## Docket No. UE-151344 - Vol. I

# Frontier Communications Northwest, Inc. v. Puget **Sound Energy**

### August 12, 2015



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

206.287.9066

www.buellrealtime.com

Olympia | 360.534.9066 Spokane | 509.624.3261 National | 800.846.6989

015 AUG 24 AM 8: 33

Certified WRF.L 's Russiness Entern

RECEIVED

email: info@buellrealtime.com

# 7015 AND 24 AND 8: 23

			,	
	Page	1		Page 3
	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON		1	FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:
	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		2	JAMES WILLIAMS Perkins Coie, LLP
	FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS ) NORTHWEST, INC., )		3	1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
	) Complainant, ) Docket No. UE-151344		4	Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 359-8000
	v.		F	jwilliams@perkinscoie.com
	) PUGET SOUND ENERGY, )		5	KAREN BLOOM (by phone)
	) Respondent. )		6	Perkins Cole, LLP
	)			1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
			7	Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 359-8000
	PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I		8	kbloom@perkinscoie.com
	Pages 1-16		9 10	
	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA		11	* * * *
			12 13	
			13	
	2:35 p.m.		15	
	August 12, 2015		16 17	
	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission		18	
	1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504-7250		19 20	
			21	
			22	
	REPORTED BY: ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032		23 24	
			25	
			+	
	Page	2		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES		1	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, AUGUST 12, 2015
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:		2	2:35 P.M.
3			3	
4	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission		4	PROCEEDINGS
5	1300 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 47250		6	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's be on the
6	Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1355		7	record in Docket UE-151344, caption Frontier
7 8	gkopta@utc.wa.gov		8	Communications Northwest, Inc., versus Puget Sound
9	FOR WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:		9	Energy.
10	JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General		10	We are here on August 12th, 2015, for a
11	DAVID GOMEZ Assistant Power Supply Manager		11	prehearing conference.
12	1400 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 40128		12	My name is Gregory Kopta. I'm the Administrative Law Judge who is presiding over this
13	Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186		13 14	proceeding.
14	(360) 664-1240 jcameron@utc.wa.gov		15	And let's begin by taking appearances,
15 16	dgomez@utc.wa.gov		16	beginning with the Complainant.
17	FOR FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS:		17	MR. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.
18	GEORGE BAKER THOMSON, JR. Frontier Communications		18	Good afternoon. George Baker Thomson, I'm
	1800 41st Street		19	an Associate General Counsel with Frontier
	Everett, Washington 98201		20	Communications. With me today is my co-counsel, Román
19	Everett, Washington 98201 (425) 261-5844 george thomson@ftr.com		1 01	Harnándaz from the firm of KRI Cates
	(425) 261-5844 george.thomson@ftr.com ROMÁN D. HERNÁNDEZ		21 22	Hernández, from the firm of K&L Gates.
19 20	(425) 261-5844 george thomson@ftr.com ROMÁN D. HERNÁNDEZ K&L Gates One SW Columbia Street, Suite 1900		21 22 23	JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
19 20 21	(425) 261-5844 george.thomson@ftr.com ROMÁN D. HERNÁNDEZ K&L Gates One SW Columbia Street, Suite 1900 Portland, Oregon 97258 (503) 226-5776		22	
19 20 21 22	(425) 261-5844 george.thomson@ftr.com ROMÁN D. HERNÁNDEZ K&L Gates One SW Columbia Street, Suite 1900 Portland, Oregon 97258		22 23	JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you. And for the Respondent?

