Docket No. U-170970 - Vol. I

In the Matter of: Hydro One Limited and Avista Corporation

October 20, 2017



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



	Page 1		Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 2		
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION In the Matter of the Joint)DOCKET NO. U-170970	2	FOR HYDRO ONE:	
Application of)	4	ELIZABETH THOMAS	
HYDRO ONE LIMITÉD (acting) through its indirect subsidiary,)	5	K&L Gates LLP	
Olympus Equity LLC)	6	Seattle, Washington 98104	
and ´)	7	liz.thomas@klgates.com kari.vanderstoep@klgates.com	
AVISTA CORPORATION,)	8	FOR ICNU:	
for an Order Authorizing) Proposed Transaction)	9	JESSE E. COWELL	
)	10	333 SW Taylor, Suite 400	
	11	(503) 241-7242	
PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I	12 13	,	
Pages 1-57	14		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DENNIS J. MOSS	15	SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law 321 High School Road NE	
9:30 a.m.	16		
October 20, 2017	17	(206) 669-8197 simon@ffitchlaw.com	
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW	18 19		
Olympia, Washington 98504	20	(Via bridge line)	
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	21	TRAVIS RITCHIE	
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840	22	Sierra Club Énvironmental Law Program	
Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066 Seattle	23		
(360) 534-9066 Olympia (800) 846-6989 National	24		
www.buellrealtime.com	25		
	Page 2		Page 4
APPEARANCES	1		
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	2	FOR NW ENERGY COALITION,	
DENNIS J. MOSS	3	RENEWABLE NORTHWEST, & NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE	
4 Washington Utilities and			
Transportation Commission	4 5		
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504		JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	5	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General	5 6 7	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit	5	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104	5 6 7 8	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS:	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000	5 6 7 8 9	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line)	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 Iisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov	5 6 7 8 9	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov	5 6 7 8 9 10	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General Soffice Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fith Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fith Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS:	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 jcameron@utc.wa.gov	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS: DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 Ilsa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 jcameron@utc.wa.gov FOR AVISTA:	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS: DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP 18 West Mercer Street, Suite 400	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 jcameron@utc.wa.gov FOR AVISTA: DAVID J. MEYER Vice President and Chief Counsel	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS: DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP 18 West Mercer Street, Suite 400 Seattle, Washington 98119 (206) 257-6011	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 jcarneron@utc.wa.gov FOR AVISTA: DAVID J. MEYER Vice President and Chief Counsel Avista Corp. PO Box 3727	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS: DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP 18 West Mercer Street, Suite 400 Seattle, Washington 98119 (206) 257-6011 franco@workerlaw.com	
Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: LISA GAFKEN Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office Public Counsel Unit 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 464-6595 Ilsa.gafken@atg.wa.gov FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI Assistant Attorney General Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 Icameron@utc.wa.gov FOR AVISTA: DAVID J. MEYER Vice President and Chief Counsel Avista Corp.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JEFFREY D. GOLTZ Cascadia Law Group 606 Columbia Street NW, Suite 212 Olympia, Washington 98501 (360) 528-3026 jgoltz@cascadialaw.com FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS: (Via bridge line) CHAD STOKES Cable Huston LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 224-3092 cstokes@cablehuston.com FOR WASHINGTON AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS: DANIELLE FRANCO-MALONE Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP 18 West Mercer Street, Suite 400 Seattle, Washington 98119 (206) 257-6011 franco@workerlaw.com	

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; OCTOBER 20, 2017 9:30 A.M.

--000--

2.2

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE MOSS: Good morning, everybody. My name is Dennis Moss. I'm an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. We are convened today in the first prehearing conference in the matter styled, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Hydro One Limited (acting through its indirect subsidiary, Olympus Equity LLC) and Avista Corporation for an Order Authorizing Proposed Transaction.

And I'm going to pause here to say that this order, this docket, was given the wrong designation. It was given an UE designation. It should have been given a U designation because it affects the whole company in the same manner, and we don't want to have to give it a separate docket number for the gas side of the business. So from this moment forward, please refer to it as Docket U-170790, and I'll appreciate that.

All right. Before we take appearances, I read the application and pretty much everything else that's been filed so far. I was struck by the statement

the Commission has concluded it has jurisdiction over transactions 'whenever the control of a plainly jurisdictional public utility changes through a corporate transaction for the transfer of the whole or a controlling interest in the company.'"

Page 7

Page 8

And there's a citation there in the application to the case styled, In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp and Scottish Power plc, Docket No. -- the reference is to Docket UE-981672, which is a frequent mistake. It's actually 981627. I don't know why that transposition occurs regularly, but it does. Again, UE-981627. Scottish Power was not a combined company, so it was appropriate to have a UE docket designation there, by the way.

So the reason I read that is because I had some involvement in the Scottish Power case many years ago, and I recalled that we had a threshold dispute over jurisdiction. This is one of the seminal cases in the Commission's jurisprudence in transfer of property cases, and we did have -- we took briefs, and early in the case, a few months into the case, we entered an order. The order I cited there, second supplemental order, was in March 1999, and then the final order was another seven months later before we got to that. But that early order did discuss in some detail the basis --

Page 6

of jurisdiction in the application. In fact, I was so struck by it that I copied it and pasted it into my agenda notes here, and I'm going to read it.

This is paragraphs four and five of the joint application. (As read) Avista is a public service company subject to the Commission's jurisdiction under RCW 80.04.010 and other statutory authority. Commission authorization is necessary under RCW 80.12.020 for Avista to sell, lease, assign or otherwise dispose of, or merge, or consolidate, any of its franchises, properties or facilities with any other public service company. Under RCW 80.12.040, Commission authorization is necessary before another public service company can, directly or indirectly, purchase, acquire, or become the owner of any of the franchises, properties, facilities, capital stocks or bonds of Avista. RCW 80.01.040 establishes the Commission's general powers and duties and, among other things, empowers the Commission to regulate in the public interest, quote, the rates, services, facilities, and practices of all -- closed quote, of all persons engaging within Washington in the business of supplying any utility service or commodity to the public for compensation and, quote, related activities.

"On the basis of this statutory authority,

bases, for the Commission's assertion of jurisdiction.

And we did that about two more times before everybody said okay, we give up and quit fighting the question of jurisdiction.

So here we are today, and I appreciate the Company's acknowledging our jurisdiction and the jurisprudence of this agency. So thank you for that, and with that, we will take appearances, and we'll start with the Company.

Mr. Meyer.

MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. I wasn't sure where you were going with that, but what I was waiting to hear is that you have no jurisdiction and just have a nice day, but it didn't go in that direction.

JUDGE MOSS: No, not at all.

MR. MEYER: All right. For the record, my name is David Meyer, and all of my particulars are in the information that's been provided to the court reporter. I'm representing Avista.

MS. VANDER STOEP: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Kari Vander Stoep at K&L Gates, and I represent Hydro One.

JUDGE MOSS: All right, Ms. Vander Stoep. I was expecting Ms. Thomas, so remind me of your

	Page 9		Page 11
1	association here. Are you part of the Company?	1	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. I've got all of you
2	MS. VANDER STOEP: No, I'm a partner at K&L	2	listed here not knowing who it would be.
3	Gates, and I work with Liz Thomas.	3	All right. And I believe we have some
4	JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I see. I actually do have	4	representatives perhaps oh, we have some more in the
5	you down here under Ms. Thomas. Of course, I'm familiar	5	room. I always forget this. You know that, don't you?
6	with Ms. Thomas, so I just sort of stopped there. If	6	Yes. All right. Go ahead.
7	you'll kindly accept my apologies.	7	MR. COWELL: Your Honor, Jesse Cowell
8	Go ahead, Ms. Thomas.	8	appearing on behalf of the Industrial Customers of
9	MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Judge Moss. I'm	9	Northwest Utilities, and Patrick J. Oshie will also be
10	Elizabeth Thomas also at K&L Gates also representing	10	appearing on behalf of ICNU.
		11	• • • •
11 12	Hydro One.	12	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you very much.
13	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you.	13	MS. FRANCO-MALONE: And, Your Honor,
	MR. GOLTZ: Good morning, Your Honor. My		Danielle Franco-Malone with Schwerin Campbell Barnard
14	name is Jeffrey Goltz. I'm with Cascadia Law Group here	14	Iglitzin & Lavitt representing the Laborers District
15	in Olympia, and we represent Northwest Energy Coalition,	15	Council of the Pacific Northwest.
16	Renewable Northwest, Natural Resources Defense Council.	16	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you very much, and
17	I apologize, in our petition, we have a typo in my email	17	I apologize again for overlooking the left side of the
18	address. I corrected that with the court reporter, and	18	room. I just do that.
19	I corrected that with the records center last night.	19	All right. Anybody on the telephone who
20	JUDGE MOSS: All right. I have 606 Columbia	20	wishes to enter an appearance?
21	Street Northwest.	21	MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Your Honor. Good
22	MR. GOLTZ: Correct.	22	morning. Travis Ritchie on behalf of the Sierra Club.
23	JUDGE MOSS: Suite 112?	23	JUDGE MOSS: Good morning, Mr. Ritchie.
24	MR. GOLTZ: Yes.	24	Anybody else?
25	JUDGE MOSS: 98501?	25	MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. This is Chad
	Page 10		Page 12
1	MR. GOLTZ: Yes.	1	Stokes for the Northwest Industrial Gas Users.
2	JUDGE MOSS: So I have it correct.	2	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Stokes.
3	MR. GOLTZ: No, my email address is wrong.	3	Mr. Brooks will be appearing with you in this case?
4	JUDGE MOSS: Oh, the email address.	4	MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.
5	MR. GOLTZ: It's jgoltz@cascadialaw.com, and	5	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.
6	I had cascadia.law.com.	6	Anybody else? All right. That would
7	JUDGE MOSS: Ah, I did have that wrong.	7	complete our appearances. Okay. All right. Now we
8	Thank you for that correction.	8	have to take up the petitions to intervene. I'll turn
9	All right. Let's go ahead, Mr. ffitch.	9	to you first, Mr. Meyer, and ask if the Company has
10	MR. FFITCH: All right. Good morning, Your	10	objections to any of the petitions.
11	Honor. Simon ffitch, attorney for The Energy Project.	11	MR. MEYER: We do not.
12	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you.	12	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Are there any other
13	Ms. Gafken.	13	objections from parties to any of the petitions?
14		14	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
15	MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken,	15	Staff does object to the interventions of Sierra Club,
15 16	Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of Public		•
	Counsel.	16	to some extent to NWEC, and also to the Washington and
17	JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.	17 18	Northern Idaho District Council of Laborers.
18	Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski.		JUDGE MOSS: All right. We will take those
19	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Good morning, Your	19	up individually. Are there other objections we're going
20	Honor. Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant Attorney	20	to need to take up?
21	General appearing on behalf of Commission Staff.	21	MS. THOMAS: No.
22	JUDGE MOSS: Will there be other Staff	22	JUDGE MOSS: Pretty much covered the bases
23	counsel involved in this case?	23	there.
	MO CAMEDON DULKOMOR N. C. C.		MO CATICAL NA ARIANCA CARA DI LUI
24 25	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Not at this time, Your Honor.	24 25	MS. GAFKEN: No objections from Public Counsel.

o 1 standard

JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Mr. ffitch has no objections from The Energy Project.

3 Mr. Cowell?

MR. COWELL: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE MOSS: Well, then, let's -- let's start with the objection to the Sierra Club, and we'll hear from the Sierra Club, Mr. Ritchie, as to you -- of course, you did file a petition, but since you are the apply applicant through your petition, I'll give you the opportunity to speak first and then I'll hear from Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski about Staff's objection. Go ahead please, Mr. Ritchie.

MR. RITCHIE: Thank you, Your Honor. Travis Ritchie for Sierra Club. As we stated in our petition to intervene, we are still reviewing the extent of the application and for all of the issues that we intend to raise are still under review. However, at a minimum, as Your Honor knows and as the other parties know, the Sierra Club has been engaged for many years on issues related to the Colstrip coal plant.

One of our primary concerns with that, something that we've raised repeatedly with this Commission, is this extent of the obligations and liabilities to the various co-owners of Colstrip. One of the things that we are -- have been working on

standard, and it's based on the Commission's rule WAC 480-07-355 and on the Administrative Procedure Act at RCW 34.05.443. And pursuant to the Commission's decision in Order 5, in order to grant a petition for intervention, the Commission must find that the petitioner either has a substantial interest in the subject matter of the proceeding or that its participation is in the public interest.

Page 15

In addition, the Commission considers whether the intervention sought is in the interest of justice and will not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding. To analyze whether a petitioner has a substantial interest, the Commission applies a zone of interest test to see if the petitioner has shown that there is a nexus between the purpose of the organization and an interest protected by a Washington statute within the Commission's jurisdiction. When the Commission evaluates whether participation is in the public interest, the Commission may consider whether intervention would enhance its understanding and analysis of the matter at hand.

Sierra Club asserts in its written petition that it has many members who are residential customers of Avista, but that's not the main basis of its petition. The interests that Sierra Club identifies in

Page 14

recently, both with the Commission, and what we're getting more information on is quantifying the extent of the liabilities and trying to understand what they are.

So this merger in particular I think is particularly important and relative to those interests on the extent of whether Hydro One coming in as a foreign company will have both the means and the intent to satisfy all of the liabilities and obligations with Avista and the co-owner of Colstrip has accrued over the years. And so that is something that is of interest to Sierra Club and also to Sierra Club's members, because they will be responsibile for many of those payments for the liabilities to unwind Colstrip whenever that time comes.

