In the Matter of the Petition of the Centurylink Companies

Docket UT-130477 - Vol. VI

November 1, 2023



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 www.buellrealtime.com email: audio@buellrealtime.com



Docket UT-130477 - Vol. VI - 11/1/2023

Page 24	Page 26
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1 November 1, 2023 - 1:30 p.m.
In the Matter of the Petition of)	2 -000- 3
THE CENTURYLINK COMPANIES -) QWEST CORPORATION;)	4 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's be on the
CENTURYTEL OF WASHINGTON;) CENTURYTEL OF INTERISLAND;)	5 record. 6 Good afternoon. We are here in Docket
CENTURYTEL OF COWICHE;) Docket No. UT-130477 AND UNITED TELEPHONE COMPANY OF)	7 UTC-130477, captioned In the Matter of the Petition of
THE NORTHWEST) vs.)	 8 the CenturyLink Companies to Be Regulated Under an 9 Alternative Form of Regulation.
) To be Regulated Under an ()	10 I'm Gregory J. Kopta, the presiding
Alternative Form of Regulation) Pursuant to RCW 80.36.135)	11 administrative law judge. And we are here this afternoon
)	 12 on November 1, 2023, for a status/prehearing conference 13 on the status of negotiations between the parties on
STATUS CONFERENCE - VOLUME VI	 13 on the status of negotiations between the parties on 14 either a negotiated competitive classification petition
PAGES 24-41	15 for CenturyLink or a revised alternative form of
BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE	16 regulation. This was something that the commission
GREGORY J. KOPTA	17required scheduling in Order 10 in this docket.18So we will begin by taking appearances,
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	19 starting with the company.
621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, Washington 98504	20 You're on mute, Mr. Sherr.
	 ATTORNEY SHERR: Let's try that again. Good afternoon. Adam Sherr on behalf (inaudible).
	23 JUDGE KOPTA: Thank you.
DATE TAKEN: November 1, 2023 TRANSCRIBED BY: ELIZABETH PATTERSON HARVEY,	And for commission staff.
FAPR, RPR, WA CCR 2731	25 ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good afternoon, Judge
Page 25	Page 27
1 APPEARANCES : 2	1 Kopta. Jeff Roberson, AAG.
FOR CENTURYLINK:	2 With me is my colleague, Cassandra Jones. 3 JUDGE KOPTA: And for public counsel.
Adam Sherr 4 adam.sherr@lumen.com	 JUDGE KOPTA: And for public counsel. ATTORNEY PAISNER: Good afternoon. This is
Lumen Technology Inc. 5 120 Lenora Street	5 Ann Paisner, assistant attorney general of the public
5th Floor 6 Seattle, Washington 98121 206.398.2507	6 counsel unit of the attorney general's office.
7 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Any other appearances?
9 Jeff Roberson jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov	9 Hearing none
10 Cassandra Jones cassandra.jones@atg.wa.gov	10 ATTORNEY MEDLYN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I'm 11 sorry for my voice. Emily Medlyn on behalf of the
11 Attorney General of Washington 7141 Cleanwater Drive SW	
12 PO Box 40145 Olympia, Washington 98504-0145	12 Department of Defense and all other federal executive 13 agencies.
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you.
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you.
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the status of negotiations between the parties. And why don't we begin with Mr. Sherr.
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15 Ann Paisner 16 ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington 17 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 18 206.464.7740	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the status of negotiations between the parties. And why don't we begin with Mr. Sherr. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you, your Honor. Yes,
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15 Ann Paisner 16 ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington 17 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 18 206.464.7740 19 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OTHER FEDERAL 20 EXECUTIVE AGENCIES:	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the status of negotiations between the parties. And why don't we begin with Mr. Sherr.
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15 Ann Paisner 16 ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington 17 800 Fifh Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 18 206.464.7740 19 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OTHER FEDERAL 20 EXECUTIVE AGENCIES: 21 Emily W. Medlyn emily.w.medlyn.civ@army.mil	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the status of negotiations between the parties. And why don't we begin with Mr. Sherr. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you, your Honor. Yes, Adam Sherr. So the status is that we provided a proposal
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 3 360.586.2466 4 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 5 Ann Paisner 16 ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington 17 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 18 206.464.7740 9 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OTHER FEDERAL 20 EXECUTIVE AGENCIES: 21 Emily W. Medlyn emily.w.medlyn.civ@army.mil 22 U. S. Army Legal Services Agency Regulatory Law ELD Division	12Department of Defense and all other federal executive13agencies.14JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you.15All right. I think that's it. So let's get16to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the17status of negotiations between the parties. And why18don't we begin with Mr. Sherr.19ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you, your Honor. Yes,20Adam Sherr. So the status is that we provided a proposal21to the parties in May. We had one meeting with22(inaudible) staff and had to answer a number of23(inaudible) informal data requests
Olympia, Washington 98504-0145 13 360.586.2466 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15 Ann Paisner 16 ann.paisner@atg.wa.gov Attorney General of Washington Attorney General of Washington 17 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 Seattle, Washington 98104 18 206.464.7740 19 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND OTHER FEDERAL 20 EXECUTIVE AGENCIES: 21 Emily W. Medlyn. emily.w.medlyn.civ@army.mil 22 U. S. Army Legal Services Agency	 Department of Defense and all other federal executive agencies. JUDGE KOPTA: Great. Thank you. All right. I think that's it. So let's get to the heart of the matter and hear what exactly is the status of negotiations between the parties. And why don't we begin with Mr. Sherr. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you, your Honor. Yes, Adam Sherr. So the status is that we provided a proposal to the parties in May. We had one meeting with (inaudible) staff and had to answer a number of