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

	Page 5		Page 7
1	of Puget Sound Energy.	1	to receive service, then that would help.
2	JUDGE KOPTA: And for Commission Staff?	2	Discovery: The Commissions's discovery
3	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Jennifer	3	rules are not generally available unless we make them
4	Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant Attorney General.	4	available.
5	MR. WILLIAMS: I should also mention I have	5	Is discovery something that the parties
6	a colleague, Karen Bloom, from Perkins Coie on the	6	believe that they would like to have available?
7	phone.	7	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, on behalf of PSE.
8	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.	8	MR. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor.
9	Is there anyone else who wishes to make an	9	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then the discovery
10	appearance?	10	rules will be made available.
11	Hearing none, Petitions to intervene: 1	11	Protective order: Is there any indication
12	have not received anything, and since there's no one	12	at this point that any of the information that will be
13	else on the phone, I am going to presume that no one is	13	exchanged between the parties or filed with the
14	seeking to intervene, so that's not an issue.	14	Commission is considered confidential?
15	Service: The Commission may decide to have	15	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. At the
16	electronic service only. Would that be something that	16	moment, in the Superior Court matter, the parties have a
17	•	17	discovery dispute over the production of documents that
	the parties would agree to should the Commission decide	18	PSE believes are important for establishing its case.
18	to do that?	10	We met and conferred with opposing counsel
19	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.	1	
20	MR. THOMSON: No objection from Frontier,	20	before this hearing and decided that we are at an
21	your Honor.	21	impasse, which means that PSE will need to file to
22	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Thank you.	22	compel production of this information because Frontier
23	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And no objection	23	disagrees that it should be turned over. So either that
24	from Staff, but at this time I would like to remember	24	issue has to be dealt with by the Superior Court judge
25	to ask for courtesy service for our Admin Staff.	25	or by the Commission.
		20000000000000000000000000000000000000	
	Page 6		Page 8
· 1		1	
1	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other	1	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
2	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this.	2	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information
2 3	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only	2 3	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a
2 3 4	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we	2 3 4	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be
2 3 4 5	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others.	2 3 4 5	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue.
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person	2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the	2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and as well as the other parties, in addition to anybody	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular proceeding for that, so I don't see a need at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and as well as the other parties, in addition to anybody else that you have already listed, then you certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular proceeding for that, so I don't see a need at this point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and as well as the other parties, in addition to anybody else that you have already listed, then you certainly may do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular proceeding for that, so I don't see a need at this point. If it becomes apparent later, we'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and as well as the other parties, in addition to anybody else that you have already listed, then you certainly may do that. We try to get these out expeditiously, so if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular proceeding for that, so I don't see a need at this point. If it becomes apparent later, we'll certainly move for a protective order at that time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that was the other issue about this. If we continue with paper service, we only serve a paper copy to one person for each party, but we also have courtesy electronic service to others. So if you could let me know who that person is because, particularly for the Complainant and the Respondent, you've listed more than one person. So if you'd just let me know who that person is that would get the paper copy for whatever we serve and, I'm assuming, what others we'll serve as well, and then others would just get the electronic copy, then that would help us. Because as part of our part of the prehearing conference order that I will order will have a master service list that will identify who it is that needs to receive the paper copy, and who else also gets electronic copies. So if Staff would make sure and provide us with all of the people who they would like to have, and as well as the other parties, in addition to anybody else that you have already listed, then you certainly may do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. In this case, I'm referring to information that is competitively sensitive. The Commission has a standard order that we will enter if there's going to be that kind of information that is at issue. Do you anticipate that there's any information that PSE would be providing that would be of a competitively-sensitive nature? MR. WILLIAMS: PSE isn't at issue. We provided everything we had without a protective order request. Frontier is suggesting that there's something sensitive or secretive about or privacy-oriented about what we are asking. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I'm not aware of any competitively-sensitive information that we've either sought or divulged in the Superior Court case. And I find the potential remote in this particular proceeding for that, so I don't see a need at this point. If it becomes apparent later, we'll