And so we think we do have a direct interest in the proceeding both as an organization and then also representing the economics and environmental interest of our members, of our customers of Avista.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, what is the basis for Staff's objection?

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Well, I would like to go over the intervention standard first. In the Verizon Frontier transaction in Docket UT-090842 in Order 5, the Commission addressed the intervention

Page 16

its petition are a responsible transition away from
reliance on the Colstrip coal plant in Montana and a
cleaner and more sustainable energy portfolio. And we
just heard from Mr. Ritchie on the phone that he's
especially -- Sierra Club is especially concerned with
the ownership interests and liabilities among multiple
owners of the Colstrip plant.

Also Sierra Club is concerned that the proposed merger would impact Avista's ongoing rights and obligations related to the Colstrip plant and Avista's commitments to moving toward cleaner energy sources that Sierra Club members -- that pay for.

The interests in transitioning away from Colstrip and in developing a cleaner energy portfolio and these ownership interests and liabilities among the multiple owners of Colstrip units are not substantial interests within the meaning of the intervention role, because these issues are not within the scope of this proceeding or even with regard to multiple owners of the Colstrip units within the Commission's power.

Colstrip Units 3 and 4 have, I believe, five owners, and Avista is in the minority with respect to percentage of ownership as I understand it. This is not the appropriate proceeding to address Avista's power supply or the useful lives of Colstrip Units 3 and 4. A

Page 17

general rate case or perhaps an integrated resource plan proceeding would be more appropriate proceedings for the issues that Sierra Club wishes to raise.

And I will note that Avista currently has a general rate case pending before the Commission, but Sierra Club did not seek intervention in that proceeding. Furthermore, Sierra Club's participation would not be in the public interest. Sierra Club states that it has substantial experience on energies -- excuse me, on issues related to clean energy in Washington. It's not clear, however, that substantial experience in clean energy will assist the Commission in its analysis of this merger.

And I should say at this point that we fully expect that some of these issues regarding the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 will be raised and will need to be addressed. This is simply not the proceeding for it. In addition, a focus on the operation of Colstrip Units 3 and 4 would unreasonably broaden the issues in this proceeding.

In the MidAmerican Energy acquisition of PacifiCorp in Docket UE-051090, the administrative law judge denied intervention to Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1 or SnoPUD. SnoPUD's interest in the proceeding concerned transmission and access to

Page 19

of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and prohibited it from raising quote/unquote labor relations matters, which the Commission deemed beyond the scope of its jurisdiction. Similarly, in the instant proceeding, Sierra Club should not be permitted to raise matters that cannot be affected in this proceeding such as determining liabilities and selling interests in Colstrip.

JUDGE MOSS: Well, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, that was the most thoroughgoing objection to an intervention that I have ever heard in 20 years of practice here, and I think you did a nice job. And I appreciate all the references to authority and so forth. I wonder if any other party wishes to say something in the wake of that.

And I'll give -- Mr. Ritchie, I'll give you another chance in a minute.

Go ahead, Ms. Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. The -- Hydro One would simply add that in the event that Sierra Club is granted intervention, Hydro One would nevertheless be quite interested in determinations about which issues properly are and are not within the scope of the proceeding. I think that Staff has raised a very good point in that.

Page 18

wholesale power markets. The administrative law judge stated in his prehearing conference order that SnoPUD's interest concern matters within the jurisdiction of FERC, that's F-E-R-C, and that his intervention would broaden issues and unnecessarily complicate the Commission's consideration of the proposed transaction.

Similarly, in the instant proceeding, pursuing any sort of commitments or resolutions related to Colstrip or otherwise addressing Avista's power supply would broaden issues in the case and could raise issues that are beyond the Commission's power to address.

In the event, however, that the Commission does decide to grant Sierra Club's petition, Staff proposes that Sierra Club's participation be limited to its general interest in a cleaner and sustainable energy portfolio and it be required to coordinate any discovery and presentation with any other intervenors addressing this issue. The APA at RCW 34.05.443 specifically allows limiting an intervenor's participation and requiring intervenors to combine their participation in a proceeding.

In the Verizon Frontier transaction, which I had cited first when I was discussing the standard for intervention, the Commission limited the participation

Page 20

JUDGE MOSS: Okay. And I'll say in response to that that we don't really know yet what the issues in this proceeding are going to be, and I think the Sierra Club has acknowledged that that question is still being analyzed. And I certainly couldn't sit here and list what they are, although I've done a few of these over the years and I have some sense of what some of them may be. There's certainly going to be issues particular to this case.

So, Mr. Goltz, did you have something to say?

MR. GOLTZ: Well, I can address it now if the objection to --

JUDGE MOSS: I assume --

MR. GOLTZ: If she has the same objection for my clients, then I'm happy to go now.

JUDGE MOSS: Is that right?

MR. GOLTZ: If there's something additional or something less, then I guess I'd like to hear that.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: It's very short what I have to discuss with respect to NWEC. I can discuss that now if you'd like, Your Honor.

JUDGE MOSS: Let's go ahead. It does seem somewhat overlapping.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: All right. The

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 21

1 Northwest Energy Coalition, that's NWEC, Renewable 2 Northwest, RNW, and the Natural Resources Defense

3 Council, NRDC, have stated the following interests in 4

their petition to intervene. One, Avista's

moderate income customers.

5 implementation of clean energy; two, Avista's ownership 6 interest in the coal-fired power plant in Colstrip,

Montana; three, issues related to energy efficiency assistance and other affordability issues for low and

For the same reasons that Sierra Club's petition should be denied, the Coalition group should not be allowed to raise clean energy issues or Colstrip ownership issues in this proceeding. The Commission should limit the Coalition group's participation to energy efficiency, assistance, and other affordability issues and require the group to coordinate its discovery and presentation with other parties such as Public Counsel and The Energy Project to avoid duplication of the record.

JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

21 Mr. Goltz now.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. So first of all, the three parties that I represent here have all participated many, many times in various Commission proceedings whether they be rate cases, whether they be exact sort of information that you'll be -- the Commission will be receiving from all the parties, what are the harms, what are the benefits, will the net benefits test be fulfilled.

Page 23

Page 24

So what does that mean? Let's go back to 2009 when that statute was enacted by the legislature shortly after the Puget Sound Energy Macquarie transaction was approved under a no harm standard. It was Senate Bill 5055, and it was proposed by the prime sponsor of the Senator Lisa Brown in Spokane. And I did a little checking on that and spent some time listening to the TVW tapes, recordings, videotapes of the proceeding before the senate committee on environment, water, and energy where Senator Brown was presenting this net benefits test proposal to the legislature, and she said she had three reasons for doing this.

One is other states have that standard, this would be consistent. And then she said whenever there's a change in ownership, there's a certain level of risk that the best analysis cannot properly eliminate completely. So the intention was to add this net benefits test to impose a certain higher standard of proof on the applicants because of that inherent risk that's involved in any acquisition transaction.

But the third reason she gave is the most

Page 22

proceedings that are not adjudications before the open meetings of the Commission on energy efficiency matters, on renewable energy matters, and their participation has been, I believe, generally welcomed by the Commission. I believe they've always been valued and never have they, to my knowledge, engaged in any tactics which would seek to delay the Commission in its efforts.

These parties are all parties in the PSE rate case where a number of these matters have also been or are being discussed. There was no objection to their intervention in that case as I recall. Now, let's -but why -- beyond that, why should this Commission allow the participation of these three environmental and energy -- clean energy and energy efficiency advocacy groups.

This Commission is going to be applying a new statutory -- a relatively new statutory test. I mean, new as far as Commission matters go. It's about eight years now, but it's now a net benefits test, and before that, it was a no harm standard. So at issue in this proceeding is going to be what is the difference, what does that mean? And there will be some sort of elaboration. There already has been in the prefiled testimony by the applicants as to what the net benefits would be of this proposed transaction, and that's the

1 relevant one to the objection by Commission Staff.

In 2009, in early 2009 of January when this was taking

3 place, we just had a brand-new federal administration.

4 Clean energy was on the front page. Clean energy was 5

thought to be a major issue facing Congress and the 6 Washington State legislature, and Senator Brown said

7

that by having this net benefits standard, there would 8

be an opportunity for having these new clean energy

9 national state policies injected into these sorts of 10

merger proceedings. She said right now they are

11 involved in rate cases. By having a net benefits

12 standard would allow them to go forward and have

13 these -- first the negotiations. Everyone recognized

14 that generally these standard, these cases are

15 negotiated settlements that would allow the parties to

the proceeding to advocate for clean energy policies and

17 energy efficiency policies.

> Now, that point is the exact sort of advocacy that the Sierra Club wants to make that my clients want to make, and that's the exact sort of advocacy that I believe Senate Bill 5055 net benefits standards should welcome, not reject. So for those reasons, I urge that the Commission grant the petitions to intervene.

> > Now, having said that, just some suggested

Page 25

limitations. I think when you start to dice -- slice and dice what is and what is not a possible area of -- of advocacy for an intervenor, it becomes very difficult to draw that line. So for example, let's say that -- assume that you allow these -- my three clients and Sierra Club into the case, and there's an advocacy for clean energy, provisions in the -- among the net benefits among the conditions of perhaps an approval. Well, one of the arguments against that might be oh my gosh, rates are going to go up. So now could we respond to that, can we talk about rates? Well, I think that would be relevant to what we're doing.

much.

My point is it's very difficult to say we're going to cabin this intervenor or that intervenor to a very finite set of issues without allowing them to at least respond, which would in effect would broaden the issues to the entire case. So for those reasons, I request the Commission grant our petitions to intervene.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you very

Anybody else want to be heard before I turn back to Mr. Ritchie?

All right. Mr. Ritchie, do you want a final word on this or do you believe we have had enough conversation about it? I certainly have heard a lot of

reliabilities related to Avista's ownership interest in the Colstrip plant and to ensure that Hydro One will be adequately positioned to address those obligations.

Now, that is an issue that is very tied to the corporate structure, the funding, and the intentions of a parent company coming in to purchase a polluting facility that has a very long tail of liability. I don't think anybody in this room, including Avista, would dispute the fact that there are going to be cleanup and remediation obligations at Colstrip.

Sierra Club's contention has been in many proceedings that the extent of those liabilities may not be fully understood at this time. And so therefore at a minimum, part of our interest is to ensure that a new corporate owner coming in understands what those liabilities are and is in a fully financial position and has the intent to fully address those liabilities. If they do not, ratepayers could be in the position of holding the bag in the future, and that is something that would have a substantial effect on the economic interest of Sierra Club's members who are customers of Avista if at some point in the future they're required to be the provider of last report, so to speak, if the corporate entity is not sufficiently set up in order to take care of these obligations.

Page 26

good information from the -- both from the objection and from the responses to it so far.

MR. RITCHIE: I would appreciate an opportunity to respond, Your Honor.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. And please try to speak up a little bit or move closer to the phone. It's a little hard to hear you, Mr. Ritchie.

MR. RITCHIE: Thank you, Your Honor. I will do that. Is this a little bit better?

JUDGE MOSS: A little bit better, thank you. MR. RITCHIE: Thank you, Your Honor. Well, first I would note that it seems that Sierra Club seems to draw objections to intervention before you from time to time. I remember addressing something similar in Puget Sound Energy's rate case, and the reason I raise that here is I think part of the objection was based off of a perception or an assumption of what Sierra Club is going to argue.

As I stated in our intervention, I'm not quite sure the extent of what we're going to argue. But our intervention did not address anything related to revenue requirement, it didn't address anything related to a retirement date for the Colstrip unit. What we did address in paragraph 6 of our intervention was that we are very interested in exploring the obligations and

Page 28

Page 27

Now, I'm not suggesting that that's what's going to happen with Hydro One. You know, that's an extreme example, but it's something that bears scrutiny and is worth looking into. Sierra Club unfortunately has a lot of experience both in the utility sector and particularly outside in the mining sector and other polluting industry sectors where changes in corporate ownership near the end of a facility's life are used to avoid obligations, both environmental and economic. Again, I'm not suggesting that this is anything that Hydro One is intending to do, but those are the worst case scenarios that Sierra Club has seen in the utility sector and elsewhere. And so those are the issues that are primarily what first caught our attention with the merger.

Now, I agree with Mr. Goltz about there are other issues that may come up with this as we start to really dig into the merger and really look at what are the obligations, what are the net benefits, what are the conditions and commitments that are being made by the various companies here, and we'd like to be able to freely address those. But I do think at a minimum that Sierra Club has shown sufficient -- with requirements of intervention that we do have a specific interest in this matter and should have a right to represent our members'

Page 29 Page 31 1 1 Club's petition should be granted, as should the interest in the proceeding. 2 2 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you, petition of NWEC, Renewable Northwest, and Natural 3 Mr. Ritchie. 3 Resources Defense Council, and so that's my ruling on 4 4 Does anyone believe that I need to hear that. All right. 5 5 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Very good, Your anything else on this? 6 MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Your Honor, may I 6 Honor. 7 7 JUDGE MOSS: All right. And I do appreciate clarify whether you'd like to hear a response to the 8 Laborers' petition to intervene separately --8 all the fine argument. Everybody was well prepared for 9 9 JUDGE MOSS: We'll take that up separately, this, more so than I was. All right. Thank you again. 10 10 thank you. Let's now hear your objection -- did -- you 11 MR. RITCHIE: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I 11 do have an objection to the Northern Idaho District 12 would like to add one more point. I will agree with 12 Council of Laborers intervention, I believe? 13 Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski that Sierra Club absolutely will 13 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That's correct, Your 14 agree to coordinate both our discovery and our 14 Honor. 15 production with the other intervenors in the proceeding. 15 JUDGE MOSS: Go ahead and state your 16 That is something we always strive to do, and I have no 16 objection. 17 problem making that commitment in this proceeding. 17 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your 18 18 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. Honor. The District Council is a construction industry 19 Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, you seem to have 19 Union as I understand it from the petition. The 20 20 something further you wish to say. District Council's stated interests are rates of pay, 21 21 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I do, Your Honor. benefit packages, and employment conditions for 22 22 Staff does remain concerned that the proceeding could be construction workers employed by third parties on Avista 23 23 burdened by discovery into what exactly the liabilities projects. 24 are and plans are for the Colstrip Units 3 and 4. And I 24 These interests are not substantial 25 would simply reiterate that this is not the proceeding 25 interests within the meaning of the intervention rule Page 30 Page 32

for these issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

24

25

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Responding first to that point, I think if Avista finds itself burdened by discovery in some way, they will let me know, and I will police that activity as I would in any case. I don't think there would be much coming in Staff's direction along those lines.