1 (Pages 24 to 27)

Docket UT-130477 - Vol. VI - 11/1/2023

	Page 28		Page 30
1	to have a hard time transcribing this. So would you	1	responses we received yesterday at close to 5:00 p.m.
2	start all over again and make it a little clearer.	2	for questions that we asked in early September. So for
3	ATTORNEY SHERR: Is this clearer?	3	our part, we're still trying to understand some of the
4	JUDGE KOPTA: That's better.	4	proposal, which is not public, because it hasn't been
5	ATTORNEY SHERR: I apologize. I'm not a	5	filed.
6	technological expert, that is for sure. I will try to	6	So we can't go into detail any more than that,
7	enunciate.	7	just that we still have questions. We haven't really
8	So we had provided a proposal to staff and	8	made any progress since we last spoke with you at the
9	public counsel in May. We have had one meeting with	9	last prehearing conference.
10	them, with staff and public counsel. I don't have the	10	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Has DOD-FEA been involved
11	date of that meeting. It was in the summer. And we have	11	in those discussions?
12	answered many informal data requests that have been	12	ATTORNEY MEDLYN: Your Honor, no, we have not
13	provided by staff and by public counsel.	13	been, to my understanding, and we would like to request
14	And we are awaiting a proposal from either	14	that, you know, we'd like to be involved going forward.
15	(inaudible) and have not received (inaudible). So that	15	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I'm sure that
16	is where we sit at this point.	16	Mr. Sherr is taking notes.
17	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Staff?	17	ATTORNEY SHERR: Indeed.
18	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good afternoon, Judge	18	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. It sounds like
19	Kopta. That's an accurate summary. The company provided	19	there's not a whole lot of progress that's being made.
20	a proposal in May. We had at least one meeting over the	20	And so I'm wondering what the parties' prospect is that
21	summer to discuss certain things. The parties have	21	there will be a filing by mid-January as the commission
22	engaged in back and forth discovery.	22	anticipated in Order 10. Mr. Sherr?
23	I believe at the last status conference, the	23	ATTORNEY SHERR: Yeah. We kind of
24	prehearing conference, I mentioned that a big issue for	24	confirming what you've heard, we're still, you know,
25	staff was getting access to the FCC broadband's data, the	25	awaiting a proposal. The company is intending to make a
	Page 29		Page 31
1	fabric data for broadband penetration. That contract	1	filing probably, given what are the status of things, is
2	took longer than probably it should have, given the	2	going to (inaudible). And it may not wait we probably
3	intricacies of the Public Records Act in Washington.	3	won't wait until January (inaudible).
4	We've ironed out those issues.	4	JUDGE KOPTA: You probably won't wait until
5	I know I believe the contract has been	5	what?
6	executed. I believe payment has been made and staff has	6	ATTORNEY JONES: I apologize, your Honor. We
7	access to the broadband data. They're engaging in their	7	probably won't wait until January. We may do it sooner.
8	analysis. They're working on a counterproposal at this	8	If there doesn't if there's not a lot of progress made
9	time.	9	towards a resolution, a negotiated resolution, then we'll
10	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. And public counsel?	10	simply move forward.
11	ATTORNEY PAISNER: Thank you, your Honor. So	11	And we don't have any incentive to wait as
12	we're engaged in an informal discovery process here,	12	long as possible. To wait until January that doesn't do
13	since there's no filing. And the premise of this	13	any good for anyone if it doesn't appear that we're going
14	extension of the AFOR is on something that has not been	14	to get anywhere. And again, I haven't even received a
15	filed and is therefore theoretical.	15	counterproposal at this point after five-plus months.
15 16	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And	16	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an
15 16 17	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered	16 17	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission
15 16 17 18	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only	16 17 18	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could
15 16 17 18 19	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after	16 17 18 19	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws
15 16 17 18 19 20	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response	16 17 18 19 20	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response period had passed, long passed, actually.	16 17 18 19 20 21	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations. That's what we've been aiming for the whole time. So if
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response period had passed, long passed, actually. And every time that we've issued questions,	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations. That's what we've been aiming for the whole time. So if that happens, that's great. And we'll act accordingly.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response period had passed, long passed, actually. And every time that we've issued questions, it's taken following up at least once and usually twice	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations. That's what we've been aiming for the whole time. So if that happens, that's great. And we'll act accordingly. If we don't see a possibility of progress, then we'll
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response period had passed, long passed, actually. And every time that we've issued questions, it's taken following up at least once and usually twice to get those answers.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations. That's what we've been aiming for the whole time. So if that happens, that's great. And we'll act accordingly. If we don't see a possibility of progress, then we'll simply move forward.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	filed and is therefore theoretical. And we've asked a number of questions. And while CenturyLink is saying that they have answered everything, the last few questions we asked, we only received a response yesterday, and that was after following up twice after the typical ten-day response period had passed, long passed, actually. And every time that we've issued questions, it's taken following up at least once and usually twice	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, you know, we're on track to prepare an appropriate petition and file it with the commission sooner than January if we can do that. Now, that could be affected if we receive a proposal that kind of draws us to the table and there are active negotiations. That's what we've been aiming for the whole time. So if that happens, that's great. And we'll act accordingly. If we don't see a possibility of progress, then we'll

