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|  | Page 5 |  | Page 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LACEY, WASHINGTON; JUNE 1, 2022 | 1 | Shute, Mihaly \& Weinberger here today representing The |
| 2 | 9:30 A.M. | 2 | Energy Project. I use he/him pronouns. |
| 3 | -000- | 3 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, all. |
| 4 |  | 4 | Let's start with a little housekeeping and |
| 5 | JUDGE DOYLE: Good morning. Today is | 5 | preliminary matters for the record. |
| 6 | Wednesday, June 1st, 2022. It's approximately 9:30 | 6 | I will ask the parties if they're willing to |
| 7 | a.m. | 7 | stipulate to the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits |
| 8 | We're here today for an evidentiary hearing in | 8 | and testimony up to and including the cross-examination |
| 9 | Docket UG-210-- or 210755 , which is captioned | 9 | exhibits that were filed. |
| 10 | Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission | 10 | MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, Cascade does have |
| 11 | versus Cascade Natural Gas Corporation. | 11 | some objections to the -- both the initial -- well, I |
| 12 | My name is Samantha Doyle. I'm the | 12 | think it's just the initial exhibits filed by the -- |
| 13 | administrative law judge with the Commission. I use | 13 | AWEC and Public Counsel, and it's mainly just because |
| 14 | she/her and they/them pronouns. I'm joined by Judge | 14 | they are -- appear to be incomplete, not including |
| 15 | Rayne Pearson, Chair Dave Danner, and Commissioner | 15 | attachments. So I can go through those, if you would |
| 16 | Rendahl. | 16 | like, at this time. |
| 17 | Let's begin by taking short form appearances | 17 | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, what do you find |
| 18 | from the parties. We'll begin with Cascade. | 18 | incomplete? |
| 19 | Please state your name, and feel free to provide | 19 | MS. BARNETT: Let's see, just so for Exhibit |
| 20 | your pronouns as well. | 20 | NEG-16, that is a data request response to AWEC Data |
| 21 | MS. BARNETT: Good morning. Thank you, Your | 21 | Request No. 65, and it -- it appears to include only the |
| 22 | Honor. | 22 | initial response to the data request, but that data |
| 23 | Donna Barnett, I use pronouns she/her, and I'm | 23 | request was supplemented, so we would ask before it's |
| 24 | with Perkins Coie, representing Cascade. And with me is | 24 | admitted to include the supplement to it. So it's |
| 25 | Megan Lin, also she/her pronouns, they/them from Perkins | 25 | incomplete right now. |
|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | Coie. | 1 | And similarly, NEG-17c, that confidential |
| 2 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. | 2 | exhibit did not include Attachment A, which was part of |
| 3 | And for Staff, please. | 3 | that data request, so we would ask that the Attachment A |
| 4 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. | 4 | be included. I understand the Attachment A to several |
| 5 | This is Nash Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General on | 5 | of these exhibits were a large Excel file, so they may |
| 6 | behalf of commissioned staff. My pronouns are he/him. | 6 | not have included that for -- for space, but for |
| 7 | And joining me today is staff member Joanna Huang. | 7 | admission, we don't object to admission as long as they |
| 8 | JUDGE DOYLE: All right. | 8 | are complete including the supplement and all |
| 9 | And Public Counsel? | 9 | attachments. So that would be for NEG-16, NEG-17c, |
| 10 | MS. PAISNER: Good morning. This is Ann | 10 | NEG-18. That was also including -- excluding Attachment |
| 11 | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant | 11 |  |
| 12 | attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of | 12 | And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a -- |
| 13 | the Washington Attorney General's office. | 13 | or is a compilation of several data request responses, |
| 14 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so | 14 | and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete |
| 15 | much. | 15 | response be admitted into evidence. |
| 16 | And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers | 16 | So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not |
| 17 | or AWEC? | 17 | include Attachment A. |
| 18 | MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad | 18 | To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include |
| 19 | Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of | 19 | Attachment A. |
| 20 | Western Energy Consumers. And my pronouns are he/him. | 20 | AWEC-38, that only included I think one page |
| 21 | Thank you. | 21 | of -- it included one tab of Attachment A but not the |
| 22 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. | 22 | full Attachment A. |
| 23 | And for The Energy Project? | 23 | AWEC-63 included only one page of attachment for |
| 24 | MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your Honor. My | 24 | C-1, but it did not include Attachments A-1 and B-1, |
| 25 | name is Yochanan or Yochi Zakai. I'm with the firm of | 25 | which were also part of that response. |


|  | Page 9 |  | Page 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Attachments AWEC-67 also included only | 1 | our witness, Joanna Huang, and so unless there are any |
| 2 | Attachment A. | 2 | questions that the bench intends to ask her, we ask that |
| 3 | And the final one, AWEC-100 also did not include | 3 | she be excused and can be called back later if anything |
| 4 | Attachment A, and so we would ask that to be included. | 4 | comes up over the course of the hearing. |
| 5 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. | 5 | JUDGE DOYLE: The Commissioners do have some |
| 6 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you. | 6 | questions for her later in the hearing, so if she can -- |
| 7 | JUDGE DOYLE: Do any of the other parties | 7 | if -- if you want to keep her on standby, that's one |
| 8 | have any other objections or responses to those | 8 | thing. Also, this is rather short, so it might be more |
| 9 | inclusions? | 9 | prudent to keep her on hand, but we do have questions |
| 10 | MS. PAISNER: Your Honor, this is Ann | 10 | for her. |
| 11 | Paisner for Public Counsel. I guess I would just like | 11 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, Your |
| 12 | some clarification. | 12 | Honor. |
| 13 | We have no objection to providing the full data | 13 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. |
| 14 | request responses, but we are wondering if it's needed, | 14 | MR. CALLAGHAN: The other thing I would like |
| 15 | if it's not something that is part of what we've | 15 | to raise is Staff would like to make an oral motion to |
| 16 | referenced for support. We're happy to provide it, but | 16 | strike the terms sheets that were filed on March 15th. |
| 17 | it just isn't part of the support for the propositions | 17 | This isn't a major issue for Staff, but we just |
| 18 | we've referenced it for. | 18 | think for the sake of the record, that the term sheet |
| 19 | MS. BARNETT: And to respond to that, I | 19 | that was filed in the record in order to give the |
| 20 | think the Commission has always preferred the complete | 20 | non-settling parties a sense of the substance of the |
| 21 | response rather than pieces of it and let the | 21 | settlement as soon as possible normally wouldn't be |
| 22 | commissioners decide whether it's needed or not. I | 22 | included in the official record because a term sheet is |
| 23 | understand the parties' position, that they want to | 23 | a settlement negotiation document. So we think it would |
| 24 | focus on certain pieces of it, but for context and for | 24 | be appropriate to strike that, but it's not a crucial |
| 25 | understanding, I think the entire response and the | 25 | issue for staff, otherwise, we would have made a written |
|  | Page 10 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | supplemental response has always been the final and full | 1 | motion to strike it. |
| 2 | exhibit. | 2 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties |
| 3 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes, | 3 | have an objection to striking the term sheet from the |
| 4 | do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on? | 4 | record? |
| 5 | MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only | 5 | I don't see any hands or hear any voices. |
| 6 | provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if | 6 | Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to |
| 7 | Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe | 7 | strike them from the record. Thank you. |
| 8 | they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to | 8 | And with that, we will look into what we're |
| 9 | that, if it's necessary, so... (Pause.) | 9 | going to do today. |
| 10 | MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that. | 10 | We'll first hear a brief opening statement from |
| 11 | We've got those handy and can file those today. | 11 | the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of |
| 12 | MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not | 12 | Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then |
| 13 | object to that if Cascade wants to provide the | 13 | pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally, |
| 14 | remainder. | 14 | the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel |
| 15 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are | 15 | and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy -- and, |
| 16 | going to admit them to the record. | 16 | finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn |
| 17 | I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the | 17 | Collins. |
| 18 | court reporter so it can be made part of the record. | 18 | We will plan to take a short break between |
| 19 | Are there any other preliminary matters before | 19 | cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite |
| 20 | we get started? | 20 | anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by |
| 21 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 21 | the raise hand feature. |
| 22 | Staff does have two preliminary matters to | 22 | Based on the parties' time estimates, we'll |
| 23 | raise. | 23 | be -- we'll likely conclude before lunch, but if we do |
| 24 | First is, yesterday, we heard from Public | 24 | not conclude by noon, we'll discuss whether to proceed |
| 25 | Counsel that they no longer intended to cross-examine | 25 | through the lunch hour or to take a break, depending on |

the estimated time remaining.
Are there any questions?
MS. PAISNER: Excuse me. May I ask a clarifying question? I did not see a time estimate for Mark Garrett.

JUDGE DOYLE: There's -- there's no cross time estimate Mark Garrett. The commissioners just have a few questions.

MS. PAISNER: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.
MR. ZAKAI: Same -- same clarification for Mr. Collins.

Do the commissioners have questions for him? JUDGE DOYLE: Apologies, yeah. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do. JUDGE DOYLE: I have a dog at my side here.
Yes, there are.
MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great. So let's begin with opening statements beginning with the settling parties.

MR. CALLAGHAN: Ms. Barnett, I can go first, if you would like.

MS. BARNETT: Yes, that's fine.
Thank you.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.
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Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, Your Honors. Judge Doyle informed the parties that opening statements should be brief, so l'll make this quick.

Staff conducted an extensive discovery in this case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement with the company.

We believe that the settlement is fair, just, and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital additions that went into service during or prior to the test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These increases are real and should be reflected in rates.

While Staff always prefers to include as many parties as possible in the settlement, in this case, staff seriously considered the positions of the non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.

Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to accept a settlement proposal based on the public interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the public interest.

Thank you.
MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judges Doyle and Pearson, and good morning, Commissioners.

Today, Cascade, along with the commissioned
staff is presenting a full multiparty settlement for your consideration.

And the settlement, as Mr. Callaghan said, it represents a compromised resolution of all the issues in this rate case, following careful vetting and thorough investigation of Cascade's operations.

No party disputes that Cascade has a revenue deficiency, and the non-settling parties cannot show that the settlement conflicts with the public interest. Instead, the non-settling parties present various alternatives aimed solely at lowering at Cascade's revenue requirement such as terminating the cost revenue mechanism or modifying Cascade's -- modifying the company's treatment of protected excess deferred income tax or in Public Counsel's case, creating a different case using a completely different test year.

Cascade filed its initial case in this proceeding on September 30th, 2021, approximately four months after the Commission issued its final order in Cascade's 2020 general rate case. For this proceeding, Cascade had the benefit of the Commission's clear direction in that final order and Cascade has attempted to address every concern the Commission has raised in it.

For just a few examples, Cascade maintained the
same capital structure approved by the Commission in that last rate case, thereby providing rate stability.
And Cascade considered the average of monthly averages rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment approved by the Commission just months before, and Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment was still appropriate for this case. But instead of filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020 case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate commission basis report this year. It filed progress report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade removed from its revenue requirement the cost and revenues related to depreciation and supplemental schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade also improved transparency and communication with other parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.

In Staff's last rate case, the Commission expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of evidence, specifically presenting important testimony and rebuttal when other parties could not respond. Cascade corrected this, formally revising and updating its testimony several months before response testimony was due.

I believe you will agree that the result is a clean rate case focused on just a few adjustments allowing for a thorough investigation and resulting in a full settlement that is in the public interest.

Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.
And for Public Counsel?
MS. PAISNER: Good morning, Judge Doyle, Judge Pearson, and Judge Danner -- or Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl.

Public Counsel is here today to opposed the full multiparty settlement filed on March 22nd, 2022, that is proposed to Cascade Natural Gas Corporation and the AGG staff.

As discussed in the testimony of Public Counsel Witness Mark E. Garrett filed on April 25th, 2022, the proposed settlement does not comply with the law because it is excessive and would give Cascade an annual revenue increase that is unreasonably large and that it is not justified. The proposed settlement is, therefore, not consistent with the public interest and, thus, fails to comply with the Commission's requirements stated in WAC 480-07-740.

The record will show that based on the company's own filings for 2021, the revenue increase proposed in
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the settlement of approximately $\$ 10.7$ million is an unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not need.

Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement, Public Counsel does not object to the low income program proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my opening remarks.

Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.

## And for AWEC?

MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.

Cascade has repeatedly called this case a limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain a narrow scope of review. In its original filing, however, Cascade asked for more than $\$ 13.7$ million, which -- which if approved, would have been approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.

The multiparty settlement, if approved, will allow Cascade to increase revenues by $\$ 10.6$ million, which is an 8.64 percent margin increase and will have an impact on rate payers, especially considering the fact that Cascade has made it clear that they intend to
file another rate case in the very near future.
It's also important to note when looking at the size of this rate case, which is a limited rate case, that if you look at Cascade's last general rate case in Docket 200568, they asked for a $\$ 13.8$ million increase, which is very similar to the amount asked for here.

This case is significant and requires scrutiny to determine if the rates are fair, just, and reasonable.

AWEC believes, after review of the record, that the rates provided in the multiparty settlement will not produce rates that are fair, just, and reasonable, and, therefore, ask the commission to reject the settlement or approve it with modifications.

Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Stokes.
And finally from The Energy Project?
MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.
Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judge Pearson and Judge Doyle.

In this general rate case, you're asked by Cascade and Staff to consider a settlement that will unreasonably increase customers' rates.

TEP opposes the settlement because many low income customers cannot afford such an increase.

The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle income customers' finances.

While many Washingtonians are now living in a post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been equal. Many low and middle income -- excuse me, many low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse position today than they were before the pandemic. Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not adequately consider customers' interests because no party passed exclusively with represented interests of customers supports the settlement. And the settlement, as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on customers.

Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider and resolve the issues before it in this general rate case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which unnecessarily compressed the timeline for response and reply testimony. Second, Cascade refused to extend the suspension date in this proceeding to accommodate the consolidation of Docket UG-220198, correcting normalization violations.

Because of these decisions about the timing of this proceeding made by Cascade, the Commission should hold customers harmless in the event that there are any negative impacts prom Cascade's decision not to address certain issues in a timely manner.

Now, I would like to turn your attention to Cascade's low income assistant program called the Washington Energy Assistance Fund, or WEAF.

In this case, TEP proposes three improvements: One: Increasing the income eligibility threshold to enable WEAF to reach more customers. Two, establishing detailed -- dedicated low income outreach effort using trusted messengers and community-based outreach. And three, requiring the low income advisory group to annually review funding levels.

In their rebuttal testimony, Cascade and Staff indicate they support tax proposals, which no party opposes and thanks Cascade and Staff for their support.

In addition, Cascade continues to make good faith efforts to serve its low income customers, and TEP thanks the company for its collaboration with its low income advisory group and respectfully requests that the Commission approve these three improvements to the WEAF program and reject the rate increase included in the settlement.

And yesterday, Cascade filed and served one errata on your testimony.

Do you have, other than that errata, do you have any other changes or corrections to your testimony or exhibits?

THE WITNESS: I have no other changes or corrections to my testimony.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you.
At this time, we present Mark Chiles for cross.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.
And I believe -- apologies. Public Counsel, would like you to --

MS. PAISNER: Yes. Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Chiles.
A. Good morning.
Q. Do you have copies of all the exhibits and cross in this case?
A. I do.
Q. Thanks.

Okay. If you would please turn to page 29 of your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit MAC-4T starting on line 5.
A. Sorry. That was page...?

Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Zakai.
And with that, thank you all the parties for your statements.

Let's first call Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles.
Would you please turn on your camera if you're able to do so.

THE WITNESS: I can.
JUDGE DOYLE: There you are. All right. Thank you.

And can you please raise your right hand.
Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
Cascade, would you like to introduce your witness and make them available for cross.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
Mr. Chiles, will you please state your full name and your position and your employer for the record.

THE WITNESS: Mark Chiles, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs and Customer Service for Cascade Natural Gas Corporation.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you.
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Q. 29.
A. Yes. I'm there.
Q. Okay. Starting on line 5, you state: Because Cascade has a decoupling mechanism, the company's test year is already weather normalized.

Is that an accurate statement?
A. That is an accurate statement.
Q. Okay. So now if you would please go to exhibit

MAC-15X, which is the commission basis report for 2021 filed by Cascade with work papers.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its
contents?
A. I am familiar, yes.
Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?
A. To the -- yes, to my knowledge, yes.
Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test year was weather normalized.

Was that weather normalize -- normalization embedded in the information reported to the Commission in this $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ commission basis report for Cascade?
A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
Q. Sure.

You just now discussed weather normalization for the test year, so my question is if that same weather normalization is embedded in the information in the commission basis report for 2021.
A. The decoupling is embedded in the Commission basis report.
Q. Thank you.

Okay. If you would please turn to page 5 of this exhibit, 5 of 22.
A. I'm there.
Q. Please look at Column B on the left side of the page.

What is the amount of net operating income on line $\mathbf{1 8}$ ?
A. Net operating income on line 18 is $\$ 28,636,318$.
Q. Is that the amount of net operating income reported for 2021?
A. It is, yes, if -- I believe it is.
Q. Okay. And did that operating income increase shareholder equity by that amount?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that net operating income include accruals for unbilled revenue?
A. It would have.
Q. As we look at the columns across the page on Row
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18, we see what appear to be adjustment amounts.
Are these adjustments that were approved by the
Commission in Cascade's most recent rate case in Docket UG-200568?
A. Those are different adjustments that -- yes, to advertising incentives and B\&O.
Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.

What is the restated net operating income found on line $18 ?$
A. $\$ 29,979,637$.
Q. Thank you.

What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?
A. Rate base on line 26 , column -- well, I guess they're the same, $\$ 488,393,608$.
Q. Thank you.

On line 27 in Column $F$, there is a percentage, 6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.

Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18 by the rate base amount on line $\mathbf{2 6} \boldsymbol{?}$
A. I believe it is.
Q. So subject to check, 29,979,637 divided by $488,393,608$ is 0.614 or 6.14 percent?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

There's another percentage on that page just below the 6.14 percent, and that percentage is 6.95 percent.

Is that the rate of return authorized in Cascade's last Washington rate case UG-200568?
A. I would have to verify that, but I -- I actually don't know off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. So subject to check, would you accept that the project of multiplying the rate base amount on line 26, Column F by the authorized return -- rate of return, 6.95 , would give you the amount needed for the company to earn its approved rate of return?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So then subject to check, the product of the rate base of $488,393,608$ and the 6.95 rate of return, subject to check, would be $33,943,356$ and change?
A. Yes.
Q. So, again, subject to check, would you accept that subtracting restated net operating income from line 18 from the amount needed for the company to earn its approved rate of return would equal an amount of revenue deficiency for the company?

$$
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A. Well, that could all be true. The issue is that there are other adjustments that would -- that would need to be made to these numbers to complete a 2021 case, and that's the company's intention with Public Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test year. There are -- there are all the things -- you know, all the different adjustments that take place within the -- within a case that Cascade did when we submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year that -- that aren't accounted for specifically in the commission basis report, so I don't think that provides an accurate picture of -- of what an appropriate 2021 test year case would be, so I think if all the appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely different case. And I think if Cascade were to have suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public Counsel has, that it just wouldn't -- it wouldn't seem appropriate, and that's -- you know, our -- our case has been fully vetted through the course of time and we've demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few hundred-plus data requests and all the analyses that our case is appropriate. 2021 hasn't gone through that analysis, and just it doesn't seem appropriate without all of the proper adjustments, that it -- that it would
be warranted.
Q. So maybe I can ask it a different way.

So assuming a 2020 test year -- assuming a 2020 test year, which is the test year the company has proposed, and assuming appropriate adjustments, subject to check, the 33 -- the approximately 33.9 million, which is the amount you just testified would be needed for the company to earn its rate of return -- I apologize -- so if you assume the 2020 test year and appropriate adjustments, subject to check, that 33.9 million -- $\$ 33,943,356$ that the company would need to earn its return minus the 29 million reported, $\$ 29,979,637$, which is net operated income restated, the 33.9 million minus the 29 million, approximately, would be $\$ 3,963,719$, subject to check?
A. I would say your math is correct.
Q. Okay. Okay. Yeah, I just -- okay. Thank you.

So if you would please turn back to your rebuttal testimony at page 30 and starting on line 7, starting on line 7, you state in your rebuttal testimony that: Public Counsel uses the 2020 test year conversion factor instead of adjusting the conversion factor to be based on the underlying revenue sensitive costs in 2020. Is that correct?
A. That is correct.
A. Conversion factor, yes.
Q. Thanks.

On line 19, where it states "Conversion Factor," is this number 0.75506 the revenue conversion factor used by the company for 2020?
A. Yes.
Q. Subject to check, would you accept that dividing the $3,963,719$ deficiencies stated a moment ago by Cascade's 2020 revenue conversion factor of 0.75506 would be $5,249,541$ ?
A. Um... (pause.)
Q. Subject to check.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know the conversion factor for 2021?
A. I do not know the conversion factor for 2021.
Q. Okay. Now I would like to ask you about your end of period analysis for the 2020 test year.

In your analysis, to which accounts did you apply an end of period analysis?
A. Which would be applied end of period?
Q. Yes.
A. In particular or in broad, you know, sort of the --
Q. I think I can restate the question maybe to --
Q. You then describe this on line 10 as a minor impact?
A. Yes.
Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?
A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.
Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and -- and that's really the point of that.
Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit JT-2, which is the joint settlement exhibit, and Tab MCG-4, conversion factor. I think it was labelled in the upper header. It says MCP-4, but the tab, it says MCG-4. And let me know when you're there, please.
A. I have JT-2 up. And I'm sorry. What tab?
Q. MCG-4, conversion factor.
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to be a little more clear.
So did you use a monthly averages approach for any accounts?
A. We -- I think we used average -- monthly averages for one item. I think we used end of period for everything. There might be one, and I just don't recall.
Q. Do you -- did you use end of period for working capital or inventory?
A. I think we might have used -- I -- we might have used an average and monthly averages for that one. Again, I'm just not sure.
Q. Okay. I have no further questions.

Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.
And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross Mr. Chiles.

MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Go ahead.
Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. STOKES:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Chiles.
A. Good morning.
Q. When does Cascade intend to file its next rate
case, as you mentioned in your direct testimony, MAC-1T, on page 3 ?
A. I think Cascade will be evaluating -- I mean, we're evaluating now the need for it as soon as we get through this particular case, know where we've landed. Certainly, we're looking for the conclusion of, you know, the PSE cases -- case, and possibly the Avista case.