7 8 And I mentioned a moment ago that I will 9 take up the Union's petition separately. And one of the 10 reasons is that we do take a somewhat different view of 11 public interest to organizations when we're considering 12 petitions to intervene because, among other things, 13 whether their interest is substantial or 14 great -- highly substantial or what have you, we have 15 found over the years that the participation of 16 organizations such as NWEC, Renewable Northwest, Natural 17 Resources Defense Council, and Sierra Club, too, have 18 been in the public interest because they bring a 19 perspective to bear on issues that are important to and 20 increasingly become essential to our jurisdiction, and 21 environmental issues have become part of our work. It's 22 part of what we have to consider under the various 23 statutes and policies that the State has enunciated in

I am persuaded on balance that the Sierra

1 because pay, benefits, and construction employment 2 conditions are not matters that the Commission 3 regulates, and the Commission's decision will not 4 control these matters. Nor is the District Council's 5 participation in the public interest. The petitioner 6 states that it can provide information including wage 7 rates, training requirements, construction standards, 8 local employment impacts, and work force development 9 investments.

Unlike the IBEW Union however, which was granted intervention in the Verizon Frontier transaction to address issues related to the safety and reliability of service to the consumer, the issues that the District Council proposes to address have no nexus with the public interest within the purview of the Commission.

When the District Council petition to intervene in the PSE transfer to Puget Holdings, this was the Macquarie case in Docket U-072375, the administrative law judge denied the petition. In the administrative law judge's prehearing conference order, he found that the Council's asserted interests that its members are PSE ratepayers did not establish a substantial interest and concluded that the District Council has established no nexus between itself as an organization and any potential issue in this proceeding.

more recent periods of time.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 33

The Commission should deny the District Council's petition in the instant proceeding as well, because the Commission cannot address the District Council's interests, and there's no basis to conclude that the information it can provide such as wage rates or local employment impacts in the construction industry is material to the proposed transaction.

JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

Ms. Franco-Malone, would you like to respond?

MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I represent the Washington and Northern Idaho District Council of Laborers who in turn represents over 100 members who are the ones actually on the frontline doing the work for various Avista contractors including NPL, North Star Enterprises, Spokane Traffic Control, Max Kuney, Garco, and Lydig.

The merger in question is going to have impacts on several issues that the Laborers have contracts with these various contractors that covers including wages, benefits, employment conditions, but also training, construction standards. All of these things do have a direct nexus on the safety and reliability of the system. Under a similar standard, intervention was recently granted to the Baltimore

JUDGE MOSS: Yes, sir.

MR. COWELL: I'd just like to add in my initial review of the filing, there's some issues that ICNU may be interested in exploring, like commitments to do it, economic development in the region, and things I'm not exactly sure where the parameters of that would fit. But I'm interested in exploring it, and the arguments that I've heard today from a ratepayer perspective have been quite frankly enlightening, some things I had not considered.

Page 35

Page 36

And I would imagine that similarly, as we explore these issues, may get some new perspectives, which I think is always a value of having a robust sampling of intervenors in a case, especially one like this with so many areas to work out and a new standard of the net benefits to consider and the application of quite a few issues.

JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.
Anybody else? Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski?
MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I suppose I would want to leave the Commission with the thought that whatever parties file in testimony and ask the Commission to do in their testimony, it has to be something that the Commission legally has the authority to do. And it's a concern that the District Council may

Page 34

Washington Construction Laborers District Council in the District of Columbia involving a merger between AltaGas and WGL Holdings.

I don't think that it's a close question whether the Laborers has a substantial interest in this proceeding, and also that it's in the public interest, given the impact on all of these various things that the merger will have that directly impact the safety and reliability of the system.

I'll also note that under 480-07-355, the other factors considered, there's no reason to think that the Laborers intervention will impair the orderly conduct of the proceeding. As with the other intervenors we are, of course, happy to coordinate discovery and take other steps to ensure that our intervention does not unreasonably burden or broaden the issues in this proceeding.

But again, believe that it's -- it's not a close call that the Laborers does have a substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding, given the direct impact that the merger will have on our members who are the ones doing the work on the Avista system.

JUDGE MOSS: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to be heard on this?

MR. COWELL: Your Honor?

be asking the Commission to do things that the

Commission simply cannot -- cannot order. And so I --

with these -- with this particular intervention, it does

seem to go beyond the scope of what we're primarily
 considering here, which is the net benefits standard.

considering here, which is the net benefits standard,
 which is net benefits to ratepayers, and it seems that

the account of the District Occurs the training to describe

the connection that District Council is trying to draw

is simply too attenuated. Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Any final words from the Union?

MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Just that the standard, the training that the workers who are performing the work are receiving, the construction standard that the Union and the various contractors have agreed to are all things that directly impact the safety and reliability of the system, and I would contend that those are not attenuated interests and directly go to whether there will be a net benefit as a result of the merger.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you.

MR. MEYER: May I be heard?

JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Meyer, I thought you were not interested in this particular

motion.

MR. MEYER: I am.

JUDGE MOSS: Well, please speak.

1 agreed procedural schedule, Your Honor.

MR. MEYER: Okay. 2 JUDGE MOSS: Sorry. JUDGE MOSS: Is it written down or will I 3 MR. MEYER: No, no, it's all good. I don't need to write it down as we go?

4 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I can pass you up a object, but I think there needs to be a clear understanding that if, with respect to any of these 5 copy that's a bit marked up, and you let me know if that 6 will suffice. interventions, the testimony wanders into areas whether 7

JUDGE MOSS: All right. So the schedule it's for in regard to your point that it's relief that can't be granted or whether it's so far afield of these 8 that I've been handed notes the filing of application on 9 proceedings that parties of course have the option, and the 14th and then identifies the date of the settlement I reserve that option to move to strike. And so we can 10 conference the week of December 11th. address those kind of issues at the time we see how 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I'm sorry, Your Honor, that should be -- I should have done a strike through there. There's a notation there that says February 6th.

Page 39

Page 40

JUDGE MOSS: February -- the day of February

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Correct. JUDGE MOSS: All right. February 6th. Yes, I did think that was a bit far out. Well, actually not. That's December of this year. So anyway, February 6th of 2018. All right. And then you -- this does call for public comment hearing in Spokane, but that will be a date to be determined, assuming there's no strong objection to having such a hearing.

to police these matters as they go forward in the manner that Mr. Meyer just suggested and we have other powers as well, I nevertheless find in considering this motion, and I read your motion carefully before I came in here today, and I haven't heard anything that has persuaded me other than to the view that the interest you have stated on behalf of your client are quite attenuated from anything we're going to be considering in this case. And they're matters that are not within our jurisdiction, they're largely matters of contract, and this Commission does not have -- this is not the right

JUDGE MOSS: And while we do have the power

they're put to the Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 38

considered between contracting construction workers or companies and the utility.

venue, if you will, for any contract-type disputes to be

To the extent we're talking about Union contracts here, I suppose the National Labor Relations Board is another venue where you might have some opportunities to pursue your client's interest, but I don't think this is a proceeding where they can be pursued, and so I'm going to deny your intervention. Thank you very much.

And I do appreciate the very thoroughgoing arguments that I've heard on all sides of these issues today. It's unusual to have to spend nearly an hour on petitions to intervene. In fact, this is probably the longest prehearing conference I've ever done, but I do appreciate it very much, and you have my rulings, and I will include some discussion in my order, all right?

Now, with that taken care of, we need to talk about procedural schedule. So I know the parties were engaged in that conversation when I walked into the room this morning, which I appreciate that effort. I wonder if it started soon enough for you all to have resolved the procedural schedules.

MR. MEYER: I think, Jennifer, you have the list.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I believe we have an

contact with Mr. Andrews on Staff, and I understand that

MS. GAFKEN: Your Honor, so I have been in

1 2 there are some discussions about how to do the public

3 comment hearings and, you know, not only in Spokane, but

4 in other locations. And so you will see on the schedule

5 here that there's public comment hearings in two

6 different places. Of course it's subject to

7 Commissioner availability, and it's possible that we

8 could do it all in one trip, but I understand that

9 there's upwards of four locations that are being looked 10 at for public comment hearing. So with those comments 11 in mind and logistics to be figured out, one thought is 12 that if that can't be done all in one trip, that it may

need to be split out before and after that first round of response testimony.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Subject to the continuing dialogue suggested by Ms. Gafken's comments, I would anticipate that the Commissioners will want to have at least one public comment hearing in this matter if not more. So I would expect you to be continuing to communicate with me on that subject matter and to keep all parties in the loop at the same time you're talking to me about it by email or what have you, and we will work out the details, all right?

You have a March 15th date for Staff, Public Counsel, intervenor testimony, correct?

	Page 41		Page 43
-	_		
1	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That's correct.	1	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That's correct.
2	JUDGE MOSS: I'm just verifying these here.	2	MR. MEYER: That's correct.
3	Let's see, Avista's rebuttal testimony and any	3	JUDGE MOSS: All right. And you're asking
4	cross-answering testimony on April 25th?	4	for a decision by August 14th, 2018.
5	MR. MEYER: I'm sorry, what date?	5	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, that
6	JUDGE MOSS: I have April 25th, 2018, on	6	would be the statutory deadline.
7	this list here.	7	JUDGE MOSS: Oh, it's 11 months. I counted
8	MR. MEYER: Yes.	8	ten months. I guess it's the old rate case thing, you
9	JUDGE MOSS: Is that right?	9	know? Because I had July 14th, but that was my mistake.
10	MR. MEYER: It is. That's what I	10	I didn't count the full 11 months because of the
11	understand.	11	different nature of this proceeding. We normally lose
12	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And, Mr. Meyer, my	12	that first 30 days on the rate cases. So by
13	apologies, I just gave the judge your copy.	13	August 14th, 2018, and I will simply note in that
14	MR. MEYER: Oh, well, you couldn't possibly	14	regard, although I do not anticipate it to be a problem,
15	read my handwriting. Not even possible, so thank you.	15	that the statute or is it a rule, I guess
16	JUDGE MOSS: All right. Now, you have	16	MR. MEYER: Statute.
17	identified a discovery deadline of May 2nd, 2018, a date	17	JUDGE MOSS: It does provide for up to a
18	for cross-examination, exhibits, witness list, and time	18	four-month extension for cause and so that we would have
19	estimates for cross-examination on May 16, evidentiary	19	that flexibility if I got hit by a bus or something, we
20	hearing you've identified May 22nd and 23rd.	20	might need some extra time.
21	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: With regard to that,	21	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Heaven forbid.
22	Your Honor, I did contact Ms. Doyle, and she indicated	22	JUDGE MOSS: I'm not sure everybody shares
23	that those dates were available as of the time we spoke.	23	your respect, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, but there you have
24	JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Well, it will be a busy	24	it.
25	month, but we have the CNG evidentiary hearing the week	25	MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And don't be
	¬		- 44
	Page 42		Page 44
1	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates	1	thinking about retiring.
1 2	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of	2	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day.
	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars	2 3	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my
2	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically	2 3 4	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm
2	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars	2 3 4 5	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do.
2 3 4	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work.	2 3 4 5 6	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did
2 3 4 5	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to	2 3 4 5 6 7	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do.
2 3 4 5 6	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down	2 3 4 5 6	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready.
2 3 4 5 6 7	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but we'll agree to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. All right. You've got a date down here for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but we'll agree to that. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, settlement conference,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. All right. You've got a date down here for initial briefs, June 28th.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but we'll agree to that. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, settlement conference, yeah, that was further up the list. I was already past
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. All right. You've got a date down here for initial briefs, June 28th. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And, Your Honor,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but we'll agree to that. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, settlement conference, yeah, that was further up the list. I was already past that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	before that, but we will go ahead and mark those dates down subject to the Commissioners' preferences, of course. We always have to accommodate their calendars to the extent we can, and I will inquire specifically about those dates, but I'll try to get those dates to work. MR. MEYER: Your Honor, if we're just trying to of course all parties are trying to lock down witnesses and everything, so if these proposed dates will not work when you check, I would like to have further discussions about other dates that would work for the Commission and all of us rather than just throwing out JUDGE MOSS: I think that makes a lot of sense. We'll have some coordinated effort to get to a date that works for everyone including the Commissioners. MR. MEYER: Thank you. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Thank you. All right. You've got a date down here for initial briefs, June 28th. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And, Your Honor, those would be simultaneous. That would be simultaneous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thinking about retiring. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, I think about it every day. All right. Let me see now, get back to my agenda here and see if there's anything that I'm forgetting to do. MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, I did have a couple of other matters when we're done with the procedural schedule and when you're ready. JUDGE MOSS: I am to the other business section. MR. GOLTZ: Your Honor, just a confirmation on the procedural schedule. You skipped right over the one of the dates that was hard to arrange was the date for the second settlement conference, and I believe it's to be determined. I just want to confirm that's what you have there. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, okay. MR. GOLTZ: We need to work on that, but we'll agree to that. JUDGE MOSS: Oh, settlement conference, yeah, that was further up the list. I was already past that. MR. GOLTZ: Okay.

