Docket No. UT-190437 - Vol. I

Public Hearing for Proposed WAC Rule Amendment 480-123

May 7, 2020



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 LACEY, WASHINGTON; MAY 7, 2020 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 2 1:30 P.M. 3 --000--PROCEEDINGS 4 Public Hearing for Proposed WAC Rule Amendment 480-123 5 Docket No. UT-190437 6 CHAIR DANNER: Today is May 7th, 2020, and TELEPHONIC ADOPTION HEARING, VOLUME I 7 we are here having a virtual hearing of the Utilities Pages 1-18 and Transportation Commission today. This is a rule 8 CHAIR DANNER, COMMISSIONER RENDAHL, AND COMMISSIONER BALASBAS 9 adoption hearing in Docket UT-190437, which is a 10 rulemaking to modify the state universal communication 11 service program. May 7, 2020 12 This is a rulemaking that began in May of 1:30 p.m. 13 2019, a little less than a year ago, and I know a lot of Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 14 work has gone into this, and I appreciate the comments 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast from everybody who has participated -- participated in 15 Lacey, Washington 98503 this, and I appreciate the Staff work. 16 17 What I'd like to do now -- I'm Dave Danner. I'm Chair of the Commission. I'm joined by my 18 19 colleagues, Ann Rendahl and Jay Balasbas. What I would REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358 20 like to do now is turn it over to Sean Bennett from Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 21 Commission Staff, who will give us an overview of the 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 22 rules and of the -- the issues before us today. (206) 287-9066 | Seattle 23 So, Mr. Bennett, why don't you go ahead. (360) 534-9066 | Olympia 24 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Good afternoon, (800) 846-6989 | National www.buellrealtime.com 2.5 Chair and Commissioners. I am Sean Bennett with Page 2 Page 4 APPEARANCES 1 1 regulatory services. 2 2 This rulemaking started as a result of DAVE DANNER, Chair 3 passage of second substitute Senate Bill 5511, also 3 ANN RENDAHL. Commissioner 4 known as the Broadband Bill, which extends the safe JAY BALASBAS, Commissioner 5 universal communication services program through fiscal 4 SEAN BENNETT, UTC Staff 6 year 2024. A notable change in that -- in this is that RICHARD FINNIGAN, Representative for WITA 5 LISA GAFKEN, Public Counsel 7 broadband service is now a supported service. 6 8 Before I dive into the details, I would like 7 9 to thank all of the stakeholders who have provided their * * * * * 10 time, expertise, and attention with this rulemaking. 8 11 Everyone's willingness to work together and talk through 9 12 issues as they arise has been invaluable to this 10 11 13 process, and quite frankly, has probably set a fairly 12 14 high expectation for me on any future rulemakings. 13 15 I also want to thank the entire rulemaking 14 16 team. So thank you, Jing Roth, Greg Kopta, Jennifer 15 17 Cameron-Rulkowski, Kristen Hillstead, Kyle Mor- -- Kyle 16 18 Murphy, and Barry Zickuhr. 17 18 19 Through the process of collaboration and 19 20 negotiation, the proposed rule includes revisions within 20 21 Title 480, Chapter 123, Sections 20, 100, 110, 120, 130, 2.1 2.2 and 150. In order to achieve the intent of Broadband 22 23 Bill, Staff proposes essentially three major revisions 23 24 to the current program rules. 24 25 25 First, we have revised the requirements for

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5

petitioning and eligibility. The current rule requires that the petition company needs to demonstrate that their customers are at risk of rate instability, service interruptions, or cessation of services. In the proposed rule, eligibility is based on a company's broadband plan to provide, enhance, or maintain broadband services while also meeting one of four eligibility criterion that the proposed rules establish.

In addition to any of the requirements with the FCC, each of these criterion have forward-looking broadband build-out obligations that a company needs to have already achieved or will achieve by the end of fiscal year 2024.

Secondly, the proposed rule allows for other providers to petition for support in the event that they meet the prerequisites of Section 100, Sub 3.

Third, the proposed rule parts from the current formula to calculate support notes. The new method removes the amounts that the petitioning company previously received from the traditional USF fund that was established in Docket U-8523. The new calculation sets the company's support amount to be no more for their pro rata share of the cumulative reduction and support from the Connect America Fund & Intercarrier Compensation mechanism incurred up, through, and

"eligibility category" needs to be changed to "eligibility criterion."