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 11
1		1	time to look at it. This this this motion is
1 2	order at this point, but leave open the possibility if, down the road, it seems to be would help make sure	2	has potential to dispose of the case, and so I'd like to
3	that we have the information that the Commission needs	3	have a little more time to look at the whole case.
		4	And I think that would given also that
4	to render a decision.	5	it's my understanding that PSE will be filing a
5	I think that leads us to scheduling. We had	6	Cross-Motion for Summary Determination, we're going to
6	a brief discussion off the record before we began.	7	then have a second round two. So this is this is
7	There is still some disagreement in terms of what kind	8	
8	of schedule we need to put together, so we will have further discussions off the record and then come back	9	going to be the place where we do a lot of work on this
9		10	Case.
10	and memorialize them.	10	And in addition, it so happens that I'm going to be going on vacation, and I would appreciate a
11	So at this point we will be off the record.	12	little more time.
12	(Discussion off the record.) JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be back on the record.	12	
13		14	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. From Frontier?
14	After having a very brief discussion off the	14	MR. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.
15	record, there are at least a couple of issues that seem	15	
16	to be needing a resolution before the parties can	17	My client's position is that these cases, although they involve the same facts and some of the
17	discuss scheduling.		• •
18	And I believe the first one is the timing of	18	same tenets of law, are not connected except to the
19	response to the Motion for Summary Determination that	19	extent that we've asked the Superior Court judge in King
20	Frontier has previously filed.	20 21	County to dismiss or stay the case in favor of the
21	So Mr. Williams, I believe this is the issue	21	Commission's primary jurisdiction.
22	that you were discussing off the record, so if you'd	1	Because, perhaps especially because
23	like to, on the record, now give us your position, and	23	Mr. Williams has indicated they intend to file a
24	that will help things along.	24	cross-motion that's also a dispositive motion, we'd like
25	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor.	25	to adhere as much as we can to the procedural rules set
	Page 10	1	
	rage 10		Page 12
1	-	1	-
1	PSE is requesting an extension of time until	1 2	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get
1 2 3	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and	1	-
2	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination.	2	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions.
2	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending	2 3	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection
2 3 4	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to	2 3 4	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more
2 3 4 5	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court.	2 3 4 5	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June,
2 3 4 5 6	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to	2 3 4 5 6	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the
2 3 4 5 6 7	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting	2 3 4 5 6 7	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are supportive of that request?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need to do in the Superior Court, which they started, so we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are supportive of that request? MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, Staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are supportive of that request? MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, Staff would support having a little more time to look at this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need to do in the Superior Court, which they started, so we can pivot and turn our attention to the WUTC quickly and in short order.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are supportive of that request? MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, Staff would support having a little more time to look at this. I don't know that Staff will be taking a position in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need to do in the Superior Court, which they started, so we can pivot and turn our attention to the WUTC quickly and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PSE is requesting an extension of time until September 18th in order to file its Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Determination. We ask for that because Frontier has pending in the King County Superior Court right now a motion to dismiss PSE's complaint that was filed in that court. We PSE is in the process now of drafting and developing opposition materials that will be submitted to that court for determination, and our preference is not to have to fight and file simultaneously in two separate courts at the same time. So the purpose of the extension would be to allow us to finish our work before the Superior Court, and to allow us sufficient time to pivot and turn our attention to responding to the Motion for Summary Determination in this case. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I understand the Staff, you are supportive of that request? MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, Staff would support having a little more time to look at this. I don't know that Staff will be taking a position in this in this matter, or how Staff will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	out by the Commission for such responses. If we can get that resolved, that's fine, but there's no connection between the two motions. And, you know, for a little bit more illustration, PSE has had Frontier's motion in the Superior Court proceeding for since the end of June, I believe. And thus, it's it should be something that they've been proceeding upon already. I don't see a whole lot of linkage between that, except to the extent that the work may largely have been done already with regard to research. And it seems to me they could file in a timely fashion in this proceeding. JUDGE KOPTA: Anything further, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. There's no urgency here. There's no risk of anybody losing anything if there's an extension granted. All we're asking for is the time to finish what we need to do in the Superior Court, which they started, so we can pivot and turn our attention to the WUTC quickly and in short order. JUDGE KOPTA: All right.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13		Page 15
1	conference, so I was a little surprised to receive that	1	MR. THOMSON: And I believe I wrote down
2	motion, and it is a dispositive motion.	2	January 19th for rebuttal, because we may have had a
3	I think given that we are still in the early	3	conflict with Martin Luther King Day.
4	stages of this proceeding, I don't really see any	4	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I have January 19th.
5	prejudice to Frontier by giving PSE some additional	5	JUDGE KOPTA: As the date for filing? What
6	time, as well as Staff, to review the motion and to file	6	day of the week is that?
7	a response and any other motions that they may believe	7	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That would be a
8	are appropriate.	8	MR. WILLIAMS: Tuesday.
9	So I will under the Commission rules, we	9	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Tuesday. Tuesday,
10	are authorized to set a different date than the default	10	January 19th.
11	date that's in our rules, so I will exercise that	11	JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
12	discretion and allow PSE to have until September 18th to	12	Then we will change that to Tuesday,
13	file its response, as well as Staff, should it choose to	13	January 19th, and then the cross-exhibits will be one
14	do so.	14	month later on February 19th.
15	At this point, I won't make any	15	All right. Thank you for the correction.
16	determination in terms of when anybody else needs to	16	And if we have nothing further, then we are
17	file a motion, whatever motion it is. I will leave that	17	adjourned. Thank you.
18	to your discretion to decide when that's appropriate,	18	MR. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.
19	and we will take them up as that happens or doesn't.	19	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor.
20	So with that, I understand that that was one	20	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you,
21	of the road blocks to setting up any further procedural	21	your Honor.
22	deadlines, and if that is all that we need to resolve at	22	(Hearing concluded at 3:03 p.m.)
23	this point, then we can go off the record again and	23	
24	allow the parties to just come up with appropriate dates	24	oOo
25	for testimony and hearing, if that's the way they feel	25	
	Page 14		Page 16
1	is the best way to try and resolve this case.	1	CERTIFICATE
2	All right. Then we will be off the record.	2	
3	Thank you.	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON )
4	(Discussion off the record.)		) ss.
5	JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be back on the record.	4	COUNTY OF KING )
6	The parties have had a discussion about	5	
7	scheduling and have proposed the following:	6	
8	Simultaneous direct testimony on	7	I, ANITA W. SELF, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
9	November 16th;	8	in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify
10	Simultaneous response testimony on	9	that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to
11	December 16th;	10	the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
12	Simultaneous rebuttal testimony on	11 12	and seal this 19th of August, 2015.
13	January 18th;	12	anu sear rins torr or August, 2010.
14	Cross-examination exhibits will be filed on	14	
15	Friday, January 19th;	15	
16	And we will schedule two days for hearing on	16	ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032
17	February 23rd and 24th, and hold in abeyance for the	17	
+ '	moment the date for post-hearing briefing.	18	
18			
18 19	Is that correct?	19	
18 19 20	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you		
18 19 20 21	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you misspoke on the cross-filing of the exhibits date. I	19	
18 19 20 21 22	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you misspoke on the cross-filing of the exhibits date. I believe that's February 19th.	19 20	
18 19 20 21 22 23	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you misspoke on the cross-filing of the exhibits date. I believe that's February 19th. JUDGE KOPTA: If I didn't say February 19th,	19 20 21 22 23	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you misspoke on the cross-filing of the exhibits date. I believe that's February 19th. JUDGE KOPTA: If I didn't say February 19th, that's what I meant to say. February 19th, the Friday	19 20 21 22 23 24	
18 19 20 21 22 23	Is that correct? MR. THOMSON: Your Honor, I think you misspoke on the cross-filing of the exhibits date. I believe that's February 19th. JUDGE KOPTA: If I didn't say February 19th,	19 20 21 22 23	