Page 45 Page 47 1 1 well, is to incorporate the what's been called the me themselves. 2 2 MR. GOLTZ: Okay. too data request in the prehearing conference order, and that would simply say -- that would require all of the 3 3 JUDGE MOSS: To find mutually convenient times for these. We like to schedule at least one into 4 parties to serve all discovery responses on all of the 4 5 the prehearing order as sort of a marker that we lay 5 other parties as a matter of course. 6 down to say yeah, you guys should sit down and talk 6 JUDGE MOSS: From my perspective, that makes 7 7 about this, and I'm sure you will. sense because you're all going to ask for it anyway, 8 MR. MEYER: We will, and I would like to 8 right? And I notice that Avista has set up a discovery 9 9 button that up, though, the second conference as soon as site, Internet site I guess you'd call it. 10 we can. We tossed around some dates among ourselves, 10 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, that's 11 and I think that Mr. Goltz had some scheduling issues 11 another issue that I have. 12 12 JUDGE MOSS: I guess we better hear it, on --13 But you'll get back to us. 13 then. 14 MR. GOLTZ: Oh, yeah. 14 Mr. Meyer, go ahead. MR. MEYER: Through email we can nail that MR. MEYER: And I know what that issue is, 15 15 16 16 but as far as serving all parties, we'll do that. There down 17 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: And the intent was 17 will be a fair amount of highly sensitive information in to keep that between the parties and on the parties' 18 this proceeding, and that will be limited by the terms 18 19 calendars and not have the second settlement conference 19 of the protective order that's already issued with 20 on the procedural schedule. 20 highly sensitive provisions built into that. JUDGE MOSS: All right. Well, then, I can 21 JUDGE MOSS: Yes, well, thank you for 21 go ahead with the prehearing order without worrying 22 22 bringing that to our attention today, and as we did put 23 23 about getting that date. out our standard protective order with highly 24 Okay. Are there other matters the parties 24 confidential provisions and that will require those who 25 wish to raise to my attention? 25 are interested in looking at that material to sign the Page 46 Page 48 MR. COWELL: Your Honor, I just wanted to 1 1 appropriate papers. 2 2 confirm with the two footnotes there, at least on the MR. MEYER: And just I know no breach -- no 3 3 schedule I was looking at, which I think pretty standard breach of that would be intentional, I'm confident of 4 4 with procedures of this length with the discovery time that, but this information is so sensitive that even an 5 5 being shortened to seven days and five days inadvertent breach would work substantial harm. So 6 respectively. 6 please, everyone, follow the procedures. 7 JUDGE MOSS: Yes, I put those footnotes in 7 JUDGE MOSS: All right. 8 8 because this has become sort of routine practice, and if MR. MEYER: Also, while we're talking about 9 the parties have some other ideas or don't want to do 9 discovery, it helps if the parties will not bunch up all 10 that, then just let me know now and we'll figure that 10 of their discovery in one batch, because even with the 11 ten business day period it's hard to do. So dribble it 11 12 MR. COWELL: I was just confirming. 12 out in manageable chunks, and that will help all of us JUDGE MOSS: Okay. I think it's good to 13 13 in the process, please. 14 shorten these response periods as we get closer and so 14 JUDGE MOSS: All right. I think that's a 15 15 that's why -very good idea, too, and I hope everyone will conduct 16 16 MR. MEYER: My experience with the themselves with the spirit of coordination and 17 practitioners around the table is that even with those 17 cooperation as we go through this process. Of course, 18 limitations, some grace is given if we're off by a few 18 again, we have powers to police the discovery process if 19 days. 19 it gets out of hand, which it sometimes does. As 20 JUDGE MOSS: Yes, yes. Grace is an 20 respecting the confidential information and the highly 21 important commodity that I hope to see extended all 21 confidential information, I think it's fair to say that 22 around through the conduct of this case because -- well, 22 we have had very good experience with that over the 23 I won't say more. All right. Anything else? 23 years in terms of the parties' careful treatment of

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: So Your Honor, one

thing I hope that the parties will agree to, and you as

24

25

24

25

these types of documents, and of course, this type of

case brings forward easily a higher volume of that sort

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 49

party so to speak, and that will help protect it, all right?

Page 51

Page 52

of thing because this is an ongoing transaction. And so by its nature, it's -- there's potential for harm that might not exist in other circumstances.

So I think your warnings are well advised, Mr. Meyer, and I'm sure that everyone else is equally sensitive to the importance of this.

MR. MEYER: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MOSS: Anything else? Yes, you had something else.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: The last issue is -concerns the electronic data center that is described in the joint application. I've had communications with counsel for the joint applicants, and we have an understanding about use of the electronic data center, and we agree that document -- they understand, we all understand that documents in the electronic data center that Commission employees or AGO employees access have the potential to become public records subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act. That's in the definition RCW 42.56.010, Subsection 3. The joint applicants will not object to provision of a document in discovery on the basis that the document is available in

the electronic data center. Nothing in the electronic data center is part of the record. If the joint applicant or any other

MR. MEYER: This probably should be done off the record, but as in prior mergers, there was this electronic data room set up, and it was meant really as a convenience for the parties to get to know some of the source data, some of the foundational stuff and -- and if that can still be used for its intended purpose by the parties of running down some questions they might have without first propounding it in discovery, that might short-circuit some of the discovery that's eventually asked. And that really was the purpose of this, so people, before they propound discovery, would have a chance to read some of these source documents. I get it, though, that you're free to ask us about any of that, and we will respond with the documentation, not just refer you to the document -- electronic document room. So that's -- and I hope this was helpful or haven't you gotten into the case that much probably yet to know, okay.

JUDGE MOSS: My prior experience with this dates back to the year 2000 when I was doing a case for the Bonneville Power Administration, and they had 80-some parties in that case, and they used this approach, and it was very effective there, and parties

Page 50

party wishes to rely on any document in the electronic data center, it must place that document into the record via testimony or other proper vehicle. The joint applicants have represented that there are no confidential materials currently in the electronic data center, is that still the case?

All right. And the joint applicants remain responsibile, however, for ensuring that any material maintained in the electronic data center is redacted to protect the confidentiality of any information that either company claims is confidential. And we wanted to set that understanding on the record here today.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. And that perhaps clarifies something that was in the back of my mind, Mr. Meyer, that you won't, then, be putting confidential information in a readable form on this data site. I think there is some risk associated with that.

MR. MEYER: Yes.

JUDGE MOSS: In this day of Russian hacking and so forth, who knows who may be peering into your data center.

MR. MEYER: That's correct, right. JUDGE MOSS: I think that's a good precaution to take, and that's -- that type of information can be shared between parties, party to 1 would first check there to see if they could find the 2 information they needed, and this did limit the 3 discovery. The case was much more manageable, from my 4 perspective, as a result, and I'm sure from the perspective of the participants as well.

So I do encourage you all to take advantage of this data center, and I think you will find it will obviate the need for at least some of your data request and keep things more manageable. I -- I am always struck, given my background, by the expansiveness of discovery in our jurisdiction. I've heard instances of there being 500 data requests and things like that. And when I practiced before the FERC, we were very limited in the number of data requests we could make. I think it was 30, and boy, you could come up with a lot of subparts, though.

MR. MEYER: Yeah.

MR. GOLTZ: So, Your Honor, so I understand, is the -- are the conditions that were mentioned, those -- will those find their way into the prehearing order or is that just something to work out among ourselves?

JUDGE MOSS: I hesitate to say I will put them into the prehearing conference order because I like to get that out pretty quickly and I would need --

2.2

2.5

Page 53

frankly, I would need the transcript in order to be able to do that unless Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, who seems to be very well prepared today, might have that in her notes and I could then draw on that in terms of laying out this agreement or understanding.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I guess -- so I had originally intended it to be in the transcript, so I'd want to check with the joint applicants if they had any objection to it being in the order. I'm happy to email out what I just presented to -- to you, Judge Moss, and copying the parties.

JUDGE MOSS: Or I could just make some generic statement that the parties will conduct their discovery in accordance with the discussion had at the prehearing conference on this date, how about that? And then you all can refer to the transcript and who knows, we may have some lively argument in the future over this. I'll look forward to that. Surprisingly enough, after all these years, I still find this all very entertaining and interesting. So anything else?

 $\label{eq:MS-RULKOWSKI:Nothing from Staff} \mbox{MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Nothing from Staff,} \\ \mbox{Your Honor.}$

MR. MEYER: So I'm just thinking process-wise as we -- excuse me, as we respond to DRs. In a general case, we will have designated -- in

on the order is something that leaves me feeling reasonably comfortable.

MR. MEYER: Thank you.

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Anything else? I do have a few more final remarks.

Page 55

Page 56

All right. Very quickly. As we've been discussing, the Commission will enter a prehearing conference order. You all have provided dates to meet with the requirement that has come more or less standard that we have witness lists and exhibit lists shortly before the evidentiary hearing and that we'll exchange cross-examination exhibits prior to the hearing and do whatever we need to do to maximize efficiency at the hearing.

We have a settlement date, a date for settlement conference in the prehearing conference order. And I'll just reiterate that the Commission encourages stipulations, both as to fact and as to issues that can be resolved via the settlement process or other means of alternative dispute resolution. We don't really have the capacity to offer you mediation services within the Commission right now. We're a little shorthanded in my section, and so that's not really a viable option. But do please keep us advised of any progress you make toward settlements -- well, I

Page 54

addition to the attorneys, there may be a few designated people to receive service, but not everyone. And I know that in our joint application we named names for service and all that stuff, so I think we're good there. But is there another more expanded service list so all of you make sure your people are on it?

JUDGE MOSS: And this has become another practice that's commonly followed at the Commission is I, as part of my closing remarks, was to ask you all to please provide me within the next couple of days the contact information for those who you wish to be kept in the loop on a more or less ongoing basis broader than the formal service list in the proceedings. So there may be a paralegal, for example, who should be receiving all the discovery responses or something like that. And if that person is identified, I will get that into the party list that I attach to the prehearing conference order, which is not -- again, not a formal list, is not the master service list as the records center calls it, but is something that's useful to the parties.

And so that's what I'd like to have. This is Friday, if I could have that by, say, Wednesday next week. Is that too soon? Are parties okay with that? And the sooner you all get it to me, the quicker I can get the order out. The, I think, three-day turnaround

won't say anything more about that right now.

So anything else, then? I believe that completes our business for today. I thank you all very much. I think you all did a fine job in your advocacy today on the various points that we discussed, and we will -- I will look forward to working with you through the course of the proceeding.

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. MEYER: Thank you.
MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Judge Moss.
(Adjourned at 10:41 a.m.)

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

	Page 57	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2	0 = 11.11.1	
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
4	COUNTY OF THURSTON	
5	•	
6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand	
7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and	
9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
10		
11	NOTO	
12		
13	- Constant	
	Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358	
14	rayler calling floates, controls	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