It's a new world with the multiyear, and we want to make sure that we're prepared for that, so, again, evaluating, I would imagine it will, you know, be 2023 at this point in time.
Q. Okay. But this case is supposed to be, in your words, a stopgap between this case and then the time when you file a new rate case with a multiyear rate plan?
A. Yes. But this case is looking at recovery of plant through 2020. We're through 2021 and well into 2022 at this point, and with the -- the amount of capital we're spending with the increase in -- the inflationary pressures in costs, I mean, all of those are impacting us as well as every other company.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

I would like to talk to you for a second about the protected plus excess deferred income tax issue.
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Does the multiparty stipulation address the proper treatment of protected plus EDIT under the IRS normalization requirements?
A. Does the -- I'm sorry. Can you --
Q. Does the multiparty stipulation that you entered into with staff address proper treatment of protected plus EDIT?
A. I -- I don't know that it specifically does address the EDIT issue.
Q. Okay.
A. Specific inherent in the settlement, itself, is, you know, all -- all items have been addressed.
Q. Okay. So the multiparty stipulation was filed on March 22nd, 2022; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So the day after the multiparty stipulation was filed, Cascade made a filing in Docket UG-220198 where Cascade proposed to make a correction to prevent a potential normalization violation; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And when I talk about the potential normalization violation, in general, it relates to the amortization of protected plus excess deferred income taxes.

## Is that your understanding?

A. That is my understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. And Cascade's filing in UG-220198 was in response to a private letter ruling, 101961-21, identified in Puget Sound Energy Docket UG -- or UE-190529; is that correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. STOKES: Okay. To the extent it's necessary, I would like to move for the Commission to take official notice of the private letter ruling 101961-21 under WAC 480-07-495. It's been referenced, but the actual private letter ruling is not in the record at this point in time.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties have any objections to taking notice of that?

MS. BARNETT: No objection.
MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor.
MS. PAISNER: No objection from Public
Counsel. Thanks.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.
MR. ZAKAI: No objection. Thank you.
BY MR. STOKES:
Q. Mr. Chiles, is it your understanding that one of Cascade's proposed normalization corrections was to eliminate rate schedule 581 credit rate and roll the
amortization rate into base rates?
A. I'm sorry. Can you -- can you say that again?
Q. So is it -- in your filing, in order to correct potential normalization violation, was it Cascade's proposal to eliminate Rate Schedule 581 and roll the amortization rate into base rates?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that one of the adjustments is to make that correction in this docket on a going forward basis?
A. I think -- I do believe that's correct. We've got that -- that separate case, and I think -- I mean, the timing of the company's file, I mean, we -- we filed our rate base September 30th, and that was a short time after everyone found out about PSE's private letter ruling. You know, there wasn't enough time for us to bring that into this case and give it justice. You know, the one thing that Cascade has been scrutinized for in the past is not having a clean, complete case, and so our goal here was to do that, to abide by the -the ruling that the Commission issued in our last case, and -- and not bring in items like this at the last minute, and so we felt that the best course of action was that we treat this the way we have, so... (Pause.)
Q. So in your opinion, if the Commission does not

|  | Page 37 |  | Page 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | eliminate Rate Schedule 581 and roll the amortization | 1 | in process over a long course of time, so... (Pause.) |
| 2 | into base rates, will Cascade continue to be in | 2 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 3 | violation of the normalization requirements? | 3 | So switching topics, I would like to talk to you |
| 4 | A. Well, I mean, based on our consultation right | 4 | about unbilled revenues. |
| 5 | now with our tax and the county personnel and outside | 5 | A. Yeah. |
| 6 | auditors, we're currently not at risk for normalization | 6 | Q. So are the billing determinates that Cascade |
| 7 | violation, given we've got the plan for correction, | 7 | uses to calculate rates based on volumes consumed or |
| 8 | which is incorporated in -- in the other docket, the | 8 | volumes billed in the test period? |
| 9 | 220198. So as long as we follow that plan, we're not -- | 9 | A. Are...? |
| 10 | we're not at risk for normalization violation. If the | 10 | Q. Are the billing determinates that Cascade uses |
| 11 | Commission allows the approach to zero out 581 and get | 11 | to calculate rates based on the volumes consumed or |
| 12 | rid of the deferral, we could still be in a violation | 12 | volumes billed in the test period? |
| 13 | position. | 13 | A. I actually do not know that. I would have to |
| 14 | Q. Well, there's two -- there's two proposals you | 14 | defer to our other witness on that. |
| 15 | have: One is to fix things going forward -- on a going | 15 | Q. Okay. I'll move on. |
| 16 | forward basis, and one is to fix things that happened in | 16 | So I would like you to look at your Chiles |
| 17 | the past; is that correct? | 17 | exhibit MAC-4T, the errata filing on page 6, lines 13 to |
| 18 | A. That's correct. | 18 | 14. |
| 19 | Q. Okay. So on September 15th, 2021, and | 19 | So in your errata filing, you acknowledge that |
| 20 | subsequent to the issuance of the private letter ruling, | 20 | the margin revenue requirement in this case has been |
| 21 | Cascade made a filing in Docket UG-210709 where you | 21 | increased by a 1.413 million, 568,000 of net unbilled |
| 22 | updated Schedule 581 rates; is that correct? | 22 | revenues from the 2020 test period; is that correct? |
| 23 | A. Which docket is that? | 23 | A. That is correct. |
| 24 | Q. 210709. It's where Cascade updates its Schedule | 24 | Q. Okay. Would you agree that the 1.4 million |
| 25 | 581 rates. | 25 | referenced in your errata filing is the amount that AWEC |
|  | Page 38 |  | Page 40 |
| 1 | A. Okay. | 1 | is proposing to remove from revenue requirement in this |
| 2 | Q. Okay. Did Cascade indicate to the parties in | 2 | case? |
| 3 | this case that the rates it was proposing might be | 3 | A. Originally, I -- I believe that the amount was |
| 4 | inconsistent with the IRS normalization requirements? | 4 | being suggested as 2.9 million. I don't have the exact |
| 5 | A. I could not speak to that. I don't have enough | 5 | number if the number has changed to the 1.4. I would |
| 6 | knowledge to speak to that. | 6 | agree that the amount of remaining unbilled in the |
| 7 | Q. Okay. So when did Cascade become aware that the | 7 | revenue requirement is the 1.4 million. |
| 8 | continued use of Schedule 581 might violate the IRS's | 8 | Q. Okay. Would you agree that AWEC is not |
| 9 | normalization requirements? | 9 | proposing to remove the 15,909,204 balance of unbilled |
| 10 | A. Well, I would have to defer to someone with more | 10 | revenues that the settling parties included in working |
| 11 | information on that particular question. | 11 | capital and rate base? |
| 12 | Q. Okay. So one final question on this topic: Can | 12 | A. The 15 million of -- |
| 13 | you explain why Cascade filed -- waited until the day | 13 | Q. Of working capital -- |
| 14 | after filing the settlement stipulation to file -- to | 14 | A. Oh. Of working capital? |
| 15 | make its file in Docket UG-220198? | 15 | Q. Yeah. |
| 16 | A. Well, a part of it was just the timing of | 16 | A. I believe that's correct. |
| 17 | getting all the information. The circumstances of that | 17 | Q. Okay. So in your exhibit MAC-4T, page 8, line 6 |
| 18 | filing were we went through a process of finding out, | 18 | and 7, you state that shareholders had advanced the cash |
| 19 | you know, what the -- well, getting the private letter | 19 | necessary to fund the cost of the service represented by |
| 20 | ruling that was issued to PSE, evaluating whether it | 20 | the unbilled revenues. |
| 21 | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate | 21 | Would you agree that AWEC is not contesting |
| 22 | parties to determine our best course of action, and once | 22 | Cascade's ability to earn a return through working the |
| 23 | we had all that information, we filed that. We -- that | 23 | capital on cash advanced to fund unbilled revenues? |
| 24 | filing was planned not in conjunction with the | 24 | A. I believe that's correct. |
| 25 | settlement stipulations or anything there, but that was | 25 | Q. Okay. Do you have a way to estimate whether |

Cascade's total unbilled revenue balance will increase or decrease on a normalized basis?
A. Well, annually, you would expect if you have customer growth -- there are a lot of variables to factor into unbilled revenue, right, and it can go up or down --
Q. Okay.
A. -- on -- in any given year, and I think that
the -- the case here is that Cascade has been consistent in how we treated unbilleds. The only difference in this particular case is that Cascade followed the Commission's order to remove supplemental schedules, and so in -- in the past, we would have removed the decoupling fees. Because of the recent order in our last case, we would have removed the supplemental schedules. But after that, Cascade has been consistent in all of its cases in how it's treated unbilleds, whether it's been to the detriment or the benefit. And I think having that consistency from year to year in each case is important. And for us to -- to try and remove or -- or keep in in any given year or in any particular case would be a departure from -- from sound judgment.
Q. Okay. But you would agree that unbilled revenue balance -- the unbilled revenue balance is influenced by
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rate changes that occur in the test period?
A. Could be, yes.
Q. Yeah.
A. It could be impacted there.
Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?
A. Isn't the whole point of...?
Q. Normalized revenue forecast.
A. Well, to -- to the whole point of normalize
revenue forecasting would be -- yes, need to get --
to -- to get to a baseline revenue, yes.
Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?
A. Throughput --
Q. Okay.
A. -- and the customer growth, due to weather.
Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?
A. Well, in general, no. I'm sorry. I misunderstood that in --
Q. Yeah, so -- so let me -- let me state that again.

All other things being equal, if the throughput
is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

All right. Moving on, I would like to talk to
you about the COVID savings, refer to your testimony
MAC-4T, page 13, line 5.
A. Just one moment.
Q. Okay. Yeah.
A. Let me get there. Lots of -- lots of paper.
Q. Lots of paper. I understand.
A. So I'm sorry. You said page 13 ?
Q. Yeah. Line 5.
A. 13 , line 5 , yes.
Q. Okay. So in your testimony, you acknowledge that the test period results include 635,000 of deferred COVID savings; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And the effect of the 635,000 deferred

COVID savings is an increase to revenue requirement; correct?
A. That would be correct.
Q. Okay. Would you agree that the savings represent a number of saving items such as, you know, reduced meals and entertainment expenses, employee lodge
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expenses, travel expenses, that sort of thing?
A. Yup.
Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?
A. Things are returning slowly. I do -- the -- the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to -- to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as -- as normal and have been over time.
Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?
A. Typically, yes.
Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?
A. Oh, there are.
Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. And if things do return to normal and there's no more virtual meetings, won't Cascade have the ability to consider that in its next rate case that it sounds like it's going to be filed in the very near future?
A. Yeah, but those aren't -- I mean, there's lots
of different costs in there. You know, if you're -you're talking about the cost specifically to rate cases or something like that, you know, there are, one, offsetting costs, but there are additional costs, and there's the impact of inflation on everything also, so there's a lot of different variables there that can impact this, but certainly as the impacts of COVID have lessened and continue to lessen, we are headed back to a more normal -- experiencing more normal -- the normal-type costs that we experienced before.
Q. I would like to switch topics again to the cost recovery mechanism, so I would like to reference you to your testimony MAC-4T page 24. It looks like lines 9 through 18.
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. So if $I$ understand your testimony correctly, Cascade did not present for recovery in this case any cost recovery mechanism plant additions other than those included in the test period; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Would you agree that Cascade is still proposing an after-the-fact adjustment to its margin revenues in its compliance filing for CRM additions that weren't identified in the initial filing in this case?
A. Well, specifically, what we've included in this
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case and what we're filing for is similar to -- I mean, again, the treatment has been the same. Our treatment of what we brought into this case from this CRM standpoint has been consistent with how we've been filing this over the course of time, so there has been no departure from -- from how we've been treating this in this case from any -- any prior cases.
Q. Okay. So given the Commission's use and useful policy statement and Docket U-190531, could Cascade have included all the potential CRM plant additions and service through the rate year in this case?
A. Sorry. One more time for me.
Q. Okay. Given the Commission's use and useful policy statement in Docket U-190531, could Cascade have included all the potential CRM plants additions and service through the rate year in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So if Cascade had done that and included the plant additions and service to the rate year, would Cascade need to seek recovery through the CRM?
A. Well, if we brought it in this case, we wouldn't bring -- be bringing it in the CRM.
Q. Okay. So turn to page 23 of your testimony.

Can you walk me through the timeline that starts at page 23? I was having a hard time tracking what
happened in the last rate case and what is being proposed in this case.
A. It is confusing. It's confusing to me. I -- I can walk you through this. I don't know that I can provide more explanation than what -- than what is included in the timeline that's shared on page 23.
Q. Okay. Well, if you can't -- if you can't elaborate on that, then I'll just move on.

So when Cascade is performing the evaluation that you describe in your testimony, how does Cascade determine what plant additions were included -- included in the rates and what were excluded from rates?
A. Well, if a plant was placed in service during -you know, during the end of that -- that test year, it should be in -- in the plan.
Q. Okay. So but aren't multiple things changing subsequent to the test period such as accumulated depreciation and increase in revenues that might offset the need for the CRM plant additions?
A. I'm sorry. I hate --
Q. So if you have a rate case --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- that includes certain things and certain plants and then you're making a later CRM filing, that's kind of like a single issue rate filing, so aren't other
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things happening that could offset the need for the CRM?
A. Well, you know, depending on the timing of everything. I mean, the CRM is in there for a specific purpose. You know, the mechanism was -- was put in place to address specific issues. And from our standpoint, it's working as the Commission intended. And so until there is an alternative and, you know, possibly the multiyear rate base, the CRM is -- is working and it's been a -- an appropriate tool for the company, and I think it's accomplishing what -- again, what the Commission intended when it was put in place.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Just one final question: If you could turn to page 3 of your testimony, MAC-4T, lines 12 through 14, can you tell me what you meant by the statement that if AWEC chose not to participate in settlement negotiations, that does not mean the negotiations did not occur?
A. Yeah, well, I mean, Cascade went into the initial settlement, January 10th, if I have the date right, expecting a negotiation to take place. My recollection of that meeting is negotiations really didn't seem to take place, that it was essentially punted to a --
Q. Well, yeah, and wasn't that the settlement
conference that was canceled and rescheduled and we convened to discuss schedules?
A. The January --

MS. BARNETT: I'll object here. This is going into -- this was a settlement negotiation as scheduled by the prehearing conference, and those are -those are confidential and shall not be used as evidence in this case.

MR. STOKES: I'm not asking for anything confidential. I'm just asking what he means my the statement that he says in his testimony that we -- so I wanted to know if he's saying that AWEC didn't attend a scheduled settlement conference.

THE WITNESS: AWEC was in attendance at that settlement conference.
BY MR. STOKES:
Q. And all the other conferences that all the parties were invited to?
A. They were, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. STOKES: Nothing further, Your Honor.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
Cascade, would you like to proceed with any redirect?

MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor.

REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. BARNETT:
Q. Working backward, I would just like to begin with -- let me turn on my video here.

Regarding the rate case, Mr. Stokes made a point
to, I guess, imply that rate case costs such as travel would be included in a rate case adjustment.

And did you include -- is Cascade including any rate case adjustment in this rate case?
A. Is Cascade including any rate specific to --
Q. Right. Does it include any rate case cost adjustment? Does it have a rate case cost adjustment in this case?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Thank you.

And back to the CBR, I think that the -- you were asked about the commission basis report's adjustments.

Are you aware of what those adjustments, what -what rate case your 2022 commission basis report filing, your last one, what rate case those were based on?
A. I'm sorry. Could you ask that a different way, or I'm not --
Q. Yeah. Yeah. I'm sorry for the confusion.

So the 2022 commission basis report is based on
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what adjustments from what rate case? Are you aware?
A. Commission basis report?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, the commission basis report, what are the adjustments based on?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. The adjustments are based on the -- our last full litigated general rate case, 200568, I believe is the number.
Q. Okay. Would you -- would -- are you aware of the Commission, if the -- the rate base was based on the commission basis report.

Is that an AMA basis or an EOP?
A. I believe that's AMA in that.
Q. And this case is EOP that you presented; correct?
A. That's correct. So but the reasoning for that being the -- the -- you know, the amount the plant that the company has been placing in service, you know, there are the -- the four factors that the Commission looks at, and I think that the circumstances of this case when compared to the prior case that had just closed, well, about a year ago at this point, but roughly four months from when we filed this case, those circumstances hadn't really changed and they haven't changed since then. We
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are spending a lot of capital to serve our customers and provide that safe, reliable service that we need to provide. We're in high inflationary periods. We haven't been earning our rate of return. And so you -the circumstances that were in place before are still in place now, and that's why we're seeking end of period.

And, again, we didn't take end of period for granted. We included that as a -- well, provided extensive support for that in our original filing, and that would have been in my testimony specifically.

## Q. Thank you.

And just -- just to clarify on the commission basis report, the 2021 commission basis report adjustments are based on the 2019 GRC outcomes; is that right? Is that how that works? So your GRC -- I think it was UG-190210 for your 2021 CBR; is that correct?
A. I believe so, yeah.
Q. Okay. No further redirect.

JUDGE DOYLE: All right. Thank you.
Do either of the commissioners have any questions before we take a short break? CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, Ido.

QUESTIONING

## BY CHAIR DANNER:

Q. Yeah, I do. I just want to -- let me -- let me
start -- good morning, Mr. Chiles.
A. Good morning.
Q. You received a question from Donna Barnett about the AMA versus the EOP, but let me just ask, it appears in the settlement that you're excluding EOP revenue growth, although, you're including EOP treatment for rate base and depreciation expense and tax expense and interest synchronization.

Did the 2020 test year experience customer growth as compared to prior years, and if so, how much in percentage terms?
A. We did experience customer growth in 2020. We have been -- Cascade service territory has gradually been growing, so we did experience customer growth in 2020, yes.
Q. So but you excluded customer growth from the EOP treatment; is that correct?
A. We -- I don't know that we excluded EOP customer growth --
Q. From growth. So -- so you think you have EOP treatment for customer growth as well?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. All right. Okay. Thank you.
A. I believe. I mean, specifically, I think
customer accounts were updated and revenue was accounted
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for when we -- when we calculated end of period.
Q. Okay.
A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.
Q. No, that's all right.

And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.

There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.

Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?
A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would -- I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.
Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.
A. Okay.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. CHAIR DANNER: If that's all right. BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. And I wanted to also ask you about the settlement.

I did not see anything in the settlement about equity, yet, we have a state law, RCW 80.28.425, that has requirements regarding equity, and I was wondering if you want to explain whether the settlement does or doesn't comply with those provisions.
A. So I'm not specifically familiar with that, but when you refer to equity, in what regard, I guess, if I could get some clarification there.
Q. Well, I can tell you, we have -- we have a state law that expands public interest to include equity as well as environmental health and greenhouse gas emission reductions and so forth in determining -- the law states, "In determining the public interest, the Commission may consider such factors including but not limited to environmental health and greenhouse gas emission reductions, health and safety concerns, economic development, and equity to the extent such factors affect the rate services and practices of the gas or electrical company regulated by the Commission."
A. Okay. And how did we address that, specifically? Cascade has been on -- I mean, we certainly feel that we've been good stewards and are striving to continue to be good stewards for the overall, you know, benefit of our customers and the citizens that live -- you know, whether they use natural
specifically target segments that, you know, we would -we would want them to and on their own have done -- you know, created new programs, you know, the big art (phonetic) program to -- to help in trying to reach out to those groups. So, again, The Energy Project proposals we're very supportive of and, you know, look forward to working with them going forward to address the issues that you specifically mention.
Q. But you are -- I mean, we're talking about 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding.

Have you done any kind of cost benefit analysis or any planning on how that money would be spent?
A. I don't have all the -- all the details of that. We can provide that to you in the information -additional information that we have on that.
Q. Yeah. I would appreciate that, if you would, and then any projections for how much participation would increase as a result of that. That would -- that would be very helpful for me.
A. Okay.
Q. Thank you.

I think -- let me see if my colleague has any other questions before I ask more.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. Thank you. I do have any -- I have questions.
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Can you hear me?
THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio issues.

Can you hear me?
THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then I gotcha back, and so... (Pause.)

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear me now?

CHAIR DANNER: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect, but if this is working, I'll just keep going.

QUESTIONING
BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.

So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me know when you're there.
A. 3 through 14 , yes, I'm -- I'm there.
Q. Okay. So could you please explain the amount of the unbilled revenue that's included in the 15.9 million in the working capital allowance that's provided in the

## settlement?

A. How much of what's... (Pause.)
Q. If you could explain the amount of the unbilled revenues that's included in the 15.9 million working capital allowance provided in the settlement.
A. Well, it would --
Q. And specifically why this doesn't include -- go ahead.
A. Oh, no, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.
Q. If you could specifically explain why this
amount doesn't include the .6 million in unbilled revenues that the company claims should be recovered in the revenue requirement.

Is my question making sense to you?
A. Not entirely. Ann, I believe that the . 6
million is the 637,000, if that's what you're --
Q. Yes.
A. -- referencing.

So that number has actually been corrected to be 1.4 million, $\$ 1,413,568$, and which would be the remaining unbilled revenue included in our revenue requirement, so that was --
Q. Okay. So let's -- okay. So let's talk about that.

Can you explain the math that justifies the

7 -- 776,556, and because of the decoupling, a reverse, that would be in addition to the unbilled revenue. And then when you back out the supplemental schedules, it's an adjustment of $1,492,986$, which would offset that, so it would be a negative 2.1 million, a negative 776,000 , and a positive 1,414,000 gets you to the adjustment -or the remaining unbilled that factors into the revenue requirement of $\$ 1,414,000$.

Does that help?
Q. Okay. Well, thank you.

I guess, why -- why did -- can you explain why in your rebuttal testimony you deducted the .8 million related to decoupling from AWEC's figure and does the -why does the errata reverse that from your rebuttal testimony?
A. Right. In the rebuttal testimony -- well, the -- the way it's written -- the way it is presented in the -- in the errata is correct. It's an judgment to -- and when you say -- you know, when we refer to it as saying subtract from, it would be a subtraction that results in an addition, if that makes sense, because of the -- it's a reversal -- or it reverses the negative back out, and so built into the original, you know, total unbilled revenue of 2.1 million was the decoupling adjustment, and it would have reversed -- or it would
have reduced that unbilled revenue to begin with, so added it -- adding that negative would then increase the -- the unbilled amount.
Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?
A. Unbilled that hasn't been -- I mean, we -- we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the -- the decoupling and the supplemental, it would -- it -- you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent -- consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.
Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could explain.
A. Well, no, certainly unbilled is going to be impacted by that. Again, there are a variety of factors that are going to impact the -- the year-end unbilled
amount. You know, that changed from year to year. Those billing determinants are certainly part of that. Customer growth is part of that. Whether -- you know, all of those things factor in, and -- and that's where, you know, from a company standpoint, again, our -- we're trying to be consistent in how we treat things, you know, at the end of any given year.

