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 1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; MARCH 23, 2016

 2 9:33 A.M.

 3

 4 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Let's be on the

 5 record.

 6 Good morning, everyone. My name is Dennis

 7 Moss. I'm an administrative law judge for the

 8 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,

 9 known I believe to all of you as you are to me.

10 Sitting to my right, and that's from your

11 perspective, is our newest judge, although not all that

12 new anymore, but this is Administrative Law Judge Rayne

13 Pearson, and she will be co-presiding with me in this

14 case, and following it from beginning to end. I will

15 also be fully engaged from beginning to end, and for the

16 postmortem as well, I'm sure.

17 In addition to that personnel announcement,

18 I want to acknowledge the many, many years of wonderful

19 support and work that Kippi Walker has given us. She

20 has decided to separate from State service after -- I

21 hesitate to say -- I think it's 31 years. Yeah, as

22 young as she is, that's hard to believe, isn't it? But

23 that is this case. And so she will be spending more

24 time down in Southern California where her husband is

25 working.
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 1 We have managed to hire a very capable woman

 2 to replace Kippi, although, of course, no one could

 3 actually replace Kippi, but we're confident that she'll

 4 do as fine a job over time. And this is Paige Doyle,

 5 who is sitting in the back of the room here. So you all

 6 will have many opportunities to interact with Ms. Doyle

 7 over the coming months and years, I hope, and we'll

 8 enjoy having her with us.

 9 And let's see. I guess we'll -- I'll

10 announce the proceeding, I suppose, first and then we'll

11 take appearances.

12 The proceeding is Washington Utilities and

13 Transportation Commission against Avista Corporation

14 d/b/a Avista Utilities, Dockets UE-160228 and UG-160229,

15 and these have previously been consolidated.

16 So with that, we'll take appearances and

17 we'll start with the Company.

18 MR. MEYER: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

19 Will the short form of appearance suffice? I provided

20 the particulars.

21 JUDGE MOSS: Yes. The short form of

22 appearance will suffice. Thank you for asking.

23 MR. MEYER: Thanks, because I'm not sure I

24 could remember all of the phone numbers anyway.

25 JUDGE MOSS: I always wrote it down.
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 1 MR. MEYER: Okay. David Meyer on behalf of

 2 Avista.

 3 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you very much. We'll

 4 just go around the room.

 5 Mr. Cowell?

 6 MR. COWELL: Jesse Cowell on behalf of the

 7 of the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities.

 8 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Roseman?

 9 MR. ROSEMAN: Ronald Roseman on behalf of

10 The Energy Project.

11 MR. FFITCH: Good morning, your Honor --

12 Honors. Simon ffitch for the Public Counsel office.

13 MR. SHEARER: Brett Shearer on behalf of

14 Staff.

15 MR. OSHIE: Patrick Oshie on behalf of

16 Staff, and we'll be also joined on this case by Jennifer

17 Cameron-Rulkowski, so put an appearance for her in this

18 morning. And if there's other attorneys that will be

19 joining, we will provide the necessary documentation.

20 JUDGE MOSS: Don't overwhelm us, Counsel. I

21 will --

22 MR. OSHIE: We like company on the bench,

23 your Honor.

24 JUDGE MOSS: So that's only fair, I suppose,

25 that you should team up on me.
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 1 All right. And I will make some -- discuss

 2 a little bit later information that I'll need concerning

 3 the master service list and whatnot. We'll get to that

 4 presently.

 5 I have petitions to intervene that I have

 6 seen, at least --

 7 MR. STOKES (via the bridge line):

 8 Your Honor --

 9 JUDGE MOSS: Sorry. Is somebody on the

10 bridge line? Oh, Northwest Industrial Gas Users must be

11 on the bridge line.

12 MR. STOKES: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

13 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Brooks; is that right?

14 MR. STOKES: No. This is Chad Stokes.

15 JUDGE MOSS: Oh, Mr. Stokes. How are you

16 this morning?

17 MR. STOKES: I'm doing fine. Thank you.

18 JUDGE MOSS: I'm sorry that I overlooked

19 you. I didn't realize you'd be on the bridge line.

20 THE WITNESS: I apologize for not being

21 there in person.

22 JUDGE MOSS: It's quite all right. Go ahead

23 and enter your appearance, please.

24 MR. STOKES: Good morning. Chad Stokes for

25 the Northwest Industrial Gas Users.
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And you will need

 2 to furnish the reporter with your contact information.