			<u> </u>	
A	24:19,21 25:3,6	appearing 10:15,21	assumption 26:17	basis 6:25 7:25
a.m 1:16 5:2 56:12	56:4	11:8,10 12:3	attach 54:17	14:20 15:24 33:4
ability 57:9	advocate 24:16	applicant 13:9	attention 28:14	49:22 54:12
able 28:21 53:1	affordability 21:8	49:25	45:25 47:22	batch 48:10
absolutely 29:13	21:15	applicants 22:24	attenuated 36:8,17	bear 30:19
accept 9:7	afield 37:8	23:23 49:13,21	37:20	bears 28:3
access 17:25 49:17	agency 8:7	50:4,7 53:8	attorney 2:8,9,15	behalf 10:15,21
accommodate 42:3	agenda 6:3 44:4	application 1:4	2:15 3:15,21	11:8,10,22 37:20
accrued 14:9	ago 7:17 30:8 49:17	5:11,24 6:1,5 7:7	10:11,15,20	believe 11:3 16:21
accurate 57:9	agree 28:16 29:12	7:8 13:16 35:16	attorneys 54:1	22:4,5 24:21
acknowledged 20:4	29:14 44:19 46:25	39:8 49:12 54:3	August 43:4,13	25:24 29:4 31:12
acknowledging 8:6	49:15	applies 15:14	authority 6:7,25	34:18 38:25 44:14
acquire 6:14	agreed 36:14 39:1	apply 13:9	19:13 35:24	56:2
acquisition 17:21	agreement 53:5	applying 22:16	authorization 6:8	benefit 31:21 36:18
23:24	Ah 10:7	appreciate 5:22 8:5	6:12	benefits 22:19,24
Act 15:2 49:19	ahead 9:8 10:9 11:6	19:13 26:3 31:7	Authorizing 1:9	23:3,4,15,22 24:7
acting 1:5 5:12	13:11 19:18 20:23	38:10,15,20	5:13	24:11,21 25:8
activities 6:24	31:15 42:1 45:22	approach 51:25	availability 40:7	28:19 32:1 33:21
activity 30:5	47:14	appropriate 7:13	available 41:23	35:16 36:5,6
add 19:20 23:21	allow 22:12 24:12	16:24 17:2 48:1	49:22	best 23:20 57:9
29:12 35:2	24:15 25:5	approval 25:8	Avenue 1:22 2:10	better 26:9,10
addition 15:9 17:18	allowed 21:12	approved 23:8	2:22 3:5 4:12	47:12
54:1	allowing 25:15	April 41:4,6	Avista 1:8 2:19,21	beyond 18:11 19:3
additional 20:18	allows 18:20	area 25:2	5:13 6:5,9,16 8:20	22:12 36:4
address 9:18 10:3,4	AltaGas 34:2	areas 35:15 37:6	14:9,18 15:24	Bill 23:9 24:21
16:24 18:12 20:12	alternative 55:20	argue 26:18,20	16:22 17:4 27:8	bit 26:6,9,10 39:5
26:21,22,24 27:3	amount 47:17	argument 31:8	27:22 30:3 31:22	39:19
27:17 28:22 32:12	analysis 15:21	53:17	33:15 34:22 47:8	Board 38:5
32:14 33:3 37:11	17:12 23:20	arguments 25:9	Avista's 16:9,10,24	bonds 6:16
addressed 14:25	analyze 15:12	35:8 38:11	18:9 21:4,5 27:1	Bonneville 51:23
17:17	analyzed 20:5	arrange 44:13	41:3	Box 2:16,22
addressing 18:9,18	Andrews 40:1	asked 51:12	avoid 21:18 28:9	boy 52:15
26:14	anticipate 40:17	asking 36:1 43:3		brand-new 24:3
adequately 27:3	43:14	asserted 32:21	<u> </u>	breach 48:2,3,5
Adjourned 56:12	anybody 11:19,24	assertion 8:1	back 23:5 25:22	bridge 3:19 4:10
adjudications 22:1	12:6 25:21 27:8	asserts 15:22	44:3 45:13 50:14	briefing 42:24
administration	35:19	assign 6:9	51:22	briefs 7:20 42:21
24:3 51:23	anyway 39:20 47:7	assist 17:12	background 52:10	42:25
administrative	APA 18:19	assistance 21:8,15	bag 27:19	bring 30:18
1:14 2:2 5:7 15:2	apologies 9:7 41:13	Assistant 2:8,15	Bainbridge 3:16	bringing 47:22
17:22 18:1 32:19	apologize 9:17	10:15,20	balance 30:25	brings 48:25
32:20	11:17	associated 50:17	Baltimore 33:25	broaden 17:19 18:5
advantage 52:6	appearance 11:20	association 9:1	Barnard 4:18	18:10 25:16 34:16
advised 49:4 55:24	appearances 5:23	assume 20:14 25:5	11:13	broader 54:12
advocacy 22:14	8:8 12:7	assuming 39:23	based 15:1 26:16	Brooks 12:3
			bases 8:1 12:22	
			1	

Ducth only and 10.1	27.17	alaaman 16,2 11 14	acomfortable 55.2	6.12 12 7.12 9.0
Brotherhood 19:1	carefully 37:17	cleaner 16:3,11,14	comfortable 55:2	6:12,13 7:13 8:9 9:1 12:9 14:7
Brown 23:10,14	Cascadia 4:5 9:14	18:16	coming 14:6 27:6	
24:6	cascadia.law.com	cleanup 27:10	27:15 30:6	27:6 50:11
Buell 1:21	10:6	clear 17:11 37:4	comment 39:22	Company's 8:6
built 47:20	case 7:7,16,21,21	Cleve 3:10	40:3,5,10,18	company.' 7:5
bunch 48:9	10:23 12:3 17:1,5	client 37:20	comments 40:10,16	compensation 6:23
burden 34:16	18:10 20:9 22:9	client's 38:6	Commission 1:2,18	complete 12:7
burdened 29:23	22:11 25:6,17	clients 20:16 24:20	2:4,13 5:9 6:7,12	completely 23:21
30:3	26:15 28:12 30:5	25:5	6:18 7:1 10:21	completes 56:3
bus 43:19	32:18 35:14 37:22	close 34:4,19	13:23 14:1,25	complicate 18:5
business 5:20 6:22	43:8 46:22 48:25	closed 6:20	15:5,9,13,18,19	concern 18:3 35:25
44:9 48:11 56:3	50:6 51:19,22,24	closer 26:6 46:14	17:5,12 18:13,25	concerned 16:5,8
busy 41:24	52:3 53:25	closing 54:9	19:3 21:13,24	17:25 29:22
button 45:9	cases 7:18,20 21:25	Club 3:19,21 11:22	22:2,4,7,12,16,18	concerns 13:21
	24:11,14 43:12	12:15 13:6,7,14	23:2 24:1,23	49:11
C	caught 28:14	13:19 14:11 15:22	25:18 32:2,15	conclude 33:4
C 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:4	cause 43:18	15:25 16:5,8,12	33:1,3 35:21,23	concluded 7:1
57:1,1	CCR 1:20 57:13	17:3,6,8 19:5,21	35:24 36:1,2	32:23
cabin 25:14	center 9:19 49:11	20:4 24:19 25:6	37:12,24 42:12	conditions 25:8
Cable 4:12	49:14,16,23,24	26:12,17 28:4,12	49:17 54:8 55:7	28:20 31:21 32:2
calendars 42:3	50:2,6,9,21 52:7	28:23 29:13 30:17		33:21 52:19
45:19	54:19	Club's 14:11 17:7	Commission's 6:6	conduct 15:12
California 3:23	certain 23:19,22	18:14,15 21:10	6:17 7:19 8:1	34:13 46:22 48:15
call 34:19 39:21	certainly 20:5,8	27:11,21 31:1	15:1,3,17 16:20	53:13
47:9	25:25	CNG 41:25	18:6,11 32:3	conference 1:12
called 47:1	Certified 57:6	co-owner 14:9	Commissioner 40:7	5:10 18:2 32:20
calls 54:19	certify 57:8	co-owners 13:24	Commissioners	38:14 39:10 44:14
Cameron-Rulko	Chad 4:11 11:25	coal 13:20 16:2	40:17 42:17	44:20 45:9,19
2:14 10:18,19,20	chance 19:17 51:14	coal-fired 21:6	Commissioners'	47:2 52:24 53:15
10:24 12:14 13:11	change 23:19	Coalition 4:2 9:15	42:2	54:17 55:8,16,16
14:20,22 19:9	changes 7:3 28:7	21:1,11,14	commitment 29:17	confident 48:3
20:20,25 29:13,19	check 42:10 52:1	Colstrip 13:20,24	commitments	confidential 47:24
29:21 31:5,13,17	53:8	14:9,13 16:2,7,10	16:11 18:8 28:20	48:20,21 50:5,11
35:19,20 38:25	checking 23:11	16:14,16,20,21,25	35:4	50:15
39:4,11,17 41:1	Chief 2:21	17:15,18 18:9	committee 23:13	confidentiality
41:12,21 42:22	chunks 48:12	19:8 21:6,12	commodity 6:22	50:10
43:1,5,21,23,25	circumstances 49:3	26:23 27:2,10	46:21	confirm 44:15 46:2
44:6 45:17 46:24	citation 7:6	29:24	commonly 54:8	confirmation 44:11
47:10 49:10 53:2	cited 7:22 18:24	Columbia 4:6 9:20	communicate	confirming 46:12
53:6,21 56:8	claims 50:11	34:2	40:20	
Campbell 4:18	clarifies 50:14			Congress 24:5
11:13		combine 18:21	communications	connection 36:7
capacity 55:21	clarify 29:7	combined 7:12	49:12	consider 15:19
capital 6:16	clean 17:10,12 21:5	come 28:17 52:15	companies 28:21	30:22 35:16
care 27:25 38:17	21:12 22:14 24:4	55:9	38:2	consideration 18:6
careful 48:23	24:4,8,16 25:7	comes 14:14	company 5:18 6:6	considered 34:11
Carciul 40.23				

	·	•		
35:10 38:1	27:15,24 28:7	Danielle 4:17 11:13	44:15	docket 1:4 5:16,20
considering 30:11	Corporation 1:8	data 47:2 49:11,14	determining 19:7	5:22 7:8,9,13
36:5 37:16,21	5:13	49:16,23,24 50:2	developing 16:14	14:24 17:22 32:18
considers 15:9	correct 9:22 10:2	50:5,9,16,21 51:5	development 32:8	document 49:15,21
consistent 23:18	31:13 39:17 40:25	51:7 52:7,8,12,14	35:5	49:22 50:1,2
consolidate 6:10	41:1 43:1,2 50:22	date 26:23 39:9,23	dialogue 40:16	51:17,17
construction 31:18	corrected 9:18,19	40:24 41:5,17	dice 25:1,2	documentation
31:22 32:1,7 33:6	correction 10:8	42:16,20 44:14	difference 22:21	51:16
33:22 34:1 36:13	Council 4:4,16 9:16	45:23 53:15 55:15	different 30:10	documents 48:24
38:1	11:15 12:17 21:3	55:15	40:6 43:11	49:16 51:14
consumer 32:13	30:17 31:3,12,18	dates 41:23 42:1,5	difficult 25:3,13	doing 23:16 25:12
Cont 3:1 4:1	32:14,16,24 33:13	42:5,9,11 44:13	dig 28:18	33:15 34:22 51:22
contact 40:1 41:22	34:1 35:25 36:7	45:10 51:22 55:8	direct 14:15 33:23	Doyle 41:22
54:11	Council's 31:20	David 2:20 8:18	34:21	draw 25:4 26:13
contend 36:16	32:4,21 33:2,4	david.meyer@av	direction 8:15 30:6	36:7 53:4
contention 27:11	counsel 2:7,9,21	2:24	directly 6:14 34:8	dribble 48:11
continuing 40:16	10:16,23 12:25	Davison 3:10	36:15,17	Drive 1:19 2:5,16
40:19	21:18 40:25 49:13	day 8:14 39:15 44:2	disclosure 49:19	DRs 53:24
contract 37:23	count 43:10	48:11 50:19	discovery 18:17	duplication 21:18
contract-type	counted 43:7	days 43:12 46:5,5	21:16 29:14,23	duties 6:17
37:25	County 17:23 57:4	46:19 54:10	30:4 34:15 41:17	
contracting 38:1	couple 44:7 54:10	deadline 41:17 43:6	46:4 47:4,8 48:9	<u>E</u>
contractors 33:15	course 9:5 13:8	December 39:10,20	48:10,18 49:22	E 2:1,1,22 3:1,1,9
33:20 36:14	34:14 37:9 40:6	decide 18:14	51:10,11,13 52:3	4:1,1 5:4,4 57:1,1
contracts 33:20	42:3,8 44:24 47:5	decision 15:4 32:3	52:11 53:14 54:15	early 7:20,25 24:2
38:4	48:17,24 56:7	43:4	discuss 7:25 20:21	easily 48:25
control 7:2 32:4	court 8:19 9:18	deemed 19:3	20:21	economic 27:20
33:16	covered 12:22	Defense 4:3 9:16	discussed 22:10	28:9 35:5
controlling 7:5	covers 33:20	21:2 30:17 31:3	56:5	economics 14:17
convened 5:9	Cowell 3:9 11:7,7	definition 49:20	discussing 18:24	effect 25:16 27:20
convenience 51:6	13:3,4 34:25 35:2	delay 22:7	55:7	effective 51:25
convenient 45:3	46:1,12	denied 17:23 21:11	discussion 38:16	efficiency 21:7,15
conversation 25:25	cross-answering	32:19	53:14	22:2,14 24:17
38:19	41:4	Dennis 1:14 2:3 5:7	discussions 40:2	55:13
cooperation 48:17	cross-examination	deny 33:1 38:8	42:11	effort 38:20 42:15
coordinate 18:17	41:18,19 55:12	described 49:11	dispose 6:9	efforts 22:7
21:16 29:14 34:14	cstokes@cablehu	designated 53:25	dispute 7:17 27:9	eight 22:19
44:25	4:14	54:1	55:20	either 15:6 50:11
coordinated 42:15	currently 17:4 50:5	designation 5:16,17	disputes 37:25	elaboration 22:23
coordination 48:16	customers 11:8	5:18 7:14	District 4:16 11:14	Electrical 19:1
copied 6:2	14:18 15:23 21:9	detail 7:25	12:17 17:24 31:11	electronic 49:11,14
copy 39:5 41:13	27:21	details 40:23	31:18,20 32:4,13	49:16,23,24 50:1
copying 53:11		determinations	32:16,23 33:1,3	50:5,9 51:5,17
Corp 2:21	<u>D</u>	19:23	33:13 34:1,2	eliminate 23:20
corporate 7:4 27:5	D 4:5 5:4	determined 39:23	35:25 36:7	Elizabeth 3:3 9:10
	D3 3:16			email 9:17 10:3,4
	:	:	•	