2 (Pages 28 to 31)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

· ·	Page 32		Page 34
-			_
1	obviously the commission established that January date	1	Mr. Roberson, anything for staff further?
2	with the concern that there needs to be something done in	2	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: No. I think staff has
3	the AFOR docket if there isn't a petition in July. And	3	been clear that if the company needs to file, then the
4			company needs to file, you know. We'll deal with
5	for competitive classification shortly before the AFOR	5	whatever happens when it happens.
6	expires or is due to expire, and we are back in the mode	6	JUDGE KOPTA: All right.
7	of having to push things off once again.	7	MS. ROTH: Hey, Jeff, this is Jing, Jing
8	So it sounds to me correct me if I'm wrong	8	Roth.
9	that the company is sensitive to that and plans to	9	Your Honor, may I be heard?
10	make a filing on or before January of next year.	10	JUDGE KOPTA: Certainly, Ms. Roth.
11	ATTORNEY SHERR: Absolutely. We heard you	11	MS. ROTH: So I just want to emphasize one
12	loud and clear. So yes. We're not planning to come in	12	thing on the record. It is the staff's understanding
13	and ask for another extension. We are going to do it in	13	that CenturyLink is not willing to negotiate a new
14	January, but likely before, unless, again, there's	14	version of AFOR, a new formal AFOR. So as far as I'm
15	something that moves to us a position where it seems like	15	concerned, that is off the table.
16	we should use more time to negotiate.	16	So we're in the AFOR docket here for the
17	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Well, and then	17	hearing. They are not waiting to negotiate a new form of
18	ATTORNEY SHERR: (inaudible) so we'll see	18	AFOR. I want to be that on the record for the company
19	what happens.	19	to confirm. And that's all have I to say.
20	JUDGE KOPTA: And if there is something that	20	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Mr. Sherr, is that
21	comes up, we may schedule another prehearing/status	21	an accurate characterization of the company's position?
22	conference if we haven't heard anything from you by early	22	ATTORNEY SHERR: I'm not sure I understand
23	January, just to see where things are. But for now, I	23	(inaudible) to be honest.
24	think we will just wait and see what the company does.	24	THE ARBITRATOR: Well, my understanding of
25	Anything further on that from staff or public	25	what Ms. Roth says is that the company is not willing to
	Page 33		Page 35
1	Page 33	1	
1 2	counsel?	1 2	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on
	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is		negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that
2	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a	2	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you,
2 3	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we	2 3	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying.
2 3 4	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings	2 3 4	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you,
2 3 4 5	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it	2 3 4 5	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a	2 3 4 5 6	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that that will be an issue in terms of scheduling, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this planet who thinks that's appropriate for Qwest at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that that will be an issue in terms of scheduling, and something I would hope that the parties would discuss	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this planet who thinks that's appropriate for Qwest at this time. I guess I shouldn't speak for other people. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that that will be an issue in terms of scheduling, and something I would hope that the parties would discuss before the prehearing conference so that we can move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this planet who thinks that's appropriate for Qwest at this time. I guess I shouldn't speak for other people. I don't believe that that's appropriate to (inaudible)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that that will be an issue in terms of scheduling, and something I would hope that the parties would discuss before the prehearing conference so that we can move expeditiously in establishing a schedule. But as you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this planet who thinks that's appropriate for Qwest at this time. I guess I shouldn't speak for other people. I don't believe that that's appropriate to (inaudible) CenturyLink pursuant to the rate (inaudible).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	counsel? ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, your Honor. This is Ann Paisner for public counsel. You know, if there's a filing of a request for competitive classification, we would really like to see some public comment hearings scheduled once that happens. I just wanted to discuss it here. I know there's no filing, so we can't make a request for that. But I know there are five service territories for you know, the five companies, each have a service territory. And, you know, we would hope to see a couple for the largest one, Qwest, and then one in each of the others. So I guess I wanted to sort of forecast that that's something we're interested in to get customer input on the record. JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Well, that's good to know. And I'm expecting that when we have a prehearing conference on any filing that CenturyLink makes, that that will be an issue in terms of scheduling, and something I would hope that the parties would discuss before the prehearing conference so that we can move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	negotiate a new AFOR, but instead is focused entirely on a petition for competitive classification. Is that MS. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you, your Honor. That's what I'm saying. ATTORNEY SHERR: Okay. MS. ROTH: I want to be on confirm on the record. ATTORNEY SHERR: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying. Thanks for the question, and thanks for clarifying the question. It is our intention to seek competitive classification. That is correct. I will let you know that I am also trying to consider whether we need to simultaneously seek an AFOR as some sort of fallback, because if we petition if we let the AFOR simply wither and disappear and we seek competitive classification, and for some reason it's denied or it's conditioned in a way that's unacceptable to the company, then we are sitting in rate return regulation. And I don't believe there's anyone on this planet who thinks that's appropriate for Qwest at this time. I guess I shouldn't speak for other people. I don't believe that that's appropriate to (inaudible)