 3 Let's do that at the end, if that's all right.

 4 MR. STOKES: Absolutely. Thank you.

 5 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you very

 6 much.

 7 Now, as I was mentioning, I do have

 8 petitions to intervene from the Industrial Customers of

 9 Northwest Utilities. I would have quickly realized my

10 error in that Northwest Industrial Gas Users have also

11 filed a petition to intervene, as has The Energy

12 Project.

13 Are there any others who wish to enter a

14 petition to intervene in this proceeding?

15 Hearing nothing in the hearing room or on

16 the bridge line, I will safely assume, I believe, that

17 it is limited to those three.

18 Are there any objections?

19 MR. MEYER: No objections, your Honor.

20 MR. OSHIE: No objections, your Honor, from

21 Commission Staff.

22 MR. FFITCH: No objections.

23 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And you won't

24 object to each other, I'm sure.

25 Well, these are, of course, familiar parties
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 1 who participate regularly in these proceedings and have

 2 demonstrated their interest in this case, and that their

 3 participation will be in the public interest, and they

 4 accordingly will be granted the status of intervenors,

 5 full rights as parties.

 6 I note, from reviewing the record in this

 7 proceeding thus far, that the Commission entered Order

 8 2, a protective order, standard form of protective

 9 order, on March the 9th, 2016, so that's taken care of.

10 Are there any preliminary matters other than

11 the schedule that counsel wish to bring to our

12 attention?

13 MR. MEYER: No preliminary matters, but the

14 usual invitation that we extend to the parties to

15 prepare and serve their discovery as early as they can

16 so we can get the process moving.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Sure. And as we work on the

18 procedural schedule, I actually was working a little

19 earlier this morning off of the prehearing conference

20 order in the prior case, and I noticed that you all set

21 a number of dates, and I'm assuming we're going to

22 similarly set those dates here.

23 There was some tweaking to the discovery, as

24 I recall, response times -- just looking through here,

25 there's -- you set dates for exchange of
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 1 cross-examination exhibits and, of course, the hearing.

 2 In any event, I assume that we'll have similar detail in

 3 this procedural schedule.

 4 And I'll just note for the record that both

 5 Avista and Staff have circulated to the assembled group

 6 and to the Bench proposed schedules that are a little

 7 bit off one from the other.

 8 So what I would suggest that we do, before

 9 having any discussion about the procedural schedule, is

10 that we recess briefly and allow the parties to see if

11 they can reconcile these small differences and present

12 an agreed schedule, which is always preferable, I think,

13 because that gives everybody buy-in.

14 So why don't we have -- how much time do you

15 think you'll need, 15 minutes?

16 MR. MEYER: Fifteen should be plenty.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And I'll be down in my

18 office -- we'll be down in our offices, which are almost

19 adjacent to one another, so just send somebody down and

20 let us know and we'll be back.

21 MR. MEYER: Thank you.

22 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. We're in recess.

23 (A break was taken from

24 9:42 a.m. to 10:17 a.m.)

25 JUDGE MOSS: Let's go back on the record.
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 1 All right. Mr. Meyer is handing up what is

 2 represented to be an agreed-upon schedule, and I will

 3 take that representation and run with it.

 4 MR. MEYER: May I just, for the record, read

 5 those dates so -- they haven't seen my chicken

 6 scratching, and I want to make sure that everyone is

 7 still --

 8 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. We want to make sure

 9 everybody's on the same page.

10 MR. MEYER: -- on the same page. We

11 rehearsed it once, but let's do it again.

12 MR. FFITCH: Could we take a brief pause?

13 I'm sorry. There's one thing I realized we did not

14 discuss.

15 MR. MEYER: Sure.

16 (Brief pause in the proceedings.)

17 MR. FFITCH: We -- I guess, just to be

18 transparent, I noticed that your schedule has a date --

19 the Avista schedule has a date that we did not discuss

20 on January 1st, and that's -- that's not something we're

21 agreeing to as a target date. We understand you're

22 requesting that, but that's not part of the agreement,

23 from our perspective.

24 MR. OSHIE: And that is absolutely true for

25 the Staff as well, your Honor. Staff doesn't agree to
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 1 the January 1st requested date. If the Commission needs

 2 the time, it needs the time, and that's how the Staff

 3 views it. We think the important date is the suspension

 4 date, and that is on the schedule January 21 so...