10.00 15.15.50 0				G 6 0 10 10
40:22 45:15 53:9	establishes 6:17	facility's 28:8	forbid 43:21	Gafken 2:8 10:13
employed 31:22	estimates 41:19	facing 24:5	force 32:8	10:14,14 12:24
employees 49:17,17	evaluates 15:18	fact 6:1 27:9 38:13	foregoing 57:8	39:25
employment 31:21	event 18:13 19:21	55:18	foreign 14:7	Gafken's 40:16
32:1,8 33:6,21	eventually 51:12	factors 34:11	forget 11:5	Garco 33:17
empowers 6:18	Evergreen 1:19 2:5	fair 47:17 48:21	forgetting 44:5	Garlinghouse 1:20
enacted 23:6	2:16	familiar 9:5	form 50:16	57:6,13
encourage 52:6	everybody 5:6 8:2	far 5:25 22:18 26:2	formal 54:13,18	gas 4:10 5:20 12:1
encourages 55:18	31:8 43:22	37:8 39:19 47:16	forth 19:13 50:20	Gates 3:4 8:22 9:3
energies 17:9	evidentiary 41:19	February 39:14,15	forward 5:21 24:12	9:10
energy 3:13 4:2	41:25 55:11	39:15,18,20	37:14 48:25 53:18	general 2:8,15 6:17
9:15 10:11 13:2	exact 23:1 24:18,20	federal 24:3	56:6	10:15,21 17:1,5
16:3,11,14 17:10	exactly 29:23 35:6	feeling 55:1	found 30:15 32:21	18:16 53:25
17:12,21 18:16	example 25:4 28:3	FERC 18:4 52:13	foundational 51:7	General's 2:9,15
21:1,5,7,12,15,18	54:14	ffitch 3:14 10:9,10	four 6:4 40:9	generally 22:4
22:2,3,14,14,14	exchange 55:11	10:11 13:1	four-month 43:18	24:14
23:7,14 24:4,4,8	excuse 17:9 53:24	Fifth 4:12	Fourth 1:22 3:5	generic 53:13
24:16,17 25:7	exhibit 55:10	fighting 8:3	franchises 6:10,15	getting 14:2 45:23
Energy's 26:15	exhibits 41:18	figure 46:10	Franco-Malone	give 5:19 8:3 13:9
engaged 13:19 22:6	55:12	figured 40:11	4:17 11:12,13	19:16,16
38:19	exist 49:3	file 13:8 35:22	29:6 33:9,11	given 5:16,17,17
engaging 6:21	expanded 54:5	filed 5:25	36:11	34:7,20 46:18
enhance 15:20	expansiveness	filing 35:3 39:8	franco@workerl	52:10
enlightening 35:9	52:10	final 7:23 25:23	4:20	go 8:14 9:8 10:9
ensure 27:2,14	expect 17:15 40:19	36:9 55:5	frankly 35:9 53:1	11:6 13:11 14:23
34:15	expecting 8:25	financial 27:16	free 51:15	19:18 20:16,23
ensuring 50:8	experience 17:9,11	find 15:5 37:16	freely 28:22	22:18 23:5 24:12
enter 11:20 55:7	28:5 46:16 48:22	45:3 52:1,7,20	frequent 7:10	25:10 31:15 36:4
entered 7:21	51:21	53:19	Friday 54:22	36:17 37:14 39:3
Enterprises 33:16	explore 35:12	finds 30:3	front 24:4	42:1 45:22 47:14
entertaining 53:20	exploring 26:25	fine 31:8 56:4	Frontier 14:24	48:17
entire 25:17	35:4,7	finite 25:15	18:23 32:11	going 5:15 6:3 8:12
entity 27:24	extended 46:21	first 5:9 12:9 13:10	frontline 33:14	12:19 20:3,8
enunciated 30:23	extension 43:18	14:23 18:24 21:22	fulfilled 23:4	22:16,21 25:10,14
environment 23:13	extent 12:16 13:15	24:13 26:12 28:14	full 43:10	26:18,20 27:9
environmental	13:23 14:2,6	30:2 40:13 43:12	fully 17:14 27:13	28:2 33:18 37:21
3:21 14:17 22:13	26:20 27:12 38:3	51:10 52:1	27:16,17	38:8 47:7
28:9 30:21	42:4	fit 35:7	funding 27:5	Goltz 4:5 9:13,14
equally 49:5	extra 43:20	five 6:4 16:21 46:5	further 29:20 42:11	9:22,24 10:1,3,5
Equity 1:6 5:12	extreme 28:3	flexibility 43:19	44:21	20:10,12,15,18
especially 16:5,5		focus 17:18	Furthermore 17:7	21:21,22 28:16
35:14	F	follow 48:6	future 27:19,22	44:11,18,23 45:2
essential 30:20	F 57:1	followed 54:8	53:17	45:11,14 52:18
establish 32:22	F-E-R-C 18:4	following 21:3		good 5:6 8:21 9:13
established 32:24	facilities 6:11,15,20	footnotes 46:2,7	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{G}}$	10:10,14,19 11:21
	facility 27:7		G 5:4	
		1		<u>'</u>

				<u> </u>
11:23 19:25 26:1	helpful 51:18	Iglitzin 4:18 11:14	intent 14:7 27:17	37:6
31:5 37:3 46:13	helps 48:9	imagine 35:11	45:17	investments 32:9
48:15,22 50:23	hesitate 52:23	impact 16:9 34:7,8	intention 23:21	involved 10:23
54:4	High 3:15	34:21 36:15	intentional 48:3	23:24 24:11
gosh 25:10	higher 23:22 48:25	impacts 32:8 33:6	intentions 27:5	involvement 7:16
gotten 51:19	highly 30:14 47:17	33:19	interest 6:19 7:5	involving 34:2
grace 46:18,20	47:20,23 48:20	impair 15:11 34:12	14:10,15,17 15:6	Island 3:16
grant 15:4 18:14	hit 43:19	implementation	15:8,10,13,14,16	issue 18:19 22:20
24:23 25:18	holding 27:19	21:5	15:19 17:8,24	24:5 27:4 32:25
granted 19:21 31:1	Holdings 32:17	importance 49:6	18:3,16 21:6 27:1	47:11,15 49:10
32:11 33:25 37:8	34:3	important 14:5	27:14,21 28:24	issued 47:19
great 30:14	Honor 8:11,21 9:13	30:19 46:21	29:1 30:11,13,18	issues 13:16,19
group 4:5 9:14	10:11,20,25 11:7	impose 23:22	32:5,15,23 34:5,6	16:18 17:3,10,15
21:11,16	11:12,21,25 12:4	inadvertent 48:5	34:20 37:19 38:6	17:19 18:5,10,11
group's 21:14	12:14 13:4,13,18	include 38:16	interested 19:22	19:23 20:2,8 21:7
groups 22:15	19:19,20 20:22	including 27:8 32:6	26:25 35:4,7	21:8,12,13,16
guess 20:19 43:8,15	21:22 26:4,8,11	33:15,21 42:16	36:22 47:25	25:15,17 28:13,17
47:9,12 53:6	29:6,11,21 31:6	income 21:9	interesting 53:20	30:1,19,21 32:12
guys 45:6	31:14,18 33:11	incorporate 47:1	interests 14:5 15:25	32:13 33:19 34:17
	34:25 36:8 39:1	increasingly 30:20	16:6,13,15,17	35:3,12,17 37:11
H	39:12,25 41:22	indicated 41:22	19:8 21:3 31:20	38:11 45:11 55:19
hacking 50:19	42:7,22 43:5 44:6	indirect 1:6 5:12	31:24,25 32:21	
hand 15:21 48:19	44:11 46:1,24	indirectly 6:14	33:4 36:17	J
handed 39:8	47:10 52:18 53:22	individually 12:19	International 19:1	J 1:14 2:3,20 11:9
handwriting 41:15	56:9	Industrial 4:9 11:8	Internet 47:9	January 24:2
happen 28:2	hope 46:21,25	12:1	intervene 12:8	jcameron@utc.w
happy 20:16 34:14	48:15 51:18	industry 28:7 31:18	13:15 21:4 24:24	2:18
53:9	hour 38:12	33:6	25:18 29:8 30:12	jec@dvclaw.com
hard 26:7 44:13	Huston 4:12	information 8:19	32:17 38:13	3:12
48:11	Hydro 1:5 3:2 5:11	14:2 23:1 26:1	intervenor 25:3,14	Jeffrey 4:5 9:14
harm 22:20 23:8	8:23 9:11 14:6	32:6 33:5 47:17	25:14 40:25	Jennifer 2:14 10:20
48:5 49:2	19:20,22 27:2	48:4,20,21 50:10	intervenor's 18:20	38:23
harms 23:3	28:2,11	50:16,25 52:2	intervenors 18:18	Jesse 3:9 11:7
hear 8:13 13:7,10		54:11	18:21 29:15 34:14	jgoltz@cascadial
20:19 26:7 29:4,7	<u> </u>	inherent 23:23	35:14	4:7 10:5
31:10 47:12	IBEW 32:10	initial 35:3 42:21	intervention 14:23	job 19:12 56:4
heard 16:4 19:11	ICNU 3:8 11:10	injected 24:9	14:25 15:5,10,20	joint 1:4 5:11 6:5
25:21,25 34:24	35:4	inquire 42:4	16:17 17:6,23	49:12,13,20,25
35:8 36:20 37:18	Idaho 4:16 12:17	instances 52:11	18:4,25 19:11,21	50:3,7 53:8 54:3
38:11 52:11	31:11 33:12	instant 18:7 19:5	22:11 26:13,19,21	judge 1:14 2:2 5:6
hearing 39:22,24	idea 48:15	33:2	26:24 28:24 31:12	5:7 8:16,24 9:4,9
40:10,18 41:20,25	ideas 46:9	integrated 17:1	31:25 32:11 33:25	9:12,20,23,25
55:11,12,14	identified 41:17,20	intend 13:16	34:12,16 36:3	10:2,4,7,12,17,22
hearings 40:3,5	54:16	intended 51:8 53:7	38:8	11:1,11,16,23
Heaven 43:21	identifies 15:25	intending 28:11	interventions 12:15	12:2,5,12,18,22
help 48:12 51:1	39:9			13:1,5 14:19
	ı	1	1	ı

17.22 19.1 10.0	40.2 42.0 44.25	 		51.4
17:23 18:1 19:9	40:3 43:9 44:25	limited 1:5 5:11	main 15:24	mergers 51:4
20:1,14,17,23	46:10 47:15 48:2	18:15,25 47:18	maintained 50:9	Meyer 2:20 8:10,11
21:20 25:19 26:5	51:6,20 54:2	52:13	major 24:5	8:17,18 12:9,11
26:10 29:2,9,18	knowing 11:2	limiting 18:20	making 29:17	36:20,21,24 37:1
30:2 31:7,15	knowledge 22:6	line 3:19 4:10 25:4	manageable 48:12	37:3,15 38:23
32:19 33:8 34:23	57:9	lines 30:7	52:3,9	41:5,8,10,12,14
35:1,18 36:9,19	knows 13:18 50:20	Lisa 2:8 10:14	manner 5:19 37:14	42:7,18 43:2,16
36:21,25 37:2,13	53:16	23:10	March 7:23 40:24	45:8,15 46:16
39:2,7,15,18	Kuney 33:17	lisa.gafken@atg	mark 42:1	47:14,15 48:2,8
40:15 41:2,6,9,13		2:11	marked 39:5	49:5,7 50:15,18
41:16,24 42:14,19	<u>L</u>	list 20:5 38:24 41:7	marker 45:5	50:22 51:3 52:17
42:25 43:3,7,17	labor 19:2 38:4	41:18 44:21 54:5	markets 18:1	53:23 55:3 56:10
43:22 44:2,9,17	Laborers 4:16	54:13,17,18,19	master 54:19	MidAmerican
44:20,24 45:3,21	11:14 12:17 31:12	listed 11:2	material 33:7 47:25	17:21
46:7,13,20 47:6	33:13,19 34:1,5	listening 23:11	50:8	mind 40:11 50:14
47:12,21 48:7,14	34:12,19	lists 55:10,10	materials 50:5	minimum 13:17
49:8 50:13,19,23	Laborers' 29:8	little 23:11 26:6,7,9	matter 1:4 5:10,11	27:14 28:22
51:21 52:23 53:10	largely 37:23	26:10 55:23	7:7 15:7,21 28:25	mining 28:6
53:12 54:7 55:4	Lavitt 4:18 11:14	lively 53:17	40:18,20 47:5	minority 16:22
56:11	law 1:14 2:2 3:15	lives 16:25	matters 18:3 19:3,6	minute 19:17
judge's 32:20	3:21 4:5 5:7 9:14	Liz 9:3	22:2,3,9,18 32:2,4	Mission 2:22
July 43:9	17:22 18:1 32:19	liz.thomas@klga	37:14,22,23 44:7	mistake 7:10 43:9
June 42:21	32:20	3:6	45:24	moderate 21:9
jurisdiction 6:1,6	lay 45:5	LLC 1:6,21 5:13	Max 33:17	moment 5:21 30:8
7:1,18 8:1,4,6,13	laying 53:4	LLP 3:4 4:12,18	maximize 55:13	Montana 16:2 21:7
15:17 18:3 19:4	lease 6:9	local 32:8 33:6	mean 22:18,22 23:5	month 41:25
30:20 37:23 52:11	leave 35:21	locations 40:4,9	meaning 16:17	months 7:21,24
jurisdictional 7:3	leaves 55:1	lock 42:8	31:25	43:7,8,10
jurisprudence 7:19	left 11:17	logistics 40:11	means 14:7 55:20	morning 5:6 8:21
8:7	legally 35:24	long 27:7	meant 51:5	9:13 10:10,14,19
justice 15:11	legislature 23:6,15	longest 38:14	mediation 55:21	11:22,23 38:20
	24:6	look 28:18 53:18	meet 55:8	Moss 1:14 2:3 5:6,7
K	length 46:4	56:6	meetings 22:2	8:16,24 9:4,9,12
K&L 3:4 8:22 9:2	let's 10:9 13:5,5	looked 40:9	members 14:11,18	9:20,23,25 10:2,4
9:10	20:23 22:11 23:5	looking 28:4 46:3	15:23 16:12 27:21	10:7,12,17,22
Kari 3:4 8:22	25:4 31:10 41:3	47:25	32:22 33:14 34:21	11:1,11,16,23
kari.vanderstoep	level 23:19	loop 40:21 54:12	members' 28:25	12:2,5,12,18,22
3:7	liabilities 13:24	lose 43:11	mentioned 30:8	13:1,5 14:19 19:9
keep 40:20 45:18	14:3,8,13 16:6,15	lot 25:25 28:5	52:19	20:1,14,17,23
52:9 55:24	19:7 27:12,16,17	42:14 52:15	Mercer 4:19	21:20 25:19 26:5
kept 54:11	29:23	low 21:8	merge 6:10	26:10 29:2,9,18
kind 37:11	liability 27:7	Lydig 33:17	merger 14:4 16:9	30:2 31:7,15 33:8
kindly 9:7	life 28:8		17:13 24:10 28:15	34:23 35:1,18
know 7:10 11:5	limit 21:14 52:2	M	28:18 33:18 34:2	36:9,19,21,25
13:18 20:2 28:2	limitations 25:1	Macquarie 23:7	34:8,21 36:18	37:2,13 39:2,7,15
30:4 38:18 39:5	46:18	32:18		
	l	l	I	I