In Section 120, Sub 6, after the first sentence add, (as read) If there is a pro rata reduction or increase in support, the company's broadband build-out obligation will be adjusted proportionally.

Page 7

Page 8

The last is Section 130, Sub 1, Paragraph 5, and this needs to be changed to, (as read) Detailed information on how the provider used program support during the preceding year to maintain, provide, or enhance telecommunication services.

I also need to note that we did provide two additional comments or recommendations that Staff does not support. These are addressed in the adoption hearing memo and has been fully discussed in your -- the Commission briefings as well. Rick Finnigan, on behalf of WITA, may wish to present their point of view on these areas.

Additionally, on May 6th, WITA did bring to Staff's attention that, on page 29, that it listed as being the United States Administrative -- Administrative Company; however, it should read, "Universal Service" Administrative Company.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt Staff's proposed revisions to Title 480, Chapter 123.

Page 6

including the 2020 fiscal year.

Now I would like to take just a couple minutes to discuss the stakeholders' comments to CR-102. On March 13th, the Washington Independent Telephone Association, or WITA, filed written comments. Based on these comments, Staff recommends the following five changes that were also included in the memo posted in this docket on May 5th.

In Section 20, there's a broadband service definition. Simply remove the word "speed" from the fifth sentence. The revised sentence will read, (as read), Any broadband standards that are established in these rules or by Commission order may be met by the communications provider or its affiliate or a combination of both.

The next is Section 110, Sub 1, Paragraph H, and the change is to make (as read), And the provider will continue to provide broadband services, that is changed into (as read), And the provider or its affiliates, if appropriate, will continue to provide broadband services.

The next is in Section 120, Sub 1. In the third sentence change "provide, maintain, and enhance," and I use air quotations, not that anyone can see those, to -- to "provide, maintain, or enhance." Additionally,

Thank you, Chair, thank you, Commissioners, stakeholders, and the rulemaking team. We are available for questions, and I -- I do believe Rick Finnigan, representing WITA, is on the line as well.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions for Mr. Bennett or others on the team?

Okay. Sean, I'm not hearing any questions. I do want to just make sure we're changing the "and" to "or" in the phrase, "Provide, maintain, or enhance"? So basically, the effect of that is you don't need to enhance your service as long as you're maintaining your service; is that the way you read this?

MR. BENNETT: It -- it kind of has two separate eligibility requirements. The -- the -- the statute is specifically that a provider needs to adopt a plan to provide, enhance, or maintain. And that's in statute, and the plan that they're providing --

CHAIR DANNER: The statute says "or;" is that correct, Sean?

MR. BENNETT: That is correct. However, in addition to the broadband plan, we're also essentially requiring these companies to submit a petition and to elect one of the four eligibility criteria. And -- and