 5 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And I'll have a

 6 question about that as well. I have read Mr. Morris's

 7 testimony, at least, and I was -- my recollection may be

 8 wrong, but I thought that he made some comment there

 9 about you all were going to seek an 18-month period, you

10 were going to try to make rates effective in the summer

11 period instead of in the middle of the winter, which, I

12 will tell you, sounded like a good idea to me.

13 Now, not to prejudge anything, and I may be

14 the only one who's involved in this case who even knew

15 that, but I just wanted to ask about that.

16 MR. MEYER: Yes. That's very much part of

17 the design of the case is to get off that annual

18 winter-to-winter cycle, and so this is the case to do

19 the two-step increase January 1, '17, and then again

20 January 1, '18, for the next six months, to then get the

21 rates established through those two steps into the

22 middle of 2018.

23 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. So that's still in the

24 works; it's just --

25 MR. MEYER: Oh, very much so.
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 1 JUDGE MOSS: So the idea, then, would be to

 2 have an order that would allow for an initial increase

 3 on January 1st followed by one or two increases?

 4 MR. MEYER: Well, there would be just one

 5 more increase the following January.

 6 JUDGE MOSS: And that would be the 18-month

 7 period?

 8 MR. MEYER: That would be the last six

 9 months.

10 JUDGE MOSS: Oh, through June 18th.

11 MR. MEYER: Yes.

12 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. All right. Now I'm

13 clear.

14 MR. MEYER: Okay.

15 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

16 MR. MEYER: But to your point, the target

17 effective date is that, it's a target date. The

18 suspension period -- and we should talk about the

19 precise date to use there. There's a one-day difference

20 between the way we calculated it, and I think the other

21 parties, so maybe some clarification around that.

22 JUDGE MOSS: A leap year problem perhaps.

23 MR. MEYER: Well, it was kind of -- yeah, I

24 wish it were that easy. And we should be accurate on

25 whatever that date is.
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 1 The reason we put in our date of the 21st is

 2 it was calculated off the proposed effective date of the

 3 tariffs as they were filed.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: Um-hmm. I believe that's the

 5 way the rule reads --

 6 MR. MEYER: Yeah.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: -- or the statute actually.

 8 MR. MEYER: So -- but people see it

 9 differently. If you want to push that up a date to the

10 20th, we're open to discussion.

11 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, I'll just say this

12 about that. These dates at the end here are nothing

13 more than aspirational. I always say that. We'll get

14 the order out when we get the order out within the

15 requirements of the law.

16 It's not up to me to tie the commissioners'

17 hands or my own in terms of an upfront commitment to a

18 specific date. So we'll -- we'll calculate the

19 suspension date ourselves, and I think we can all rely

20 on that.

21 But it's also not my practice to get orders

22 out at that late a time. I would prefer -- in fact, I

23 always try to get them out at least days in advance of

24 the suspension date, if not further than that. So I

25 don't see the suspension date as posing a problem for
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 1 us. Whether we could achieve something that would allow

 2 for January 1st, that -- a lot depends on how the case

 3 goes, and we'll just have to see how that plays out over

 4 time.

 5 There is also, of course, the prospect for

 6 settlement, partial, full, what have you, that can

 7 affect these things. So we don't need to get too far

 8 ahead of ourselves on that. We can put these dates in

 9 the schedule if parties wish to have them memorialized,

10 or even if just one party wishes to have them

11 memorialized, with the understanding of what I just

12 said, that they are nothing more than aspirational,

13 placeholder-type dates. I'm not going to commit the

14 Commission to them.

15 MR. MEYER: Well, I think the Avista

16 preference -- and maybe the only party -- but the Avista

17 preference would be to have the target effective date --

18 Company's target effective.

19 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Then we'll say,

20 "Avista requested effective date." How about that?

21 MR. MEYER: Yes.

22 JUDGE MOSS: And then the suspension date

23 will -- like I said, I'll sit down with my calendar and

24 my abacus and I'll figure it out.

25 MR. MEYER: So if it pleases the Bench,
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 1 would you like me on the record to restate these dates?

 2 JUDGE MOSS: Sure. Why don't you do that,

 3 just to make sure we don't have any confusion.

 4 MR. MEYER: I'll start from the top and work

 5 down.

 6 The first date was just the date the general

 7 rate cases were filed. That was February 19th of 2016.

 8 Of course, the next entry is today's date,

 9 the Prehearing Conference date, or March 23rd.

10 The Public Notice Report would be

11 April 29th, 2016.

12 Avista would circulate the Joint Issues List

13 on June 17th of 2016.