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

### BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

				Page 17
A	<b>back</b> 9:9,13 14:5	Communications	<b>DAVID</b> 2:11	electronic 5:16 6:5
abeyance 14:17	Baker 2:17 4:18	1:4 2:16,18 4:8,20	day 15:3,6	6:12,17
ability 16:10	began 9:6	compel 7:22	days 14:16	Energy 1:7 3:1 4:9
acceptable 8:24	beginning 4:16	competitively 8:3	deadlines 13:22	5:1
accurate 16:9	<b>behalf</b> 4:25 7:7	competitively-se	dealt 7:24	enter 8:4,25
addition 6:20 11:10	believe 7:6 9:18,21	8:8,17	December 14:11	especially 11:22
additional 13:5	12:7 13:7 14:22	Complainant 1:5	decide 5:15,17	establishing 7:18
adhere 11:25	15:1	4:16 6:7	13:18	Everett 2:19
adjourned 15:17	believes 7:18	complaint 10:6	decided 7:20	<b>Evergreen</b> 1:18 2:5
Admin 5:25	best 14:1 16:10	concluded 15:22	decision 9:4	2:12
Administrative	<b>bit</b> 12:4	conference 1:11	default 13:10	exchanged 7:13
1:13 2:2 4:13	blocks 13:21	4:11 6:14 13:1	determination 9:19	exercise 13:11
afternoon 4:18	<b>Bloom</b> 3:5 5:6	conferred 7:19	10:3,9,16 11:6	exhibits 14:14,21
<b>agree</b> 5:17	<b>Box</b> 2:5,12	confidential 7:14	12:25 13:16	expeditiously 6:23
<b>allow</b> 10:13,14	brief 9:6,14	conflict 15:3	developing 10:8	extension 10:1,12
13:12,24	briefing 14:18	connected 11:18	dgomez@utc.wa	12:18
ANITA 1:23 16:7		connection 12:2	2:15	extent 11:19 12:10
16:16	C	considered 7:14	different 13:10	
anticipate 8:6	<b>C</b> 2:1 4:4 16:1,1	continue 6:3	direct 14:8	<u> </u>
anticipate 8.0 anybody 6:20	Cameron-Rulko	Continued 2:25	disagreement 9:7	<b>F</b> 16:1
12:18 13:16	2:10 5:3,4,23	copies 6:17	disagrees 7:23	facts 11:17
apparent 8:22	10:20 15:4,7,9,20	copy 6:4,10,12,16	discovery 7:2,2,5,9	fashion 12:12
appearance 5:10	caption 4:7	correct 14:19	7:17	<b>favor</b> 11:20
appearances 4:15	case 7:18 8:2,18	correction 15:15	discretion 13:12,18	<b>February</b> 14:17,22
appreciate 10:25	10:16 11:2,3,9,20	counsel 4:19 7:19	discuss 9:17	14:23,24 15:14
11:11	14:1	<b>County</b> 10:5 11:20	discussing 9:22	<b>feel</b> 13:25
appropriate 13:8	cases 11:16	16:4	discussion 9:6,12	<b>fight</b> 10:10
13:18,24	CCR 1:23 16:16	couple 9:15	9:14 14:4,6	<b>file</b> 7:21 10:2,10
asked 11:19	certainly 6:21 8:23	court 7:16,24 8:18	discussions 9:9	11:23 12:12,24
asking 8:14 12:19	Certified 16:7	10:5,6,9,13 11:19	dismiss 10:6 11:20	13:6,13,17
Assistant 2:10,11	certify 16:8	12:6,20	dispose 11:2	<b>filed</b> 7:13 9:20 10:6
5:4	change 15:12	courtesy 5:25 6:5	dispositive 11:24	14:14
Associate 4:19	choose 13:13	<b>courts</b> 10:11	13:2	<b>filing</b> 11:5 15:5
assuming 6:10	<b>client's</b> 11:16	Cross-examination	dispute 7:17	<b>find 8</b> :19
attention 10:15	co-counsel 4:20	14:14	divulged 8:18	<b>fine</b> 12:2
12:21	<b>Coie</b> 3:2,6 4:25 5:6	cross-exhibits	<b>Docket</b> 1:5 4:7	<b>finish</b> 10:13 12:19
Attorney 2:10 5:4	colleague 5:6	15:13	documents 7:17	<b>firm</b> 4:21
August 1:16 4:1,10	Columbia 2:22	cross-filing 14:21	drafting 10:7	<b>first</b> 9:18
16:12	<b>come</b> 9:9 13:24	cross-motion 10:3	<b>Drive</b> 1:18 2:5,12	following 14:7
authorized 13:10	<b>Commission</b> 1:2,17	11:6,24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	foregoing 16:9
available 7:3,4,6,10	2:4,9 5:2,15,17		E	Friday 14:15,24
Avenue 3:3,6	7:14,25 8:3 9:3	D	<b>E</b> 2:1,1 4:4,4 16:1,1	<b>Frontier</b> 1:4 2:16
aware 8:16	12:1 13:9	<b>D</b> 2:21 4:4	<b>e-mail</b> 6:25	2:18 4:7,19 5:20
awaic 0.10	Commission's	date 13:10,11 14:18		7:22 8:12 9:20
B	11:21	14:21 15:5	either 6:24 7:23	10:4 11:14 13:5
	<b>Commissions's</b> 7:2	dates 13:24	8:18	Frontier's 12:5
1	I	1	1	I