3 (Pages 32 to 35)

	Page 36	Dage 28
		Page 38
1	other process that is connected to this to ensure that we	1 JUDGE KOPTA: The original order was that
2	don't end up where nobody wants us to be.	2 there would be some discussion and/or negotiation about a
3	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you,	3 revised form of AFOR that would then be reflected in
4	Mr. Sherr.	4 whatever the company files in July.
5	Ms. Roth, I believe the answer to your	5 So I'm assuming that if the AFOR is still on
6	question is that a new AFOR is not off the table. And I	6 the table, which it is, according to the company, that
7	assume that staff and the company and the other parties	7 there will be discussions between staff and the company
8	will be addressing that possibility as part of the	8 in terms of what that filing will look like.
9	discussions that they are having on an ongoing basis. Ms. Paisner, did you have something	9 So above and beyond that, I am not prepared
10	-	10 to have a discussion about that particular filing. I
11	further?	11 will discuss process, but not substance. So
12	ATTORNEY PAISNER: Yes, thank you, your	12 ATTORNEY SHERR: Judge Kopta, can I make
13	Honor. I guess I just wanted to circle back, because I	13 another comment?
14 15	as though the company has given the impression that they've been sitting back waiting for us to make a	14 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, Mr. Sherr.
	proposal when for almost the last month, we had pending	15 ATTORNEY SHERR: I am certainly not intending
16 17	data requests that weren't responded to.	16 to impugn staff or public counsel in terms of the
	And I feel like it's been we've been	17 process. I understand I mean, I think both are
18 19	dealing with some chronic unresponsiveness from the	18 working very diligently to obtain the information that
20	company when we ask questions. We've had to ask the same	19 they think they need. 20 I don't know staff has indicated that a
20	questions multiple times.	
21	So I just wanted to clarify that it's not for	21 proposal will come at some point. 22 I have not heard that from public counsel. I
23	lack of attempting to get information from our part. So	23 don't know if that's the intention or not (inaudible).
23	I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.	24 It's up to them.
25	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I have no judgments	25 I was simply you asked me what the status
20		
	Page 37	Page 39
1		
1	about any party or anything having to do with the	1 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm
1 2 3	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a
2 3	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and
2	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not
2 3 4	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to
2 3 4 5	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you
2 3 4 5 6	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you
2 3 4 5 6 7	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the status is at that point if there is no such filing by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations. MS. ROTH: This is the AFOR I'm talking	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the status is at that point if there is no such filing by then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations. MS. ROTH: This is the AFOR I'm talking about.	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the status is at that point if there is no such filing by then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations. MS. ROTH: This is the AFOR I'm talking about. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, that is part of the	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the status is at that point if there is no such filing by then. So I believe that concludes what we need to talk about today unless there is anything further.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations. MS. ROTH: This is the AFOR I'm talking about. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, that is part of the negotiation. I mean, the original	1was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm2not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a3voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and4I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not5interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to6get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you7know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information.8JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that9clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not10seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this11point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be12involved to that extent anyway.13So at this point, my understanding is that14the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will15make at least at this point, intends to make a filing16on or before January, either an agreed petition for17competitive classification or an independent petition.18And we will see what happens, and if19necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the20status is at that point if there is no such filing by21then.22So I believe that concludes what we need to23talk about today unless there is anything further.24ATTORNEY ROBERSON: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about any party or anything having to do with the negotiations themselves. I am only concerned in terms of the commission's scheduling and knowing what we are likely to be able to receive. So duly noted. And I hope that the parties will continue their discussions, and I will leave it up to them to decide whether they are fruitful or not. And I will just leave it at that. MS. ROTH: Judge Kopta, this is Jing again. JUDGE KOPTA: Yes. MS. ROTH: I know you don't want to know the details of negotiation. But there's a couple informal questions that staff asked the company about AFOR, you know, asked them what can we work out streamlining the current AFOR. We're in the AFOR docket. Stop me if I'm not talking appropriately. We asked that. The company didn't ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Kopta, I feel like this gets into the substance of settlement negotiations. MS. ROTH: This is the AFOR I'm talking about. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, that is part of the	 was. And I was indicating what the status is, and I'm not here to impugn anybody. But since a negotiation is a voluntary act, right, and I can't force someone and I'm not here to force someone to negotiate if they're not interested or are unable to. I just didn't want you to get the wrong impression. That statement gave me, you know, a concern that I gave you the wrong information. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, thank you for that clarification, Mr. Sherr. I do not have I'm not seeing anyone impugning anyone else's motives at this point. And it wouldn't be appropriate for me to be involved to that extent anyway. So at this point, my understanding is that the discussions are ongoing, and that the company will make at least at this point, intends to make a filing on or before January, either an agreed petition for competitive classification or an independent petition. And we will see what happens, and if necessary, reconvene in January to discuss whatever the status is at that point if there is no such filing by then. So I believe that concludes what we need to talk about today unless there is anything further.