14 The first round of settlement conferences

15 would be July 13-14 of 2016.

16 The next date is for Staff, Public Counsel

17 and Intervenor response testimony and exhibits. That

18 would be August 17th.

19 The next entry would be for settlement

20 conferences on August 24th and 25th.

21 The Joint Issues List would be filed on

22 August 31, 2016 -- August 31, 2016.

23 Company rebuttal, as well as Staff, Public

24 Counsel, Intervenor, cross-answering testimony and

25 exhibits, September 19th.
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 1 Public Comment hearing date to be

 2 determined.

 3 Discovery deadline would be September 26th.

 4 And of course, there are a series of

 5 footnotes that talk about response times that lever off

 6 some of these dates, and nothing has changed in that

 7 regard in terms of what has been passed out.

 8 The deadline for filing of cross-exhibits is

 9 October 6th.

10 Evidentiary hearings, October 11th through

11 the 13th.

12 Post-hearing briefs and updated issue lists,

13 November 7th.

14 The Company's requested effective date of

15 January 1, 2017.

16 The suspension date of -- is what will be

17 determined.

18 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And do we have

19 confirmation that the October 11 through 13 dates are

20 available for the commissioners' calendars?

21 MR. MEYER: Yes, as per Staff's inquiry this

22 morning.

23 MR. OSHIE: We have -- excuse me, Counsel.

24 We had confirmation that the 12th, 13th and 14th dates

25 were available, not the 11th, 12th and 13th, so --
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 1 MR. MEYER: If there's -- okay. That's a

 2 good correction. So either set of dates. We prefer to

 3 start on the 11th.

 4 JUDGE MOSS: If it has to slip a day or --

 5 MR. MEYER: Yeah, yeah.

 6 JUDGE MOSS: I'll check on that. All right.

 7 I believe we have it down and it's

 8 memorialized for the transcript. So fine. That will be

 9 our procedural schedule, and that will be reflected in

10 the order.

11 Mr. ffitch, is your pen up in the air

12 because you wish to say something or --

13 MR. FFITCH: Yes, your Honor.

14 JUDGE MOSS: -- just happenstance?

15 MR. FFITCH: No. I was waiting for my

16 moment.

17 JUDGE MOSS: Here's your moment.

18 MR. FFITCH: Just a couple things,

19 your Honor, on the schedule.

20 The Public Notice Report, we'll consult with

21 the Company and with the Commissions' Public Affairs

22 Staff on the form of the Notice as per standard

23 procedure.

24 And then with regards to the Public Comment

25 hearing, I've spoken to the Public Affairs Staff, they
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 1 were here earlier, and they're comfortable with the

 2 Commission picking a date in the fall timeframe, and

 3 taking the approach that the Commission has taken for

 4 Avista hearings in several cases in the recent past,

 5 which we support, which is trying to have two hearings.

 6 I think typically it's become a daytime

 7 hearing in Spokane Valley at some location, and an

 8 evening hearing in the center of the city, often at City

 9 Hall, I think, has worked out.

10 So we think that's been a good approach, and

11 we would just defer to the Commission on picking

12 something in those general parameters that works for the

13 Commission and its Staff.

14 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

15 MR. MEYER: And as always, if the Company

16 can assist in lining up venues --

17 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

18 MR. MEYER: -- please call on us.

19 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you very much.

20 Mr. Cowell, you have something?

21 MR. COWELL: Maybe you were gonna get to

22 this, your Honor, but different judges sometimes have

23 preferences, would like e-mail service lists or courtesy

24 lists. Do you have any specifications --

25 JUDGE MOSS: You're right. I'm going to get
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 1 to that.

 2 Anything else?

 3 MR. OSHIE: Your Honor, on behalf of Staff,

 4 this is Pat Oshie. The -- there's an issue that Staff

 5 would like to bring to the Bench's attention with regard

 6 to how cases are developed by all the parties in the

 7 case. And in Staff's mind, the most -- use of a common

 8 baseline will make the analysis of the case more

 9 effective. It will make it perhaps better

10 understandable.

11 The Company begins its case with a per books

12 analysis; it then makes adjustments from that. Staff

13 looks at the case, they do their own per books analysis,

14 and then they perform their own analysis with the

15 adjustments. So there we have a common baseline that

16 Staff believes is a common baseline. If the per books

17 don't match up, Staff will point that out to the

18 Commission.

19 Now, it's Staff's request that the other

20 parties also use the same baseline, and it's Counsel's

21 understanding here, based on my conversations with

22 Staff, that if a party uses the adjustments made by the

23 Company and builds an analysis from that adjustment,

24 then there's some confusion as to how they got there and

25 it's hard to compare that with the baseline, the per
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 1 books baseline that both the Company and Staff uses.