And this -- certainly by -- if we were to remove those, it would -- it could have, in most years, a positive impact to the revenue requirement and require more and -- or -- so, again, to me, consistency has been the key here, you know, in how we treated things.
Q. Okay. And one other question on this topic, and this relates both to your testimony and to Ms. Nygard's testimony, and so if you can't answer this in part or in full, I can defer to -- to her, and this is pointing to your testimony, rebuttal testimony on page 8, lines 5 through 9.

So was the amount of money that you stated that shareholders advanced to fund the cost of services represented by the unbilled revenue, was that part of the equity infusion that are mentioned in Ms. Nygard's testimony?
A. I think it would be part of the --
Q. Do you want me to repeat the question?
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A. Sure.
Q. Okay. So was the amount of money that you state in your testimony that shareholders advanced to fund the cost of the services represented by the unbilled revenue part of the equity infusions that are mentioned in Ms. Nygard's testimony?
A. It would be part of the equity infusion. It would be part of overall working capital that the company uses to fund those items, so yes, the equity infusion would be included in that.

## Q. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Dave, I have a few additional questions, but if you have a few, please jump in.

CHAIR DANNER: Why don't you go ahead. We -- we may want to take a break before Mr. Chiles is done, or we -- before we're done with our questions with Mr. Chiles. What is your preference, Commissioner? Would you like to just plow ahead?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I can take a break -I can take a break now, and then if we take maybe five, ten minutes -- I don't know, Judge Doyle, what your preference is -- I can fix my -- fix my audio in the meantime.

JUDGE DOYLE: No preference here.

Do the commissioners want a five- or ten-minute break?

CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Can we take a five-minute break?

JUDGE DOYLE: Great. It's 11:07. Wow. Math is hard apparently. Let's do 11:12--

MS. CHAIR DANNER: Why don't we call it 11:15.

JUDGE DOYLE: Love it. Make it simple. CHAIR DANNER: All right.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. We'll be off the record until 11:15.
(A break was taken from
11:07 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)
JUDGE DOYLE: Welcome back, everyone. It is 11:15. We've just been on a break. Let's be back on the record, and I believe, Commissioner Rendahl, you still have some questions for Mr. Chile.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.
Maybe let me verify you can hear me maybe better.

THE WITNESS: I can hear you.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Always a good thing.
BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.

And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?
A. I would yes.
Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if -- what is that process, if you --
A. Right.
Q. -- can explain?
A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the -- all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so -- and our -- our compliance filing did follow the established rules. Getting into the details of that, I actually would not be the best witness to do that, so we could provide follow-up on that.
Q. Well, let me just ask if you know whether in that last rate case, whether the company provided testimony that it was going to make these CRM changes in
its compliance filing.
Are you aware of that or not?
A. I believe that we did. I mean, it's been our standard practice that we have done that. I can't say specifically that it was mentioned in that rate case or in that filing that we would be adjusting rates for the C -- CRM as we did and have in the past.
Q. So do you think that companies should be allowed to make changes to rates that have not been granted explicit authorization from the Commission or otherwise been allowed to take effect by operation of law?
A. Well, in general, no. I mean, we should not be changing our rates without the proper authorization. I think our understanding of this is that we would have, through the various mechanisms, had the approval to make the changes appropriately as we did.
Q. Okay. So in -- in the rebuttal testimony, your rebuttal testimony in this case, you stated that -- that the company plans to make the CRM rate changes in its compliance filing consistent with the last case.

So how will the company address the change in this case to ensure the filing is clear as to what changes are being made and under what authority?
A. Specific to that, maybe they should make the request that that is stated in the order that we would
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make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.
Q. Okay. I'll move on.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?

CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
(Telephonic interruption.)
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not. BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you -can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you there?
A. I am there, yes.
Q. Okay. Great.

So you make the statement that the trend suggests that business operations are returning to pre-pandemic levels, and you spoke a bit to AWEC's counsel about this -- this issue, but my question is, is if this is the case, how does this impact the company's

COVID-19 accounting deferral going forward and what are the company's plans regarding that deferral?
A. Well, I would say that we were working through all the different plans. As far as the deferral, itself, you know, we have those -- still tracking all of those costs and will continue to treat those as we're treating them now; although, I would say very minimal on our part at this point.
Q. So are there any savings that you're still tracking in addition to costs?
A. I think -- well, we're -- we're still seeing -I mean, there are some savings in addition to the cost, yes.
Q. Okay. And one last question -- and this, again, your rebuttal testimony on page 10 relating to uncollectible expenses, and this is at lines 1 and 2.
A. Yes.
Q. Where you testify that the current 2020 test year's uncollectible amount is representative of past amounts and doesn't reflect an elevated level due to the coronavirus pandemic.

So did the uncollectible amounts identified in this case or included in this case include amounts that are deferred under the mechanism and Docket U-200281 that deals with COVID disconnection moratorium?

## issuance?

A. Oh, I can get that for you. I'm not exactly sure.
Q. Okay. And, again, what was the amount of the long-term debt? Can you get that for us?
A. I believe it was 50 million. I can follow up on that.
Q. Okay. And so in Tammy Nygard's testimony, I believe it was 35 million.

So are there some updates that needed -- need to be made?
A. I -- well, certainly what we're seeing is, and as, you know, you may be aware, gas prices have been significantly higher than what we would have anticipated, and so we're -- you know, the additional amounts there would be covering those gas costs.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. I think I would like to have on the record the actual dates and the actual amount and then any updates that need to be made that could affect the settlement, and so maybe we could -- we could do a bench request for that. BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. Also in her testimony on page 4, can you speak to what was Cascade's actual debt percentage in 2020?
A. The actual debt percentage in 2020, I would
A. It would include all -- all uncollectibles,
anything that we've written off as an uncollectible account, so any of those customers that were protected would not include those balances.
Q. Okay. I don't think I understand, so -- from your answer, so does the uncollectible amounts in this case include those amounts deferred related to those disconnection, those customers --
A. No.
Q. -- that you have not collected money from?
A. Yeah, I don't believe they do, no.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.

I don't have any further questions. Thank you very much for your patience.

QUESTIONING (CONTINUED) BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. So I just want to ask some questions. These are in Tammy Nygard's testimony, and I'm hoping that you can answer these, but basically, in her exhibit, TJM-1T, on page 5 at the top of the page, just was wondering -- I just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt been issued yet?
A. The new long-term debt has been issued, yes.
Q. It has been issued, okay.

And what was the actual date of the debt
refer to -- sorry -- it would be Exhibit 8-X, which would be our reply to AWEC Data Request No. 119, where we illustrate the -- the capital structure with and without the impacts of the normalization, so at the end of $12-$ - 12/31 of 2020, without the impacts, we would be in debt of 53 and equity of 47 .

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So we -- yeah, we -we may follow up with a bench request to get precise numbers on that, but l'Il -- but thank you.

I have no further questions.
Commissioner Rendahl, do you?
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have nothing further for Mr. Chiles. Thank you.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Chiles, you may be excused.
As we didn't exactly do this as a panel forum as usually intended, we do, however, still have questions for the settling parties for Staff's witness, Joanna Huang. Are you still available?

And if not, would Staff please make your witness available.

There you are.
And I will swear you in.
Can you please raise your right hand.
Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you
will give today is the full truth, nothing but -- the
whole truth and nothing but the truth?
MS. HUANG: I do.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.
And commissioners?
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, actually, Judge Doyle, if you wouldn't mind, I think there was some -- I was thinking we were doing a settlement panel, so I think there are some questions that maybe --

JUDGE DOYLE: Sure.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- that Mr. Chiles may want to be available, so I'm not sure he's actually excused yet.

JUDGE DOYLE: My apologies.
So if we could keep Mr. Chiles in then.
Ms. Barnett, do you have any other witnesses that you were anticipating bringing into the settlement panel?

MS. BARNETT: No. Mr. Chiles is the only witness supporting the settlement, and as far as other -- and this is the only one that was identified by any parties or the Commission, was Mr. Chiles, so but we do have other people available if -- if it's appropriate or welcomed.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. All right. With that,
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Commissioners, is there any -- anyone else that -anything else before you would like to continue?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can go forward.

Dave, do you want to go ahead?
CHAIR DANNER: Sure.
QUESTIONING BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.

There was another settlement conference scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to give them an opportunity to respond to this -- you know, prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?
A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the procedure and did the right thing, so... (pause.)
Q. And so that would have been that your lawyer brought the agreement terms to the other parties to give them an opportunity to respond --
A. Yes.
Q. -- prior to February 18th?
A. Yes. I believe he followed the procedure.
Q. Okay. But it doesn't sound like you're sure what that procedure is?
A. I provide an analysis, but I don't deal too much with the exact date or which settlement. I don't get too much involved with the procedure.
Q. Okay. And so are you aware of how this would have been communicated to the other parties, if it was?
A. Usually by e-mail, and I was included. I just can't remember exact date.
Q. Okay. Okay.
A. And I'm working on two general rate cases at the same time, so --
Q. I understand. I understand.

Let me ask again another question that l've already asked Mr. Chiles, and that's with regard to the Washington Energy Assistance program.

Was there -- you are agreeing to what The Energy Project is proposing?
A. Yes.
Q. And so just wanted to know, we're talking about 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding, which is a million and a half. Have you completed or undertaken any kind of cost benefit analysis? Can you -- do you know how this money will be spent and what it will achieve?

> Page
A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree what The Energy Project request.
Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis done --
A. I don't believe so, but we agree.
Q. All right.

MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might interrupt for a moment?

## QUESTIONING (CONTINUED)

 BY CHAIR DANNER:
## Q. You may.

A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on May 18th this year, and it should -- it provides details on the path that we're working on to help address that low income segment of our customer base, and specifically those of color, so we -- we do have a filing out there that would provide information on that.
Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that correct?
A. It is not in this docket.
Q. But you're saying that it's directly relevant to the questions I'm asking?
A. Yeah. I believe it's relevant to your question.
Q. All right. Well, we might want to see about
getting that into the record, so thank you.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, may I
ask a follow-up?
CHAIR DANNER: Of course.
QUESTIONING (CONTINUED) BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. So if the Commission were to approve this proposal, is it the parties' intent that the low income advisory group would work with the company to figure out how best and most efficiently and most cost effectively to implement this proposal?
A. Yes. That's certainly our goal, is, again, working closely with Staff, working closely with the individual agencies to see how we can best serve this segment of our population of our customer base to make sure that they're getting the help that they need during some really trying times. That is our goal.
Q. Okay. Because I think Chair Danner had asked you some specific questions about if you have specific activities or specific funding proposals in mind within this proposal, and -- and so it sounds like it is not -it's still in the proposed -- it's still a proposal that could be funded, but the details need to be addressed.
A. Well, I think there are details within this plan
that we filed that I couldn't -- couldn't specifically
provide to you at this time, so I think the document would speak much better to the plans of the company than I would be able to at this point -- at this point in time.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So, Judge Doyle, maybe we want to take notice of that filing in this docket.

JUDGE DOYLE: And, Mr. Chiles, can you please state the -- the name of that filing again and if you have the docket number.

MR. CHILES: Let me -- I don't specifically have that in front of me. I will get it and provide it to you.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
MS. BARNETT: I have that, if you want it. I know I'm not a witness, but if it would help, I do have that handy if you would like that.

JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, if you could quickly.
MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.

JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.
MS. BARNETT: Uh-huh.
JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead, Commissioner Rendahl, thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, I was jumping
into Chair Danner's questions, so I just wanted to follow up on that, so Chair Danner, go ahead.

CHAIR DANNER: And I appreciate you doing so. Thank you.

QUESTIONING (CONTINUED) BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. So, Joanna, I want to ask you questions about equity.

We have direction from state law that we are to consider equity, and it was not addressed specifically in the settlement.

Can you tell me if it was -- if I'm missing it? Is it there? Can you speak to that?
A. Whether the settlement addressed that portion of the -- I just can't address to that issue. I'm sorry.
Q. All right. Thank you.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Commissioner Rendahl, I don't have any further questions right now for the panel.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a couple of more, and so -- to both Staff and Cascade witnesses.

In the joint testimony, JT-1T at page 5, lines 2 through 8 , relating to depreciation, the testimony is that you've analyzed depreciation expenses using end of period depreciation, 2020 actual depreciation, and 2021
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actual depreciation, and that each methodology includes benefits and drawbacks, but no methodology is clearly better or more appropriate than the other.

Can you identify which method was used in actually arriving at the number in the settlement?

MS. HUANG: I believe that we used a 2021 actual depreciation expense.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Chiles, would you -- do you have any changes to that?

MR. CHILES: Yeah, I can't specifically say that it was the 2021. I'm not -- not disputing, but it would be -- you know, the depreciation was a compromised on behalf of the parties, and in general, I mean, a \$3 million reduction, can't -- wouldn't be specific to a particular depreciation number, but, in general, it -it was a compromised position by the company and I guess by Staff also.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So for purposes of in the next general rate case that the company will bring, how does the commission or other parties address the change between this settlement black box number and going forward? How do we -- how do we have a baseline going forward if we're not using an actual number?

|  | Page 81 |  | Page 83 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. CHILES: For depreciation in -- | 1 | look at Column I. |
| 2 | specifically? | 2 | MR. CHILES: Correct, yes. |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. | 3 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you |
| 4 | MR. CHILES: Well, I mean, our -- our goal | 4 | confirm that Adjustment R-7 removes all of the |
| 5 | is to use, you know, the -- you know, the test year | 5 | supplemental schedules from base rates, including |
| 6 | depreciation to make the appropriate adjustments so that | 6 | Schedule 581, protected plus excess deferred income |
| 7 | we're filing specifically on, you know, a -- a number. | 7 | taxes from the general rate case? |
| 8 | In this case, in terms of the settlement, it was | 8 | MR. CHILES: If I look here, go from that |
| 9 | to get to an agreed-upon position by -- by both parties | 9 | particular number over to -- because that links over to |
| 10 | that -- you know, an amount that we could both live | 10 | the operating report, and I'm going to move to the |
| 11 | with, given the different methods of calculating | 11 | operating report, but it does remove all the |
| 12 | depreciation. | 12 | supplemental adjustments, yes, so it would remove the |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I | 13 | Schedule 581. |
| 14 | appreciate -- I appreciate your response. | 14 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. |
| 15 | Unless you have something else, Chair Danner, | 15 | And then next there's a spreadsheet named |
| 16 | I'm going to move on to one other line of questions | 16 | sup- -- s-u-p-p-l, s-c-h, so supplemental schedule, and |
| 17 | related to the protected plus excess deferred income | 17 | the a-d-g [sic], so supplemental schedule adjustment. |
| 18 | tax. | 18 | Do you see that spreadsheet name? |
| 19 | CHAIR DANNER: No, go right ahead. | 19 | MR. CHILES: I do, yes. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I realize | 20 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you |
| 21 | that counsel for AWEC already asked a number of | 21 | confirm that Column C removes all amounts associated |
| 22 | questions about this, but l'm hoping that my questions | 22 | with Washington State's allocated protected plus excess |
| 23 | are not repeating. | 23 | deferred income taxes Schedule 581 for the 2020 test |
| 24 | So do you have the Excel workbook, Exhibit JT-2, | 24 | year? |
| 25 | both witnesses? | 25 | MR. CHILES: Yes. |
|  | Page 82 |  | Page 84 |
| 1 | MR. CHILES: I do have that, yes. | 1 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. |
| 2 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Ms. Huang, do you | 2 | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up |
| 3 | have access to that? | 3 | subject to check once you get the transcript, but I |
| 4 | THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file? | 4 | believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2. | 5 | And I do not have any further questions for the |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of | 6 | panel. |
| 7 | the Excel file? | 7 | Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name? | 8 | CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have |
| 9 | MR. CHILES: If I may? | 9 | any more questions for this panel. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead. | 10 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the |
| 11 | MR. CHILES: It's | 11 | panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and |
| 12 | 210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2. | 12 | giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: I don't have that file. | 13 | now excused. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask | 14 | I believe we've got a question for Public |
| 15 | my questions and you can answer them -- | 15 | Counsel's witness. |
| 16 | MS. HUANG: Okay. | 16 | Is Mark Garret available? |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check -- | 17 | MS. PAISNER: I believe he is. |
| 18 | MS. HUANG: Okay. | 18 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- and, Mr. Chiles, | 19 | for Mr. Garrett -- Mr. Barnett, do you have a question? |
| 20 | you can go ahead with your understanding. | 20 | MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if |
| 21 | So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a | 21 | people don't object. I'm sorry. |
| 22 | spreadsheet name Exhibit MCG-5, summary of adjustments. | 22 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, let's take a |
| 23 | Do you have that, Mr. Chiles? | 23 | quick five-minute break. We'll be off the record and |
| 24 | MR. CHILES: I do have that, yes. | 24 | return at 11:50. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And if you | 25 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you. |


|  | Page 85 |  | Page 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (A break was taken from |  | cases. |
| 2 | 11:46 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.) | 2 | MS. PAISNER: Is Public Counsel opposing the |
| 3 | JUDGE DOYLE: We've just returned from a | 3 | settlement? |
| 4 | short break, and we'll turn it back over to the | 4 | MR. GARRETT: Yes. |
| 5 | Commissioners. | 5 | MS. PAISNER: Okay. Thank you. |
| 6 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. | 6 | Our witness is available for questions. |
| 7 | JUDGE DOYLE: Apologies. I just realized I | 7 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. |
| 8 | didn't get a chance to swear in our witness. | 8 | QUESTIONING |
| 9 | CHAIR DANNER: Yes. I was going to ask you, | 9 | BY CHAIR DANNER: |
| 10 | who is the witness right now. | 10 | Q. And it's still morning, so good morning, Mr. |
| 11 | We have excused Joanna Huang and Mr. Chiles; | 11 | Garrett. |
| 12 | correct? | 12 | A. Good morning. |
| 13 | JUDGE DOYLE: Yes. | 13 | Q. So in your testimony in MEG-1T on page 8, you |
| 14 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. | 14 | are recommending a 2021 test year, but you have an |
| 15 | JUDGE DOYLE: So we're bringing up Public | 15 | exhibit MEG-3, on page 2, you refer to the twelve months |
| 16 | Counsel. | 16 | ending September 31st, 2020, so can you clarify, are you |
| 17 | Mr. Garrett, have you been able to bring | 17 | recommending a calendar year, a calendar test year of |
| 18 | yourself up? | 18 | 2020 or 2021? |
| 19 | MR. GARRETT: Yes, I'm here. | 19 | A. No. I think this -- that needs to be cleared |
| 20 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. Can you please | 20 | up. I think there's some confusion about the way we |
| 21 | raise your right hand. | 21 | presented the testimony, the opposition testimony. |
| 22 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony that | 22 | What I was really trying to do is show that the |
| 23 | you'll give today is the truth, the whole truth, and | 23 | stipulation of increase of 10.7 million was too high |
| 24 | nothing but the truth? | 24 | based upon actual results in 2021, so the stipulation |
| 25 | MR. GARRETT: I do. | 25 | came out of the 2020 results because it was filed in |
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| 1 | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. | 1 | 2021, the case was filed in 2021, so they didn't have |
| 2 | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your | 2 | 2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate |
| 3 | witness? | 3 | affected period, which is typically the next year, close |
| 4 | MS. PAISNER: Yes, please. | 4 | to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the |
| 5 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you. | 5 | settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual |
| 6 | MS. PAISNER: Thanks. | 6 | results for the next year. |
| 7 | Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your | 7 | We didn't have a commission basis report at that |
| 8 | name for the record and spell your last name. | 8 | time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results, |
| 9 | MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett, | 9 | but -- but we did ask for the financial results for |
| 10 | G-a-r-r-e-t-t. | 10 | 2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show |
| 11 | MS. PAISNER: What is your place of | 11 | based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too |
| 12 | employment? | 12 | high. |
| 13 | MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc. | 13 | And since our testimony was filed, we actually |
| 14 | MS. PAISNER: Thank you. | 14 | now have the commission basis report with all the proper |
| 15 | What is your occupation? | 15 | adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it |
| 16 | MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert | 16 | shows the same -- about the same thing. It shows $\$ 5.2$ |
| 17 | witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly. | 17 | million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made |
| 18 | MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you | 18 | some mistakes in our -- in our adjustments, but the |
| 19 | testifying? | 19 | commission basis report is probably the best evidence of |
| 20 | MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel. | 20 | what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7 |
| 21 | MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education | 21 | million difference; it's about $\$ 5.2$ million. |
| 22 | and experience. | 22 | Q. Okay. So just to clarify then, you -- are you |
| 23 | MR. GARRETT: So I'm a CPA and an attorney | 23 | looking -- you would like the Commission to use the 2021 |
| 24 | and $I$ have about 20 years in public utility regulation | 24 | test year? |
| 25 | experience, and I've testified in maybe 220 utility rate | 25 | A. No. I think -- I think the point I was trying |

to make is that the company's adjustments for 2020 were supposed to predict what would happen in 2021. We actually know now what happened in 2021. It's nowhere near what the company predicted, and so I'm just showing that the settlement is too high based upon what's really going on at the company.
Q. All right. Thank you for that.

CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner Rendahl, if you don't have any follow-up on that, I'm going to ask some other questions then.

Okay. Thank you.
BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. So I also want to turn to The Energy Project's proposal. It sounds like Public Counsel is okay with that proposal, but the question I asked to the other witnesses I also ask to you: Did you do any kind of analysis or did you see any plan about how that money would actually be spent, how it would attract new users, participants into the WEAF program?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Okay. And, finally, the same question I asked others about equity: We do have a state law that's directing us to focus on equity. Did you -is -- from your point of view, do you see anything in the settlement regarding equity?
A. Well, I apologize for not knowing what the -what the statute is referring to when it talks about equity. My entire testimony was really about -- was about the equity of the settlement, you know, about the fairness of the settlement, but I don't know what the statute is really contemplating when it included that.

CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no further questions for Mr. Garrett.

Thank you, Mr. Garrett.
MR. GARRETT: Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. I believe, with that, we can dismiss Mr. Garrett. Thank you for your testimony today.