				ı
39:18 40:15 41:2	24:21 25:7 28:19	26:13	organization 14:16	28:6
41:6,9,16,24	35:16 36:5,6,18	obligations 13:23	15:16 32:25	particulars 8:18
42:14,19,25 43:3	never 22:5	14:8 16:10 26:25	organizations	parties 12:13 13:18
43:7,17,22 44:2,9	nevertheless 19:22	27:3,10,25 28:9	30:11,16	21:17,23 22:8,8
44:17,20,24 45:3	37:16	28:19	originally 53:7	23:2 24:15 31:22
45:21 46:7,13,20	new 22:17,17,18	obviate 52:8	Oshie 11:9	35:22 37:9 38:18
47:6,12,21 48:7	24:8 27:14 35:12	occurs 7:11	outcome 34:20	40:21 42:8 44:25
48:14 49:8 50:13	35:15	October 1:17 5:1	outside 28:6	45:18,24 46:9,25
50:19,23 51:21	nexus 15:15 32:14	offer 55:21	overlapping 20:24	47:4,5,16 48:9
52:23 53:10,12	32:24 33:23	Office 2:9,15	overlooking 11:17	50:25 51:6,9,24
54:7 55:4 56:11	nice 8:14 19:12	oh 9:4 10:4 11:4	owner 6:15 27:15	51:25 53:11,13
motion 36:23 37:16	night 9:19	25:9 36:21 41:14	owners 16:7,16,19	54:20,23
37:17	normally 43:11	43:7 44:2,17,20	16:22	parties' 45:18
move 26:6 37:10	North 33:16	45:14	ownership 16:6,15	48:23
moving 16:11	Northern 4:15	okay 8:3 11:1,16	16:23 21:5,13	partner 9:2
MSC 2:22	12:17 31:11 33:12	12:7 13:1 20:1	23:19 27:1 28:8	party 19:14 50:1,25
multiple 16:6,16,19	Northwest 4:3,9	37:1 41:24 42:25		51:1 54:17
mutually 45:3	9:15,16,21 11:9	44:17,23 45:2,24	P	pass 39:4
	11:15 12:1 21:1,2	46:13 51:20 54:23	P 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1	pasted 6:2
N	30:16 31:2	old 43:8	5:4	Patrick 11:9
N 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:4	notation 39:13	Olympia 1:19,23	Pacific 11:15	pause 5:15
nail 45:15	note 17:4 26:12	2:5,17 4:6 5:1	PacifiCorp 7:8	pay 16:12 31:20
name 5:7 8:18,22	34:10 43:13	9:15	17:22	32:1
9:14	notes 6:3 39:8 53:3	Olympus 1:6 5:12	packages 31:21	payments 14:12
named 54:3	notice 47:8	ones 33:14 34:22	page 24:4	PC 3:10
names 54:3	NPL 33:16	ongoing 16:9 49:1	Pages 1:13	peering 50:20
national 1:24 24:9	NRDC 21:3	54:12	papers 48:1	pending 17:5
38:4	number 5:20 22:9	open 22:1	paragraph 26:24	people 51:13 54:2,6
Natural 4:3 9:16	52:14	operation 17:18	paragraphs 6:4	percentage 16:23
21:2 30:16 31:2	NW 4:2,6	opportunities 38:6	paralegal 54:14	perception 26:17
nature 43:11 49:2	NWEC 12:16 20:21	opportunity 13:10	parameters 35:6	performing 36:12
NE 3:15	21:1 30:16 31:2	24:8 26:4	parent 27:6	period 48:11
near 28:8		option 37:9,10	Park 1:19 2:5,16	periods 30:24
nearly 38:12	0	55:24	part 9:1 26:16	46:14
necessary 6:8,13	O 5:4	order 1:9 5:13,16	27:14 30:21,22	permitted 19:5
need 12:20 17:16	000 5:3	7:22,22,23,23,25	49:25 54:9	person 54:16
29:4 38:17 39:3	Oakland 3:23	14:25 15:4,4 18:2	participants 52:5	persons 6:21
40:13 43:20 44:18	object 12:15 37:4	27:24 32:20 36:2	participated 21:24	perspective 30:19
52:8,25 53:1	49:21	38:16 45:5,22	participation 15:8	35:9 47:6 52:4,5
55:13	objection 13:6,11	47:2,19,23 52:21	15:18 17:7 18:15	perspectives 35:12
needed 52:2	14:21 19:10 20:13	52:24 53:1,9	18:20,21,25 21:14	persuaded 30:25
needs 37:4	20:15 22:10 24:1	54:18,25 55:1,8	22:3,13 30:15	37:18
negotiated 24:15	26:1,16 31:10,11	55:17	32:5	petition 9:17 13:8,9
negotiations 24:13	31:16 39:24 53:9	orderly 15:11 34:12	particular 14:4	13:14 15:4,22,25
net 22:19,24 23:3	objections 12:10,13	Oregon 3:11 4:13	20:8 36:3,22	16:1 18:14 21:4
23:15,21 24:7,11	12:19,24 13:2		particularly 14:5	
	•			•

	_	_		
21:11 29:8 30:9	48:18	32:25 33:2 34:6	15:19 17:8,23	ratepayers 27:18
31:1,2,19 32:16	practice 19:12 46:8	34:13,17,20 38:7	21:17 30:11,18	32:22 36:6
32:19 33:2	54:8	43:11 47:18 56:7	32:5,15 34:6	rates 6:19 25:10,11
petitioner 15:6,13	practiced 52:13	proceedings 17:2	39:22 40:2,5,10	31:20 32:7 33:5
15:14 32:5	practices 6:20	21:25 22:1 24:10	40:18,24 49:18,19	RCW 6:7,8,12,16
petitions 12:8,10	practitioners 46:17	27:12 37:9 54:13	Puget 23:7 26:15	15:3 18:19 49:20
12:13 24:23 25:18	precaution 50:24	process 48:13,17,18	32:17	read 5:24 6:3,5
30:12 38:13	preferences 42:2	55:19	purchase 6:14 27:6	7:15 37:17 41:15
phone 16:4 26:6	prefiled 22:23	process-wise 53:24	purpose 15:15 51:8	51:14
place 24:3 50:2	prehearing 1:12	production 29:15	51:12	readable 50:16
places 40:6	5:10 18:2 32:20	Program 3:22	pursuant 15:3	ready 44:8
plainly 7:2	38:14 45:5,22	progress 55:25	pursue 38:6	really 20:2 28:18
plan 17:1	47:2 52:20,24	prohibited 19:2	pursued 38:8	28:18 51:5,12
plans 29:24	53:15 54:17 55:7	Project 3:13 10:11	pursuing 18:8	55:21,24
plant 13:20 16:2,7	55:16	13:2 21:18	purview 32:15	Realtime 1:21
16:10 21:6 27:2	prepared 31:8 53:3	projects 31:23	put 37:12 46:7	reason 7:15 23:25
plc 7:8	presentation 18:18	prompt 15:11	47:22 52:23	26:15 34:11
please 5:21 13:12	21:17	proof 23:23	putting 50:15	reasonably 55:2
26:5 36:25 48:6	presented 53:10	proper 50:3		reasons 21:10
48:13 54:10 55:24	presenting 23:14	properly 19:23	Q	23:16 24:23 25:17
PO 2:16,22	President 2:21	23:20	quantifying 14:2	30:10
point 17:14 19:25	pretty 5:24 12:22	properties 6:11,15	question 8:3 20:4	rebuttal 41:3
24:18 25:13 27:22	46:3 52:25	property 7:19	33:18 34:4	recall 22:11
29:12 30:3 37:7	primarily 28:14	proposal 23:15	questions 51:9	recalled 7:17
points 56:5	36:4	proposed 1:10 5:14	quicker 54:24	receive 54:2
police 30:5 37:14	primary 13:21	16:9 18:6 22:25	quickly 52:25 55:6	receiving 23:2
48:18	prime 23:9	23:9 33:7 42:9	quit 8:3	36:13 54:14
policies 24:9,16,17	prior 51:4,21 55:12	proposes 18:15	quite 19:22 26:20	recognized 24:13
30:23	probably 38:13	32:14	35:9,17 37:20	record 8:17 21:19
polluting 27:6 28:7	51:3,19	propound 51:13	quote 6:19,21,23	49:25 50:2,12
portfolio 16:3,14	problem 29:17	propounding 51:10	quote/unquote	51:4
18:17	43:14	protect 50:10 51:1	19:2	recordings 23:12
Portland 3:11 4:13	procedural 38:18	protected 15:16	R	records 9:19 49:18
position 27:16,18	38:22 39:1 44:8	protective 47:19,23	R 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:4	49:19 54:19
positioned 27:3	44:12 45:20	provide 32:6 33:5	K 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:4 57:1	redacted 50:9
possible 25:2 40:7	Procedure 15:2	43:17 54:10	raise 13:17 17:3	refer 5:21 51:17
41:15	procedures 46:4	provided 8:19 55:8	18:10 19:6 21:12	53:16
possibly 41:14	48:6	provider 27:23	26:15 45:25	reference 7:9
potential 32:25	proceeding 14:16	provision 49:21	raised 13:22 17:16	references 19:13
49:2,18	15:7,12 16:19,24	provisions 25:7	19:25	regard 16:19 37:7
power 7:8,12,16	17:2,7,17,20,25	47:20,24	raising 19:2	41:21 43:14
16:20,24 18:1,9	18:7,22 19:5,7,24	PSE 22:8 32:17,22	rate 17:1,5 21:25	regarding 17:15
18:11 21:6 37:13	20:3 21:13 22:21	public 2:7,9 6:5,11	22:9 24:11 26:15	region 35:5
51:23	23:13 24:16 29:1	6:13,19,23 7:3	43:8,12	regularly 7:11
powers 6:17 37:15	29:15,17,22,25	10:15 12:24 15:8	ratepayer 35:8	regulate 6:19
			Tatepayer 33.0	