 2 So Mr. Schooley's here. He can probably

 3 explain it better than I, the effect of having sort of

 4 mismatched baselines. But this is a matter that Staff

 5 has brought to the attention of at least one party, and

 6 it's just -- it's a question for the Bench in the sense

 7 that -- I mean, Staff is not asking that the Commission

 8 order this. And there may be some further questions

 9 about what Staff does and how there can be some

10 alignment in all the cases.

11 But I think we just want to put it on the

12 table and see if there's further inquiry from the Bench

13 or from other parties as to, you know, having a

14 commonly-understood baseline for the analysis of the

15 cases.

16 JUDGE MOSS: Well, we can discuss this

17 further if there's a need to do so. I appreciate you

18 bringing it up, Mr. Oshie.

19 The -- in point of fact, I work very closely

20 with the policy and accounting advisors in these cases,

21 and I understand the problem of not having this common

22 baseline. And in fact, I have torn out a considerable

23 amount of my own hair from time to time when we're

24 trying to make these apples-to-apples comparisons.

25 So I will say, before I hear from anybody
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 1 else, that I certainly encourage that. If you will take

 2 the same approach that the -- well, I'll back up half a

 3 step and say, of course the Company puts on a full case;

 4 typically Staff puts on a full case; sometimes,

 5 oftentimes, Public Counsel will put on a full case; and

 6 in those three, it is particularly important to be able

 7 to draw the comparisons, as I said, in an

 8 apples-to-apples basis.

 9 As to other parties, they typically are

10 focused on discrete issues. And again, if we have the

11 ability to look at the various proposals on a particular

12 issue and say, okay, they're all -- they're all measured

13 the same way, it does help a lot.

14 And so I encourage it. Staff is not asking

15 me to order it. You know, at some point we may address

16 this in our procedural rules rulemaking. It would

17 probably be a good idea to at least have some discussion

18 about that at a stakeholder conference. But that's what

19 I have to say about it.

20 Now, I'm happy to hear from other parties

21 who may wish to chime in on this issue so that they have

22 a record of their position as well.

23 Mr. Cowell, anything from you?

24 MR. COWELL: Your Honor, I guess this is a

25 live issue in another case right now, and I think, as
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 1 you had mentioned, it might be most conducive to resolve

 2 in a general proceeding or a stakeholder conference.

 3 But your -- the preferences are duly noted and -- but in

 4 terms of -- and I know we're not making that final

 5 resolution. We would like to see it maybe handled most

 6 efficiently in the general process.

 7 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And my recollection may

 8 be confused with the passage of time, but I do seem to

 9 recall cases in the past when we have actually ordered

10 this to be done, and toward the end of a case. So to

11 the extent it causes some inconvenience along the way,

12 or some extra work by an expert witness, it might be

13 worth making that investment up front, explaining to the

14 expert that this needs to be done -- rather than having

15 to respond to a bench request late in the proceeding

16 that will require the same thing anyway.

17 I think it's been some time since I have

18 issued such a bench request, but that is something that

19 can be done. If we find ourselves, as the Commissions'

20 advisors, unable to fully analyze the case in a way that

21 makes us comfortable, we have to figure out ways to deal

22 with that, and that's always our goal.

23 And there may still be misunderstandings, as

24 happens -- certainly these cases are very complicated.

25 There are a vast number of entries. But we certainly
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 1 make every effort to have everybody, as the overused

 2 expression, on the same page.

 3 Okay. Anything -- Mr. Roseman, did you want

 4 anything else?

 5 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I would just echo

 6 Mr. Cowell' comments. We're also in that other

 7 proceeding where it's a live issue, so this is helpful.

 8 I guess we'll see how it bubbles up in that other

 9 proceeding.

10 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. And you all may wish to

11 have a little conference among yourselves, an informal

12 gathering that's other than a settlement conference,

13 just to talk about this sort of thing. And I think if

14 everybody understands the practical situation, maybe

15 that can -- maybe there can be some meeting of the minds

16 on this. And certainly you could even involve your

17 witnesses in such a technical conversation and come to

18 some understanding of something that will work. That

19 would certainly be my hope.