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9 Page 11 1 1 of other providers, everything is put off until we see that eligibility criteria would also be used in 2 determining whether or not a company should be eligible 2 if there is going to be any -- anyone like that, and 3 for funds. 3 then the advisory committee is supposed to come up with 4 some standards. If a company -- just as an illustration, if 4 5 a company only had one broadband customer and they 5 What WITA thought was that there ought to be 6 provide a broadband plan to only maintain their network 6 a baseline standard, and that baseline standard should 7 7 for that one service, I don't think that would quite be there needs to be a commitment to build to the same 8 8 number of locations, broadband locations, at the same or pass muster. It is called a -- the state universal 9 9 communication services program. And so as broadband is better speed than what the incumbent would be required 10 now a supported service, the program purpose was changed 10 to do. If -- if that standard isn't there, it's 11 to support continued provision of basic telecom 11 possible the customers would be worse off, not better 12 services, and the provision enhancement and [inaudible] 12 off to move forward. Now, it may be that the advisory 13 the broadband services. And so with that, it's kind of 13 committee will -- will recommend such a standard, but 14 a two-prong eligibility criteria in order to receive 14 WITA thought it ought to be included in the rules as a 15 baseline standard. support. 15 16 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very 16 And that -- that's all I have. If -- if 17 much. 17 there are any questions about that, I'd be happy to try 18 18 All right. Any other questions for to respond. 19 19 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Are there Mr. Bennett? 20 20 All right, then. Thank you so much. Stay questions for Mr. Finnigan? 21 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yes, Chair, I do tuned unless we need to come back to you. 21 22 Let me ask, Mr. Finnigan, do you wish to 22 have a question for Mr. Finnigan. 23 23 comment on this proceeding? CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead, Commissioner. 24 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, thank you. Rick 24 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Thank you. 25 Finnigan on behalf of the Washington Independent 25 So good afternoon, Mr. Finnigan. So I'd Page 10 Page 12 1 Telecommunications Association. First, I -- I want to 1 like to just ask, do you anticipate any of current WITA 2 2 members requesting funding from the program under express our thanks to Commission Staff. This was a very 3 3 criterion one? highly collaborative effort, and we appreciate the 4 opportunity to be involved. 4 MR. FINNIGAN: At this moment, I do not. 5 5 As Sean noted, there are two items we There are a couple of companies where -- where if things 6 include in our comments that Staff disagrees with, and I 6 don't stay the way they are today, and -- and given 7 just want to touch on those very briefly. 7 where we're doing things today, it's -- it's uncertain. 8 8 The first has to do with what's called They may -- they may fall into that default category, but my last count was that that would not happen. So 9 criterion one, which is essentially a default standard 9 10 where the company would have to go through the same sort 10 I'm hoping that's the case, but we're -- in dealing with 11 11 the rulemaking, you tend -- you tend to have to deal of rate of return analysis that has been in effect for 12 the past five years. The -- the tradeoff that we had 12 with the what-ifs. And so that was the basis for our 13 13 comment. for finding ways to avoid a rate of return analysis was 14 to agree to build two additional locations and thought 14 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. All right. 15 15 that was a very -- very good, very equitable trade. Thank you. 16 16 CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'd like to -- to For a company if they're in the rate of 17 return review provision, and -- and they're -- and 17 go back to Mr. Bennett. Mr. Bennett, you heard those 18 they're found to be eligible to get support, it means 18 comments, how do you respond to a situation -- do you 19 that they have a rate of return below an acceptable 19 agree that customers might be worse off under this 20 level, and they may be needing those funds simply to 20 21 keep everything going. And so it was on that basis that 21 MR. BENNETT: I don't. The intent of the 22 22 legislation is to certainly provide companies or to help WITA took the position that there shouldn't be 23 additional build-out requirements for that category of 23 companies be able to provide and take care of their 24 24 participant. maintenance expenses; however, it is also to -- to 25 25 And then the other one was for the category promote broadband. It's a voluntary program, and I

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13 ed on a

Page 15

Page 16

think that determining eligibility solely based on a company's rate of return doesn't fully take into consideration a company's plan to enhance or provide broadband service.

2.5

I mean, a company could have a reasonable rate of return below -- typically, historically the benchmark we kind of looked has -- has been 10 percent; however, the -- there's certainly been circumstances where it has been higher. But the company could have a reasonable rate of return and not deploy broadband to any new locations.

By having these two separate eligibility considerations, both the rate of return and then the broadband build-out commitment, I think funds can best be directed for those companies that exhibit that they will maintain, provide, and enhance both voice and broadband services.

CHAIR DANNER: Thank you very much. So let -- let's -- first, let me ask, is there anyone else on the line who wishes to speak on the proposed rules today?

MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner.
This is Lisa Gafken with Public Counsel.
CHAIR DANNER: Good afternoon.
MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. I just wanted

certainly maintenance is a component, but it's, you know, all things being equal, if you have two proposals and one of them shows that they would expand it, we would feel that the money would go towards the expansion proposal.

So we -- we certainly think that removing expansion requirements or build-out requirements from criterion one would not be appropriate.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Ms. Gafken?

All right. I -- I -- I am struggling because I -- I see there's twofold here and one is to promote broadband, of course, but the other is to maintain the existing network, and, you know, you need -- you need to do both. You can't promote broadband and then let the existing network fall apart and -- and vice versa.

So I think what we're trying to do is -- is find the approach that basically meets all the goals here. What I'd be interested to -- to hear if -- if -- if others have some thoughts on that as well. All right. So let me ask --

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: This is Commissioner Rendahl. I don't know if you're seeking stakeholders or Commissioner thoughts.