	•	1	1	<u> </u>
regulates 32:3	47:24	29:18 30:2 31:4,7	scheduling 45:11	settlements 24:15
reiterate 29:25	required 18:17	31:9 36:9,19	School 3:15	55:25
55:17	27:22	37:24 38:16 39:7	Schwerin 4:18	seven 7:24 46:5
reject 24:22	requirement 26:22	39:18,21 40:15,23	11:13	shared 50:25
related 6:23 13:20	55:9	41:9,16 42:19,20	scope 16:18 19:4,24	shares 43:22
16:10 17:10 18:8	requirements 28:23	43:3 44:3,12	36:4	short 20:20
21:7 26:21,22	32:7	45:21 46:23 47:8	Scottish 7:8,12,16	short-circuit 51:11
27:1 32:12	requiring 18:21	48:7,14 50:7,13	scrutiny 28:3	shorten 46:14
relations 19:3 38:4	reserve 37:10	50:22 51:2 55:4,6	Seattle 1:22,23	shortened 46:5
relative 14:5	residential 15:23	55:22 56:1	2:10 3:5 4:19	Shorthand 57:6
relatively 22:17	resolution 55:20	rights 16:9	second 7:22 44:14	shorthanded 55:23
relevant 24:1 25:12	resolutions 18:8	risk 23:19,23 50:17	45:9,19	shortly 23:7 55:10
reliabilities 27:1	resolved 38:22	Ritchie 3:20 11:21	section 44:10 55:23	shown 15:15 28:23
reliability 32:12	55:19	11:22,23 13:7,12	sector 28:5,6,13	side 5:20 11:17
33:24 34:9 36:15	resource 17:1	13:13,14 16:4	sectors 28:7	sides 38:11
reliance 16:2	Resources 4:3 9:16	19:16 25:22,23	see 9:4 15:14 37:11	Sierra 3:19,21
relief 37:7	21:2 30:17 31:3	26:3,7,8,11 29:3	40:4 41:3 44:3,4	11:22 12:15 13:6
rely 50:1	respect 16:22 20:21	29:11	46:21 52:1	13:7,14,19 14:11
remain 29:22 50:7	37:5 43:23	RNW 21:2	seek 17:6 22:7	14:11 15:22,25
remarks 54:9 55:5	respecting 48:20	Road 3:15	seen 28:12	16:5,8,12 17:3,6,7
remediation 27:10	respectively 46:6	robust 35:13	sell 6:9	17:8 18:14,15
remember 26:14	respond 25:10,16	role 16:17	selling 19:7	19:5,21 20:3
remind 8:25	26:4 33:10 51:16	room 11:5,18 27:8	seminal 7:18	21:10 24:19 25:6
renewable 4:3 9:16	53:24	38:20 51:5,18	senate 23:9,13	26:12,17 27:11,21
21:1 22:3 30:16	Responding 30:2	round 40:13	24:21	28:4,12,23 29:13
31:2	response 20:1 29:7	routine 46:8	Senator 23:10,14	30:17,25
repeatedly 13:22	40:14 46:14	rule 15:1 31:25	24:6	sign 47:25
reply 42:25	responses 26:2 47:4	43:15	sense 20:7 42:15	similar 26:14 33:24
report 27:23	54:15	ruling 31:3	47:7	similarly 18:7 19:4
REPORTED 1:20	responsibile 14:12	rulings 38:15	sensitive 47:17,20	35:11
reporter 8:20 9:18	50:8	running 51:9	48:4 49:6	Simon 3:14 10:11
57:7	responsible 16:1	Russian 50:19	separate 5:20	simon@ffitchlaw
Reporting 1:21	result 36:18 52:4		separately 29:8,9	3:17
represent 8:23 9:15	retirement 26:23	S 2:1,16 3:1 4:1 5:4	30:9	simply 17:17 19:20
21:23 28:25 33:12	retiring 44:1	safety 32:12 33:23	serve 47:4	29:25 36:2,8
representatives	revenue 26:22	34:8 36:15	service 6:5,11,13	43:13 47:3
11:4	review 13:17 35:3	sampling 35:14	6:22 32:13 54:2,3	simultaneous 42:23
represented 50:4	reviewing 13:15	satisfy 14:8	54:5,13,19	42:23
representing 8:20	right 5:23 8:17,24	says 39:13	services 6:20 55:22	sir 35:1
9:10 11:14 14:17	9:12,20 10:9,10	scenarios 28:12	serving 47:16	sit 20:5 45:6
represents 33:13	10:12 11:3,6,19	schedule 38:18	set 25:15 27:24	site 47:9,9 50:16
request 25:18 47:2	12:6,7,12,18	39:1,7 40:4 44:8	47:8 50:12 51:5	skill 57:9
52:8	14:19 20:17,25	44:12 45:4,20	settlement 39:9	skipped 44:12
requests 52:12,14	24:10 25:19,23	46:3	44:14,20 45:19	slice 25:1
require 21:16 47:3	26:5 28:25 29:2	schedules 38:22	55:15,16,19	Snohomish 17:23
		Schedules 30.22		

G PVID 45 04	1.50.47.00.55.0	1 ,	L., , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
SnoPUD 17:24	46:3 47:23 55:9	substantial 15:6,13	telephone 11:19	56:11
SnoPUD's 17:24	standards 24:22	16:16 17:9,11	ten 43:8 48:11	thoroughgoing
18:2	32:7 33:22	27:20 30:13,14	terms 47:18 48:23	19:10 38:10
somewhat 20:24	Star 33:16	31:24 32:23 34:5	53:4	thought 24:5 35:21
30:10	start 8:8 13:6 25:1	34:19 48:5	test 15:14 22:17,19	36:22 40:11
soon 38:21 45:9	28:17	suffice 39:6	23:4,15,22	three 21:7,23 22:13
54:23	started 38:21	sufficient 28:23	testimony 22:24	23:16 25:5
sooner 54:24	state 24:6,9 30:23	sufficiently 27:24	35:22,23 37:6	three-day 54:25
sorry 29:11 36:21	31:15 57:3,7	suggested 24:25	40:14,25 41:3,4	threshold 7:17
37:2 39:11 41:5	stated 13:14 18:2	37:15 40:16	50:3	throwing 42:13
sort 9:6 18:8 22:22	21:3 26:19 31:20	suggesting 28:1,10	thank 8:7,11 9:9,12	THURSTON 57:4
23:1 24:18,20	37:20	Suite 1:22 2:10 3:5	10:8,12,17 11:11	tied 27:4
45:5 46:8 48:25	statement 5:25	3:10,16,22 4:6,12	11:16 12:2,5	time 10:24 14:13
sorts 24:9	53:13	4:19 9:23	13:13 14:19 19:19	23:11 26:13,14
sought 15:10	states 17:8 23:17	supplemental 7:22	19:19 21:20,22	27:13 30:24 37:11
Sound 23:7 26:15	32:6	supply 16:25 18:10	25:19 26:8,10,11	40:21 41:18,23
source 51:7,14	statute 15:17 23:6	supplying 6:22	29:2,10,18 31:9	43:20 46:4
sources 16:11	43:15,16	suppose 35:20 38:4	31:17 33:8,11	times 8:2 21:24
South 1:19 2:5	statutes 30:23	sure 8:12 26:20	34:23 35:18 36:8	45:4
speak 13:10 26:6	statutory 6:7,25	35:6 43:22 45:7	36:19 38:9 41:15	today 5:9 8:5 35:8
27:23 36:25 51:1	22:17,17 43:6	49:5 52:4 54:6	42:18,19 47:21	37:18 38:12 47:22
specific 28:24	steps 34:15	Surprisingly 53:18	49:7 55:3 56:3,8	50:12 53:3 56:3,5
specifically 18:19	stipulations 55:18	sustainable 16:3	56:10,11	tossed 45:10
42:4	stocks 6:16	18:16	thing 43:8 46:25	Traffic 33:16
spend 38:12	Stoep 3:4 8:21,22	SW 1:19 2:5,16	49:1	training 32:7 33:22
spent 23:11	8:24 9:2	3:10 4:12	things 6:18 13:25	36:12
spirit 48:16	Stokes 4:11 11:25	system 33:24 34:9	30:12 33:23 34:7	transaction 1:10
split 40:13	12:1,2,4	34:22 36:16	35:5,10 36:1,15	5:14 7:4 14:24
Spokane 2:23	stopped 9:6		52:9,12	18:6,23 22:25
23:10 33:16 39:22	Street 3:22 4:6,19	$\frac{1}{T 57:1,1}$	think 14:4,15 19:12	23:8,24 32:11
40:3	9:21	,	19:24 20:3 25:1	33:7 49:1
spoke 41:23	strike 37:10 39:12	table 46:17	25:11 26:16 27:8	transactions 7:2
sponsor 23:10	strive 29:16	tactics 22:6	28:22 30:3,6 34:4	transcript 53:1,7
Staff 2:13 3:21	strong 39:23	tail 27:7 take 5:23 8:8 12:8	34:11 35:13 37:4	53:16 57:8
10:21,22 12:15	struck 5:25 6:2		38:7,23 39:19	transfer 7:4,19
18:14 19:25 24:1	52:10	12:18,20 27:25	42:14 44:2,24	32:17
29:22 40:1,24	structure 27:5	29:9 30:9,10	45:11 46:3,13	transition 16:1
53:21	stuff 51:7 54:4	34:15 50:24 52:6	48:14,21 49:4	transitioning 16:13
Staff's 13:11 14:21	styled 5:10 7:7	taken 38:17	50:17,23 52:7,14	transmission 17:25
30:6	subject 6:6 15:7	talk 25:11 38:18	54:4,25 56:4	Transportation 1:2
standard 14:23	40:6,15,20 42:2	45:6	thinking 44:1 53:23	1:18 2:4 5:8
15:1 18:24 22:20	49:18	talking 38:3 40:21	third 23:25 31:22	transposition 7:11
23:8,17,22 24:7	subparts 52:16	48:8	Thomas 3:3 8:25	Travis 3:20 11:22
24:12,14 33:24	Subsection 49:20	tapes 23:12	9:3,5,6,8,9,10	13:13
35:15 36:5,11,13	subsidiary 1:6 5:12	Tayler 1:20 57:6,13	12:21 19:18,19	travis.ritchie@si
		Taylor 3:10		
	-	-	-	-

3:24	unusual 38:12	53:8	32:8 33:15 34:22	14th 39:9 43:4,9,13
treatment 48:23	unwind 14:13	wanted 46:1 50:11	35:15 36:13 40:23	15th 40:24
trip 40:8,12	upwards 40:9	wants 24:19	42:6,10,11 44:18	16 41:19
true 57:8	urge 24:23	warnings 49:4	48:5 52:21	18 4:19
try 26:5 42:5	use 49:14	Washington 1:1,18	workers 19:1 31:22	1840 1:22
trying 14:3 36:7	useful 16:25 54:20	1:19,22 2:4,5,10	36:12 38:1	1999 7:23
42:7,8	Users 4:10 12:1	2:17,23 3:5,16 4:6	working 13:25 56:6	
turn 12:8 25:21	UT-090842 14:24	4:15,19 5:1,8 6:21	works 42:16	2
33:13	Utilities 1:2,18 2:4	12:16 15:17 17:10	worrying 45:22	20 1:17 5:1 19:11
turnaround 54:25	5:8 11:9	24:6 33:12 34:1	worst 28:11	2000 2:10 4:12
TVW 23:12	utility 6:22 7:3	57:3,7	worth 28:4	51:22
two 8:2 21:5 40:5	17:24 28:5,12	wasn't 8:12	write 39:3	2009 23:6 24:2,2
46:2	38:2	water 23:14	written 15:22 39:2	2017 1:17 5:1
type 48:24 50:24		way 7:14 30:4	wrong 5:16 10:3,7	2018 39:21 41:6,17
types 48:24	V	52:20	www.buellrealti	43:4,13
typo 9:17	value 35:13	we'll 8:8 13:6 29:9	1:25	206 1:23 2:11,23
	valued 22:5	42:15 44:19 46:10		3:6,17 4:20
U	Van 3:10	47:16 55:11	X	2101 3:22
U 5:18	Vander 3:4 8:21,22	we're 12:19 14:1		212 4:6
U-072375 32:18	8:24 9:2	25:12,13 26:20	Y	224-3092 4:13
U-170790 5:22	various 13:24	30:11 36:4 37:21	yeah 44:21 45:6,14	22nd 41:20
U-170970 1:4	21:24 28:21 30:22	38:3 42:7 44:7	52:17	23rd 41:20
UE 5:17 7:13	33:15,20 34:7	46:18 48:8 54:4	year 39:20 51:22	241-7242 3:11
UE-051090 17:22	36:14 56:5	55:22	years 7:16 13:19	257-6011 4:20
UE-981627 7:12	vehicle 50:3	we've 13:22 55:6	14:10 19:11 20:7	25th 41:4,6
UE-981672 7:9	venue 37:25 38:5	Webster 3:22	22:19 30:15 48:23	27 2:22
understand 14:3	verifying 41:2	Wednesday 54:22	53:19	287-9066 1:23
16:23 31:19 40:1	Verizon 14:24	week 39:10 41:25	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	28th 42:21
40:8 41:11 49:15	18:23 32:11	54:23	zone 15:14	2900 3:5
49:16 52:18	viable 55:24	welcome 24:22	zone 15:14	2nd 41:17
understanding	Vice 2:21	welcomed 22:4	0	
15:20 37:5 49:14	videotapes 23:12	West 4:19		3
50:12 53:5	view 30:10 37:19	WGL 34:3	1	3 16:21,25 17:16,19
understands 27:15	volume 1:12 48:25	wholesale 18:1	1 17:24	29:24 49:20
understood 27:13	XX /	wish 29:20 34:24	1-57 1:13	30 43:12 52:15
unfortunately 28:4	W	45:25 54:11	10:41 56:12	321 3:15
Union 31:19 32:10	WAC 15:2	wishes 11:20 17:3	100 33:14	333 3:10
36:10,14 38:3	wage 32:6 33:5	19:14 50:1	1001 4:12	3358 1:20 57:13
Union's 30:9	wages 33:21	witness 41:18 55:10	11 43:7,10	34.05.443 15:3
unit 2:9 26:23	waiting 8:13	witnesses 42:9	112 9:23	18:19
units 16:16,20,21	wake 19:15	wonder 19:14	11th 39:10	360 1:23 2:17 4:7
16:25 17:16,18	walked 38:19	38:21	1300 1:19 2:5 3:22	370-7631 3:6
29:24	wanders 37:6	word 25:24	1325 1:22	3727 2:22
unnecessarily 18:5	want 5:19 24:20	words 36:9	1400 2:16	383 3:16
unreasonably	25:21,23 35:21	work 9:3 30:21	1411 2:22	4
17:19 34:16	40:17 44:15 46:9			
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

1 age 05			
4 16:21,25 17:16,19 29:24 400 3:10 4:19 40128 2:16 415 3:23 42.56.010 49:20 464-6595 2:11 480-07-355 15:2 34:10 5 5 14:25 15:4 500 52:12 503 3:11 4:13 5055 23:9 24:21 528-3026 4:7 534-9066 1:23 5th 2:10 6 6 26:24 606 4:6 9:20 623-7580 2:23 664-1186 2:17 669-8197 3:17 6th 39:14,16,18,20 7 8 80-some 51:24 80.01.040 6:16 80.04.010 6:7 80.12.020 6:8 80.12.040 6:12 800 1:24 2:10 846-6989 1:24 9 9:30 1:16 5:2 925 3:5 94612 3:23 97204 3:11 4:13 977-5727 3:23 98101 1:22 98104 2:10 3:5	98110 3:16 98119 4:19 981627 7:10 98501 4:6 9:25 98504 1:19 2:5,17 99220 2:23		
70104 2.10 3.3			