MR. GARRETT: Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: And I believe we would like to bring up Bradley Mullins for AWEC.

Are you available?
There you are. Thank you. That was my error.
Can you please raise your right hand?
Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give today is the truth the full truth and nothing but the truth.

MR. MULLINS: I do.
JUDGE DOYLE: Mr. Stokes, would you please introduce your witness.

MR. STOKES: Good morning. Would you please state your full name for the record and who you're representing.

THE WITNESS: Brad Mullins, spelled M-u-I-I-i-n-s, representing AWEC, the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers.

MR. STOKES: And who employs you right now?
MR. MULLINS: I am a self-employed
consultant.
MR. STOKES: Okay. If you had to file your same testimony today, would you file the same testimony? MR. MULLINS: Yes.
MR. STOKES: Okay. I will open up this
witness for questions.
CHAIR DANNER: All right. Well, thank you.
I just have --
QUESTIONING BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. For Mr. Mullins, good afternoon, just the same questions that l've asked before about equity: Were you involved in -- when you look at the settlement, are you -- do you believe the settlement does or does not
comply with the equity provisions in the state laws 80.28.425.
A. Well, yeah, I don't know whether if it complies or not, but, you know, it -- at least in my reading of it, it doesn't specifically address, you know, issues of underserved communities and things like that, so, you know --
Q. Okay.
A. -- it's obviously not a, you know -- yeah --
Q. Not an explicit term?
A. Right, right.
Q. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR DANNER: That's all the questions I have Mr. Mullins.

Commissioner Rendahl, do you have any follow-up? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no follow-up. Thank you.

MR. MULLIN: Thank you very much. JUDGE DOYLE: All right. Speed round. Thank you, Mr. Mullins, for being available to testify today.

And finally for The Energy Project is Shawn Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Hello. Good afternoon.
JUDGE DOYLE: Good afternoon.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Can you please raise your right hand. | 1 | populations throughout the state in order to achieve |
| 2 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you | 2 | greater -- as I said, trust and communication. |
| 3 | will give today is the whole truth and nothing but the | 3 | You know, we're seeing this now with a lot of |
| 4 | truth? | 4 | the accounts in arrears across the state and people not |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: I do. | 5 | reaching out for that assistance, and so this effort, I |
| 6 | JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you. | 6 | believe, would help increase the number of households |
| 7 | And please introduce your witness. | 7 | served as well as the budget utilized for the assistance |
| 8 | MR. ZAKAI: Thank you, Judge Doyle. | 8 | program. |
| 9 | Mr. Collins, could you please state your name, | 9 | Q. Okay. But there's no -- there's no written plan |
| 10 | position, and employer? | 10 | that says: Here's how we're going to spend the |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Shawn | 11 | additional \$73,000? |
| 12 | Collins. I'm director of The Energy Project, a program | 12 | A. No. So, you know, the approach we took here was |
| 13 | about opportunity counsel located in Bellingham, | 13 | a conversation with the utility and agencies and other |
| 14 | Washington. | 14 | stakeholders about this effort, and so if it were to be |
| 15 | MR. ZAKAI: Do you have any changes or | 15 | approved, then we would begin the nuts and bolts of this |
| 16 | corrections to your pre-filed testimony? | 16 | effort, and so what we have on paper is really what was |
| 17 | MR. COLLINS: I do not. | 17 | in our testimony at this point. |
| 18 | MR. ZAKAI: At this time, The Energy Project | 18 | Q. All right. Thank you. I have no further |
| 19 | presents Mr. Collins for the Commissions' questions. | 19 | questions. |
| 20 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. | 20 | QUESTIONING |
| 21 | QUESTIONING | 21 | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: |
| 22 | BY CHAIR DANNER: | 22 | Q. So I guess I would just have one follow-up, and |
| 23 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Collins. | 23 | I did ask that of Mr. Chiles, that the assumption is if |
| 24 | So, again, some of the questions l've asked to | 24 | the Commission were to approve this proposal that you've |
| 25 | others: This is -- you're asking for basically an | 25 | made and that the other parties do not seem to object |
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| 1 | additional 5 percent of the $\mathbf{2 2} / \mathbf{2 3}$ program funding. It's | 1 | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income |
| 2 | going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about | 2 | advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to |
| 3 | 73,000? | 3 | make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and |
| 4 | Have you done any kind of planning, what you | 4 | would there be a way to bring that back to the |
| 5 | would do with this additional money? Have you done a | 5 | Commission, or is that just -- what is the process that |
| 6 | cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, | 6 | you envision going forward, if we were to approve this |
| 7 | you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder | 7 | and to implement it? |
| 8 | if you can describe basically what are you going to get? | 8 | A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee |
| 9 | A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the | 9 | staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, |
| 10 | calculations. That would be the maximum available | 10 | agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there |
| 11 | budget for the -- for the effort. In terms of the | 1 | is if this was an allowed expense, the up to -- you |
| 12 | community-based social marketing concept and the way it | 12 | know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific |
| 13 | would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar | 13 | proposal would be put together much like we have worked |
| 14 | approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the | 4 | with the company in the past on their existing marketing |
| 15 | agencies there that's currently underway and has worked | 5 | and outreach efforts. |
| 16 | in some of the previous efforts l've led before with | 16 | There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, |
| 17 | energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for | 17 | nline search optimization expenses that promote the |
| 18 | modern income households. | 18 | program now. And so we would essentially compliment |
| 19 | And the idea here really is to build trust in | 19 | those efforts, come up with a plan for -- well, you |
| 20 | the local communities served by the utilities so that | 20 | know, essentially -- you know, a potential pay point |
| 21 | people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and | 21 | contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would |
| 22 | to agencies for assistance. And while I don't have a | 22 | be made available to participate in community-based |
| 23 | specific percentage increase in participation that we | 3 | organizations, so we would outline that, have a scope of |
| 24 | would expect, it is a longer-term effort to build | 24 | work and outcomes or work projects associated with |
| 25 | relationships with underserved and vulnerable | 25 | those -- with those dollars utilized, and that would go |

through the advisory committee.
And, you know, I think I would expect this would show up in the next rate case as an expense, for example, for a review, not necessarily anticipating submitting it in a docket for, you know, additional approval. Though, that -- you know, I certainly leave that to your discretion to do so.

## Q. Thank you. That's -- that's a helpful

 explanation.COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have anything else, or is there another question I can ask?

CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead. I have no further questions at this time.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. And I guess I would ask the question of you that Chair Danner asked of the others, and that relates to -and I think you addressed this in your testimony as well, as to how the settlement does or doesn't address or comply with the equity provision in RCW 80.28.425.
A. Yes. I would -- my opinion is it does not.

We -- you know, in our settlement negotiations and then in our testimony and then what was reflected in the testimony I think of both Staff and the company contain

CHAIR DANNER: Yes. That is correct. Thank you.

JUDGE DOYLE: And then for Bench Request No. 3, we're looking at -- I'm looking at my notes here, the cost and benefits analysis and projections, and based on that analysis for The Energy Project's proposal, I believe that was for the settling parties.

Was that a request that you wanted to make, or did I maybe mis-note?

CHAIR DANNER: It's my recollection that Mr. Chiles said that there was such a document or such a plan and that he would share it with us.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great.
And then for Bench Request No. 4, the date and amount of the long-term debt issuance, including any updates that would affect the settlement.

CHAIR DANNER: Again, that was my request. Yes, that's basically -- we know that the long-term debt has been issued. We wanted to know the date of that issuance, the actual amount, and the reasons for any differences from what was reported in Tammy Nygard's testimony.

And then there was some follow-up: What was the actual debt percentage for 2022, so that's what --

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.
elements that address equity; however, in the settlement itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's -- that's all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you, Mr. Collins.

MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you.
JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to go over the bench requests -- the bench requests that I took note of, so I want to clarify.

So for the Request No. 2 to the settling parties, please provide the dates and methods of communication regarding the settlement process between the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?

CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that and I think you have captured it. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically too after the -- what occurred prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule. Is that -- is that the clarification?

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. I made that adjustment. Is that correct, Dave?
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CHAIR DANNER: -- what I would actually like to see.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for 2022.

Okay. So essentially the follow-up -- the Bench Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's essentially that same request?

Okay.
CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.
JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.
Commissioners, was there anything that you had noted that I have missed or -- it looks like we have three bench requests from today's hearing.

CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it. Thank you.

JUDGE DOYLE: Great.
MS. BARNETT: And I will -- I know it's unusual. I do have -- but -- but understanding that this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one -- one witness called to address all the issues, we do have, I think response -- or another witness available that could address quickly one of the bench requests if that's something you're interested in, specifically with regard to the date and amount of the debt issuance, and
we could take that off the table, if -- if you would like that, but -- but we could also respond in that bench request. We just have that witness available, if you would like.

CHAIR DANNER: Well, since basically what I'm asking for is numbers, I'm agnostic whether it's a bench request, or I assume you're talking about bringing Tammy Nygard forward?

MS. BARNETT: That's correct. Yeah, she's right here. She's listening in. She can address your concerns now if that would be more -- more helpful than waiting for a bench request response.

JUDGE DOYLE: Would you like me to swear in the witness?

CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, why don't you. We can do this quickly.

JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.
And if you are available to come on the screen. Great.

Can you raise your right hand.
Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you'll give today is the full truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. NYGARD: I do.
JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. And --
MS. BARNETT: Oh, sorry.

## Q. And that is due to what?

A. An increase need when we did request the -- put
our -- form our request with the Commission, we did request to issue debt up to 50 million, where we were initially projecting 35 . We did take advantage of that 50 million that was available based on the interest rates today and the need we see going forward.
Q. Can you be specific about the needs you see going forward?
A. The --
Q. The more specific --
A. The capital, to fund the capital program.
Q. Okay. And can you tell me what your actual debt percentage was for 2020?
A. Let's see if I can. I may need to look at work papers. I'm assuming we have work papers filed in the case for that.
Q. Okay. So we may have to do a bench request anyway, and -- and then I would also like to see, you know, if you could lay around the 2022 debt issuance and the equity infusions and get us to a new debt percentage estimate, that would be -- I would like to see that too, if that's possible.
A. Sure.
Q. That's all I have.

JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead.
MS. BARNETT: I was going to introduce.
Could you please state your name and spell your last name for the record and provide your position at Cascade?

MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you.
I present Tammy Nygard for questions.
CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.

## QUESTIONING

## BY CHAIR DANNER:

Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr. Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that issuance.
A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been funded.
Q. Okay. So -- so it has not yet been issued?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But June 15th.

$$
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A. Correct.