Page 14

CHAIR DANNER: Oh, anyone.

to -- to also express my support for the adoption of the rules as proposed and modified as described by Mr. Bennett this morning. I'll -- I'll start off by also expressing my appreciation to all the work that's gone into this docket to implement the legislation from SB-5511 that extended the -- the universal service funding for broadband infrastructure. We recognize that this fund is limited and it's part of a bigger broadband picture.

I want to express some support on the accountability pieces in the proposed rule. That was one area that Public Counsel provided substantial comment on, and so we -- we are very appreciative that the rule include some enhanced accountability for carrier in terms of what a carrier needs to show in order to have access to the funds. We -- we do think that that's an important piece.

carrier in terms of what a carrier needs to show in order to have access to the funds. We -- we do think that that's an important piece.

We also agree with Staff that the Commission should not eliminate or reduce the build-out requirements in criterion one, which was being discussed here. We -- we think that that's also a fairly critical piece, because the purpose of the -- the legislation is

to support broadband and -- and to have that -- you

know, in our view, we had recognize that that -- the

funding be focused on expansion of broadband, and

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I just wanted to acknowledge that the balance that you've identified, there is a change. The statute did add broad -- broadband capability to -- to the focus of the funds. So it's -- it's both maintaining the network and building out broadband, so I just wanted to echo your thoughts on that.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Well, thank you.
Is there anyone else on the line today who
wishes to comment on this -- on these proposed rules?
All right. Well, I guess that brings us to

All right. Well, I guess that brings us to the end of the testimony here today, and I believe our -- our charge now is to take what we've heard today, and we will take this under advisement, and we will issue an order in due course. And unless there's anything else from any of the parties this -- this afternoon, I think we're ready to adjourn.

So let me ask my colleagues, is there anything else we need this afternoon?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I don't think so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: No, I don't have anything else today.

CHAIR DANNER: All right, then. Thank you,

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	everyone, for your participation in this docket. It has really been helpful, and I think we're on the cusp here, and and we'll come out with something shortly. So thank you all for your participation today and throughout this proceeding. So with that, we're adjourned. (Adjourned at 1:49 p.m.)	
24 25		
2.5		
	Page 18	
1		
1 2	CERTIFICATE	
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 10	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
11	WILLIAM STATES	
12	Janka Applinationes.	
13	Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358	
14	7.4	
15		
16		
17 18		
18		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

5 (Pages 17 to 18)