20 But perhaps before I retire, I'll see the

21 day when everybody does it the same way and it will be,

22 oh, this is so simple. So -- but yeah, it can be -- it

23 can be a difficult issue sometimes.

24 MR. MEYER: Your Honor --

25 JUDGE MOSS: Go ahead, Mr. Meyer.
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 1 MR. MEYER: May I just address one other

 2 matter very quickly?

 3 JUDGE MOSS: Sure. We're here for your

 4 convenience.

 5 MR. MEYER: Okay. We've settled on a

 6 procedural conference. And at the outset, I encouraged

 7 all the parties to get their discovery to us so we can

 8 get the ball rolling on this, and hope that happens.

 9 The first settlement conference in the

10 agreed-upon schedule is nearly five months after we

11 filed this case. Our hope is that all parties will

12 attend that conference in good faith with sufficient

13 information in hand and positions, settlement positions

14 developed, so we can make meaningful progress at that

15 very first settlement conference.

16 JUDGE MOSS: All right.

17 MR. MEYER: I don't know if you have any

18 further thoughts.

19 JUDGE MOSS: Well, clearly there's little

20 advantage in having a settlement conference if people

21 aren't prepared to participate fully and in good faith,

22 so I certainly would encourage that.

23 In fact, when I mediate cases, or disputes,

24 it's a requirement that you be prepared and negotiate in

25 good faith. And if you don't, that will bring our
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 1 mediation session to an abrupt halt. So clearly, I

 2 think that is part of the pattern that's anticipated in

 3 settlement negotiations, so I would certainly encourage

 4 that.

 5 Again, there's little I can do to compel it,

 6 not -- but I have done what I can do in encouraging it,

 7 I think.

 8 MR. MEYER: Thank you. That's all.

 9 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Anything else?

10 You all have me in a good mood. You can

11 just go with the flow here.

12 MR. OSHIE: Nothing more from Staff,

13 your Honor.

14 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

15 MR. FFITCH: We just have the electronic

16 service --

17 JUDGE MOSS: Oh, yes. Thank you very much

18 for reminding me, Mr. ffitch. I am slipping in my

19 middle years, or perhaps they are my elder years, I hate

20 to admit it.

21 Okay. Yes. I would like to get from each

22 of you an e-mail identifying lead counsel, that will be

23 the person who actually gets service from the

24 Commission; a client contact, who is also a person who

25 gets service from the Commission; and then what I think
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 1 of as the courtesy e-mail recipients, that is to say,

 2 everybody else. So if you have co-counsel, if you have

 3 experts -- I noticed that the list was fairly extensive

 4 in the prior Avista case.

 5 I looked at that order this morning, and I'm

 6 fine with that. But if I'm going to produce such a

 7 detailed and extensive list, I will need to have

 8 communications from each of you so that I don't miss it.

 9 And sometimes addresses change and phone numbers change,

10 and I'll be sure to catch anything like that.

11 MR. MEYER: When would you like that by?

12 JUDGE MOSS: When would you like a

13 prehearing conference order by?

14 MR. MEYER: What is today? Today is the

15 23rd. I would think that by Friday of this week we'll

16 have everything to you. And is that an acceptable date?

17 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. Friday's fine. And I

18 can get an order out early next week. There's no real

19 push on that, I don't think, is there? I usually get my

20 orders out either the same day or the next day, but

21 because I'm doing this step, I'm certainly willing to

22 give a little bit more time. You all have to travel

23 back to Spokane and so forth, so why don't we just make

24 it Friday, and I'll get the order out on probably

25 Monday.
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 1 Mr. Roseman?

 2 MR. ROSEMAN: I just have a question about

 3 that. We have a very small number, and they're the ones

 4 that are listed in our petition to intervene. Do you

 5 want a separate one?

 6 JUDGE MOSS: I can take your representation

 7 that that's the extent of it and use that source instead

 8 of an e-mail, a separate e-mail, if that's your

 9 preference.

10 MR. ROSEMAN: That is my preference.

11 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. I will do that.

12 MR. ROSEMAN: Thank you.

13 JUDGE MOSS: I think I can be mindful of

14 that without even taking a note.

15 All right. Anything else?

16 Well, thank you all for being here today. I

17 appreciate the fact that you were able to work out the

18 schedule, and I look forward to working with all of you

19 in this case and bringing it to a successful conclusion.

20 MR. MEYER: Thank you.

21 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you all.

22 (Hearing concluded at 10:39 a.m.)

23
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