## Page 104
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                                    Page 104
            CHAIR DANNER: Back to you, Judge Doyle.
            JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Nygard.
        You may be excused.
            THE WITNESS: Thank you.
            JUDGE DOYLE:So I was just reviewing.
            Do the Commissioners know what we would like
        to -- it looks like we would like to limit the final
        briefs to }60\mathrm{ pages and only one round; is that correct?
            CHAIR DANNER:That works for me.
            COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:And that works for me
        as well.
            JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any
        questions regarding those final briefs?
            Ms. Paisner.
            MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not -- I believe
    there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was
    wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if
    I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are
    other cases proceeding at the same time right now and
    there are testimony filings happening about a month from
    now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which
    is a Friday as a filing date for those briefs.
            COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And what is the --
    I'm sorry, but what is the suspension date for this
    case? I just don't want to compress our time for
```
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | preparing this final order. I appreciate the need to -- | 1 | MS. PAISNER: So the last thing I had to ask |
| 2 | to -- we've all got multiple cases going, and so I'm | 2 | about, for the public comment exhibit, we would like to |
| 3 | just trying to make sure we don't get compressed in the | 3 | get an exhibit number so we may file that, and I believe |
| 4 | end, Judge Doyle. | 4 | at the public comment hearing that was held on May 25th, |
| 5 | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, September 1st, l've | 5 | I think on the record it was stated that it would be one |
| 6 | confirmed. I believe we're considering June 29th. That | 6 | week from June 2nd, since, at that point, we weren't |
| 7 | would allow the parties four weeks, and if Public | 7 | sure whether this hearing would conclude on the 1st or |
| 8 | Counsel wants to submit theirs on the 15th, there's | 8 | the 2nd, and sol guess the first request is for an |
| 9 | nothing restricting you from doing it sooner. | 9 | exhibit number to file it and if we may file that on |
| 10 | How do the commissioners feel about that? | 10 | Thursday, June 9th, 2022. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I guess I would | 11 | JUDGE DOYLE: Great. June 9th sounds great, |
| 12 | just ask Ann Paisner what -- if there's specific dates | 12 | and I believe -- pardon me for the delay. I'm pulling |
| 13 | that are problematic, and how does the 29th work in | 13 | up the exhibit list. |
| 14 | terms of the other schedules going on? | 14 | That would be BR-5. |
| 15 | MS. PAISNER: In the Avista case, so that's | 15 | MS. PAISNER: I apologize. Did you say |
| 16 | the 220053 and 54 cases, there's testimony filing due | 16 | BR-5? |
| 17 | July 6th, which is a Wednesday, and so it looks like -- | 17 | JUDGE DOYLE: Yes. I had to double check. |
| 18 | so I believe you just said June 29th, which is the | 18 | I had a couple of changes in my notes. |
| 19 | Wednesday prior to that. I suppose I would maybe ask | 19 | And with that, Mr. Stokes, your hand is raised. |
| 20 | for Friday, the 1st, if that's possible, just that would | 20 | MR. STOKES: Just a quick clarification: It |
| 21 | allow a little bit more time, you know, for doing both | 21 | sounds like we're supposed to file a brief as soon as we |
| 22 | of these things, helping to prepare testimony in that | 22 | can. I just want to clarify that parties will not be |
| 23 | case and also file briefing in this one. | 23 | able to respond to the opening brief of other parties if |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's fine with me. | 24 | they filed early. |
| 25 | CHAIR DANNER: So I am very concerned about | 25 | CHAIR DANNER: So I was -- thank you, Mr. |
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| 1 | how compressed this is going to be. I'm okay with those | 1 | Stokes. I was just expressing a -- you know, something |
| 2 | dates, but I would encourage all the parties to submit | 2 | aspirational on my part. I don't -- I fully expect that |
| 3 | their briefs as early as possible. | 3 | everybody's briefs will come in on the same day, so I |
| 4 | JUDGE DOYLE: It sounds like we have the | 4 | will amend my remarks accordingly. |
| 5 | deadline of the close of business on Friday, July 1st, | 5 | MR. STOKES: Okay. Thank you. |
| 6 | the page limit being 60 pages. | 6 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great. If there's no |
| 7 | Are there any other matters before we conclude? | 7 | other housekeeping...? |
| 8 | MS. PAISNER: I do have a couple. | 8 | I'm giving it a short pause. |
| 9 | I'm wondering if it would be possible -- it | 9 | Okay. That concludes the evidentiary hearing |
| 10 | sounds as though, not certain, so perhaps you could | 10 | and settlement hearing today. We are now adjourned and |
| 11 | confirm whether the Cascade witness and Staff witness | 11 | off the record. Thank you all for your participation. |
| 12 | were not sworn prior to giving their testimony, and I'm | 12 | (Proceedings concluded at 12:25 p.m.) |
| 13 | wondering if it's possible that they could be sworn | 13 |  |
| 14 | retroactively here today so that we may assume that | 14 |  |
| 15 | their testimony was true and accurate as if they were | 15 |  |
| 16 | under oath, so that's the first thing. | 16 |  |
| 17 | JUDGE DOYLE: I'm sorry. Which? | 17 |  |
| 18 | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath. | 18 |  |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms. | 19 |  |
| 20 | Huang was under oath as well. | 20 |  |
| 21 | MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay. | 21 |  |
| 22 | For some reason, I wasn't sure that that | 22 |  |
| 23 | happened. Okay. | 23 |  |
| 24 | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, thank you for | 24 |  |
| 25 | clarifying. | 25 |  |



| A | 61:21 66:7 69:10 | advertising 26:6 | allows 37:11 | apparently 65:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-1 8:24 | :12 | advisory 21:14,22 | alternative 48:7 | ear 7 |
| a-d-g 83: | additional 45:4 | 77:9 96:2,8 97:1 | alternatives 15 | appearances 5:17 |
| a.m 5:2,7 65:14,14 | 57:15 64:13 71:15 | Affairs 22:23 | AMA 51:13,14 | appearing 1:13 |
|  | 94:1,5 95:11 97:5 | affect 55:18 71:20 | 53:4 | ppears 7:21 53 |
| abide 36:20 | additions 14:11 | $9: 16$ | amend | 66:5 |
| ability 20:16 40:22 | 45:18,23 46:10,15 | affirm 22:12 72 | amortization 34:24 | ed 31:21 |
| 44:22 109:9 | 46:19 47:11,19 | 85:22 90:23 | 36:1,6 37:1 | 38:21 |
| able 14:6 22:7 78:3 | address 15:23 21: | 101:21 | amount 18:2 19 | apply 31:20 94:13 |
| 85:17 107:23 | 34:1,6,9 48:5 | afford 19:25 | 25:13,16,20 26:13 | appreciate 57:16 |
| accept 14:19 27:10 | 55:20 57:7 66:4 | after-the-fact | 26:22 27:11,13,23 | 79:3 81:14,14 |
| 27:21 31:7 | 67:21 76:2,15 | 45:22 | 27:24 29:7 33:19 | 84:11 98:9 105 |
| acce | 79:15 80:22 92 | afternoon | 9:25 40:3,6 | pproach 32:2 |
| access 82:3 | 97:20 98:1 100:21 | 91:22 92:24,2 | 1:18 58:23 59 | 37:11 94:14 95:12 |
| accommodate | 100:23 101:10 | 93:23 | 59:11 62:3 63:1 | appropriate 11:24 |
| 20:23 | addressed 34:12 | agencies | 63:19 64:2 69:19 | 16:7 28:12,14,17 |
| accomplishing | 56:12 77:23 79:10 | 94:15,22 95:13 | 71:4,19 81:10 | 28:19,23,24 29:5 |
| 48:10 | 79:14 97:19 | 96:10 | 99:15,20 100:25 | 29:10 38:21 48:9 |
| account | ade | A | amounts 26:1 | 62:5,9 66:11,17 |
| accounted 28:10 | adjourned 108:10 | agnostic 101:6 | 69:20,22,23 70:6 | 68:1 73:23 80:3 |
| 53:25 | adjust 60:8,24 | ago 31:8 51:23 | 0:7 71:16 83:21 | 81:6 |
| account | adjusted 30:10 | agree 17:1 39:2 | 100 | appropriately |
|  | adjusting 29:22 | 40:6,8,21 41:24 | analyses 28:22 | 67:16 |
| accounts 30:6 | 67:6 | 43:23 44:11,1 | analysis 28:24 | approval 67:15 |
| 31:19 32:3 53:25 | adjustment 26:1 | 45:21 62:17 66:8 | 31:18,19,20 57 | 97:6 |
| : 4 | 45:22 50:7,9,12 | 76:2, | 75:3,23 76:1,4 | approve 19:14 |
| accrual | 50:12 60:8,19,25 | agre | 89:17 94:6 99: | 21:23 77:7 95:2 |
| accumulated $47: 1$ | 61:4,6,25 83:4,17 | agreeing 75:1 | analyzed 79:24 | 96:6 |
| accurate 16:11 | 98:24 | agreement 54:9 | Ann 2:8,22 6:10 | approved 16:1,5 |
| :6,7 28:12 | adjustments 14:5 | 74:13,13,21 | 9:10 59:15 105:12 | 18:18,21 26:2 |
| 98:17 106:15 | 17:2 26:2,5 28:2,7 | ahead 32:19 59 | Annhove@gmail... | 27:14,24 95:15 |
| 109:9 | 28:14,17,25 29:5 | 62.15 64:15,19 | 2:25 | pproximately 5 |
| achieve 75:25 95:1 | 29:10 36:9 50:18 | 74:5 78:23 79:2 | ann | 15:18 18:1,19 |
| acknowledge 39:19 | 50:19 51:1,5,7 | 81:19 82:10,20 | annually $21: 15$ | 29:6,14 94:9 |
| 43.15 | 52:14 62:9 81:6 | 84:7 97:13 102:1 | 41:3 | April 17:16 18:7 |
| action 36:23 38 | 82:22 83:12 88:15 | aime | answer 63:15 | 54:8,16 74:12 |
| activities 77:20 | 88:18 | Alliance 6:16, | 0:19 82:15 | rea 56:5 86:17 |
| actual 35:12 62:19 | administrative | 91:8 | answered 84:4 | 94:17 |
| 70:25 71:18,18,24 | 1:11 2:2 5:13 | all | anticipated 71:15 | rear |
| 71:25 79:25 80:1 | admission 7:7 8:7,7 | allow 18:22 105:7 | anticipating 73:17 | rriving 80:5 |
| 80:7,25 87:24 | admit 10:16 | 105 | 97:4 | art 57:3 |
| 88:5,11 99:20,24 | admitted 7:24 8:1 | allowanc | anyway 103:19 | sked 18:17 19:5,6 |
| 102:16 103:13 | ads 96:16 | 59:5 | apologies 13:13 | 19:21 50:17 74:10 |
| added 62:2 | advanced 40:18,23 | allowed 60:2 67 | 23:11 73:14 85:7 | 75:15 77:18 81:21 |
| adding 62:2 | 3:20 64:3 | 67:11 96:11 | apologize 29:9 90:1 | 89:15,22 91:23 |
| addition 21:19 | advantage 103:5 | allowing 17:3 | 107:15 | 93:24 97:18 98:18 |


| 102:13,14,16 | averages 16:3 32:2 | 84:19,20,25 | believes 19:10 | 96:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| asking 49:9,10 | 32:5,11 | 100:18 101:9,25 | Bellevue 2:13 | bringing 46:22 |
| 74:12 76:23 93:25 | Avista 33:7 94:14 | 102:2,8 106:18 | Bellingham 93:13 | 73:17 85:15 101:7 |
| 101:6 | 105:15 | base 26:13, 15,22 | bench 11:2 54:19 | broad 31:23 |
| aspirational 108:2 | aware 38:7 50:19 | 27:11,17 36:1,6 | 71:21 72:8 98:12 | Broadway 3:4 |
| assistance 21:8 | 51:1,10 67:2 | 36:14 37:2 40:11 | 98:12 99:3,14 | brought 46:3,21 |
| 56:15 75:16 94:22 | 71:13 75:6 | 48:8 51:11 53:7 | 100:5,14,23 101:3 | 74:21 |
| 95:5,7 | AWEC 3:2 6:17 | 76:16 77:15 83:5 | 101:7,12 103:18 | budget 94:11 95:7 |
| assistant 6:5,11 | 7:13,20 18:11 | based 12:22 14:19 | benefit 15:21 41:18 | build 94:19,24 |
| 21:7 | 19:10 32:16 39:25 | 17:24 28:9 29:23 | 55:24 57:11 60:13 | built 61:23 |
| associated 83:21 | 40:8,21 48:16 | 37:4 39:7,11 | 75:23 94:6 | business 44:9 68:22 |
| 96:24 | 49:12,14 66:4 | 50:21,25 51:5,7 | benefits 80:2 99:5 | 106:5 |
| assume 29:9 101:7 | 72:2 81:21 90:19 | 51:11 52:14 87:24 | best 36:23 38:22 | businesses 44:7 |
| 106:14 | 91:8 | 88:11 89:5 99:5 | 66:21 77:10,14 | C |
| assuming 29:3,3,5 | AWEC's 8:12 | 103:6 | 88:19 109:9 | C |
| 44:4 103:16 | 60:19 61:13 62:17 | baseline 42:12 | better 65:21 78:2 | C 2:1 3:1,1 $23: 14$ |
| assumption 44:8 | 68:23 | 80:24 | 80:3 | 32:21 50:1 67:7 |
| 95:23 | AWEC-05 8:18 | basically 70:19 | BGN-4 8:12 | 70:15 76:10 77:5 |
| attachment 8:2,3,4 | AWEC-100 9:3 | 93:25 94:8 99:18 | big 57:3 | 79:5 83:21 109:1 |
| 8:10,17,19,21,22 | AWEC-38 8:20 | 101:5 | bill 20:13 | 109:1 |
| 8:23 9:2,4 | AWEC-4 8:16 | basis 16:12 18:20 | billed 39:8,12 | C-1 8:24 |
| attachments 7:15 | AWEC-63 8:23 | 24:9,23 25:4,6 | billing 39:6,10 | Cable 3:3 6:19 |
| 8:9,24 9:1 | AWEC-67 9:1 | 28:11 36:10 37:16 | 62:19 63:2 | calculate 39:7,11 |
| attempted 15:22 |  | 41:2 50:17,20,25 | bio 84:20 | calculated 54:1 |
| attend 49:12 | B | 51:2,4,12,13 | bit 58:6,18 68:23 | calculating 81:11 |
| attendance 49:14 | B 25:11 | 52:13,13 88:7,14 | 105:21 | calculations 94:10 |
| attention 21:6 | B-1 8:24 | 88:19 | black 80:22 | calendar 87:17,17 |
| attorney 2:18,23 | B\&O 26:6 | beginning 12:14 | bolts 95:15 | California 3:10 |
| 6:5,12,13 86:23 | back 11:3 29:18 | 13:19 | box 2:18 80:23 | call 22:5 65:7 |
| attract 89:18 | 44:8 45:8 50:16 | behalf 6:6,12,19 | BR-5 107:14,16 | Callaghan 2:17 6:4 |
| audio 58:3 64:23 | 58:7 61:3,23 62:4 | 80:14 86:18 | Brad 91:7 | 6:5 10:21 11:11 |
| auditors 37:6 | 65:15,16 85:4 | believe 14:8 17:1 | Bradley 4:13 90:19 | 11:14 13:21,25 |
| authority 67:23 | 94:2 96:4 104:1 | 23:11 25:18 26:23 | break 12:18,20,25 | 15:3 35:17 |
| authorization | backward 50:3 | 36:7,11 40:3,16 | 52:21 58:13 64:16 | called 11:3 18:14 |
| 67:10,13 | balance 40:9 41:1 | 40:24 50:14 51:8 | 64:20,21 65:2,4 | 21:7 100:21 |
| authorized 27:6,12 | 41:25,25 | 51:14 52:17 53:22 | 65:13,16 84:20,23 | camera 22:6 |
| 66:7 | balances 42:13 | 53:24 59:15 65:17 | 85:1,4 | canceled 49:1 |
| available 22:18 | 70:4 | 66:10,16 67:3 | brief 12:10 14:3 | capital 14:10 16:1 |
| 72:19,21 73:12,23 | Barnett 2:11 4:4 | 70:11 71:6,9 | 107:21,23 | 32:9 33:20 40:11 |
| 84:16 87:6 90:20 | 5:21,23 7:10,19 | 74:18,25 76:6,24 | briefing 105:23 | 40:13,14,23 52:1 |
| 92:20 94:10 96:12 | 9:6,19 10:10 | 80:6 84:4,12,14 | briefs 104:8,13,17 | 58:25 59:5 64:8 |
| 96:22 100:22 | 13:21,23 14:23 | 84:17 90:14,18 | 104:22 106:3 | 72:3 103:12,12 |
| 101:3,18 103:6 | 22:19,25 23:8 | 91:25 95:6 98:2 | 108:3 | captioned 5:9 |
| Avenue 2:23 | 35:16 49:4,25 | 99:7 100:11 | bring 36:17,22 | captured 98:19 |
| average 16:3 32:4 | 50:2 53:3 73:16 | 104:15 105:6,18 | 46:22 54:9 74:12 | 100:15 |
| 32:11 | 73:19 78:15,19,22 | 106:19 107:3,12 | 80:21 85:17 90:19 | careful 15:5 |


| Cascade 1:7 2:10 | 47:1,2,21 49:8 | chance 85:8 | 106:25 | 95:24 96:5 103:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5:11,18,24 7:10 | 50:5,6,7,9,9,11,12 | change 27:19 67:21 | clean 17:2 36:19 | 109:17 |
| 10:7,13 14:25 | 50:13,20,21 51:1 | 80:22 | 88:8 | Commission's |
| 15:7,17,21,22,25 | 51:8,15,21,22,24 | changed 40:5 51:25 | clear 15:21 18:25 | 15:21 17:22 20:16 |
| 16:3,6,9,11,13,16 | 66:6,24 67:5,18 | 51:25 63:1 | 20:8 32:1 67:22 | 41:12 46:8,13 |
| 16:23 17:13,18 | 67:20,22 68:25 | changes 23:4,6 | cleared 87:19 | commissioned 6:6 |
| 18:14,17,22,25 | 69:23,23 70:7 | 42:1,6,14 62:19 | clearly 80:2 | 14:25 |
| 19:22 20:18,22 | 80:20 81:8 83:7 | 62:19 66:7,25 | close 56:23 88:3,17 | Commissioner 2:7 |
| 21:2,16,18,19 | 88:1 97:3 103:17 | 67:9,16,19,23 | 106:5 | 4:5,7,10,15 5:15 |
| 22:17,23 23:1 | 104:25 105:15,23 | 68:1 80:9 93:15 | closed 51:22 | 13:14 17:10 18:12 |
| 24:4,10, 16,23 | cases 33:7 41:17 | 107:18 | closely 77:13,13 | 18:13 19:19 57:24 |
| 28:8,15 32:25 | 45:2 46:7 75:11 | changing 47:16 | Coie 2:12 5:24 6:1 | 58:3,8,12,16 |
| 33:3 34:17,18 | 87:1 104:19 105:2 | 67:13 | collaboration | 64:12,18,20 65:17 |
| 36:18 37:2,21,24 | 105:16 | check 26:20,24 | 21:21 | 65:19,23,25 68:3 |
| 38:2,7,13 39:6,10 | cash 40:18,23 | 27:10,16,18,21 | colleague 57:22 | 68:9,11,12 72:11 |
| 41:9,11,16 44:4 | CBR 50:16 52:16 | 29:6,10,15 31:7 | collected 70:10 | 72:12 73:6,11 |
| 44:21 45:17,21 | CCR 1:25 109:15 | 31:12 82:17 84:3 | Collins 4:14 12:17 | 74:3 77:2,6 78:5 |
| 46:9,14,18,20 | certain 9:24 21:5 | 107:17 | 13:11 92:23,24 | 78:23,25 79:17,20 |
| 47:9,10 48:19 | 47:23,23 106:10 | Chile 65:18 | 93:9,12,17,19,23 | 80:8,19 81:3,13 |
| 49:23 50:8,10 | certainly 33:6 45:7 | Chiles 4:3,10 12:12 | 98:6,7,8,10 | 81:20 82:2,5,8,10 |
| 53:13 55:21 60:1 | 55:22 56:3 62:23 | 22:5,20,22 23:9 | color 56:19,20 | 82:14,17,19,25 |
| 79:21 96:2 102:5 | 63:2,8 71:12 | 23:16 32:17,23 | 76:17 | 83:3,14,20 84:1 |
| 102:7 106:11 | 77:12 94:9 97:6 | 35:23 39:16 53:1 | column 25:11 26:7 | 89:8 90:10 92:15 |
| Cascade's 12:12 | Certified 109:6 | 58:17 64:16,18 | 26:15,18 27:12 | 92:16 95:21 97:10 |
| 14:5 15:6,11,13 | certify 109:7 | 68:13 72:13,15 | 83:1,21 | 97:15,16 98:4,20 |
| 15:20 16:20 19:4 | Chad 3:3 6:18 | 73:11,15,19,22 | columns 25:25 | 104:10,23 105:11 |
| 20:15 21:4,7 22:5 | Chair 2:5 4:5,6,6,8 | 74:10 75:15 76:8 | come 94:2 96:19 | 105:24 106:19 |
| 26:3 27:7 31:9 | 4:9,12,13,15,17 | 78:8,11 80:9,11 | 101:18 108:3 | commissioners |
| 35:3,24 36:4 | 5:15 17:9 19:19 | 81:1,4 82:1,9,11 | comes 11:4 60:18 | 9:22 11:5 12:12 |
| 40:22 41:1 71:24 | 52:22,24 54:22,23 | 82:19,23,24 83:2 | comfortable 94:21 | 13:7,12 14:1,24 |
| 94:13 | 58:10 64:15 65:3 | 83:8,19,25 84:4 | commencing 109:8 | 52:20 65:1 73:5 |