4 (Pages 36 to 39)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Docket UT-130477 - Vol. VI - 11/1/2023

	Page 40	
1	are concluded and off the record. Thank you all for your	
2	cooperation.	
3	(Proceedings concluded.)	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11 12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21 22		
22		
24		
25		
	Page 41	
1	Page 41 CERTIFICATE	
2	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
2 3	CERTIFICATE	
2 3 4	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
2 3 4 5	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING)	
2 3 4 5 6	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified	
2 3 4 5	C E R T I F I C A T E STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2023	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2023	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))SS COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2023	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2023	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON))ss COUNTY OF KING) I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter within and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal recordings were transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and ability; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2023	

5 (Pages 40 to 41)

Page 42

				1 ugo 42
A	anyway 39:12	Box 25:12	32:1	customer 33:15
	apologize 28:5 31:6	breaking 27:24	commission's 37:4	
AAG 27:1	appear 31:13	broadband 29:1,7	companies 24:5	D
ability 41:10	appearances 26:18	broadband's 28:25	26:8 33:10	data 27:23 28:12
able 37:5	27:8	biodubaliu 5 20.25	company 24:7	28:25 29:1,7
Absolutely 32:11	appropriate 31:17	С	26:19 28:19 30:25	36:17
access 28:25 29:7	35:20,22 39:11	C 25:1 41:1,1	32:9,24 34:3,4,18	date 24:23 28:11
accurate 28:19	appropriately	captioned 26:7	34:25 35:18 36:7	32:1
34:21 41:9	37:17	Cassandra 25:10	36:14,20 37:14,18	day 41:15
act 29:3 31:22 39:3	ARBITRATOR	27:2	38:4,6,7 39:14	deal 34:4
active 31:20	34:24	cassandra.jones	company's 34:21	dealing 36:19
Adam 25:3 26:22	Army 25:22	25:10	competitive 26:14	decide 37:8
27:20	asked 29:16,18	CCR 24:25 41:21	32:5 33:4 35:2,11	Defense 25:19
adam.sherr@lu	30:2 37:14,15,18	CenturyLink 24:5	35:16 39:17	27:12
25:4	38:25	25:2 26:8,15	concern 32:2 39:7	denied 35:17
addressing 36:8	assistant 27:5	29:17 33:19 34:13	concerned 34:15	Department 25:19
administrative	assume 36:7	35:23	37:3	27:12
24:14 26:11	assume 30.7 assuming 38:5	CENTURYTEL	concluded 40:1,3	detail 30:6
AFOR 29:14 32:3,5	attempting 36:23	24:6,6,7	concludes 39:22	details 37:13
34:14,14,16,18	attorney 25:11,16	certain 28:21	conditioned 35:17	determination
35:1,13,15 36:6	26:21,25 27:4,5,6	certainly 34:10	conference 24:12	33:25
37:14,16,16,21	27:10,19 28:3,5	38:15	26:12 28:23,24	diligently 38:18
38:3,5	28:18 29:11 30:12	Certified 41:4	30:9 32:22 33:19	direction 41:9
afternoon 26:6,11	30:17,23 31:6	certify 41:6	33:22	disappear 35:15
26:22,25 27:4	32:11,18 33:2	characterization	confirm 34:19 35:6	discovery 28:22
28:18	34:2,22 35:5,8	34:21		29:12
agencies 25:20	36:12 37:19 38:12	chronic 36:19	<pre>confirming 30:24 connected 36:1</pre>	discuss 28:21 33:6
27:13	38:15 39:24 41:11	circle 36:13	consider 35:13	33:21 38:11 39:19
Agency 25:22	Avenue 25:17	clarification 39:9		discussion 38:2,10
agreed 39:16		clarify 36:22,24	continue 37:7	discussion 30:2,10
aiming 31:21	awaiting 28:14	clarifying 35:9,10	contract 29:1,5	36:9 37:7 38:7
alternative 24:10	30:25	classification 26:14	cooperation 40:2 CORPORATION	39:14
26:9,15	<u> </u>	32:5 33:4 35:2,11		Division 25:22
analysis 29:8	back 28:22 32:6	35:16 39:17	24:5	docket 24:7 26:6,17
analyze 29:25	36:13,15	Cleanwater 25:11	correct 32:8 35:11	32:3 34:16 37:16
and/or 38:2	basis 36:9	clear 32:12 34:3	counsel 25:14 27:3	DOD-FEA 30:10
Ann 25:15 27:5	behalf 26:22 27:11	clearer 28:2,3	27:6 28:9,10,13	draws 31:19
33:3	believe 28:23 29:5	close 30:1	29:10 33:1,3	Drive 25:11
ann.paisner@atg	29:6 35:19,22	colleague 27:2	38:16,22 41:11	due 32:6
25:16	36:5 39:22	come 32:12 38:21	counterproposal	duly 37:6
answer 27:22 36:5	Belvoir 25:23	comes 32:21	29:8 31:15 COUNTY 41:3	
answered 28:12	best 41:10	comment 33:5		E
29:17	better 28:4	38:13	couple 33:11 37:13	E 25:1,1 41:1,1
answers 29:24	beyond 38:9	commission 24:2	court 27:25 41:5,7	early 30:2 32:22
anticipated 30:22	big 28:24	24:17 25:8 26:16	COWICHE 24:7	either 26:14 28:14
anybody 39:2	bit 27:25	26:24 30:21 31:17	current 37:16	39:16
	DIC 27.23	20.27 JU.21 J1.17		