A	anticipate 12:1	brings 16:12	changing 8:10	considerations		
ability 18:9	apart 15:16	broad 16:4	Chapter 4:21 7:25	13:13		
able 12:23	appreciate 3:14,16	broadband 4:4,7	charge 16:14	continue 6:18,20		
acceptable 10:19	10:3	4:22 5:6,7,11 6:9	circumstances 13:8	continued 9:11		
access 14:16	appreciation 14:4	6:12,18,21 7:5	collaboration 4:19	correct 8:21,22		
accountability	appreciative 14:13	8:23 9:5,6,9,13	collaborative 10:3	Counsel 2:5 13:23		
14:11,14	approach 15:19	11:8 12:25 13:4	colleagues 3:19	14:12		
accurate 18:9	appropriate 6:20	13:10,14,17 14:7	16:19	count 12:9		
achieve 4:22 5:12	15:8	14:8,23,25 15:13	combination 6:15	COUNTY 18:4		
achieved 5:12	area 14:12	15:16 16:5,7	come 9:21 11:3	couple 6:2 12:5		
acknowledge 16:3	areas 7:18	Buell 1:21	17:3	course 15:13 16:16		
add 7:4 16:4	Association 6:5	build 10:14 11:7	comment 9:23	CR-102 6:3		
addition 5:9 8:23	10:1	build-out 5:11 7:6	12:13 14:13 16:11	criteria 8:25 9:1,14		
additional 7:13	attention 4:10 7:20	10:23 13:14 14:19	comments 3:14 6:3	criterion 5:8,10 7:2		
10:14,23	available 8:2	15:7	6:5,6 7:13 10:6	10:9 12:3 14:20		
Additionally 6:25	Avenue 1:22	building 16:7	12:18	15:8		
7:19	avoid 10:13		Commission 1:2,15	critical 14:21		
addressed 7:14		C	3:8,18,21 6:13	cumulative 5:23		
adjourn 16:18	B	C 2:1 3:4 18:1,1	7:16,24 10:2	current 4:24 5:1,18		
adjourned 17:6,7	back 9:21 12:17	calculate 5:18	14:18	12:1		
adjusted 7:6	balance 16:3	calculation 5:21	Commissioner 1:10	cusp 17:2		
Administrative	Balasbas 1:10 2:3	called 9:8 10:8	1:10 2:3,3 11:21	customer 9:5		
7:21,21,23	3:19 11:21,24	Cameron-Rulko	11:23,24 12:14	customers 5:3		
adopt 7:24 8:17	12:14 16:23	4:17	15:23,23,25 16:2	11:11 12:19		
adoption 1:8 3:9	Barry 4:18	capability 16:5	16:21,23			
7:14 14:1	based 5:5 6:5 13:1	care 12:23	Commissioners	D		
advisement 16:15	baseline 11:6,6,15	carrier 14:15,15	3:25 8:1	D 3:4		
advisory 11:3,12	basic 9:11	case 12:10	commitment 11:7	Danner 1:10 2:2		
affiliate 6:14	basically 8:12	category 7:1 10:23	13:14	3:6,17 8:5,20 9:16		
affiliates 6:20	15:19	10:25 12:8	committee 11:3,13	11:19,23 12:16		
afternoon 3:24	basis 10:21 12:12	CCR 1:20 18:13	communication	13:18,22,24 15:9		
11:25 13:22,24,25	began 3:12	certainly 12:22	3:10 4:5 9:9	16:1,9,25		
16:18,20	behalf 7:16 9:25	13:8 15:1,6	communications	Dave 2:2 3:17		
ago 3:13	believe 8:3 16:13	Certified 18:6	6:14	deal 12:11		
agree 10:14 12:19	benchmark 13:7	certify 18:8	companies 8:24	dealing 12:10		
14:18	Bennett 2:4 3:20,23	cessation 5:4	12:5,22,23 13:15	default 10:9 12:8		
ahead 3:23 11:23	3:24,25 8:7,15,22	Chair 1:10 2:2 3:6	company 5:2,11,19	definition 6:10		
air 6:24	9:19 12:17,17,21	3:18,25 8:1,5,20	7:22,23 9:2,4,5	demonstrate 5:2		
allows 5:14	14:3	9:16 11:19,21,23	10:10,16 13:5,9	deploy 13:10		
Amendment 1:5	best 13:14 18:9	12:16 13:18,22,24	company's 5:5,22	described 14:2		
America 5:24	better 11:9,11	15:9 16:1,9,25	7:5 13:2,3	Detailed 7:8		
amount 5:22	bigger 14:8	change 4:6 6:17,23	Compensation 5:25	details 4:8		
amount 5:22 amounts 5:19	Bill 4:3,4,23	16:4	component 15:1	determining 9:2		
analysis 10:11,13	briefings 7:16	changed 6:19 7:1,8	Connect 5:24	13:1		
Ann 2:3 3:19	briefly 10:7	9:10	consideration 13:3	directed 13:15		
FAIII 4.3 3.19	bring 7:19	changes 6:7		disagrees 10:6		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