| case 14:5,15 15:5 | 65:7,10 68:3,6 | 85:11 95:23 99:11 | comment 107:2,4 | 74:1 85:5 100:12 |
| 15:15,16,17,20 | 70:16 71:17,22 | 102:14 106:18 | commission 1:2,4 | 104:6 105:10 |
| 16:2,7,9,19 17:2 | 72:7 74:6,8 76:8 | chose 48:16 | 5:10,13 9:20 | Commissions' |
| 18:14,15 19:1,3,3 | 76:11 77:2,4,18 | circumstances | 15:19,23 16:1,5 | 93:19 |
| 19:4,7,21 20:15 | 79:1,2,3,6,17 | 38:17 51:21,24 | 16:12,16,19 19:13 | committee 96:8 |
| 20:18 21:9 23:19 | 81:15,19 84:7,8 | 52:5 | 21:2,23 24:9,17 | 97:1 |
| 26:3 27:7 28:4,8,9 | 85:6,9,14 87:7,9 | citizens 55:25 | 24:22,23 25:4,5 | communicated |
| 28:13,15,19,23 | 89:8,12 90:7 | claims 59:12 | 26:3 28:11 35:9 | 75:7 |
| 33:1,5,7,8,13,14 | 91:18,21 92:13 | clarification 9:12 | 36:21,25 37:11 | communication |
| 33:15,17 36:12,17 | 93:20,22 97:10,13 | 13:10 55:8 98:23 | 48:6,11 50:17,20 | 16:17 95:2 98:16 |
| 36:19,21 38:3 | 97:18 98:18 99:1 | 107:20 | 50:25 51:2,4,11 | communities 56:20 |
| 39:20 40:2 41:9 | 99:10,17 100:1,10 | clarify 52:12 87:16 | 51:12,20 52:12,13 | 56:21 92:6 94:20 |
| 41:11,15,20,22 | 100:15 101:5,15 | 88:22 98:13 | 55:14,19 67:10 | community 56:19 |
| 44:22 45:18,24 | 102:10,12 104:1,9 | 107:22 | 73:22 77:7 80:21 | community-based |
| 46:1,3,7,11,16,21 | 105:25 107:25 | clarifying 13:4 | 88:7,14,15,19,23 | 21:13 94:12 96:22 |


| companies 67:8 | 108:9 | context 9:24 | costs 29:23 33:21 | 94:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| company 14:7 18:2 | conclusion 33:6 | continue 37:2 45:8 | 44:7 45:1,4,4,10 | customer 22:23 |
| 21:21 27:14,23,25 | conducted 14:4 | 55:23 69:6 74:2 | 50:6 69:6,10 | 41:4 42:18 53:9 |
| 29:4,8,11 31:5 | conference 49:1,6 | continued 4:6,6,7,9 | 71:16 | 53:12,14,16,18,21 |
| 33:22 48:10 51:19 | 49:13,15 54:7 | 38:8 | counsel 2:21 6:9,12 | 53:25 63:3 76:16 |
| 55:19 56:5 59:12 | 74:11 | continues 21:19 | 7:13 9:11 10:12 | 77:15 |
| 60:2 63:5 64:9 | conferences 49:17 | contract 96:21 | 10:25 12:14 17:7 | customers 18:20 |
| 66:5,24 67:19,21 | confidential 8:1 | controller 102:7 | 17:11,15 18:5 | 19:25 20:11,14 |
| 77:9 78:2 80:17 | 49:7,10 | convened 49:2 | 23:11 28:18 29:21 | 21:3,11,20 52:1 |
| 80:21 89:4,6 96:9 | confirm 83:4,21 | conversation 95:13 | 35:19 68:24 81:21 | 55:24 70:3,8 |
| 96:14 97:25 | 106:11 | conversion 29:21 | 85:16 86:2,20 | customers' 19:23 |
| company's 15:14 | confirmed 24:19 | 29:22 30:5,20,25 | 87:2 89:14 93:13 | 20:2,6,9 |
| 17:24 24:4,19 | 105:6 | 31:1,3,4,9,14,16 | 96:9 105:8 | cut 58:6 |
| 28:4 36:13 68:25 | conflicts 15:9 | conversions 56:4 | Counsel's 15:15 | D |
| 69:2 89:1 | confused 60:16 | copies 23:18 | 28:5 30:15 84:15 | D |
| compared 51:22 | confusing 47:3,3 | copy 10:17 | county 37:5 109:4 | D 3:1 50:1 70:15 |
| 53:10 | confusion 50:24 | coronavirus 69:21 | couple 79:20 106:8 | 76:10 77:5 79:5 |
| compilation 8:13 | 87:20 | Corporation 1:7 | 107:18 | Danner 2:6 4:5,6,6 |
| complete 8:8,14 | conjunction 38:24 | 5:11 17:13 22:24 | course 11:4 28:20 | 4:8,9,12,13,15,17 |
| 9:20 16:11 28:3 | consider 19:22 | correct 29:16,24,25 | 36:23 38:22 39:1 | 5:15 17:9,9 18:13 |
| 36:19 | 20:9,16 44:22 | 34:14,15,20,21 | 46:5 62:20 77:4 | 19:19 52:22,24 |
| completed 75:22 | 55:14 79:10 | 35:6,7 36:3,7,11 | court 10:18 | 54:22,23 58:10 |
| completely 15:16 | consideration 15:2 | 37:17,18,22 39:22 | covering 71:16 | 64:15 65:3,7,10 |
| compliance 45:23 | considered 14:16 | 39:23 40:16,24 | COVID 43:6,17,20 | 68:3,6 70:16 |
| 66:5,11,19 67:1 | 16:3 | 42:15 43:17,18,21 | 44:3 45:7 69:25 | 71:17,22 72:7 |
| 67:20 | considering 18:24 | 43:22 45:19,20 | COVID-19 68:14 | 74:6,8 76:8,11 |
| complies 92:3 | 105:6 | 51:16,17 52:16 | 69:1 | 77:2,4,18 79:2,3,6 |
| compliment 96:18 | consistency 41:19 | 53:17 61:18 76:20 | CPA 86:23 | 79:17 81:15,19 |
| comply 17:17,22 | 62:14 63:11 | 83:2 85:12 98:25 | created 57:3 | 84:7,8 85:6,9,14 |
| 55:5 92:1 97:21 | consistent 17:21 | 99:1 101:9 102:22 | creating 15:15 | 87:7,9 89:8,12 |
| compress 104:25 | 41:9,16 46:4 | 102:25 104:8 | credit 35:25 | 90:7 91:18,21 |
| compressed 20:21 | 62:12,14 63:6 | corrected 16:23 | CRM 45:23 46:3 | 92:13 93:20,22 |
| 105:3 106:1 | 67:20 | 59:19 | 46:10,15,20,22 | 97:10,13,18 98:18 |
| compromised 15:4 | consolidation | correcting 20:24 | 47:19,24 48:1,3,8 | 99:1,10,17 100:1 |
| 80:13,17 | 20:24 | correction 34:18 | 66:2,25 67:7,19 | 100:10,15 101:5 |
| concept 94:12 | consultant 86:16 | 36:9 37:7 | cross 13:6 22:18 | 101:15 102:10,12 |
| concepts 62:5 | 91:12 | corrections 23:4,7 | 23:9,18 32:16 | 104:1,9 105:25 |
| concern 15:23 | consultation 37:4 | 35:24 93:16 | cross-examination | 107:25 |
| 16:20 | Consulting 86:13 | correctly 45:17 | 4:3,4 7:8 12:11,19 | Danner's 79:1 |
| concerned 105:25 | consumed 39:7,11 | corroborate 16:18 | cross-examine | data 7:20,20,22,22 |
| concerns 55:16 | Consumers 6:16,20 | cost 15:12 16:14 | 10:25 | 8:3,13,16,18 9:13 |
| 101:11 | 91:9 | 40:19 45:2,11,18 | crucial 11:24 | 10:7 28:22 72:2 |
| conclude 12:23,24 | contain 97:25 | 50:11,12 57:11 | Cstokes@cableh ... | date 1:24 20:23 |
| 106:7 107:7 | contemplating 90:6 | 63:20 64:4 69:12 | 3:6 | 48:20 70:25 75:4 |
| concluded 108:12 | contents 24:13 | 75:23 77:10 94:6 | current 69:18 | $75: 9$ $100: 29: 14,19$ 102.16 |
| concludes 18:7 | contesting 40:21 | 99:5 | currently $37: 6$ | 100:25 102:16 |


| 104:16,17,22,24 | depending 12:25 | 25:1 | 101:13,17,24 | eligibility 21:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dates 71:18 98:15 | 48:2 | discussions 96:1 | 102:1 104:1,2,5 | eliminate 35:25 |
| 105:12 106:2 | depreciation 16:15 | dismiss 90:15 | 104:12 105:4,5 | 36:5 37:1 42:6 |
| Dave 2:6 5:15 | 47:18 53:7 79:23 | disputes 15:7 | 106:4,17,24 | embedded 24:22 |
| 64:12 74:5 98:25 | 79:24,25,25 80:1 | disputing 80:12 | 107:11,17 108:6 | 25:3,5 |
| day 34:16 38:13 | 80:7,13,16 81:1,6 | divided 26:24 | drawbacks 80:2 | emission 55:11,16 |
| 108:3 109:11 | 81:12 | dividing 26:21 31:7 | due 14:10 16:25 | employee 43:25 |
| Dbarnett @ perki... | describe 24:15 30:1 | docket 5:9 19:5 | 30:5 42:18 69:20 | employer 22:21 |
| 2:14 | 30:5,11 47:10 | 20:24 26:3 34:17 | 103:1 105:16 | 93:10 |
| deadline 106:5 | 86:21 94:8 | 35:5 36:10 37:8 | E | employment 86:12 |
| deal 75:3 | detail 74:18 | 37:21,23 38:15 | E | employs 91:10 |
| deals 69:25 | detailed 21:12 | 46:9,14 69:24 | E 2:1,1 3:1,1,1 | enable 21:11 |
| debt 70:21,23,25 | details 57:13 66:20 | 76:19,21 78:7,10 | 17:16 23:14 32:21 | encourage 106:2 |
| 71:5,24,25 72:6 | 76:14 77:23,24 | 97:5 | 50:1,1,1 52:23 | encouraging 56:25 |
| 99:15,18,24 100:3 | 96:2 | document 11:23 | 58:15 70:15,15 | energy 3:7 6:16,20 |
| 100:25 102:15,18 | determinants 63:2 | 78:199:11 | 74:7 76:10,10 | 6:23 7:2 12:15,16 |
| 103:4,13,20,21 | determinates 39:6 | $\operatorname{dog} 13: 15$ | 77:5,5 79:5,5 86:9 | 18:7 19:17 21:8 |
| decide 9:22 | 39:10 62:20 | doing 73:8 79:3 | 87:8 91:20 93:21 | 35:5 56:2,3,14,14 |
| decides 14:18 | determine 19:8 | 105:9,21 | 95:20 102:11 | 56:23 57:5 75:16 |
| decision 20:15 21:4 | 38:22 47:1 | dollars 96:25 | 109:1,1 | 75:17 76:3 89:13 |
| decisions 21:1 | determined 16:6 | Donna 2:11 5:23 | e-mail 54:11 74:15 | 91:9 92:22 93:12 |
| decoupling 24:4 | determining 55:12 | 53:3 | 75:8 98:21 | 93:18 94:17 99:6 |
| 25:5 41:14 60:9 | 55:13 | double 107:17 | early 106:3 107:24 | ensure 67:22 |
| 60:25 61:1,13,24 | detriment 41:18 | Doyle 1:11 2:3 5:5 | earn 27:14,23 29:8 | entered 34:5 |
| 62:10 | development 55:17 | 5:12 6:2,8,14,22 | 29:12 40:22 | entertainment |
| decrease 41:2 | difference 30:4,6 | 7:3,17 9:5,7 10:3 | earning 52:4 | 43:25 |
| 60:12 | 41:10 88:21 | 10:15 11:5,13 | economic 20:4 | entire 9:25 90:3 |
| dedicated 21:12 | differences 99:21 | 12:2 13:6,13,15 | 55:17 | entirely $28: 14$ |
| deducted 61:12 | different 15:15,16 | 13:18 14:2,23 | EDIT 34:2,7,9 | 59:15 |
| Defendants 1:8 | 26:5 28:7,15 29:2 | 17:6,8 18:10,13 | education 86:21 | entries 62:18 |
| defer 38:10 39:14 | 30:9 45:1,6 50:22 | 19:16,20 22:2,9 | effect 43:19 67:11 | envelope 94:2 |
| 56:11 63:16 | 69:4 81:11 | 22:16 23:10 32:15 | effectively 77:10 | environmental |
| deferral 37:12 44:3 | direct 16:9 33:1 | 32:19 35:14,20 | efficiency 56:3 | 55:11,15 |
| 69:1,2,4 | directed 16:16 | 49:22 52:19 54:19 | 94:17 | envision 96:6,10 |
| deferred 15:14 | directing 89:23 | 54:21 64:22,25 | efficient 56:5 | EOP 16:10 51:13 |
| 33:25 34:24 43:16 | direction 15:22 | 65:5,9,11,15 | efficiently $20: 16$ | 51:15 53:4,5,6,16 |
| 43:19 69:24 70:7 | 79:9 | 72:14 73:4,7,10 | 77:10 | 53:18,20 |
| 81:17 83:6,23 | directly 76:22 | 73:14,25 78:6,8 | effort 21:12 94:11 | equal 18:20 20:5 |
| deficiencies 31:8 | director 93:12 | 78:14,18,21,23 | 94:24 95:5,14,16 | 27:24 42:25 |
| deficiency 15:8 | disconnection | 84:10,18,22 85:3 | efforts 21:20 94:16 | equipment $56: 5$ |
| 27:25 88:17 | 69:25 70:8 76:13 | 85:7,13,15,20 | 96:15,19 | equity $25: 20$ 55:2,3 |
| delay 107:12 | 78:19 | 86:1,5 90:14,18 | either 52:20 | 55:7,10,17 56:7 |
| demonstrated | discovery 14:4 | 91:2 92:19,25 | elaborate 47:8 | 63:22 64:5,7,9 |
| 28:21 | discretion 97:7 | 93:6,8 98:5,8,11 | electrical 55:19 | 72:6 79:8,10 |
| departure 41:22 | discuss 12:24 49:2 | 98:24 99:3,13,25 | elements 98:1 | 89:22,23,25 90:3 |
| 46:6 | discussed 17:15 | 100:3,11,17 | elevated 69:20 | 90:4 91:23 92:1 |

97:21 98:1 103:21
errata 23:2,3 39:17 39:19,25 60:1 61:14,18
error 90:21
especially 18:24
essentially 48:23
96:18,20 100:5,8
established 66:19
establishing 21:11
estimate 13:4,7 40:25 103:22
estimated 13:1
estimates 12:22
evaluating 33:3,4 33:11 38:20
evaluation 47:9
event 21:3
everybody's 108:3
evidence 8:15 16:21 49:7 88:19
evidentiary $1: 10$ 5:8 100:20 108:9
exact 40:4 75:4,9
exactly 71:2 72:16
examination 4:1,4
example 97:4
examples 15:25
Excel 8:5 81:24
82:4,7,21
excess 15:14 33:25 34:24 81:17 83:6 83:22
excessive 17:18 18:2
excluded 47:12 53:16,18
excluding 8:10 53:5
exclusively 20:10
excuse 13:3 20:5 excused 11:3 72:15 73:13 84:13 85:11 98:9 104:3
exhibit 7:19 8:2 10:2,17 23:23
24:8,12,15 25:9
$30: 19,2039: 17$
$40: 1770: 1972: 1$
$81: 2482: 2287 \cdot 15$
factors 14:10 51:20
55:14,18 61:7
62:24
fails 17:21
fair $14: 8$ 19:8,12
fairly $88: 17$
fairness 90:5
faith $21: 20$
familiar 24:12,14 55:6
far 69:4 73:20
feature 12:21
February 54:12
74:15,24 98:22
feel 5:19 55:22 94:21 105:10
fees $41: 14$
felt 36:23
figure 61:13 77:9
file 8:5 10:11 19:1 32:25 33:15 36:13 38:14,15 76:13 82:4,7,13 91:13 91:14 104:17 105:23 107:3,9,9 107:21
filed 7:9,12 11:16 11:19 15:17 16:9 16:11,12 17:12,16 18:6 23:1 24:10 34:13,17 36:13 38:13,23 44:23 51:24 60:1 66:5 77:25 78:20 87:25 88:1,5,13 103:16 107:24
files 10:6
filing 14:6 $16: 8$ 18:16 20:20 34:17 35:3 36:3 37:21 38:14,18,24 39:17 39:19,25 45:23,24 46:1,5 47:24,25 50:20 52:9 66:6 66:11,18,19 67:1 67:6,20,22 76:18
$78: 6,9$ 81:7
104:16,22 105:16
filings $17: 25$
104:20
final 9:3 10:1 15:19
15:22 38:12 48:13
66:8,11 104:7,13
105:1
finally $12: 13,16$
19:17 89:21 92:22
finances 20:2,6
financial 88:9
find $7: 17$
finding 38:18
fine 13:23 105:24
firm 6:25
first 10:24 12:10
13:21 14:10 20:18
22:5 106:16 107:8
five $64: 21$
five- $65: 1$
five-minute 65:4 84:23
fix $37: 15,16$ 64:23
64:23
flesh 96:2
focus 9:24 89:23
focused 17:2
follow 37:9 66:19
71:6 72:8 79:2
84:2 100:7
follow-up 66:22
74:9 77:3 89:9
92:15,16 95:22
98:17 99:23 100:5
followed 41:11
66:17 74:18,25
following 15:5
forecast 42:6,9
forecasting 42:11
foregoing 109:8
forgive 60:20
form 5:17 103:3
formally $16: 23$
forth 55:12
forum 72:16
forward 36:10
37:15,16 57:7,7
69:1 74:4 80:23
80:24 96:6 101:8 103:7,9
found 14:5,17 26:9 36:15
four 15:18 51:20,23 105:7
Francisco 3:10
free 5:19
Friday 104:22
105:20 106:5
front 78:12
full 8:22 9:13 10:1 10:7 15:1 17:4,11 22:20 51:8 63:16 73:1 90:24 91:5 101:22
fully $28: 20$ 56:6 108:2
fund $21: 8$ 40:19,23 63:20 64:3,9 103:12
funded 77:23 102:19,20
funding 21:15 57:10 75:21 77:20 94:1
further 32:13 49:21 52:18 70:13 72:10,13 79:18 84:5 90:7,10 95:18 97:13
future 19:1 44:24

## G

G 52:23 58:15 70:15 74:7 76:10 77:5 79:5 87:8 91:20 93:21 95:20 102:11
G-a-r-r-e-t-t 86:10
Garret 84:16
Garrett 4:11 12:15 13:5,7 17:16

84:19 85:17,19,25
86:7,9,9,13,13,16
86:20,23 87:4,11
90:11,12,13,15,17
gas 1:7 5:11 17:13
22:24 55:11,15,19
56:1 71:13,16
102:7
general 6:5,12
15:20 19:4,21
20:17 34:23 42:21
51:8 60:23 62:4
66:6 67:12 75:11
80:14,16,20 83:7
General's 2:18,23 6:13
getting 38:17,19 44:7 66:20 77:1 77:16
give 11:19 17:18 22:12 27:13 36:17 54:10 73:1 74:14 74:21 85:23 90:23 93:3 101:22
given 37:7 41:8,21 46:8,13 63:7 81:11
giving $84: 12$ 106:12 108:8
go $7: 15$ 13:21 $24: 8$ 32:19 41:5 59:7 62:15 64:15 68:8 74:4,5 78:23 79:2 81:19 82:10,20 83:8 84:7 96:1,25 97:13 98:12 102:1
goal 36:20 77:12,17 81:4
going 10:16 12:9 36:10 37:15,15 44:23 49:5 57:7 58:12,14 62:4,23 62:25 66:1,25 68:5,6,7 69:1 80:23,24 81:16 83:10 85:9 89:6,9

94:2,8 95:10 96:6 98:11 102:2 103:7 103:9 105:2,14 106:1
$\operatorname{good} 5: 5,21$ 6:4,10 6:18,24 14:1,1,24
17:8 18:12 19:19
21:19 23:16,17
32:23,24 53:1,2
55:22,23 65:24
86:7 87:10,12 91:4,22 92:24,25 93:23
gotcha 13:9 58:7 gradually 53:13
grant 12:6
granted 52:8 67:9
GRC 52:14,15
great 6:14 13:18
56:4 60:18 65:5 68:20 78:21 93:6 99:13 100:17 101:19 107:11,11 108:6
greater 95:2
green 56:2
greenhouse 55:11 55:15
group 21:14,22 77:9 86:13 96:2
groups 57:5
growing 53:14
growth 41:4 42:18
53:6,10,12,14,16
53:19,20,21 63:3
guess 9:11 26:15 30:8 50:6 55:7 60:13,13 61:11 80:17 95:22 97:17 105:11 107:8

| $\mathbf{H}$ |
| :--- |
| half 75:22 |
| hamper 20:16 |
| hand 11:9 12:21 |
| 22:11 72:24 85:21 |

90:22 93:1 101:20 107:19 109:10
hands 12:5
handy 10:11 78:17
happen 89:2
happened $37: 16$
47:1 88:20 89:3
106:23
happening 48:1 104:20
happy $9: 16$
hard 46:25 65:6
harmless 21:3
hate 47:20
havoc 20:1
Hayes 3:9
he/him 6:6,20 7:2
head 27:9 30:9
headed 45:8
header 30:21
health 55:11, 15,16
hear 12:5,10,11
58:1,2,5,8,11
65:20,22
heard 10:24 102:13
hearing 1:10 5:8 11:4,6 56:8 100:14,20 107:4,7 108:9,10
hearings 44:11
held 107:4
Hello 92:24
help 57:4 61:9
76:15 77:16 78:16 95:6
helpful 57:19 97:8 101:11
helping 105:22
hereunto 109:10
high 52:3 87:23 88:12 89:5
higher 71:14
historical 62:21
hold 21:3
Honor 5:22 6:4,24
7:10 9:10 10:5,21

11:12 22:19 32:18 35:17 49:21,25
Honors 14:2
hoping 70:18 81:22
hour 12:25
households 94:18
95:6
housekeeping 7:4 108:7
Huang 4:8,10 6:7
11:1 72:19 73:3
74:10 80:6 82:2
82:16,18 84:2
85:11 106:20
hundred-plus 28:22
Huston 3:3 6:19

## I

idea 94:19
identified 35:5
45:24 56:17 69:22
73:21
identify 80:4
illustrate 72:3
imagine 33:11
immigrant 56:20
impact 18:24 20:13
30:2,10 42:6 45:5
45:7 62:25 63:10
68:25
impacted 42:4,14 62:24
impacting 33:22
impacts 21:4 45:7
72:4,5
implement 77:11 96:7
imply 50:6
important 16:21
19:2 41:20
improved 16:17
improvements 21:9 21:23 94:17
in-person 44:17
incentives 26:6
include 7:21,24 8:2 8:17,18,24 9:3 14:14 25:22 43:16 50:8,11 55:10 59:7,11 62:12,15 69:23 70:1,4,7
included 8:4,6,20
8:21,23 9:1,4
11:22 21:24 40:10
45:19,25 46:10,15
46:18 47:6,11,11
50:7 52:8 58:24
59:4,21 60:5,6
64:10 69:23 75:8
90:6
includes 47:23 80:1
including 7:8,14
8:8,10 50:8,10
53:6 55:14 83:5
99:15
inclusions 9:9
income 15:14 18:5
19:25 20:2,5,6
21:7,10,12,14,20
21:22 25:13,15,16
25:19,22 26:9,21
27:22 29:13 33:25
34:24 76:16 77:8
81:17 83:6,23
94:18 96:1
incomplete 7:14,18 7:25
inconsistent 38:4
incorporated 37:8
increase 17:19,25
18:19,22,23 19:5
19:23,25 21:24
25:19 33:20 41:1
43:20 47:18 56:18
57:18 60:10 62:2
87:23 94:7,23
95:6 103:2
increased 14:9 39:21
increases 14:12,13
increasing 21:10

| 42:19 43:1 | invite 12:19 | 19:16,20,20 22:2 | KING 109:4 | lay 103:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| independent 76:4 | invited 49:18 | 22:9,16 23:10 | know 12:20 27:9 | leave 97:6 |
| INDEX 4:1 | involved 75:5 | 32:15,19 35:14,20 | 28:7,19,21 30:23 | led 94:16 |
| indicate 21:17 38:2 | 91:24 | 49:22 52:19 54:18 | 31:14,16,23 33:5 | ledger 60:23 |
| indicates 60:1 | IRS 34:2 38:4 | 54:21 64:22,25 | 33:7,11 34:8,12 | left 25:11 |
| individual 56:24 | IRS's 38:8 | 65:5,9,11,15 | 36:16,18 38:19 | lessen 45:8 |
| 77:14 | issuance 37:20 71:1 | 72:14 73:4,6,10 | 39:13 43:24 45:1 | lessened 45:8 |
| inflation 45:5 | 99:15,20 100:25 | 73:14,25 78:5,8 | 45:3 47:4,14 48:2 | let's 5:17 7:4,19 |
| inflationary 33 | 102:17 103:20 | 78:14,18,21,23 | 48:4,7 49:12 | 13:18 22:5 58:18 |
| 52:3 | issue 11:17,25 | 84:10,18,22 85:3 | 51:18,19 53:18 | 59:23,23 65:6,16 |
| influenced 41:25 | 18:15 28:1 33:25 | 85:7,13,15,20 | 54:17 55:24,25 | 84:22 103:15 |
| information 10:8 | 34:9 47:25 66:4 | 86:1,5 90:14,18 | 56:1,10,12,22,25 | letter 35:4,10,12 |
| 24:16,22 25:3 | 68:13,24 79:15 | 91:2 92:19,25 | 57:1,3,3,6 58:21 | 36:15 37:20 38:19 |