Page	1	8
------	---	---

			-	
further 9:9 12:14	impasse 7:21	<b>Kopta</b> 1:13 2:3 4:6	motions 12:3 13:7	pending 10:4
13:21 15:16	important 7:18	4:12,22 5:2,8,22	move 8:23	people 6:19
	indicated 11:23	6:1 7:9 8:1,15,24		<b>Perkins</b> 3:2,6 4:25
G	indication 7:11	9:13 10:17 11:13	<u> </u>	5:6
<b>G</b> 4:4	individuals 6:25	12:14,23 14:5,23	N 2:1 4:4	person 6:4,6,8,9
Gates 2:21 4:21	information 7:12	15:5,11	<b>name</b> 4:12	Petitions 5:11
General 2:10 4:19	7:22 8:2,5,7,17		nature 8:8	<b>phone</b> 3:5 5:7,13
5:4	9:3	L	need 7:21 8:20 9:8	<b>pivot</b> 10:14 12:21
generally 7:3	intend 11:23	largely 12:10	12:19 13:22	place 11:8
George 2:17 4:18	<b>intervene</b> 5:11,14	law 1:13 2:2 4:13	needing 9:16	point 7:12 8:21 9:1
george.thomson	involve 11:17	11:18	<b>needs</b> 6:16 9:3	9:11 13:15,23
2:20	issue 5:14 6:2 7:24	leads 9:5	13:16	Portland 2:22
give 9:23	8:5,9 9:21	leave 6:24 9:1	Northwest 1:4 4:8	position 9:23 10:22
given 11:4 13:3	issues 9:15	13:17	November 14:9	11:16
giving 13:5		let's 4:6,15 9:13		possibility 9:1
gkopta@utc.wa	J	14:5	0	post-hearing 14:18
2:7	<b>J</b> 1:13 2:3	linkage 12:9	04:4	potential 8:19 11:2
<b>go</b> 13:23	<b>James</b> 3:2 4:25	list 6:15	objection 5:20,23	<b>Power</b> 2:11
going 5:13 8:4 11:6	<b>January</b> 14:13,15	listed 6:8,21	Okay 5:8,22 8:1,15	preference 10:10
11:8,11,11	15:2,4,10,13	little 10:21,25 11:3	8:24	prehearing 1:11
<b>GOMEZ</b> 2:11	jcameron@utc.w	11:12 12:4,24	<b>Olympia</b> 1:18 2:6	4:11 6:14 12:25
<b>Good</b> 4:18	2:14	13:1	2:13 4:1	prejudice 13:5
granted 12:18	<b>Jennifer</b> 2:10 5:3	LLP 3:2,6	<b>oOo</b> 4:3 15:24	presiding 4:13
Gregory 1:13 2:3	<b>JR</b> 2:17	look 10:21 11:1,3	open 9:1	presume 5:13
4:12	judge 1:13 2:2 4:6	losing 12:18	opposing 7:19	previously 9:20
	4:13,22 5:2,8,22	lot 11:8 12:9	opposition 10:2,8	primary 11:21
H	6:1 7:9,24 8:1,15	Luther 15:3	order 6:14,14 7:11	privacy-oriented
hand 16:11	8:24 9:13 10:17	M	8:4,10,23 9:1 10:2	8:14
happens 11:10	11:13,19 12:14,23		12:22	procedural 11:25
13:19	14:5,23 15:5,11	Manager 2:11	Oregon 2:22	13:21
hearing 5:11 7:20	<b>June</b> 12:6	Martin 15:3	P	proceeding 4:14
13:25 14:16,25	jurisdiction 11:21	<b>master</b> 6:15	<b>P</b> 2:1,1 4:4	8:20 12:6,8,13
15:22	jwilliams@perki	materials 10:8	<b>p.m</b> 1:15 4:2 15:22	13:4
help 6:12 7:1 9:2,24	3:4	matter 7:16 10:23	<b>P.O</b> 2:5,12	process 10:7
hereunto 16:11	K	means 7:21	Pages 1:12	production 7:17,22
Hernández 2:21		meant 14:24 memorialize 9:10	paper 6:3,4,10,16	proposed 14:7
4:21	K&L 2:21 4:21 Karen 3:5 5:6	memorialize 9:10 mention 5:5	Park 1:18 2:5,12	protective 7:11
hold 14:17 Honor 4:17,24 5:21		mention 5:5 met 7:19	part 6:13,13	8:10,23,25
7:8,15 8:16 9:25	kbloom@perkin 3:8	misspoke 14:21	participating 10:24	provide 6:18
10:20 11:15 12:16	5:8 kind 8:5 9:7	misspoke 14:21 moment 7:16 14:18	particular 8:19	provided 8:10
14:20 15:18,19,21	King 10:5 11:19	moment 7:16 14:18 month 15:14	particularly 6:7	providing 8:7
14.20 13.10,19,21	15:3 16:4	<b>motion</b> 9:19 10:5	parties 5:17 6:20	<b>PSE</b> 7:7,18,21 8:7,9
Ι	<b>know</b> 6:6,9 10:22	10:15 11:1,24	6:25 7:5,13,16	10:1,7 11:5 12:5
identify 6:15	12:4	12:5,24 13:2,2,6	9:16 13:24 14:6	13:5,12
illustration 12:5	knowledge 16:10	12:3,24 13:2,2,0	party 6:4	<b>PSE's</b> 10:6
	Knowieuge 10.10	1.5.17,17		
	1	1	1	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Ρ	age	е 1	9

