?

25 MR. GOLTZ: Well, I -- I think it's fine to
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1 schedule them at the hearing, but I think the variable

2 there is, you know, I like to think the vast vault of

3 the evidence will be in written form submitted prior to

4 the hearing, whether it be investigation report, whether

5 it be actual exhibits, whether it be our -- our prefiled

6 direct testimony with exhibits.

7 So writing a brief based on that would be

8 relative -- so we would not have to wait for a

9 transcript is what I'm saying. If, however, the hearing

10 is -- morphs into a long, you know, set of examination,

11 cross-examination so there is a substantial transcript,

12 then that would suggest a longer time in order to write

13 a brief. But I think the question of whether there

14 should be a brief or not I think is important to us

15 to -- to be able to make those arguments, because a lot

16 of them are going to be legal arguments and then some

17 discussion of how the facts fit into that.

18 And -- and frankly, I think it's -- would

19 help the Commission more to have those succinctly

20 written, in written form, rather than have to rely on a

21 bunch of just facts in the record.

22 JUDGE KOPTA: I take your point, and

23 ultimately I think what I'm looking for is whatever is

24 going to help me and the Commission make a determination

25 in this case. And that's something that I'm not going
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1 to be able to know until we are at or just at the end of

2 the hearing. So I will reserve at this point

3 post-hearing briefing both whether and when for the

4 hearing, and I will also note in the prehearing

5 conference order.

6 Anything else? All right. Then hearing

7 nothing more, I believe that we have resolved all of the

8 issues, at least at this point, and we are adjourned.

9 (Adjourned at 10:04 a.m.)
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