| 38:11,17,23 57:14 | 103:4 | 93:6,8 98:5,8,11 | 61:19,23 62:11,14 | level 69:20 |
| 57:15 76:18 | issued 15:19 36:21 | 98:24 99:3,13,25 | 63:1,3,5,7,12 | levels 21:15 44:5 |
| informed 14:2 | 38:20 66:12 70:22 | 100:3,11,17 | 64:22 66:16,17,23 | 68:23 |
| infusion 63:22 64:7 | 70:23,24 99:19 | 101:13,17,24 | 69:5 71:13,15 | life 20:4 |
| 64:10 | 102:15,21 | 102:1 104:1,2,5 | 74:14 75:20,24 | limit 104:7 106:6 |
| infusions 64:5 | issues 15:4 20:17 | 104:12 105:4,5 | 78:16 80:13 81:5 | limited 18:15 19:3 |
| 103:21 | 21:5 30:15 48:5 | 106:4,17,24 | 81:5,7,10 89:3 | 55:15 |
| inherent 34:11 | 56:12 57:8 58:4 | 107:11,17 108:6 | 90:4,5 92:3,4,5,7 | Lin 2:11 5:25 |
| 56:10,11 | 92:5 100:21 | Judges 2:2 14:23 | 92:9 94:7 95:3,12 | line 23:24 24:3 |
| initial 7:11,12,22 | item 32:5 | 18:13 | 96:12,16,20,20 | 25:14,15 26:10,13 |
| 14:5 15:17 45:24 | items 30:9 34:12 | judgment 41:23 | 97:2,5,6,23 99:18 | 26:15,18,21,22 |
| 48:20 | 36:22 43:24 64:9 | 61:18 | 99:19 100:18 | 27:12,22 29:19,20 |
| initially 103:5 | IV 1:10 | July 104:21 105:17 | 103:20 104:6,18 | 30:1 31:3 40:17 |
| intend 18:25 32:25 |  | 106:5 | 105:21 108:1 | 43:7,13,14 60:12 |
| intended 10:25 | J | jump | knowing 90:1 | 81:16 |
| 48:6,11 72:17 | January 48:20 49:3 | jumping 78:25 | knowledge 24:18 | lines 39:17 45:13 |
| intends 11:2 | Joanna 4:8,10 6:7 | June 1:24 5:1,6 | 38:6 96:21 109:9 | 48:14 58:20 63:17 |
| intent 77:8 | 11:1 72:18 74:10 | 102:19,23 105:6 |  | 68:16 69:16 79:22 |
| intention 28:4 | 79:7 85:11 | 105:18 107:6,10 | L | links 83:9 |
| interest 14:20,21 | joined 5:14 | 107:11 109:8,11 | L 1:25 109:6,15 | list 10:17 107:13 |
| 15:9 17:4,21 53:8 | joining 6:7 | justice 36:17 | labelled 30:21 | listed 26:19 |
| 55:10,13 103:6 | joint 4:10 30: | justified 17:20 | LACEY 5:1 | listening 101:10 |
| interested 100:24 | 79:22 | justifies 59:25 | landed 33:5 | litigated 51:8 |
| interests 20:9,10 | JT-1T 79:22 | justifying 16:10 | large 8:5 17:19 | little 7:4 32:1 |
| interrupt 54:3 59:9 | JT-2 30:19,24 |  | 30:17 | 105:21 |
| 76:9 | 81:24 82:5 | K | Lastly 18:4 | live 55:25 81:10 |
| interruption 68:10 | judge 1:11 5:5,13 | keep 11:7,9 41:21 | Laura 1:25 109:6 | living 20:3 |
| introduce 22:17 | 5:14 6:2,8,14,22 | 58:14 68:4,6 | 109:15 | LLC 3:9 |
| 86:2 91:3 93:7 | 7:3,17 9:5,7 10:3 | 73:15 | law 1:11 2:2 5:13 | LLP 2:12 3:3 |
| 102:2 | 10:15 11:5,13 | keeping 44:3 | 17:17 55:2,10,12 | load 16:13 |
| inventory 32:9 | 12:2 13:6,13,15 | key 63:12 | 67:11 79:9 89:22 | local 94:20 |
| investigation 15:6 | 13:18 14:2 17:6,8 | kind 47:25 57:11 | laws 92:1 | located 93:13 |
| 17:3 | 17:9,9 18:10 | 75:23 89:16 94:4 | lawyer 74:18,20 | lodge 43:25 |

long 8:7 20:19 37:9 39:1
long-term 70:21,23 71:5 99:15,18 102:15,18
longer 10:25
longer-term 94:24
look 12:8 19:4 25:11,25 26:7 39:16 57:6 58:19 83:1,8 91:24 96:21 103:15
looked 56:21
looking 19:2 33:6 33:17 56:1 88:23 99:4,4
looks 45:13 51:20 100:13 104:7 105:17
lot 41:4 45:6 52:1 95:3
lots 43:10,10,11 44:7,25
Love 65:9
low 18:5 19:24 20:1 20:5,6 21:7,12,14 21:20,21 76:16 77:8 96:1
lowering 15:11 lunch 12:23,25

## M

M23:14 32:21 50:1
M-u-l-I-i-n-s 91:8
MAC-15X 24:9
MAC-1T 33:1
MAC-4T 23:23 39:17 40:17 43:7 45:13 48:14 58:20
maintain 18:15 maintained 15:25
major 11:17
majority $14: 9$
making 47:24
59:14
manner 21:5

March 11:16 17:12 34:14 109:18
margin 18:19,20,23 39:20 45:22
marginalized 56:21
Mark 4:3,10, 11 12:12,15 13:5,7 17:16 22:5,22 23:9 84:16 86:9
marketing 94:12 96:14
math 29:16 59:25 65:6 94:2
matters 7:5 10:19 10:22 106:7
maximum 94:10
MCG-4 30:20,22 30:25
MCG-5 82:22
MCP-4 30:22
meals 43:25
mean 33:3,21 36:12 36:13 37:4 44:25 46:1 48:3,17,19 53:24 54:3 55:21 57:9 59:9 62:8,9 67:3,12 69:12 80:14 81:4
meaning 44:7
means 49:10
meant 48:15
mechanism 15:13
24:4 45:12,18 48:4 60:25 68:1 69:24
mechanisms 67:15
meeting 48:22
54:16
meetings 44:15,18 44:21
meets 98:2
MEG-1T 87:13
MEG-3 87:15
Megan 2:11 5:25
member 6:7
memory 54:14
mention 20:13 57:8 mentioned 33:1 63:22 64:5 67:5
messengers 21:13
method 80:4
methodology 80:1
80:2
methods 81:11 98:15
middle 20:1,5,6
Mihaly 3:9 7:1
million 18:1,17,22
19:5 29:6,11,12
29:14,14 39:21,24
40:4,7,12 58:24
59:4,11,16,20
60:2,3,6,12 61:5
61:12,24 71:6,9
75:22 80:15 87:23
88:17,21,21
102:18,24,24
103:4,6
mind 73:7 77:20
minimal 69:7
minor 30:1,11,14
minus 29:12,14
minute 36:23
minutes 64:22
mis-note 99:9
missed 100:13
missing 79:12
mistakes 88:18
misunderstood 42:22
MLin@ perkinsc...
2:15
modern 94:18
modifications
19:14
modifying 15:13,13
moment 31:8 43:8 76:9
money 57:12 63:19
64:2 70:10 75:24
89:17 94:5
month 104:20
monthly 16:3 32:2
32:4,11
months 15:19 16:5
16:24 51:23 87:15
moratorium 69:25
morning 5:5,21 6:4
6:10,18,24 14:1,1
14:24 17:8 18:12
19:19 23:16,17
32:23,24 53:1,2
58:18 87:10,10,12
91:4
motion 11:15 12:1
12:6
move 10:4 28:5,16
35:9 39:15 47:8
68:2 81:16 83:10
moving 8:12 43:5
MULLIN 92:18
Mullins 4:13 90:19
91:1,7,11,15,22
92:14,20
multicounty 94:17 multiparty $15: 1$
17:12 18:21 19:11
34:1,5,13,16
multiple 47:16
105:2
multiplying 27:11
multiyear 33:9,15 48:8

## N

N 2:1 3:1,1,1 23:14 23:14 32:21,21
50:1,1 52:23,23
58:15,15 70:15,15
70:15,15 74:7,7
76:10,10,10,10
77:5,5,5,5 79:5,5
79:5,5 87:8,8
91:20,20 93:21,21
95:20,20 102:11
102:11
N-y-g-a-r-d 102:6
nail 70:21
name 4:2 5:12,19
6:25 22:20 78:9 82:6,8,22 83:18 86:8,8 91:5 93:9 93:11 102:3,4
named 83:15
narrow 18:16
Nash 2:17 6:5
Nash.callaghan... 2:20
natural 1:7 5:11 17:13 22:24 55:25 102:7
near 19:1 44:23 89:4
necessarily 97:4
necessary 10:9 35:9 40:19
need 18:3 28:3
29:11 33:4 42:11 46:20 47:19 48:1
52:2 71:10,19
77:16,23 103:2,7
103:15 105:1
needed $9: 14,22$ 27:13,23 29:7 71:10
needs 12:20 87:19 103:8
NEG-167:20 8:9
NEG-17c 8:1,9
NEG-18 8:10
negative 21:4 61:5 61:5,22 62:2
negotiation 11:23 48:21 49:5 54:6
negotiations 48:17 48:17,22 97:23
net $25: 13,15,16,22$ 26:9,21 27:22 29:13 39:21
new 33:9, 15 57:3 70:21,23 89:18 103:21
non-settling 11:20 12:14 14:17 15:8

| 15:10 | o00-5:3 | 54:21 55:20 56:7 | 93:13 | 10:12 13:3,9 17:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| noon 12:24 | oath 106:16,18,20 | 56:13 57:20 58:8 | opposed 17:11 | 23:13,15 35:18 |
| normal 44:8,10,20 | object 8:7 10:8,13 | 58:12,23 59:23,23 | opposes 19:24 | 84:17 86:4,6,11 |
| 45:9,9 | 18:5 49:4 84:21 | 61:10 62:4,17 | 21:18 | 86:14,18,21 87:2 |
| normal-type 45:10 | 95:25 | 63:13 64:2,11 | opposing 87:2 | 87:5 104:14,15 |
| normalization | objection 9:13 12:3 | 66:1,10 67:17 | opposition 87:21 | 105:12,15 106:8 |
| 20:25 24:21 25:1 | 35:16,17,18,21 | 68:2,9,13,18,20 | optimization 96:17 | 106:21 107:1,15 |
| 25:3 34:3,19,23 | objections 7:11 9:8 | 69:14 70:5,12,24 | oral 11:15 | pandemic 20:1,7 |
| 35:24 36:4 37:3,6 | 35:15 | 71:4,8,17 72:7,14 | order 11:19 15:19 | 69:21 |
| 37:10 38:4,9 72:4 | obviously 56:22 | 73:25 75:1,6,10 | 15:22 18:15 36:3 | panel 12:13,19 |
| normalize 24:21 | 92:9 | 75:10 76:4 77:18 | 41:12,14 66:8,12 | 72:16 73:8,18 |
| 42:5,10 62:9 | occupation 86:15 | 78:5,14 80:8,19 | 67:25 95:1 105:1 | 79:19 84:6,9,11 |
| normalized 24:5,20 | occur 42:1 48:18 | 81:13,20 82:14,16 | Oregon 3:5 | paper 43:10,11 |
| 41:2 42:9 62:6,7 | occurred 62:20 | 82:18,25 83:3,14 | organizations | 95:16 |
| normally 11:21 | 98:21 | 83:20 84:1,10,18 | 56:24 96:23 | papers 24:10 60:7 |
| Northeast 2:12,23 | office 2:18,23 6:13 | 84:22 85:14 86:5 | original 18:16 28:9 | 103:16,16 |
| note 19:2 98:13 | official 11:22 35:10 | 87:5 88:22 89:11 | 52:9 60:5,14 | pardon 107:12 |
| noted 100:13 | offset 47:18 48:1 | 89:14,21,21 90:14 | 61:23 | part 8:2,25 9:15,17 |
| notes 99:4 107:18 | 61:4 | 91:13,16 92:8,12 | Originally 40:3 | 10:18 38:16 63:2 |
| notice 35:10,15 | offsetting 45:4 | 95:9 97:15 98:3 | outcomes 52:14 | 63:3,15,21,24 |
| 78:6 | Oh 40:14 44:16 | 98:11,24 99:13,25 | 96:24 | 64:5,7,8 69:8 76:1 |
| number 31:4 40:5 | 54:14 59:9 71:2 | 100:3,5,9 101:17 | outline 96:23 | 108:2 |
| 40:5 43:24 51:9 | 101:25 | 102:21,23 103:13 | outreach 21:12,13 | partial 8:14 |
| 56:9 59:19 78:10 | Ohman 1:25 109:6 | 103:18 104:2,12 | 96:15 | participants 1:13 |
| 80:5,16,23,25 | 109:15 | 106:1,21,23 108:5 | outside 37:5 | 89:19 |
| 81:7,21 83:9 95:6 | okay 9:5 10:3,15 | 108:6,9 | overall 55:24 64:8 | participate 48:16 |
| 107:3,9 | 11:11 12:2,6 13:9 | Olympia 2:19 |  | 54:11 96:22 |
| numbers 28:3 | 13:18 22:16 23:22 | once 38:22 62:10 | $\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{P} 2.1 .13: 1.1}$ | participates 96:9 |
| 60:14 72:9 101:6 | 24:3,8 25:8,19 | 84:3 | P 2:1, 1 3:1,1 | participation 56:18 |
| nuts 95:15 | 26:7 27:10,16 | online 96:17 | p.m 108:12 | 57:17 94:7,23 |
| Nygard 4:16 101:8 | 29:17,17,17 30:11 | open 91:16 | P. $O$ 2:18 | 108:11 |
| 101:23 102:6,6,9 | 30:13,19 31:14,17 | opening 12:10 | page 4:2 8:20,23 | particular 31:23 |
| 104:2 | 32:13,19 33:13,23 | 13:19 14:2 18:8 | 23:22,25 25:8,12 | 33:5 38:11 41:11 |
| Nygard's 63:14,22 | 34:10,13,16,22 | 107:23 | 25:25 26:8,14 | 41:22 80:16 83:9 |
| 64:6 70:18 71:8 | 35:3,8,14,20 36:8 | operated 29:13 | 27:3 29:19 33:2 | parties 5:18 7:6 9:7 |
| 99:21 100:6 | 37:19 38:1,2,7,12 | operating 25:13,15 | 39:17 40:17 43:7 | 11:20 12:2,11,14 |
|  | 39:2,15,24 40:8 | 25:16,19,22 26:9 | 43:12 45:13 46:23 | 13:20 14:2,15,17 |
| 0 | 40:17,25 41:7,24 | 26:21 27:22 83:10 | 46:25 47:6 48:14 | 15:8,10 16:18,22 |
| O 3:1 23:14,14 | 42:13, 17,19 43:4 | 83:11 | 58:20 60:12 63:17 | 22:3 35:14 38:2 |
| 32:21,21 50:1 | 43:9,15,19,23 | operation 67:11 | 68:15 69:15 70:20 | 38:22 40:10 49:18 |
| 52:23 58:15 70:15 | 44:3,17,20,20 | operations 15:6 | 70:20 71:23 79:22 | 54:9,10 72:18 |
| 70:15 74:7 76:10 | 45:15,16,21 46:8 | 68:22 | 87:13,15 106:6 | 73:22 74:13,21 |
| 76:10 77:5,5 79:5 | 46:13,18,23 47:7 | opinion 36:25 | pages 66:3 104:8 | 75:7 80:14,22 |
| 79:5 87:8 91:20 | 47:16 48:12 49:20 | 97:22 | 106:6 | 81:9 95:25 96:10 |
| 93:21 95:20 | 49:22 51:10 52:18 | opportunity $32: 16$ | Paisner 2:22 4:3 | 98:15,17 99:7 |
| 102:11 | 53:23 54:2,18,20 | 54:10 74:14,22 | 6:10,11 9:10,11 | 104:12 105:7 |


| 106:2 107:22,23 | placed 47:13 | 22:21 37:13 80:17 | prior 14:11 46:7 | prom 21:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| parties' 9:23 12:22 | placing 51:19 | 81:9 93:10 102:4 | 51:22 53:10 54:11 | promote 56:2 |
| 20:12 77:8 | Plaintiffs 1:5 | positions 14:16 | 74:15,24 98:21 | 96:17 |
| party 15:7 20:10 | plan 12:18 16:13 | positive 61:6 63:10 | 105:19 106:12 | pronouns 5:14,20 |
| 21:17 | 33:16 37:7,9 | possible 11:21 | private 35:4,10,12 | 5:23,25 6:6,11,20 |
| passed 20:10 | 47:15 76:13 77:24 | 14:15 103:23 | 36:15 37:20 38:19 | 7:2 |
| path 76:15 | 78:20 89:17 95:9 | 105:20 106:3,9,13 | probably 88:19 | proper 28:25 34:2 |
| patience 70:14 | 96:3,19 99:12 | possibly 33:7 48:8 | problem 10:10 | 34:6 67:13 88:14 |
| pause 10:9 31:11 | planned 38:24 | post-pandemic | problematic | proposal 14:19 |
| 36:24 39:1 58:7 | planning 57:12 | 20:4 | 105:13 | 36:5 56:13 77:8 |
| 59:2 60:15 74:19 | 94:4 | potential 34:19,22 | procedural 54:12 | 77:11,21,22 89:14 |
| 108:8 | plans 67:19 69:2,4 | 36:4 46:10,15 | 74:16 98:22 | 89:15 95:24 96:13 |
| pay 96:20 | 78:2 | 96:20 | procedure 74:19 | 99:6 |
| payers 18:24 | plant 33:18 45:18 | practice 67:4 | 74:25 75:2,5 | proposals 18:6 |
| Pearson 2:3 5:15 | 46:10,19 47:11,13 | practices 55:18 | proceed 12:24 | 21:17 37:14 57:6 |
| 14:24 17:9 18:13 | 47:19 51:18 | pre-filed 7:7 93:16 | 49:23 | 77:20 |
| 19:20 | plants 46:15 47:24 | pre-pandemic 44:5 | proceeding 15:18 | proposed 17:13,17 |
| people 73:23 84:21 | please 5:19 6:3 | 44:12 68:23 | 15:20 20:23 21:2 | 17:20,25 18:4 |
| 94:21 95:4 | 12:20 22:6,11,20 | precise 72:8 | 104:19 | 29:5 34:18 35:24 |
| percent 18:19,23 | 23:22 24:8 25:8 | predict 88:2 89:2 | proceedings 20:18 | 47:2 66:7 77:22 |
| 26:19,25 27:4,5 | 25:11 26:7 29:18 | predicted 89:4 | 108:12 | proposes 21:9 |
| 57:10 75:21 94:1 | 30:19,23 58:23 | preference 64:18 | process 38:18 39:1 | proposing 38:3 |
| 96:12 | 64:13 72:20,24 | 64:23,25 | 54:6 66:11,12 | 40:1,9 45:22 |
| percentage 18:20 | 78:9 84:7 85:20 | preferred 9:20 | 96:5 98:16 | 75:18 |
| 26:18,20 27:3,4 | 86:4,7,21 90:22 | prefers 14:14 | produce 19:12 | propositions 9:17 |
| 53:11 71:24,25 | 91:2,4 93:1,7,9 | prehearing 49:6 | product 27:16 | protected 15:14 |
| 94:23 99:24 100:3 | 98:15 102:3 | preliminary 7:5 | program 18:5 21:7 | 33:25 34:2,6,24 |
| 103:14,21 | plow 64:19 | 10:19,22 | 21:24 56:15,17 | 70:3 81:17 83:6 |
| performing 47:9 | plus 16:10 33:25 | prepare 105:22 | 57:4,10 75:16,21 | 83:22 |
| period 16:4,6 31:18 | 34:2,7,24 81:17 | prepared 33:10 | 89:19 93:12 94:1 | provide 5:19 9:16 |
| 31:20,21 32:5,8 | 83:6,22 | preparing 105:1 | 94:13 95:8 96:18 | 10:8,13,17 47:5 |
| 39:8,12,22 42:1,7 | point 30:14,17 | present 15:10 23:9 | 103:12 | 52:2,3 57:14 |
| 43:16 45:19 47:17 | 33:12,19 35:13 | 45:17 102:9 | programs 56:19 | 66:21 75:3 76:18 |
| 52:6,7 54:1 62:21 | 42:5,8,10 44:15 | presentation 16:20 | 57:3 | 78:1,12 98:15 |
| 79:25 88:3 | 50:5 51:23 60:20 | presented 51:15 | progress 16:12 | 102:4 |
| periods 52:3 | 69:8 78:3,3 88:10 | 61:17 87:21 | project 3:7 6:23 7:2 | provided 10:6 |
| Perkins 2:12 5:24 | 88:25 89:24 95:17 | presenting 15:1 | 12:16 18:7 19:17 | 19:11 52:8 58:25 |
| 5:25 | 96:20 107:6 | 16:21 | 27:11 56:14,23 | 59:5 66:24 |
| person 44:12 | pointing 63:16 | presents 93:19 | 57:5 75:18 76:3 | provides 28:11 |
| personnel 37:5 | policy 46:9,14 | President 22:22 | 92:22 93:12,18 | 76:14 |
| phonetic 57:4 | population 77:15 | pressures 33:21 | Project's 89:13 | providing 9:13 |
| picture 28:12 | populations 95:1 | presumably 18:15 | 99:6 | 16:2 |
| pieces 9:21,24 | portion 79:14 | pretty 44:14 | projecting 103:5 | provision 97:21 |
| place 28:7 48:5,11 | Portland 3:5 | prevent 34:19 | projections 57:17 | provisions 55:5 |
| 48:21,23 52:5,6 | pose 12:13 | previous 94:16 | 94:6 99:5 | 92:1 |
| 86:11 | position 9:23 20:7 | prices 71:13 | projects 96:24 | prudent 11:9 |


| PSE 33:7 38:20 | 97:14 98:5 102:9 | 103:7 | 46:20 | remaining 13:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PSE's 36:15 | 102:13 104:13 | Rayne 2:3 5:15 | redirect 4:4 49:24 | 40:6 59:21 61:7 |
| public 2:21 6:9,12 | quick 14:3 84:23 | RCW 55:2 97:21 | 52:18 | 62:12 |
| 7:13 9:11 10:12 | 107:20 | reach 14:6 21:11 | reduce 42:20 43:1 | remarks 18:8 |
| 10:24 12:14 14:19 | quickly 10:4 78:18 | 57:4 | reduced 43:25 62:1 | 108:4 |
| 14:21 15:9,15 | 100:23 101:16 | reaching 20:19 | reduction 76:13 | remember 74:17 |
| 17:4,7,11,15,21 |  | 94:21 95:5 | 78:20 80:15 | 75:9 |
| 18:5 23:11 28:4 | R | reading 92:4 | reductions 55:12 | remove 40:1,9 |
| 28:17 29:21 30:15 | R 2:1 3:1 23:14 | real 14:13 | 55:16 | 41:12,21 63:8 |
| 35:18 55:10,13 | 32:21 50:1,1 | realize 81:20 | refer 43:6 55:7 | 83:11,12 |
| 84:14 85:15 86:2 | 109:1 | realized 85:7 | 61:19 72:1 87:15 | removed 16:14 |
| 86:20,24 87:2 | R-7 83:4 | really 30:17 48:22 | reference 45:12 | 41:13,15 |
| 89:14 96:9 105:7 | radio 96:16 | 51:25 77:17 87:22 | referenced 9:16,18 | removes 83:4,21 |
| 107:2,4 | raise 10:23 11:15 | 89:5 90:3,6 94:19 | 35:11 39:25 | removing 60:11 |
| Puget 35:5 | 12:21 22:11 72:24 | 95:16 | referencing 59:18 | Rendahl 2:8 4:5,7 |
| pulling 107:12 | 85:21 90:22 93:1 | reason 106:22 | 60:13 | 4:10,15 5:16 |
| punted 48:24 | 101:20 | reasonable 14:9 | referring 82:21 | 13:14 17:10 18:13 |
| purpose 48:4 | raised 15:23 | 19:9,12 | 90:2 | 19:20 57:24 58:3 |
| purposes 80:20 | 07:19 | reasoning 51:17 | reflect 69:20 | 58:8,12,16 64:12 |
| put 48:4,11 96:13 | rate 15:5,20 16:2,2 | reasons 99:20 | reflected 14:13 | 64:20 65:17,19,23 |
| 103:2 | 16:4,4,6,10,19 | rebuttal 16:9,22 | 97:24 | 65:25 68:3,9,11 |
|  | 17:2 18:15,24 | 21:16 23:23 29:19 | reflects 14:20 | 68:12 72:11,12 |
| Q | 19:1,3,3,4,21 | 29:20 58:19 61:12 | refund 66:2 | 73:6,11 74:3 77:2 |
| question 13:4 25:2 | 20:13,17 21:24 | 61:14,16 63:17 | refused 20:22 | 77:6 78:5,24,25 |
| 31:25 38:11,12 | 26:3,13,15,19,22 | 66:3 67:17,18 | regard 55:7 56:6 | 79:18,20 80:8,19 |
| 48:13 53:3 54:5 | 27:6,7,11,12,14 | 68:15 69:15 76:2 | 75:15 100:25 | 81:3,13,20 82:2,5 |
| 59:14 63:13,25 | 27:17,17,24 29:8 | recall 32:7 54:15 | regarding 50:5 | 82:8,10,14,17,19 |
| 68:24 69:14 75:14 | 30:6 32:25 33:15 | 54:18 | 55:3 56:14 69:2 | 82:25 83:3,14,20 |
| 76:24 84:14,19 | 33:15 35:25,25 | received 53:3 | 89:25 98:16 | 84:1 89:8 90:10 |
| 89:15,21 97:11,17 | 36:1,5,6,14 37:1 | recollection 48:22 | 104:13 | 92:15,16 95:21 |
| questioning 4:5,5,6 | 40:11 42:1,6 | 99:10 | regulated 55:19 | 97:10,15,16 98:4 |
| 4:6,7,8,9,10,12,13 | 44:22 45:2 46:11 | recommending | regulation 86:17 | 98:20 104:10,23 |
| 4:15,15,17 | 46:16,19 47:1,21 | 87:14,17 | 86:24 | 105:11,24 106:19 |
| questions 11:2,6,9 | 47:25 48:8 50:5,6 | reconnect 58:13 | Regulatory 22:23 | repeat 24:24 63:25 |