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Page 43	
---------	--

ELD 25:22	31:1 32:4,10 33:4	32:19 33:6 34:5,5	interested 33:15	Kopta 24:15 26:4
Elizabeth 24:24	33:7,19 38:8,10	39:18	39:5 41:12	26:10,23 27:1,3,7
41:4,20	39:15,20	hard 28:1	INTERISLAND	27:14,24 28:4,17
else's 39:10	financially 41:12	Harvey 24:24 41:4	24:6	28:19 29:10 30:10
Emily 25:21 27:11	five 33:9,10	41:20	intricacies 29:3	30:15,18 31:4,25
emily.w.medlyn	five-plus 31:15	hear 27:16	involved 30:10,14	32:17,20 33:17
25:21	Floor 25:5	heard 30:24 32:11	39:12	34:6,10,20 36:3
emphasize 34:11	focused 35:1	32:22 34:9 38:22	ironed 29:4	36:25 37:10,11,19
employed 41:11	following 29:20,23	hearing 27:9 34:17	issue 28:24 33:20	37:23 38:1,12,14
employee 41:11	force 39:3,4	39:25	issued 29:22	39:8,25
engaged 28:22	forecast 33:14	hearings 33:5	issues 29:4	
29:12	foregoing 41:7	heart 27:16		L
engaging 29:7	form 24:10 26:9,15	hereto 41:12	J	Lacey 24:18
ensure 36:1	34:17 38:3	hereunto 41:14	J 24:15 26:10	lack 36:23
entirely 35:1	formal 34:14	Hey 34:7	January 31:3,7,12	largest 33:12
enunciate 28:7	Fort 25:23	honest 34:23	31:18 32:1,10,14	law 24:14 25:22
established 32:1	forth 28:22	Honor 27:10,19	32:23 39:16,19	26:11
establishing 33:23	forward 30:14	29:11 30:12 31:6	Jeff 25:9 27:1 34:7	leave 37:7,9
exactly 27:16	31:10,24		jeff.roberson@ut	legal 25:22 41:8
v	,	33:2 34:9 35:3,4 36:13	25:9	Lenora 25:5
executed 29:6	fruitful 37:8		Jing 34:7,7 37:10	let's 26:4,21 27:15
executive 25:20	further 32:25 34:1	hope 33:11,21 37:6	Jones 25:10 27:2	little 27:25 28:2
27:12	36:11 39:23	I		
expecting 33:18	G		31:6	long 29:21 31:12
expeditiously 33:23		impression 36:14	judge 24:14 26:4	longer 29:2
expert 28:6	general 25:11,16	39:6	26:11,23,25 27:3	look 38:8
expire 32:6	27:5	impugn 38:16 39:2	27:7,14,24 28:4	Loop 24:18
expires 32:6	general's 27:6	impugning 39:10	28:17,18 29:10	lot 30:19 31:8
extension 29:14	getting 28:25	inaudible 26:22	30:10,15,18 31:4	loud 32:12
32:13	given 29:2 31:1	27:22,23 28:15,15	31:25 32:17,20	Lumen 25:4
extent 39:12	36:14	31:2,3 32:18	33:17 34:6,10,20	
	go 30:6	34:23 35:22,23	36:3,25 37:10,11	M
F	going 27:25 30:14	38:23	37:19,23 38:1,12	matter 24:4 26:7
F 41:1	31:2,13 32:13	incentive 31:11	38:14 39:8,25	27:16
fabric 29:1	good 26:6,21,25	independent 39:17	judgments 36:25	mean 31:25 37:24
fallback 35:14,25	27:4 28:18 31:13	indicated 38:20	July 32:3 38:4	38:17
FAPR 24:25 41:21	33:17	indicating 39:1		Medlyn 25:21
far 34:14	great 27:14 31:22	informal 27:23	K	27:10,11 30:12
FCC 28:25	Gregory 24:15	28:12 29:12 37:13	kind 30:23 31:19	meeting 27:21 28:9
federal 25:19 27:12	26:10	information 36:23	KING 41:3	28:11,20
feel 36:18 37:19		38:18 39:7	know 29:5 30:14,24	mentioned 28:24
	guess 33:14 35:21		31:16 33:3,7,9,10	mid-January 30:21
Fifth 25:17	36:13	input 33:16	33:11,18 34:4	mode 32:6
file 31:17 34:3,4	Gunston 25:23	intending 30:25		month 36:16
filed 29:15 30:5	H	38:15	35:12 37:12,12,15	
33:24		intends 39:15	38:20,23 39:7	months 31:15
files 38:4	hand 41:15	intention 35:10	knowing 37:4	motives 39:10
filing 29:13 30:21	happens 31:22	38:23	knowledge 41:10	move 31:10,24