	I	1	1	
discuss 6:3	expressing 14:4	18:6,13	instability 5:3	M
discussed 7:15	extended 14:6	give 3:21	intent 4:22 12:21	maintain 5:6 6:23
14:20	extends 4:4	given 12:6	Intercarrier 5:24	6:25 7:10 8:11,18
dive 4:8		go 3:23 10:10 11:23	interested 15:20	9:6 13:16 15:14
docket 1:6 3:9 5:21	F	12:17 15:4	interruptions 5:4	maintaining 8:13
6:8 14:5 17:1	F 18:1	goals 15:19	invaluable 4:12	16:6
doing 12:7	fairly 4:13 14:21	going 10:21 11:2	involved 10:4	maintenance 12:24
due 16:16	fall 12:8 15:16	good 3:24 10:15	issue 16:16	15:1
	FCC 5:10	11:25 13:22,24,25	issues 3:22 4:12	major 4:23
E	feel 15:4	Greg 4:16	items 10:5	March 6:4
E 2:1,1 3:4,4 18:1,1	fifth 6:11	guess 16:12		mean 13:5
echo 16:7	filed 6:5		J	means 10:18
effect 8:12 10:11	find 15:19	H	Jay 2:3 3:19	mechanism 5:25
effort 10:3	finding 10:13	H 6:16	Jennifer 4:16	meet 5:16
elect 8:25	Finnigan 2:4 7:16	happen 12:9	Jing 4:16	meet 5.10
eligibility 5:1,5,8	8:3 9:22,24,25	happy 11:17	joined 3:18	meets 15:19
7:1,2 8:16,25 9:1	11:20,22,25 12:4	hear 15:20		members 12:2
9:14 13:1,12	first 4:25 7:3 10:1,8	heard 12:17 16:14	K	memo 6:7 7:15
eligible 9:2 10:18	13:19	hearing 1:5,8 3:7,9	keep 10:21	met 6:13
eliminate 14:19	fiscal 4:5 5:13 6:1	7:15 8:9	kind 8:15 9:13 13:7	method 5:19
enhance 5:6 6:23	five 6:6 10:12	help 12:22	know 3:13 14:24	minutes 6:3
6:25 7:11 8:11,13	focus 16:5	helpful 17:2	15:2,14,24	modified 14:2
8:18 13:3,16	focused 14:25	high 4:14	knowledge 18:9	modify 3:10
enhanced 14:14	following 6:6	higher 13:9	known 4:4	moment 12:4
enhancement 9:12	foregoing 18:8	highly 10:3	Kopta 4:16	money 15:4
entire 4:15	formula 5:18	Hillstead 4:17	Kristen 4:17	Mor- 4:17
equal 15:2	forward 11:12	historically 13:6	Kyle 4:17,17	morning 14:3
equitable 10:15	forward-looking	hoping 12:10		move 11:12
essentially 4:23	5:10	т	Lacey 1:16 3:1	Murphy 4:18
8:23 10:9	found 10:18	I	-	muster 9:8
establish 5:8	four 5:7 8:25	identified 16:3	legislation 12:22 14:5,22	
established 5:21	Fourth 1:22	illustration 9:4	let's 13:19	N
6:12	frankly 4:13	implement 14:5	level 10:20	N 2:1 3:4
event 5:15	fully 7:15 13:2	important 14:17	limited 14:8	National 1:24
everybody 3:15	fund 5:20,24 14:8	inaudible 9:12	line 8:4 13:20 16:10	need 7:12 8:12 9:21
Everyone's 4:11	funding 12:2 14:7	include 10:6 14:14		15:15,15 16:20
exhibit 13:15	14:25	included 6:7 11:14	Lisa 2:5 13:23	needing 10:20
existing 15:14,16	funds 9:3 10:20	includes 4:20	listed 7:20 little 3:13	needs 5:2,11 7:1,8
expand 15:3	13:14 14:16 16:5	including 6:1	LLC 1:21	8:17 11:7 14:15
expansion 14:25	future 4:14	increase 7:5		negotiation 4:20
15:4,7		incumbent 11:9	locations 10:14 11:8,8 13:11	network 9:6 15:14
expectation 4:14	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G} \cdot \mathbf{A}}$	incurred 5:25	<i>'</i>	15:16 16:6
expenses 12:24	G 3:4	Independent 6:4	long 8:13 looked 13:7	new 5:18,21 13:11
expertise 4:10	Gafken 2:5 13:22	9:25	Loop 1:15	notable 4:6
express 10:2 14:1	13:23,25 15:10	information 7:9	lot 3:13	note 7:12
14:10	Garlinghouse 1:20	infrastructure 14:7	101 3.13	
	<u> </u>	I	l	I