·				Page 19
<b>Puget</b> 1:7 3:1 4:8	round 11:7	started 12:20	today 4:20 6:24	wishes 5:9
5:1	<b>RPR</b> 1:23 16:16	State 16:3,8	transcript 16:9	WITNESS 16:11
purpose 10:12	rules 7:3,10 11:25	stay 11:20	<b>Transportation</b> 1:2	work 10:13 11:8
put 9:8	13:9,11	Street 2:18,22	1:17 2:4,9	12:10
•		submitted 10:9	<b>true</b> 16:9	wrote 15:1
Q	S	sufficient 10:14	try 6:23 14:1	<b>WUTC</b> 12:21
quickly 12:21	<b>S</b> 2:1 4:4	suggesting 8:12	<b>Tuesday</b> 15:8,9,9	
	schedule 9:8 14:16	<b>Suite</b> 2:22 3:3,6	15:12	X
R	scheduling 9:5,17	Summary 9:19	<b>turn</b> 10:14 12:21	
<b>R</b> 2:1 4:4 16:1	14:7	10:3,15 11:6	turned 7:23	Y
really 13:4	seal 16:12	12:25	<b>two</b> 10:11 11:7 12:3	Z
rebuttal 14:12 15:2	Seattle 3:3,7	Superior 7:16,24	14:16	<b>L</b>
receive 6:16 7:1	second 11:7	8:18 10:5,13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0
13:1	secretive 8:13	11:19 12:6,20	<u> </u>	
received 5:12	see 8:20 12:9 13:4	Supply 2:11	UE-151344 1:5 4:7	1
record 4:7 9:6,9,11	seeking 5:14	support 10:21	understand 10:18	<b>1-16</b> 1:12
9:12,13,15,22,23	<b>SELF</b> 1:23 16:7,16	supportive 10:19	13:20	<b>12</b> 1:16 4:1
13:23 14:2,4,5	<b>send</b> 6:24	<b>sure</b> 6:18 9:2	understanding	<b>1201</b> 3:3,6
referring 8:2	sensitive 8:3,13	surprised 13:1	11:5	12th 4:10
regard 12:11	separate 10:11	<b>SW</b> 2:5,12,22	unusual 12:24	<b>1300</b> 1:18 2:5
remember 5:24	September 10:2		urgency 12:17	<b>1400</b> 2:12
remote 8:19	13:12	<u> </u>	<b>Utilities</b> 1:2,17 2:4	16th 14:9,11
render 9:4	serve 6:4,10,11	<b>T</b> 16:1,1	2:8	1800 2:18
REPORTED 1:23	service 5:15,16,25	take 13:19	<b>v</b>	<b>18th</b> 10:2 13:12
<b>Reporter</b> 16:7	6:3,5,15 7:1	tenets 11:18	$\frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}  1:6}$	14:13