| 12:13 13:2,8,12 | 50:7,9,9,10,11,12 | record 7:5 10:16,18 | reject 19:13 21:24 | 102:14 |
| 32:13 52:21 57:23 | 50:20,21 51:1,8 | 11:18,19,22 12:4 | related 16:15 20:18 | repeatedly $18: 14$ |
| 57:25 64:13,17 | 51:11 52:4 53:7 | 12:7 17:24 19:10 | 61:13 70:7 81:17 | repeating 81:23 |
| 65:18 66:1 68:4,8 | 55:18 62:19 66:6 | 22:21 35:13 65:12 | relates 34:23 63:14 | replaced 44:17 |
| 70:13,17 72:10,17 | 66:7,24 67:5,19 | 65:17 71:18 77:1 | 97:18 | reply 20:22 72:2 |
| 73:9 74:9 76:23 | 75:11 80:20 83:7 | 84:23 86:8 91:5 | relating 69:15 | report 16:12,13 |
| 77:19 79:1,7,18 | 86:25 88:2 97:3 | 102:4 107:5 | 79:23 | 24:9,23 25:4,6 |
| 81:16,22,22 82:15 | rates 14:13 19:8,11 | 108:11 | relationships 94:25 | 28:11 50:20,25 |
| 84:4,5,9 87:6 | 19:12,23 36:1,6 | recover 60:2 | relevant 10:6 76:22 | 51:2,4,12 52:13 |
| 89:10 90:8,11 | 37:2,22,25 38:3 | recovered 59:12 | 76:24 | 52:13 83:10,11 |
| 91:17,23 92:13 | 39:7,11 47:12,12 | recovery 20:4 | reliable 52:2 | 88:7,14,19 |
| 93:19,24 95:19 | 67:6,9,13 83:5 | 33:17 45:12,17,18 | remainder 10:14 | report's 50:17 |


| reported 1:25 | 101:2 107:23 | 40:10,20,23 42:20 | s-c-h 83:16 | seeking 52:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:22 25:17 29:12 | response 7:20,22 | 43:1 45:23 47:18 | s-u-p-p-1 83:16 | seen 56:4 |
| 99:21 | 8:15,16,18,25 | 59:4,12 | safe 44:8 52:2 | segment 76:16 |
| reporter 10:18 | 9:21,25 10:1,7 | reversal 61:22 | safety 55:16 | 77:15 |
| 109:6 | 16:24 20:21 35:4 | reverse 61:1,14 | sake 11:18 | segments 57:1 |
| reporting $24: 15$ | 81:14 100:22 | reversed 61:25 | Samantha 1:11 2:3 | self-employed |
| represent 43:24 | 101:12 | reverses 61:22 | 5:12 | 91:11 |
| representative | responses 8:13 9:8 | review 18:16 19:10 | San 3:10 | sense 11:20 59:14 |
| 69:19 | 9:14 | 21:15 97:4 | saving 43:24 | 61:21 62:15 |
| represented 20:10 | restate 31:25 | reviewing 104:5 | savings 43:6,17,20 | sensitive 29:23 |
| 40:19 63:21 64:4 | restated 26:9,21 | revising 16:23 | 43:23 44:3 68:14 | 62:18 |
| representing 5:24 | 27:22 29:13 | rid 37:12 | 68:14 69:9,12 | sent 54:12 74:15 |
| 7:1 91:6,8 | restricting 105:9 | right 6:87:25 22:9 | saw 56:13 | 98:22 |
| represents 15:4 | result 17:1 26:20 | 22:11 26:7 33:23 | saying 49:12 61:20 | separate 18:4 |
| request 7:20,21,22 | 57:18 | 37:4 41:5 43:5 | 76:22 | 36:12 |
| 7:23 8:3,13,16,18 | resulting 17:3 | 48:21 50:11 52:15 | says 30:22,22 49:11 | September 15:18 |
| 9:14 54:19 67:25 | results 43:16 61:21 | 52:19 53:23 54:4 | 95:10 | 36:14 37:19 87:16 |
| 71:21 72:2,8 76:3 | 87:24,25 88:6,8,9 | 54:22 60:17 61:16 | schedule 35:25 | 105:5 |
| 98:14 99:3,8,14 | 88:11 | 65:10,23 66:14 | 36:5 37:1,22,24 | seriously $14: 16$ |
| 99:17 100:6,8 | retroactivel | 70:12 72:24 73:25 | 38:8 54:13 60:18 | serve 21:20 52:1 |
| 101:3,7,12 103:2 | 106:14 | 74:19 76:7,19,25 | 74:16 83:6,13,16 | 77:14 |
| 103:3,4,18 104:18 | return 26:19 27: | 79:16,17,18 81:19 | 83:17,23 98:23 | served 23:1 94:20 |
| 104:21 107:8 | 27:12,13,14,18,24 | 82:10 85:6,10,21 | scheduled 49:6,13 | 95:7 |
| requesting 100:6 | 29:8,12 40:22 | 87:7 89:7 90:22 | 54:7 74:12 | service 14:11 22:23 |
| requests 21:22 | 44:5,20 52:4 66:1 | 91:10,18 92:11,11 | schedules 16:16 | 40:19 46:11,16,19 |
| 28:22 98:12,12 | 84:24 | 92:19 93:1,20 | 41:12,16 49:2 | 47:13 51:19 52:2 |
| 100:14,23 | returned | 95:18 101:10,20 | 60:11 61:3 83:5 | 53:13 |
| require 63:10 | returning 44:6,7,9 | 102:10 104:19 | 105:14 | services 55:18 |
| required 24:16 | 68:22 | risk 37:6,10 | scope 18:16 96:23 | 63:20 64:4 |
| requirement 14:10 | revenue 14:9 15:7 | roll 35:25 36:5 37:1 | screen 101:18 | set 104:16 109:10 |
| 15:12 16:14 39:20 | 15:12,12 16:14 | roughly 51:23 | scrutinized 36:18 | settlement 11:21 |
| 40:1,7 42:20 43:2 | 17:18,25 25:23 | round 92:19 104:8 | scrutiny 19:7 | 11:23 12:13,19 |
| 43:20 44:4 59:13 | 27:24 29:23 30:4 | Row 25:25 | seal 109:10 | 14:6,8,15,19,20 |
| 59:22 61:8 62:7 | 31:4,9 39:20 40:1 | RPR 1:25 109:15 | search 96:17 | 15:1,3,9 17:4,12 |
| 62:13 63:10 | 40:7 41:1,5,24,25 | rules 66:19 | Seattle 2:24 | 17:17,20 18:1,4 |
| requirements | 42:5,9,11,12,13 | ruling 35:4,10,12 | second 14:12 20:22 | 18:21 19:11,13,22 |
| 17:22 34:3 37:3 | 42:20 43:1,20 | 36:16,21 37:20 | 33:24 | 19:24 20:8,11,11 |
| 38:4,9 55:3 | 44:4 53:5,25 | 38:20 | see 7:19 12:5 13:4 | 20:13,20,20 21:25 |
| requires $19: 788: 15$ | 58:18,24 59:13,21 |  | 26:1 55:1 57:22 | 30:20 34:11 38:14 |
| requiring 21:14 | 59:21 60:3,4,6,22 | S | 60:16 68:7 76:25 | 38:25 48:16,20,25 |
| rescheduled 49:1 | 60:24 61:2,7,24 | S 2:1 3:1 23:14,14 | 77:14 83:18 89:17 | 49:5,13,15 53:5 |
| resolution 15:4 | 62:1,6,7,13,18 | $32: 21,2152: 23$ | 89:24 100:2 103:7 | 54:5,7,25 55:1,4 |
| resolve 20:17 | 63:10,21 64:4 | 58:15 70:15 74:7 | 103:8,15,19,22 | 56:8,11 59:1,5 |
| respectfully 21:22 | 68:14 | 76:10 77:5 79:5 | seeing 69:11 71:12 | 71:20 73:8,17,20 |
| respond 9:19 16:22 | revenues 16:15 | 87:8 91:20 93:21 | 95:3 | 74:11 75:4 79:11 |
| 54:1174:14,22 | 18:22 39:4,22 | 95:20 102:11 | seek 46:20 | 79:14 80:5,22 |


| 81:8 87:3 88:5 | Soon 11:21 33:4 | 82:22 83:15,18 | stipulate 7:7 | supplement 7:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89:5,25 90:4,5 | 107:21 | stability 16:2 | stipulation 34:1,5 | 8:8 |
| 91:24,25 97:20,23 | sooner 105:9 | staff 2:16 6:3,6,7 | 34:13,17 38:14 | supplemental 10:1 |
| 98:1,16 99:16 | sorry 23:25 24:24 | 10:22 11:15,17,25 | 87:23,24 88:11 | 16:15 41:12,15 |
| 108:10 | 30:24 34:4 36:2 | 14:4,14,16,18 | stipulations 38:25 | 60:11 61:3 62:11 |
| settling 13:19 | 42:21 43:12 46:12 | 15:1 16:18 17:14 | Stokes 3:3 4:4 6:18 | 83:5,12,16,17 |
| 20:12 40:10 54:9 | 47:20 50:22,24 | 19:22 20:18 21:16 | 6:19 10:3,5 18:12 | supplemented 7:23 |
| 72:18 98:14 99:7 | 59:9 72:179:15 | 21:18 34:6 54:12 | 19:16 32:18,22 | support 9:16,17 |
| share 99:12 | 84:21 101:25 | 56:11 72:20 76:2 | 35:8,22 49:9,16 | 20:12 21:17,18 |
| shared 47:6 | 104:24 106:17 | 77:13 79:21 80:18 | 49:21 50:5 91:2,4 | 52:9 |
| shareholder 25:20 | sort 31:23 44:1 | 96:9 97:25 98:22 | 91:10,13,16 | supporting 16:8,11 |
| shareholders 40:18 | sound 35:5 41:22 | 106:11 | 107:19,20 108:1,5 | 73:20 |
| 63:20 64:3 | 75:1 | Staff's 16:19 72:18 | stopgap 33:14 | supportive $56: 6,15$ |
| Shawn 4:14 12:16 | sounds 44:23 77:21 | stakeholders 95:14 | Street 2:12 3:9 | 56:24 57:6 |
| 92:22 93:11 | 89:14 106:4,10 | standard 67:4 98:2 | strike 11:16,24 | supports 20:11 |
| she/her 5:14,23,25 | 107:11,21 | standby 11:7 | 12:1,7 | suppose 105:19 |
| 11 | Southwest 3 | standpoint 46 | striking | supposed 33:13 |
| sheet 11:18,22 12:3 | spac | 48:6 56:3 62:14 | striving 55:23 | 88:2 89:2 107:21 |
| sheets 11:16 | speak 10:4 38:5,6 | 63:5 | structurally 96:21 | sure 16:18 24:25 |
| short 5:17 11:8 | 71:23 78:2 79:13 | start 7:4 53:174:9 | structure 16:1 72:3 | 32:12 33:10 64:1 |
| 12:18 36:14 52:21 | specific $34: 1148: 3$ | started 10:20 | study 16:13 | 71:3 73:10,12 |
| 85:4 108:8 | 48:5 50:10 56:7 | starting 23:24 24:3 | subject 26:20,24 | 74:6 75:1 77:16 |
| Shorthand 109:6 | 62:19 67:24 77:19 | 29:19,20 | 27:10,16,18,21 | 78:19 96:3,8 |
| show 15:8 17:24 | 77:19,20 80:15 | starts 46:24 | 29:5,10,15 31:7 | 103:24 105:3 |
| 87:22 88:10,20 | 94:23 96:12 103:8 | state 2:18,23 5:19 | 31:12 82:17 84:3 | 106:22 107:7 |
| 97:3 | 103:11 105:12 | 22:20 24:3 29:20 | submit 104:18 | suspend 54:12 |
| showing | specifically 16:21 | 40:18 42:23 55: | 105:8 106:2 | 74:16 98:22 |
| shows 88:16,16 | 28:10 34:8 45:2 | 55:9 64:2 78:9 | submitted 18:6 | suspension 20:23 |
| Shute 3:9 7:1 | 45:25 52:10 53:24 | 79:9 86:7 89:22 | 24:17 28:9 | 104:24 |
| sic 83:17 | 54:15 55:6,21 | 91:5 92:1 93:9 | submitting 97:5 | swear 22:12 72:23 |
| side 13:15 25:11 | 57:1,8 59:7,10 | 95:1,4 102:3 | subsequent 37:20 | 72:25 85:8,22 |
| 26:8 | 67:5 68:16 76:17 | 109:3,7 | 47:17 | 90:23 93:2 101:13 |
| significant 19:7 | 77:25 78:11 79:10 | State's 83:22 | substance 11:20 | 101:21 |
| significantly 71:14 | 80:11 81:2,7 92:5 | stated 17:22 31:8 | substantial 16:9 | switch 45:11 |
| similar 19:6 46:1 | 98:20 100:24 | 63:19 67:18,25 | subtract 61:20 | switching 39:3 |
|  |  | 107:5 | subtracting 27:22 | sworn 106:12,13 |
| similarly | spell 86:8 102:3 | statement 12:10 | subtraction 61:20 | synchronization |
| simple 65:9 | spelled 91:7 | 24:6,7 46:9,14 | success 56:4 | 53:8 |
| single 47:25 | spend 95:10 | 8:15 49:11 62:17 | suggested 28:16 |  |
| size | spending 33:20 | 68 | , | T |
| skill 109:9 | 52:1 | statements 1 | suggestion 28:5 | T 3:1 23:14 32:21 |
| slowly 44:6 | spent 57:12 75:24 | 4:3 | 30:15 104:18 | 50:1,1 52:23 |
| small 30:16 | 89:18 | states 31:3 5 | suggests 68:22 | 58:15 70:15,15 |
| social 94:12 |  | sta | Suite 2:13 3:4 | 74:7 76:10,10 |
| solely 15:11 | spread 18:20 | steps 66:18 | summary 82:22 | 77:5,5 79:5,5 87:8 |
| somewhat 56:10 | spreadsheet 82:8 | stewards 55:22,23 | sup- 83:16 | 91:20 93:21 95:20 |


| 102:11 109:1,1 | 42:1,7 43:16 | 32:15,20 33:23 | 53:24 57:22 63:24 | topics 39:3 45:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tab 8:21 30:20,22 | 45:19 47:14,17 | 35:21 39:2 43:4 | 67:8,14 68:11 | total 41:1 60:22 |
| 30:24 | 53:9 69:18 81:5 | 48:12 49:20,22 | 69:11 70:5 71:17 | 61:24 |
| table 101:1 | 83:23 87:14,17 | 50:15 52:11,19 | 73:7,9 74:3 77:18 | tracking 46:25 |
| take 12:18,25 28:7 | 88:2,24 | 53:23 57:21,24 | 77:24 78:1 87:19 | 69:5,10 |
| 35:10 48:21,23 | testified 29:7 86:25 | 58:17 61:10 64:11 | 87:20 88:25,25 | transcript 84:3 |
| 52:7,21 58:13 | testify 69:18 92:20 | 65:11 70:12,13 | 97:2,19,25 98:18 | 109:8 |
| 64:16,20,21,21 | testifying 86:19 | 72:9,13,14 73:4 | 98:19,20 100:15 | transparency |
| 65:3 67:11 78:6 | testimony 7:8 10:6 | 77:1 78:14,21,24 | 100:22 107:5 | 16:17 |
| 84:22 101:1 103:5 | 16:8,10,21,24,24 | 79:4,16 80:8 | thinking 73:8 | Transportation 1:1 |
| taken 1:24 62:10 | 17:15 18:6 20:12 | 83:14 84:1,8,10 | thorough 15:5 17:3 | 1:4 5:10 |
| 65:13 85:1 | 20:22 21:16 22:12 | 84:25 85:20 86:1 | three 21:9,14,23 | travel 44:1 50:6 |
| talk 33:24 34:22 | 23:2,4,7,23 29:19 | 86:5,14 87:5,7 | 100:14 | treat 36:24 63:6 |
| 39:3 43:5 58:18 | 29:20 33:1 43:6 | 89:7,11 90:7,12 | threshold 21:10 | 69:6 |
| 59:23 | 43:15 45:13,16 | 90:13,15,17,21 | throughput 42:14 | treated 41:10,17 |
| talking 45:2 57:9 | 46:23 47:10 48:14 | 91:18 92:12,17,18 | 42:16,19,25 | 63:12 |
| 75:20 101:7 | 49:11 52:10 58:17 | 92:20 93:6,8,20 | Thursday 107:10 | treating 46:6 69:7 |
| talks 90:2 | 58:19,20 60:14,19 | 95:18 97:8 98:3,5 | time 7:16 12:22 | treatment 15:14 |
| Tammy 4:16 70:18 | 61:12,15,16 63:14 | 98:8,10,19 99:1 | 13:1,4,7 20:19 | 16:4,4,6,10 34:2,6 |
| 71:8 99:21 101:8 | 63:15,17,17,23 | 100:16 101:24 | 23:9 28:20 33:12 | 46:2,2 53:6,17,21 |
| 102:6,9 | 64:3,6 66:3,25 | 102:8,10 104:2,4 | 33:14 35:13 36:14 | 62:11 |
| target 57:1 | 67:17,18 68:15 | 106:24 107:25 | 36:16 39:1 44:10 | trend 68:21 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a x }} 15: 15$ 21:17 | 69:15 70:18 71:8 | 108:5,11 | 46:5,12,25 75:12 | tribal 56:20 |
| 33:25 37:5 53:7 | 71:23 72:25 76:2 | thanks 6:14 21:18 | 78:1,4 88:4,8 | tried 56:24 |
| 81:18 | 79:22,23 84:12 | 21:21 23:21 31:2 | 93:18 97:14 | true 28:1 106:15 |
| taxes 34:25 83:7,23 | 85:22 87:13,21,21 | 35:19 86:6 | 104:19,25 105:21 | 109:8 |
| Telephonic 68:10 | 88:5,10,13 90:3 | theirs 105:8 | timeline 20:21 | trust 94:19 95:2 |
| tell 30:8 48:15 55:9 | 90:16,23 91:14,14 | they/them 5:14,25 | 46:24 47:6 | trusted 21:13 |
| 56:17 79:12 82:6 | 93:2,16 95:17 | thing 11:8,14 36:18 | timely 21:5 | truth 22:13,13,14 |
| 103:13 | 97:19,24,25 98:9 | 44:1 65:24 74:19 | times 77:17 | 73:1,2,2 85:23,23 |
| ten 64:22 | 99:22 100:7 | 88:16 106:16 | timing 21:1 36:13 | 85:24 90:24,24,25 |
| ten-minute 65:1 | 101:21 104:20 | 107:1 | 38:16 48:2 54:16 | 93:3,4 101:22,22 |
| TEP 19:24 21:9,20 | 105:16,22 106:12 | things 28:6 30:16 | TJM-1T 70:19 | try 41:20 |
| term 11:18,22 12:3 | 106:15 | 30:17 37:15,16 | TJN-2 100:7 | trying 57:4 60:20 |
| 92:10 | testing 54:14 | 42:25 44:5,6,20 | today 5:5,8 6:7 7:1 | 63:6 77:17 87:22 |
| terminating 15:12 | thank 5:21 6:2,14 | 47:16,23 48:1 | 10:11 12:9 14:25 | 88:25 105:3 |
| terms 11:16 20:20 | 6:21,22 7:3 9:6 | 63:4,6,12 92:6 | 17:11 20:7 22:13 | turn 21:6 22:6 |
| 53:11 54:10 74:13 | 10:21 11:11,13 | 105:22 | 73:1 85:23 90:16 | 23:22 25:8 29:18 |
| 74:21 81:8 94:11 | 12:7 13:9,17,24 | think 7:12 8:20 | 90:24 91:14 92:21 | 30:19 46:23 48:13 |
| 105:14 | 13:25 14:22,23 | 9:20,25 11:18,23 | 93:3 98:9 101:22 | 50:4 68:15 85:4 |
| territory 53:13 | 17:5,6 18:9,10 | 28:11,13,15 30:14 | 103:7 106:14 | 89:13 |
| test 14:12 15:16 | 19:15,16,18 22:1 | 30:21 31:25 32:4 | 108:10 | turning 68:13 |
| 24:4,19 25:2 28:5 | 22:2,3,10,16,19 | 32:5,10 33:3 | today's 100:14 | twelve 87:15 |
| 28:9,13, 16 29:3,4 | 22:25 23:8,10,13 | 36:11,12 41:8,19 | tool 48:9 | two 10:22 14:10 |
| 29:4,9,21 30:16 | 25:7 26:12,17 | 44:8 48:10 50:16 | top 27:9 30:9 70:20 | 21:11 37:14,14 |
| 31:18 39:8,12,22 | 27:2 29:17 32:14 | 51:21 52:15 53:20 | topic 38:12 63:13 | 75:11 |



| 104:10 | yesterday 10:24 | 12:25 108:12 | 31:15,16 33:18 | 30th 15:18 36:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| world 33:9 | 23:1 60:1 | 13 39:17 43:7,12,14 | 37:19 52:13,16 | 3186 1:25 109:15 |
| worse 20:6 | Yochanan 6:25 | 68:15,16 | 79:25 80:6,12 | 31st 87:16 |
| wouldn't 10:8 | Yochi 3:8 6:25 | 13.7 18:17 | 87:14,18,24 88:1 | 32 4:4 |
| 11:21 28:18,18 | Yup 44:2 | 13.8 19:5 | 88:1,2,10,11,20 | 33 29:6 |
| 46:21 73:7 80:15 | Yzakai@smwla... | 1439:18 48:14 | 88:23 89:2,3 | 33,943,356 27:18 |
| Wow 65:5 | 3:11 | 58:20,22 | 2022 1:24 5:1,6 | 29:11 |
| wreacked 20:1 |  | 1455 3:4 | 17:12,16 18:7 | 33.9 29:6,10,14 |
| written 11:25 | Z | 15 40:12 | 33:19 34:14 50:20 | $3571: 9$ 102:24 |
| 16:13 61:17 70:2 | Zakai 3:8 6:24,25 | 15,909,204 40:9 | 50:25 99:24 100:4 | 103:5 |
| 95:9 | 13:10,17 19:18 | $15.958: 24$ 59:4 | 102:19 103:20 | 360.915.4521 2:19 |
| WUTC 2:5,7 | 22:2 35:21 93:8 | 1500 3:4 | 107:10 109:8,11 | 36th 2:23 |
|  | 93:15,18 | 15th 11:16 37:19 | 2023 33:11 109:18 | 396 3:9 |
| X | zero 37:11 | 102:19,23 104:21 | 210709 37:24 |  |
| X 23:14 32:21 50:1 |  | 105:8 | 210755 5:9 | 4 |
|  | 0 | 18 25:14,15 26:1,10 | 210755-Cascade... | 471:23 99:14 |
| Y | 0.614 26:25 | 26:21 27:23 45:14 | 82:12 | 40128 2:18 |
| yeah 7:17 13:13 | $0.7550631: 4,9$ | 68:16 | 22 25:9 | 415.552.7272 3:10 |
| 29:17 39:5 40:15 | 1 | 18th 54:12 74:15 | 22/23 57:10 75:21 | 425.635.1419 2:14 |
| 42:3,23 43:9,13 | $\frac{1}{11.245 .160 .12}$ | 74:24 76:14 98:22 | 94:1 | 47 72:6 |
| 44:25 47:22 48:19 | $11: 24$ 5:1 60:12 | $1931: 3$ | $22086: 25$ | 480-07-495 35:11 |
| 48:25 50:24,24 | 69:16 109:8 1,41356859:20 | 1st 5:6 105:5,20 | 220053 105:16 | 480-07-740 17:23 |
| 52:17,22,25 56:22 | 1,413,568 59:20 | 106:5 107:7 | 220198 37:9 | 480-90-257 24:16 |
| 57:16 65:3 66:16 | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 4 , 0 0 0} 61: 6,8$ |  | 22nd 17:12 34:14 | 488,393,608 26:16 |
| 70:11 72:7 76:24 | 1,492,986 61:4 | 2 | 23 4:3 46:23,25 | 26:25 27:17 |
| 78:18 80:11 92:3 | 1.439:24 40:5,7 | 2 60:6 69:16 79:22 | 47:6 66:3 | 4th 2:12 |
| 92:9,12 94:9 96:8 | 59:20 60:2 | 87:15 98:14 | 24 45:13 66:4 |  |
| 98:18 100:10 | 1.413 39:21 | 2,129,998 60:23 | 25th 17:16 18:7 | 5 |
| 101:9,15 105:5 | $1030: 1$ 69:15 | 2.1 60:6 61:5,24 | 107:4 | 5 23:24 24:3 25:8,9 |
| 106:24 | 10.6 18:22 | 2.9 40:4 | $2626: 13,15,22$ | 43:7,13,14 57:9 |
| year 14:12 15:16 | $10.718: 187: 23$ | 20 86:24 | 27:12 27 | 63:17 70:20 75:21 |
| 16:12 24:5,20 | 88:20 | 200568 19:5 51:8 | 27 26:18 | 79:22 94:1 96:12 |
| 25:2 28:6,9,13,16 | 101961-21 35:4,11 | 2019 52:14 | 28,636,318 25:15 | 100:6 |
| 29:3,4,4,9,21 30:7 | 102 4:17 | 2020 15:20 16:8 | 29 23:22 24:1 29:12 | 5,249,541 31:10 |
| 30:16 31:18 41:8 | 10885 2:12 | 28:9 29:3,3,9,21 | 29:14 | $5.288: 16,21$ |
| 41:19,19,21 42:14 | 10th 48:20 | 29:23 30:4 31:5,9 | 29,979,637 26:11 | 50 4:4 71:6 102:18 |
| 42:14 46:11,16,19 | 11.118:19 | 31:18 33:18 39:22 | $26: 2429: 13$ | 102:24 103:4,6 |
| 47:14 51:23 53:9 | 11:07 65:5,14 | 53:9,12,15 60:22 | 29th 105:6,13,18 | 503.224.3092 3:5 |
| 63:1,1,7 76:14 | 11:12 65:6 | 69:18 71:24,25 | $\text { 2nd 107:6,8 } 109: 11$ | 52 4:5 |
| 81:5 83:24 87:14 | 11:15 65:8,12,14,16 | 72:5 79:25 83:23 | 2nd 107.6,8 109.11 | $5372: 6$ |
| 87:17,17 88:2,3,4 | 11:46 85:2 | 87:16,18,25 89:1 | 3 | 54 105:16 |
| 88:6,24 | 11:50 84:24 | 103:14 | 333:2 48:14 58:20 | 568,000 39:21 |
| year's 69:19 | 11:51 85:2 | 2021 14:12 15:18 | 58:22 80:14 99:4 | 58 4:5 |
| year-end 62:25 | $11972: 2$ | 17:25 24:9,17,23 | 3,963,719 29:15 | 581 35:25 36:5 37:1 |
| years 53:10 63:9 | 12 48:14 72:5 | 25:4,17 28:3,5,12 | 31:8 | 37:11,22,25 38:8 |
| 86:24 | 12/31 72:5 | 28:16,23 30:16 | 30 29:19 | 83:6,13,23 |