	1	ı	ı	
noted 10:5	possible 11:11	quotations 6:24	return 10:11,13,17	service 3:11 4:7,7
notes 5:18	posted 6:7		10:19 13:2,6,10	5:3 6:9 7:22 8:13
number 11:8	preceding 7:10	R	13:13	8:14 9:7,10 13:4
	prerequisites 5:16	R 2:1 3:4 18:1	review 10:17	14:6
0	present 7:17	rata 5:23 7:4	revised 4:25 6:11	services 4:1,5 5:4,7
O 3:4	previously 5:20	rate 5:3 10:11,13	revisions 4:20,23	6:18,21 7:11 9:9
o0o 3:3	pro 5:23 7:4	10:16,19 13:2,6	7:25	9:12,13 13:17
obligation 7:6	probably 4:13	13:10,13	RICHARD 2:4	set 4:13
obligations 5:11	proceeding 9:23	read 6:11,12,17,19	Rick 7:16 8:3 9:24	sets 5:22
Oh 16:1	17:5	7:4,8,22 8:14	right 8:5 9:16,18,20	share 5:23
Okay 8:9 12:14	process 4:13,19	ready 16:18	11:19 12:14,16	Shorthand 18:6
15:9	program 3:11 4:5	really 17:2	15:11,22 16:9,12	shortly 17:3
Olympia 1:23	4:24 7:9 9:9,10	Realtime 1:21	16:25	show 14:15
opportunity 10:4	12:2,25	reasonable 13:5,10	risk 5:3	shows 15:3
order 4:22 6:13	promote 12:25	receive 9:14	Roth 4:16	simply 6:10 10:20
9:14 14:16 16:16	15:13,15	received 5:20	rule 1:5 3:8 4:20	situation 12:18
ought 11:5,14	proportionally 7:6	recognize 14:7,24	5:1,5,14,17 14:11	skill 18:9
overview 3:21	proposal 15:5	recommend 11:13	14:14	solely 13:1
	proposals 15:2	recommendations	rulemaking 3:10,12	sort 10:10
P	proposed 1:5 4:20	7:13	4:2,10,15 8:2	Southeast 1:15
P 2:1,1 3:4	5:5,8,14,17 7:25	recommends 6:6	12:11	speak 13:20
p.m 1:13 3:2 17:7	13:21 14:2,11	7:24	rulemakings 4:14	specifically 8:17
page 7:20	16:11	reduce 14:19	rules 3:22 4:24 5:8	speed 6:10 11:9
Pages 1:9	proposes 4:23	reduction 5:23 7:4	6:13 11:14 13:21	Square 1:15
Paragraph 6:16 7:7	provide 5:6 6:18,20	regulatory 4:1	14:2 16:11	Staff 2:4 3:16,21
part 14:8	6:23,25 7:10,12	remove 6:10		4:23 6:6 7:13,24
participant 10:24	8:11,18 9:6 12:22	removes 5:19	S	10:2,6 14:18
participated 3:15	12:23 13:3,16	removing 15:6	S 2:1 3:4	Staff's 7:20,25
3:15	provided 4:9 14:12	Rendahl 1:10 2:3	safe 4:4	stakeholders 4:9
participation 17:1	provider 6:14,17	3:19 15:23,24	says 8:20	8:2 15:24
17:4	6:19 7:9 8:17	16:2,21	SB-5511 14:6	stakeholders' 6:3
parties 16:17	providers 5:15 11:1	REPORTED 1:20	scenario 12:20	standard 10:9 11:6
parts 5:17	providing 8:19	Reporter 18:7	Sean 2:4 3:20,25	11:6,10,13,15
pass 9:8	provision 9:11,12	Reporting 1:21	8:9,21 10:5	standards 6:12
passage 4:3	10:17	Representative 2:4	Seattle 1:22,23	11:4
percent 13:7	Public 1:5 2:5	representing 8:4	second 4:3	start 14:3
petition 5:2,15 8:24	13:23 14:12	requesting 12:2	Secondly 5:14	started 4:2
petitioning 5:1,19	purpose 9:10 14:22	required 11:9	Section 5:16 6:9,16	state 3:10 9:8 18:3
phrase 8:11	put 11:1	requirements 4:25	6:22 7:3,7	18:7
picture 14:9		5:9 8:16 10:23	Sections 4:21	States 7:21
piece 14:17,22	Q	14:20 15:7,7	see 6:24 11:1 15:12	statute 8:17,19,20
pieces 14:11	question 11:22	requires 5:1	seeking 15:24	16:4
plan 5:6 8:18,19,23	questions 8:3,7,9	requiring 8:24	Senate 4:3	stay 9:20 12:6
9:6 13:3	9:18 11:17,20	respond 11:18	sentence 6:11,11,23	struggling 15:11
point 7:17	15:10	12:18	7:4	Sub 5:16 6:16,22
position 10:22	quite 4:13 9:7	result 4:2	separate 8:16 13:12	,
		l	l	