request 8:11 10:19	set 11:25 13:10	terms 9:7 13:16	}	<b>1900</b> 2:22
requesting 10:1	16:11	testimony 13:25	vacation 11:11 versus 4:8	<b>19th</b> 14:15,22,23,24
research 12:11	setting 13:21	14:8,10,12	VOLUME 1:11	15:2,4,10,13,14
<b>resolution</b> 9:16	short 12:22	<b>Thank</b> 4:17,22,24	VOLUME I:II	16:12
resolve 13:22 14:1 resolved 12:2	Shorthand 16:7	5:22 9:25 11:15	W	
	Simultaneous 14:8	14:3 15:15,17,18	W 1:23 16:7,16	$\frac{2}{2}$
<b>Respondent</b> 1:8 4:23 6:8	14:10,12	15:19,20	want 6:25	<b>2:35</b> 1:15 4:2
	simultaneously	things 9:24	Washington 1:1,17	<b>2015</b> 1:16 4:1,10
responding 10:15	10:11	think 9:5 11:4 13:3	1:18 2:4,6,8,13,19	16:12
response 9:19 13:7 13:13 14:10	skill 16:10	14:20	3:3,7 4:1 16:3,8	206 3:4,7
responses 12:1	sought 8:18	<b>Third</b> 3:3,6	way 13:25 14:1	<b>226-5776</b> 2:23
review 13:6	Sound 1:7 3:1 4:8	<b>Thomson</b> 2:17 4:17	we'll 6:11 8:22	<b>23rd</b> 14:17
<b>right</b> 4:6 7:9 10:5	5:1	4:18 5:20 7:8	we're 11:6 12:19	<b>24th</b> 14:17
10:17 11:13 12:23	South 1:18	8:16 11:15 14:20	we've 8:17 11:19	<b>261-5844</b> 2:19
14:2 15:11,15	Southwest 1:18	15:1,18	week 15:6	3
risk 12:17	ss 16:3	time 5:24 8:23 10:1	<b>WHEREOF</b> 16:11	<b>3:03</b> 15:22
road 9:2 13:21	Staff 5:2,24,25 6:18	10:11,14,21 11:1	Williams 3:2 4:24	<b>3032</b> 1:23 16:16
<b>Román</b> 2:21 4:20	10:18,20,22,23	11:3,12 12:19	4:25 5:5,19 7:7,15	<b>359-8000</b> 3:4,7
roman.hernande	13:6,13	13:6	8:9 9:21,25 11:23	<b>360</b> 2:6,13,14
2:23	stages 13:4	timely 12:12	12:15,16 15:8,19	500 2.0,13,14
<i>L.L.J</i>	standard 8:4	timing 9:18		



Page 20	······		 
4 40128 2:12 41st 2:18 425 2:19			
<b>47250</b> 2:5 <b>4900</b> 3:3,6 <u>5</u> <b>503</b> 2:23			
6 664-1186 2:13 664-1240 2:14 664-1355 2:6		r	
7 8 9 97258 2:22			
98101 3:3,7 98201 2:19 98504 2:6,13 98504-7250 1:18			