0	1	1	1	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				Page 44
33:22	38:1	30:9 33:18,22	reason 35:16	S 25:1,22
moves 32:15	original 37:24 38:1	prehearing/status	receive 31:19 37:5	s /41:20
multiple 36:21	outcome 41:13	32:21	received 28:15	saying 29:17 35:4
mute 26:20		premise 29:13	29:19 30:1 31:14	says 34:25
	P	prepare 31:16	reconvene 39:19	schedule 32:21
N	P 25:1,1	prepared 38:9	record 26:5 33:16	33:23
N 25:1	p.m 26:1 30:1	presiding 26:10	34:12,18 35:7	scheduled 33:6
necessary 39:19	PAGES 24:13	probably 29:2 31:1	40:1	scheduling 26:17
need 35:13,25	Paisner 25:15 27:4	31:2,4,7	recordings 41:8	33:20 37:4
38:19 39:22	27:5 29:11 33:2,3	procedural 35:24	Records 29:3	SE 24:18
needs 32:2 34:3,4	36:10,12	proceedings 40:3	reflected 38:3	Seattle 25:6,17
negotiate 32:16	part 30:3 36:8,23	41:8	Registered 41:5	see 31:23 32:18,23
34:13,17 35:1	37:23	process 29:12 36:1	Regulated 24:9	32:24 33:5,11
39:4	particular 38:10	38:11.17	26:8	39:18
negotiated 26:14	parties 26:13 27:17	Professional 41:5	regulation 24:10	seeing 39:10
31:9	27:21 28:21 33:21	progress 30:8,19	26:9,16 35:19	seek 35:10,13,15
negotiation 37:13	36:7 37:6 41:12	31:8,23	Regulatory 25:22	sensitive 32:9
37:24 38:2 39:2	parties' 30:20	proposal 27:20	relative 41:11	September 30:2
negotiations 26:13	party 37:1	28:8,14,20 30:4	reporter 27:25 41:5	service 33:9,10
27:17 31:20 37:2	passed 29:21,21	30:25 31:19 36:16	41:5	Services 25:22
37:20	Patterson 24:24	38:21	request 30:13 33:4	set 41:14
new 34:13,14,17	41:4,20	prospect 30:20	33:8	settlement 37:20
35:1 36:6	payment 29:6	provided 27:20	requests 27:23	Sherr 25:3 26:20
NORTHWEST	penalty 41:7	28:8,13,19	28:12 36:17	26:21,22 27:18,19
24:8	pending 36:16	public 25:14 27:3,5	required 26:17	27:20,24 28:3,5
noted 37:6	penetration 29:1	28:9,10,13 29:3	resolution 31:9,9	30:16,17,22,23
notes 30:16	people 35:21	29:10 30:4 32:25	responded 36:17	32:11,18 34:20,22
November 24:23	period 29:21	33:3,5 38:16,22	response 29:19,20	35:5,8 36:4 38:12
26:1,12 41:15	perjury 41:7	pursuant 24:10	responses 30:1	38:14,15 39:9
number 27:22	perspective 35:25	35:23	return 35:18	shortly 32:5
29:16	petition 24:4 26:7	push 32:7	revised 26:15 38:3	simply 31:10,24
	26:14 31:17 32:3	Public 2.	right 26:4 27:7,15	35:15 38:25
0	35:2,14 39:16,17	Q	30:15,18 31:25	simultaneously
000- 26:2	planet 35:20	question 35:9,10	32:17 34:6,20	35:13
obtain 38:18	planning 32:12	36:6	36:3,25 39:3	sit 28:16
obviously 32:1	plans 32:9	questions 29:16,18	Road 25:23	sitting 35:18 36:15
office 27:6	PO 25:12	29:22 30:2,7	Roberson 25:9	sooner 31:7,18
Oh 37:25	point 28:16 31:15	36:20,21 37:14	26:25 27:1 28:18	sorry 27:10,11
okay 28:17 29:10	38:21 39:11,13,15	Qwest 24:5 33:12	34:1,2 37:19	sort 33:14 35:14
30:10 33:17 35:5	39:20	35:20	39:24	sounds 30:18 32:8
37:25 39:25	position 32:4,15		Roth 34:7,8,10,11	speak 35:21
Olympia 25:12	34:21	<u> </u>	34:25 35:3,6 36:5	spoke 30:8
once 29:23 32:7	possibility 31:23	R 25:1 41:1	37:10,12,21,25	Square 24:18
33:6	36:8	rate 35:18,23	RPR 24:25 41:21	ss 41:3
ongoing 36:9 39:14	possible 31:12	RCW 24:10		staff 25:8 26:24
order 26:17 30:22	prehearing 28:24	really 30:7 33:5	S	
	-	I	I	I