				Page 22
7:3,7	THURSTON 18:4	WAC 1:5	1:30 1:13 3:2	800 1:24
submit 8:24	time 4:10	want 4:15 8:10	1:49 17:7	846-6989 1:24
substantial 14:12	Title 4:21 7:25	10:1,7 14:10	10 13:7	040-0707 1.24
substitute 4:3	today 3:6,8,22 12:6	wanted 13:25 16:2	10 13.7 100 4:21 5:16	9
Suite 1:22	12:7 13:21 16:10	16:7	110 4:21 5:16 110 4:21 6:16	98101 1:22
support 5:15,18,22	16:13,14,24 17:4	Washington 1:1,15	120 4:21 6:22 7:3	98503 1:16
5:24 7:5,9,14 9:11	touch 10:7	1:16,22 3:1 6:4	120 4.21 0.22 7.3 123 4:21 7:25	70000 1.10
9:15 10:18 14:1	trade 10:15	9:25 18:3,7	130 4:21 7:7	
	trade 10.13	way 8:14 12:6	130 4.21 7.7 1325 1:22	
14:10,23		•		
supported 4:7 9:10	traditional 5:20	ways 10:13	13th 6:4	
supposed 11:3	transcript 18:8	we'll 17:3	150 4:22	
sure 8:10	Transportation 1:2	we're 8:10,23 12:7	1840 1:22	
T	1:15 3:8	12:10 15:18 16:18	2	
T = T = T = T = T = T = T = T = T = T =	true 18:8 try 11:17	17:2,5 we've 16:14	20 4:21 6:9	
take 6:2 12:23 13:2	trying 15:18	what-ifs 12:12	2019 3:13	
16:14,15	tuned 9:21	willingness 4:11	2020 1:12 3:1,6 6:1	
talk 4:11	tuned 9:21 turn 3:20	wish 7:17 9:22	2024 4:6 5:13	
Tayler 1:20 18:6,13	two 7:12 8:15 10:5	wishes 13:20 16:11	206 1:23	
team 4:16 8:2,8	10:14 13:12 15:2	WITA 2:4 6:5 7:17	287-9066 1:23	
telecom 9:11		7:19 8:4 10:22	29 7:20	
telecommunication	two-prong 9:14 twofold 15:12			
7:11		11:5,14 12:1 Woodland 1:15	3	
Telecommunicati	typically 13:6	word 6:10	3 5:16	
10:1	U	work 3:14,16 4:11	3358 1:20 18:13	
Telephone 6:4	U-8523 5:21	14:4	360 1:23	
TELEPHONIC 1:8	uncertain 12:7	worse 11:11 12:19		
tend 12:11,11	United 7:21	written 6:5	4	
terms 14:15	universal 3:10 4:5	www.buellrealti	480 4:21 7:25	
testimony 16:13	7:22 9:8 14:6	1:25	480-123 1:5	
thank 3:24 4:9,15	use 6:24	1.23		
4:16 8:1,1,5 9:16	USF 5:20	X	5	
9:20,24 11:24	UT-190437 1:6 3:9		57:7	
12:15 13:18 15:9	UTC 2:4	Y	534-9066 1:23	
16:9,22,25 17:4	Utilities 1:2,15 3:7	year 3:13 4:6 5:13	5511 4:3	
thanks 10:2		6:1 7:10	5th 6:8	
things 12:5,7 15:2	V	years 10:12	6	
think 9:7 13:1,14	versa 15:17		6 7:3	
14:16,21 15:6,18	vice 15:17	Z	621 1:15	
16:18,21 17:2	view 7:17 14:24	Zickuhr 4:18	6th 7:19	
third 5:17 6:23	virtual 3:7	0	UII . 1 7 	
thought 10:14 11:5	voice 13:16	— — ·	7	
11:14	VOLUME 1:8	1	7 1:12 3:1	
thoughts 15:21,25	voluntary 12:25	1 6:16,22 7:7	7th 3:6	
16:8	***	1-18 1:9		
three 4:23	W	1 10 1.7	8	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>