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Page 45

		l		1
27:22 28:8,10,13	39:8 40:1	V	X	8
28:17,25 29:6	thanks 35:8,9,9	version 34:14		80.36.135 24:10
32:25 34:1,2 36:7	theoretical 29:15	VI 24:12	Y	800 25:17
37:14 38:7,16,20	thing 34:12	Virginia 25:23	Yeah 30:23	
staff's 34:12	things 28:21 31:1	voice 27:11	year 32:10	9
start 28:2	32:7,23	VOLUME 24:12	yesterday 29:19	9275 25:23
starting 26:19	think 27:15 32:24	voluntary 39:3	30:1	98104 25:17
State 24:1 41:2,6	34:2 38:17,19	vs 24:8		98121 25:6
statement 39:6	thinks 35:20		Z	98504 24:18
status 24:12 26:13	time 28:1 29:9,22	W		98504-0145 25:12
27:17,20 28:23	29:25 31:21 32:16	W 25:21	0	
31:1 38:25 39:1	35:21	WA 24:25 41:21	1	
39:20	times 36:21	wait 31:2,3,4,7,11	$\frac{1}{124:2326:1,12}$	
status/prehearing	today 39:23	31:12 32:24	1:30 26:1	
26:12	track 31:16	waiting 34:17	1.30 26:17 30:22	
Stop 37:17	transcribed 24:24	36:15	10 26:17 30:22 120 25:5	
streamlining 37:15	41:8	want 32:4 34:11,18	120 23:5 14th 41:15	
Street 25:5	transcribing 28:1	35:6 37:12 39:5	1411 41.13	
substance 37:20	transcript 41:9	wanted 33:6,14	2	
38:11	Transportation	36:13,22,24	2000 25:17	
Suite 25:17,23	24:2,17	wants 36:2	2023 24:23 26:1,12	
summary 28:19	true 41:9	Washington 24:1,6	41:15	
summer 28:11,21	try 26:21 28:6	24:17,18 25:6,11	206.398.2507 25:6	
sure 28:6 30:15	trying 30:3 35:12	25:12,16,17 29:3	206.464.7740 25:18	
34:22	twice 29:20,23	41:2,6	22060 25:23	
SW 25:11	typical 29:20	way 35:17	24-41 24:13	
		we'll 31:9,22,23	2731 24:25 41:21	
<u> </u>		32:18 34:4		
T 41:1,1	U 25:22	we're 29:12 30:3,24	3	
table 31:20 34:15	unable 39:5	31:13,16 32:12	360.586.2466 25:13	
36:6 38:6	unacceptable 35:17	33:15 34:16 37:16		
taken 24:23 29:23	understand 30:3	we've 29:4,16,22	4	
talk 39:23	34:22 38:17	31:21 36:18,20	40145 25:12	
talking 37:17,21	understanding	weren't 36:17	4300 25:23	
technological 28:6	30:13 34:12,24	WHEREOF 41:14	5	
Technology 25:4 TELEPHONE	39:13	willing 34:13,25	5:00 30:1	
	unit 27:6	wither 35:15	5:00 30:1 5th 25:5	
24:7	UNITED 24:7	WITNESS 41:14	5til 25:5	
ten-day 29:20	unresponsiveness	wondering 30:20	6	
terms 33:20 37:3	36:19 use 32:16	Woodland 24:18	621 24:18	
38:8,16 territories 33:9		work 37:15		
	usually 29:23	working 29:8 38:18	7	
territory 33:11	UT-130477 24:7	worried 27:25	703.614.3908 25:24	
thank 26:23 27:14 27:10 20:11 25:2	UTC-130477 26:7	wouldn't 39:11	7141 25:11	
27:19 29:11 35:3	Utilities 24:2,17	wrong 32:8 39:6,7		
35:3,8 36:3,12,24				

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC