WUTC v. Murrey's Disposal Company, Inc. dba Olympic Disposal

Docket No. TG-230778 - Vol. II

July 18, 2024



1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 Bellingham | Everett | Tacoma | Olympia | Yakima | Spokane Seattle 206.287.9066 Tacoma 253.235.0111 Eastern Washington 509.624.3261 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u>

email: audio@buellrealtime.com

×		Page 10			Page 12
	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON		1	INDEX OF PROCEEDIN	IGS
	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		2	PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND) TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)		4	Proceedings Commence	13
	Complainant,)		5	Opening Argument by the Company	21
١	/s.) DOCKET NO. TG-230778		6		
) MURREY'S DISPOSAL COMPANY, INC.) 幼/b/a OLYMPIC DISPOSAL,)		7	Opening Argument by Commission Staff Scheduling Discussion	30 87
) Respondent.)) PAGES 10 - 91		8 9 10		AGE
-	BRIEF ADJUDICATORY PROCEEDING - VOL II July 18, 2024		11 12	BRIAN VANDENBURG Direct Examination by Attorney Wiley	38
-	BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE AMY BONFRISCO VIA ZOOM		13 14 15 16	BENJAMIN SHARBONO Direct Examination by Attorney Roberson Cross-Examination by Attorney Wiley Redirect Examination by Attorney Robers	72
	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, Washington 98504		10 17 18 19	EXHIBIT INDEX	AGE
-			20 21 22 23	JW-30 Murrey's Disposal dba Olympic E Interim Rate Request Comparison w Staff Testimony B-12 Regulatory Fee Calculation Sched	Disposal rith I 6
٦	TRANSCRIBED BY: ELIZABETH PATTERSON HARVEY, W	A CCR 2731	24 25	B-13 General Objection BS-11C Redacted (Confidential)	17 17
		Page 11			Page 13
1 2	APPEARANCES		1	July 18, 2024	
	FOR COMMISSION STAFF:		2	-000-	
	Jeff Roberson		3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Goo	d afternoon.
4	jeff.roberson@utc.wa.gov Colin O'Brien		5	We're on record today. And today is Thurs	
5	colin.obrien@atg.wa.gov Office of the Attorney General		6	2024, and the time is 1:32 p.m.	
6	Utilities and Transportation Division PO Box 40128		7	This is Docket Number TG-23778.	This case
7	Olympia, Washington 98504		8	is captioned Washington Utilities and Trans	-
8	360.664.1188		9	Commission versus Murrey's Disposal, doir	•
9 F 10	FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:		10	Olympic Disposal. And the issue before us whether or not the standards are met for inf	-
	Robert D. Sykes robert.sykes@atg.wa.gov		11	relief.	lemminale
11	Attorney General of Washington Public Counsel Unit		13	The commission is recording this m	atter
12	800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000		14	for later transcription, and if you remain on	
13	Seattle, Washington 98104 206.464.7740		15	hearing, we're deeming consent to this reco	
14 15 F	FOR THE RESPONDENT:		16	My name is Amy Bonfrisco, and I'm	-
16	David W. Wiley		17	administrative law judge presiding over toda	
17	dwiley@williamskastner.com Christopher Luhrs		18	adjudicatory hearing.	
	Cluhrs@williamskastner.com		19	So let's just take appearances from	both
10	Williams Kastner & Gibbs, PLLC 601 Union Street, Suite 4100		20	parties, and then we'll talk about how we're	going to
18			21	proceed today. So with that, I'd like to start	with
18 19	Seattle, Washington 98101		22		
19 20	Seattle, Washington 98101 206.628.6600			commission staff.	
19			23	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good a	-
19 20 21 22 23			23 24	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good a Bonfrisco. My name is Jeff Roberson. I'm	an AAG
19 20 21 22			23	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good a	an AAG

1 (Pages 10 to 13)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 14		Page 16
1	is my colleague, Colin O'Brien.	1	redirect.
2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Nice to meet you.	2	Then we'll end the hearing by allowing
3	And for the company?	3	each party a chance to give a closing statement, which is
4	ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. David	4	simply a chance to explain what you're asking the
5	Wiley, appearing today on behalf of Murrey's Disposal,	5	commission to do today and why.
6	d/b/a Olympic Disposal, and with me at the conference	6	I have received Murrey's exhibit list, an
7	table is Christopher Luhrs of my office.	7	exhibit marked JW-30, as well as staff's exhibit list
8	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And I	8	with exhibits marked B-12, B-13, and BS-11(c), that last
9	believe we have your contact information on record with	9	one which is marked as confidential.
10	your address, telephone number, and e-mail address, and	10	So I'm not aware of any prior stipulation
11	that's all up to date, correct?	11	to the admission of these pre-filed exhibits. So I just
12	ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it is, your Honor.	12	want to ask at this point, are the parties willing to
13	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. So as you know,	13	stipulate to the admission of these exhibits?
14	we're going to be conducting this hearing virtually	14	ATTORNEY WILEY: The company is, your
15	through Zoom today. I'm going to ask that the parties be	15	Honor.
16	aware of any background noise and that you mute your	16	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: As is staff.
17	microphone when you're speaking. If you need to object	17	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I'm sorry. Say that
18	or raise an issue, please identify yourself when you're	18	again?
19	speaking. And we should just make an effort not to talk	19	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: As is staff.
20	over one another today so the court reporter can make a	20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. And
21	clear record of our hearing.	21	Murrey's counsel?
22	However, before we start, as a preliminary	22	ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, we are willing to
23	matter, I would like to note for the record that in	23	stipulate.
24	accordance with WAC 480-07-375 (b), Murrey's Disposal's	24	
25	motion for leave to file a reply brief in support of a	25	(Company Exhibit JW-30 admitted.)
	Page 15		Doco 17
			Page 17
1	potition for interim rate relief, which was dated on June	1	Page 17 (Stoff Exhibits BS 12 BS 12 and
1	petition for interim rate relief, which was dated on June	1	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and
2	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding	2	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.)
2 3	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just	2 3	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a
2 3 4	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there	2 3 4	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that
2 3 4 5	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that.	2 3 4 5	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information.
2 3 4 5 6	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that,	2 3 4	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm.
2 3 4 5	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly	2 3 4 5 6	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information.
2 3 4 5 6 7	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to ask that Murrey's legal counsel present their case first. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have an objection to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to ask that Murrey's legal counsel present their case first. And then I'm going to have staff 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have an objection to that. I hope Mr. Roberson I mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to ask that Murrey's legal counsel present their case first. And then I'm going to have staff cross-examine the witness, and then I'll allow commission 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have an objection to that. I hope Mr. Roberson I mean Mr. Vandenburg is on the phone. I've sent him the link.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to ask that Murrey's legal counsel present their case first. And then I'm going to have staff cross-examine the witness, and then I'll allow commission staff to present their case, have their witnesses 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have an objection to that. I hope Mr. Roberson I mean Mr. Vandenburg is on the phone. I've sent him the link. And if there's any if he needs to be contacted, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 5, was deemed denied by the former presiding administrative law judge, Bijan Hughes. And I just wanted to make sure before we jumped in today that there weren't any questions about that. ATTORNEY WILEY: I was unaware of that, your Honor. So I'm glad to know that. That certainly then raises concerns about bringing you up to speed on the legal issues in addition to the legal arguments that will probably be made today. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And basically, the way that provision words it, is if there's no response within that five-day window, it's deemed denied. But, you know, we can definitely address that today throughout the proceeding with regards to any other concerns that you feel would be pertinent to ensure that I'm up to speed, now that I've been substituted in. So basically, as you're both aware, because this hearing was initiated following Murrey's petition for interim rate relief, I'm actually going to ask that Murrey's legal counsel present their case first. And then I'm going to have staff cross-examine the witness, and then I'll allow commission 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Staff Exhibits BS-12, BS-13, and BS-11C admitted.) ATTORNEY WILEY: I did want to make a couple comments procedurally at the start that Mr. Roberson is aware of for your information. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mm-hm. ATTORNEY WILEY: When you're ready for that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: You can proceed now. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, Joe Wonderlick, who is our witness as you see in the designated exhibits, was unfortunately hospitalized on Tuesday evening, and I spoke with him or early Wednesday morning. And I spoke with him this morning. And he is still in the hospital under observation. So he is unable to testify, but his colleague, Brian Vandenburg, who's been involved in this case from the start, is available. I've spoken with Mr. Roberson about that substitution, and my understanding is that he didn't have an objection to that. I hope Mr. Roberson I mean Mr. Vandenburg is on the phone. I've sent him the link.

2 (Pages 14 to 17)

,	Page 18		Page 20
1	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Let me see if	1	clarifying that.
2	Mr. Vandenburg is actually present.	2	So I guess with that, are there any other
3	MR. VANDENBURG: I am, your Honor.	3	additional questions before we proceed?
4	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. And	4	ATTORNEY WILEY: One question, your Honor,
5	staff counsel, is Murrey's counsel recap accurate of how	5	and that is whether you would prefer to have the stage
6	we're going to proceed today with substituting	6	set for the demonstrative exhibits, which are
7	Mr. Vandenburg?	7	quantitative, by the legal by opening legal arguments
8	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Yes, Judge Bonfrisco.	8	to give context, or do you prefer just not to have any of
9	Staff has no objection to substituting Mr. Vandenburg for	9	that, because we are prepared to provide that context.
10	Mr. Wonderlick.	10	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I was actually going to
11	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Then,	11	provide each party the opportunity, you know, to provide
12	you know, we'll proceed with that. Oh, go ahead.	12	a general opening statement, and then to move on to
13	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I do have one other	13	having you present your witness. And at that stage, once
14	procedural matter.	14	your ready to present the witness, then I would swear the
15	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes.	15	witness in.
16	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Which is in lieu of a	16	So, you know, if you would like to proceed
17	closing statement, staff would prefer to brief the issues	17	with an opening statement, you may actually do so now
18	for you. Just given the nature of the issues, it's	18	unless staff counsel, provided you don't have any
19	probably better to write them out.	19	additional questions before we transition to that
20	I don't anticipate it will take staff a	20	stage?
21	long time to write the brief. I understand this is	21	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: No.
22	supposed to be an expedited proceeding. So we would just	22	JUDGE BONFRISCO: No. Okay. Okay. So
23	need maybe a week if you're willing to entertain that	23	Mr. Wiley
24	idea.	24	ATTORNEY WILEY: Luhrs sorry for
25	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I have no problem with	25	talking over you. I'm going to hand this to Mr. Luhrs.
	Page 19		Page 21
1	Page 19 that.	1	
1 2	that.	1	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies.
	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our	1	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine.
2	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that	2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies.
2 3	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we	2 3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours,
2 3 4	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that	2 3 4	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs.
2 3 4 5	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted.	2 3 4 5	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your
2 3 4 5 6	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the	2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present
2 3 4 5 6 7	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their	2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that accordingly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that accordingly. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: And I don't anticipate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that accordingly. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: And I don't anticipate asking Mr. Sharbono questions that will divulge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that accordingly. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: And I don't anticipate asking Mr. Sharbono questions that will divulge confidential information. It's mostly just to have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, from our standpoint, particularly in light of the revelation that the reply was denied, which was I was unaware of, we would like the opportunity to reply seven days after the staff's brief is submitted. JUDGE BONFRISCO: And in response to their written brief, correct? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. And I don't see any problem with that. ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Wonderful. And the only other thing I would note, just because, you know, Staff's Exhibit BS-11 is marked confidential, if for any reason we need to go off record or go into a breakout room, just please let me know so that we can have records staff work with us on that accordingly. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: And I don't anticipate asking Mr. Sharbono questions that will divulge confidential information. It's mostly just to have the exhibit for you if you want to look into it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. ATTORNEY WILEY: No, mine. JUDGE BONFRISCO: The floor is yours, Mr. Luhrs. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you very much, your Honor, and I appreciate the opportunity to present argument today. Just as a threshold matter, I just wanted to confirm whether there's a particular window of time you'd like me to limit my argument to? JUDGE BONFRISCO: We are scheduled today you know, I guess it depends how much time we think we're going to need for cross and rebuttal. I guess could you give me an idea how much time you think you might need to present initially? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. I think 10 to 15 minutes would suffice. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I don't see that as a problem at this juncture. ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay.

3 (Pages 18 to 21)

· · · · ·	Page 22	Page	24
_			27
1	As you know, we are gathered on Olympic's	1 climate that Olympic is operating in and the finances of	
2	petition, which requests that your Honor grant its	2 Olympic itself.	
3	petition requesting the adoption of interim rates until	3 So with that, I'll note that it has been	
4	the end of its general rate case.	4 more than 13 years since Olympic has had its most rece	ent
5	And we think it is important, your Honor,	5 rate case. And that passage of time alone should	
6	as you consider this request, to recognize the fact that	6 certainly not by itself serve as a basis against standing	
7	this request is subject to a full refund, which is to say	7 alone to grant the relief that we are requesting.	
8	that there is no risk on the shoulders of the ratepayers	8 However, the reality is that that is a	
9	at issue that will be impacted by such a decision. If it	9 long time. It's been more than 13 years since its	
10	is the case that the general that the petition is	10 general rate case. And the practical reality is that	
11	granted today, and that thereafter, there's some sort of	11 over that span of time, it's been more expensive to	
12	a divergence at the general rate case stage, the	12 operate the business. Wages have increased, fuel cost	S
13	ratepayers would have an opportunity to get a full refund	13 have increased.	
14	of whatever rates were issued here today.	14 And of course this is detailed in our	
15	Conversely, there is no such remedy for	15 pleadings, but I just want to make sure that that	
16	Olympic. So in other words, if it is the case that the	16 background is provided for your Honor.	
17	petition is not granted today, and thereafter the general	17 JUDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you.	
18	rate case proves to be successful, there's no mechanism	18 ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly. And so	
19	by which Olympic could recoup the otherwise lost funds.	19 turning to the standard at issue, which is a litigated	
20	And this concept is in fact required under	20 dispute, historically the seminal case in this area of	
21 22	the relevant statute or rule, WAC 480-07-520 (6).	 law has been the UTC versus Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company. 	
22	And again, ratepayers' right to refund is a requirement. And I think it's well stated, your Honor,	 Telephone Company. Now this was a utility case, a telephone 	
23	in the case of General Telephone Company of Northwest,	 utility case from 1972, which is more than 50 years ago. 	
25	which stated that the interim rate increase is not	 And in that case, the PNB case, as I'll refer to it, six 	
20			
	Page 23	Page	25
		I dgc	25
1		1 standards or six factors were established. And in	25
1 2	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during	1 standards or six factors were established. And in	25
		1 standards or six factors were established. And in	25
2	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was 	25
2 3	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of 	25
2 3 4	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six 	25
2 3 4 5	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. 	
2 3 4 5 6	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as 	ion
2 3 4 5 6 7	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgated 	ion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as 	ion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin.	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity.	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission may properly 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to be granted.	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission may properly consider in its decision. 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to be granted. Similarly, we're not aiming to overcollect	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission should 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to be granted. Similarly, we're not aiming to overcollect against the ratepayers.	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission should remain open to consider unique circumstances for 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to be granted. Similarly, we're not aiming to overcollect against the ratepayers. We are instead requesting that an interim	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and require compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission should remain open to consider unique circumstances for evolution in the factors. 	ion es
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ratemaking, but the creation of a pool of funds during the appeal period. Those funds will be returned to consumers with interest if the appeal fails. If General Telephone is successful on the merits, it is entitled to those funds, but would be unable to recoup them retroactively. Again, the fact that there is this right to refund is, I think, important to emphasize at the outset of my remarks because of the fact that there simply is no risk facing the ratepayers as to this issue. A theme of staff's response to our petition is that Olympic is not on the verge of bankruptcy; that it's not at the doorstep of financial ruin. Of course, Olympic has not held itself out as facing bankruptcy. We are not making the assertion that Olympic is facing financial calamity. But in fact, that is not the standard here today. We do not need to demonstrate that Olympic is facing bankruptcy in order for our request for relief to be granted. Similarly, we're not aiming to overcollect against the ratepayers.	 standards or six factors were established. And in essence, when a company sought interim relief, it was necessary to satisfy or meet those six factors. And of course, each party has argued and briefed those six factors. About 30 years after PNB was decided, 480-07-520 was promulgated. And while the promulgate of a rule after a case does not override a case as precedent, the WAC does serve as authority and requir compliance therewith. In its opposition, staff has argued via citation to Verizon Northwest, which is a case, and staff asserts that it stands for the proposition that if a petitioner cites only PNB as its authority, that it should be relegated to the analysis of those six factors. But in fact, Verizon Northwest didn't say that. It includes the experts that the commission has broad powers to award interim relief; that the PNB factors are neither a formula for interim relief, nor are they the only factors that the commission should remain open to consider unique circumstances for 	ion es

4 (Pages 22 to 25)

	Page 26		Page 28
1	important to then take a look at what exactly the WAC	1	unfair. It simply would not make sense because
2	says. Again, 480-07-520 (6) states that companies	2	effectively, what it would mean is that it would preclude
3	requesting this type of relief must demonstrate, after a	3	any company that has a large parent company from being
4	brief proceeding, an emergency, an undue hardship, or	4	awarded interim rate relief via a petition.
5	inequity.	5	And that certainly is not espoused in the
6	Now, those are disjunctive factors. In	6	WAC itself. It was not espoused in the PNB case. And it
7	other words, a company need only satisfy one of them:	7	would simply be not fair. Again, to satisfy or meet the
8	Either an Emergency, undue hardship, or inequity.	8	burden for the granting of interim rate relief, the
9	And it's our position that Olympic does in	9	petitioner must satisfy the requirements as spelled out
10	fact meet those standards, particularly undue hardship	10	in 480-07-520.
11	and inequity. As the record indicates, shareholders for	11	And in fact, the case that we cited in our
12	Olympic are losing about \$100,000 in revenue each month.	12	materials, Waste Management of Spokane, was a case
13	Again, it's been more 13 years since	13	decided in 2015, and involved of course, as the litigant
14	Olympic's last general rate case, and the denial of our	14	therein would indicate, Waste Management. Now this case
15	petition would eliminate Olympic's opportunity to recoup	15	was one where interim rates were granted. And the entity
16	such rates.	16	in question had a very large parent company in the form
17	Again, I'm harkening back to the Waste	17	of Waste Management.
18	Management of Spokane case that I cited earlier for your	18	So we have an example of the commission
19	Honor, whereas interim rates are subject to a full refund	19	granting interim rate relief, even though the petitioner
20	as it concerns ratepayers.	20	had a very large parent company.
21	And so even if it is the case that there's	21	Similarly, Olympic has a large parent
22	a determination that Olympic needs to satisfy the six	22	company, as was highlighted by staff in its opposition to
23	factors espoused in PNB, it certainly does so.	23	our petition.
24	And I'd like to highlight a couple of	24	But again, the Waste Management of Spokane
25	those factors for your Honor.	25	case from 2015 indicates that the mere reality that a
	Deere 27		Dama 20
	Page 27		Page 29
1	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks	1	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude
2	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It	2	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC.
2 3	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a	2 3	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to
2 3 4	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's	2 3 4	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its
2 3 4 5	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city	2 3 4 5	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually
2 3 4 5 6	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation.	2 3 4 5 6	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And
2 3 4 5 6 7	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and	2 3 4 5 6 7	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments and specifically they address it, staff did, as Factor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period of time since the last generated case, more than 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments and specifically they address it, staff did, as Factor Number 3 analysis. Staff argued that Olympic is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period of time since the last generated case, more than 13 years, is far greater than that which was at issue in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments and specifically they address it, staff did, as Factor Number 3 analysis. Staff argued that Olympic is financially healthy and but one subdivision of a larger	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period of time since the last generated case, more than 13 years, is far greater than that which was at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments and specifically they address it, staff did, as Factor Number 3 analysis. Staff argued that Olympic is financially healthy and but one subdivision of a larger operation, Murrey's.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period of time since the last generated case, more than 13 years, is far greater than that which was at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case. So your Honor, I'd like to just again
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	First, as to Factor Number 2, this speaks exactly to that which is stated in the WAC provision. It speaks to an emergency existing, a gross hardship, or a gross inequity. And to this point, we know that there's a lack of excuse me; there's the loss of a city contract that has adversely impacted Olympic's operation. There's been protracted administrative and judicial litigation that that has occurred over the past 13 years; and of course just the general inflationary realities that have prevailed over that period of time. Now staff in response has argued that Olympic merely suffers from regulatory lag, and that a granting of Olympic's petition today may lead to a slew of other companies seeking relief in the form of interim rates. Well, that's not the case. Just as the case with Olympic, any entity that wants to come forward and request interim rate relief must satisfy the standards under 480-07-520 (6). Another of staff's general arguments and specifically they address it, staff did, as Factor Number 3 analysis. Staff argued that Olympic is financially healthy and but one subdivision of a larger	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	petitioner has a large parent company should not preclude relief under this WAC. The Spokane case was also quite similar to the facts at issue in this case. Here, Olympic filed its request for rate relief more than 12 years actually more than 13 years after its last general rate case. And in the Waste Management of Spokane case, it was a period of about two years. As with Waste Management of Spokane, Olympic faced increasing costs due to rerouting of regulated and nonregulated services and labor shortages, including those for frontline workers. Olympic faced increasing operating expenses and costs associated with insurance claims, metric-based compensation, travel-related expenses, and company specific severance pay and safety training. And while the request that's being lodged by Olympic here today is admittedly larger than the request at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case, I surmise that it's understandable, given that the period of time since the last generated case, more than 13 years, is far greater than that which was at issue in the Waste Management of Spokane case.

5 (Pages 26 to 29)

·	Page 30		Page 32
1	don't want to cut you off, certainly.	1	inequity as the treatment of similarly situated entities
2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: No, go ahead.	2	differently.
3	ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor.	3	As the commission noted in the notice
4	I'm just wrapping up here. In essence, staff argues that	4	setting this hearing, interim rate relief is an
5	Olympic is merely earning less than it would like. But	5	extraordinary form of relief. That is because it
6	that's not the case.	6	involves potentially increasing costs to ratepayers
7	As demonstrated by the record which is	7	without the commission making a decision after a full
8	before the commission, and as will be highlighted during	8	adjudication. It's something that traditionally, the
9	the testimony today, Olympic seeks only to earn a rate of	9	commission has sparingly granted.
10	return that is reflective of the current financial	10	Now to the extent that Murrey's is arguing
11	climate and its own financial health. There would be no	11	the fact that the rates are subject to refund, that
12	adverse impact to ratepayers, particularly because the	12	changes the analysis, the commission rejected that in its
13	form of relief that we are requesting is subject to full	13	Verizon order in 2004. It's Order 11 in Docket 040788.
14	refund.	14	In that case, the commission said that
15	So thank you, your Honor, for the	15	interim rates subject to refund are not a neutral remedy,
16	opportunity to make argument before you, and I'd be happy	16	and that is because ratepayers are subject to an increase
17	to answer any questions you might have.	17	in cost which may or may not be justified, and the
18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I do have some follow-up	18	ratepayers may not receive that money returned, right?
19	questions, but I will reserve those until after cross.	19	They may move, they may stop service, whatever. They
20	And at this point, I'd like to turn it	20	would be unjustifiably paying increased costs. It
21	over to staff counsel to provide their opening statement.	21	remains an extraordinary form of relief.
22		22	Given that fact, staff will present
23	OPENING ARGUMENT BY COMMISSION STAFF	23	testimony from Benjamin Sharbono, who is the witness on
24	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Good afternoon, Judge	24	staff who was assigned to review Murrey's rate filing.
25	Bonfrisco, again, I guess. As you noted, we're here on	25	Mr. Sharbono will testify that Murrey's
-			
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31 Murrey's petition for interim rate relief.	1	Page 33 faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy
1 2		1 2	
	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection		faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy
2	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will	2	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its
2 3	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection	2 3	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service.
2 3 4	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors	2 3 4	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether
2 3 4 5	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity.	2 3 4 5	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments
2 3 4 5 6	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are	2 3 4 5 6	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest	2 3 4 5 6 7	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Murrey's is claiming
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Mr the events that Murrey's is claiming underlie its claims of hardship, the loss of the city
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same precedent makes clear that simply the loss of revenue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Mr the events that Murrey's is claiming underlie its claims of hardship, the loss of the city contract and the mill hauls litigation resulted in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same precedent makes clear that simply the loss of revenue does not constitute a hardship because literally every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. And the events that Murrey's is claiming underlie its claims of hardship, the loss of the city contract and the mill hauls litigation resulted in compensation to the company for the loss of the contract,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same precedent makes clear that simply the loss of revenue does not constitute a hardship because literally every carrier or utility that files for a rate increase is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Me loss of the city contract and the mill hauls litigation resulted in compensation to the company for the loss of the contract, and an increase in ratepayers and an increase in revenues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same precedent makes clear that simply the loss of revenue does not constitute a hardship because literally every carrier or utility that files for a rate increase is losing revenue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Mr of the company for the loss of the city contract and the mill hauls litigation resulted in compensation to the company for the loss of the contract, and an increase in ratepayers and an increase in revenues for the mill hauls litigation. So it's difficult to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Murrey's petition for interim rate relief. Under WAC 480-07-526, the commission will grant interim rate relief to a solid waste collection company that shows emergency, undue hardship, or inequity. Those are the exact same factors identified in the second factor for the Pacific Northwest Bell analysis. So to the extent that those are incorporated into the rule, it seems pretty clear that the commission is trying to incorporate the Pacific Northwest Bell line of cases into its rules. That's kind of further shown by the fact that the commission does not define what constitutes an emergency, a hardship, or an inequity. That's all defined by administrative precedent. An emergency is an existing or looming threat to a utility such that it would no longer be able to provide regulated service in Washington. A hardship is an occurrence or an event that causes harm to the utilities' owners. That same precedent makes clear that simply the loss of revenue does not constitute a hardship because literally every carrier or utility that files for a rate increase is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	faces no emergency. As a company, it has shown healthy revenue growth over the last five or six years. Its Olympic division, the division at issue here, shows net revenue. There's no evidence that it's going to shut down service. And in fact, when asked by staff whether it was avoiding incurring expenses or making investments or whether it planned to avoid incurring expenses or making investments, the company said no, which suggests that it's carrying on in the business of performing its public service duties. Mr. Sharbono will also present evidence that Murrey's is not facing a hardship. We will present evidence that the company is not at risk of a credit downgrade. It's not at risk of insolvency or bankruptcy which would wipe out the owners' stake in the company. It's not taking any actions that suggest that it believes it's facing hardship. Me loss of the city contract and the mill hauls litigation resulted in compensation to the company for the loss of the contract, and an increase in ratepayers and an increase in revenues

6 (Pages 30 to 33)

	Page 34		Page 36
1	hardship.	1	ATTORNEY WILEY: I have it here, your
2	Finally, Mr. Sharbono will present	2	Honor.
3	evidence that factually distinguishes the Murrey's case	3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, if you could
4	from the Waste Management case, which it's unclear to me,	4	provide that, that would be great.
5	but I believe that Murrey's is arguing that there's an	5	ATTORNEY WILEY: It's Docket TG-143889,
6	inequity there if Waste Management of Spokane receives	6	Order 02, Westlaw 2015 WL-863028.
7	interim rates and it doesn't; the most obvious of which	7	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I'm just going to read
8	is that Waste Management experienced kind of a rapid	8	that back. Docket TG-143189-02, Westlaw 863028; is that
9	deterioration in its tariff, like the income derived from	9	correct?
10	its tariff, whether that was sufficient.	10	ATTORNEY WILEY: Except the docket number
11	There was a much shorter period of time	11	is TG-143889.
12	between when it came in for rate cases. Murrey's delayed	12	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you.
13	some 13 years; could have filed it at any time, which	13	ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes.
14	suggests that it's not showing a burning desire for a	14	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Appreciate that.
15	rate increase, I guess.	15	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: If I may, your Honor,
16	Staff will also argue on brief that the	16	if you pull up on the commission's website, I have it as
17	two cases are legally distinguishable. The Waste	17	143089. So it's going to be one of those two.
18	Management of Spokane case went through the open meeting.	18	ATTORNEY WILEY: I'm reading from Westlaw.
19	The commission issued Order 13 in Docket 040788, and	19	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I may have been
20	quite explicitly said that the grant of temporary rates	20	reading that wrong.
21	at an open meeting does not serve as precedent for a	21	(Overlapping speech.)
22	litigated interim rate relief proceeding, which is what	22	ATTORNEY WILEY: It's one or the other.
23	we have here. So the Waste Management case is factually	23	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I appreciate that. I
24	and legally distinguishable.	24	just want to make sure I can cross reference later. So
25	With all that said, I'm finished.	25	thank you.
	Page 35		Page 37
1	Page 35 JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one	1	Page 37 And I guess with that, I would like to
1 2		1 2	
	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one		And I guess with that, I would like to
2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly.	2	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically,
2 3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488,	2 3	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness.
2 3 4	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788.	2 3 4 5 6	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian
2 3 4 5	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg.
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040.	2 3 4 5 6	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 748. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard to the Washington versus Spokane case that you said was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're going to give today will be the truth, the whole
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard to the Washington versus Spokane case that you said was distinguishable that I know Murrey's counsel is relying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're going to give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard to the Washington versus Spokane case that you said was distinguishable that I know Murrey's counsel is relying upon, I think you provided a citation to that. Could you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're going to give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard to the Washington versus Spokane case that you said was distinguishable that I know Murrey's counsel is relying upon, I think you provided a citation to that. Could you reiterate that for me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're going to give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I do. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I did have one clarifying question that I got your citation correctly. The Verizon case you cross referenced, that's 07488, correct? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I believe it is 040788. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 047 sorry. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 040. JUDGE BONFRISCO: 040. Okay. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: 788. And the relevant orders there are Order 11, which kind of defines the three factors: Emergency, hardship, and inequity; and then Order 13, which corrected Order 11 to add a paragraph for the thing that I just talked about, which is whether or not interim rates granted at an open meeting are precedential for a litigated proceeding. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And with regard to the Washington versus Spokane case that you said was distinguishable that I know Murrey's counsel is relying upon, I think you provided a citation to that. Could you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And I guess with that, I would like to turn back, you know, to Murrey's counsel to basically, you know, proceed with presenting their first witness. But before we do that, I can go ahead and swear in your first witness. And you said that was Mr. Brian THE WITNESS: Vandenburg. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Brian Vandenburg, correct? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I've had the name for 37 years and have trouble pronouncing it at times. JUDGE BONFRISCO: I just want to make sure I'm pronouncing it correctly. Thank you, Mr. Vandenburg. THE WITNESS: I'll still know who you're referring to, so we're good. JUDGE BONFRISCO: If you would like to raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're going to give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I do.

7 (Pages 34 to 37)

1 BRIAN VANDENBURG, witness herein, having been duty swom on cah, testified as follows: or - 2 A Yes, I do. 3 follows: 4 4 4 5 DIREOT EXAMINATION 6 BY ATTORNEY WILEY: 7 G codd atternoon, Mr. Vandenburg, You've spelled your name, I think, for the record. 7 G codd atternoon, Mr. Vandenburg, You've spelled your name, I think, for the record. 9 Connections, plesse. 10 Connections, plesse. 11 operations and econnections? 12 A I am. 13 operations and econnections? 14 and could you describe what your job duties are, briefly, for the record? 15 welve saked for in interim rates. and we take out all welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates. And wen, I think it welve saked for in interim rates.	÷	Page 38		Page 40
3 follows: 3 C Catality ou plases give us some background and 4 explain this exhibit to the best of your ability? A Cotality. Not best of your ability? 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION A Cotality. Iwo ability? A Cotality. Not big this the the fact that the 6 BY ATTORNEY WILEY: A Cotality. Iwo big this the company recognizes 9 So could you plase give us some background and explain this exhibit to the best of your ability? 10 Connections, plass. Iwo in the contant test of big yorethraged, even if 11 Targepayers are not at its, because if we factor in what 12 Q And in that capacity, are you familiar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated 13 operations and economics of Washington regulated Iwo wasks to in what 13 A ram. we transport the term ortics, plass, and even, this if 14 are plant out the concert? So realky, again, if's the higher than what we asked for in at apayers of being overcharged in this process? 14 are reaction the factor in what we're asked for in at apayers in out if so its solil by plant the what you plant the test plant on the solil higher than what we asked for in at apayers in out if so its solil by plant the what you plant the test plant its solil higher than wha	1	BRIAN VANDENBURG, witness herein, having been duly	1	or
a follows: a C Could you please give us some background and explain this exhibit to the best of your ability? b DIRECT EXMINATION A Catainy. I would say the main purpose of the exhibit really to highlight the fact that the ready to highlight the tact that the ready to highlight the tact back the power ability? coord afterroom, Mr. Yandenburg. You've spelled The exhibit really to highlight the tact that the ready to highlight the tact that the ready to highlight the company recognizes. connections, please. The an pricing analyst. The an pricing analyst. companies at Waste Connections? A I am. the terms contested by staff in their testmony, and we take out all or the terms contested by staff in their testmony, we asked for in a lavel of about 9900, at that point the ready the return what we asked for in a lavel of about 9900, at that point the return of the terms contested by staff in their testmony, we asked for in a lavel of the terms contested by staff in their testmony, we asked for in a lavel of about 9900, at that point the ready and the test and the return what we asked for in a trappers are not at ifs, because if we fact that if. a pricing analyst. a fact that is, an involved in the record? So reality, again, if's the higher rate. There is no risk to ratappyors of boing overcharged in this procees. a A for the record? M. Wonderlick's tilt and your relationship to Companies at Waste Connections, please. a A for the record? A for the record? So realiv, again, if's the higher rate. There is no	2	sworn on oath, testified as	2	A Yes, I do.
4 explain this exhibit to the best of your ability? 6 BY ATTORNEY WILEY: 5 A Carainy! Housd say the main purpose of this exhibit is really to highlight the fact that the ratepayer is not at risk of being overcharged, even if a the exhibit is really to highlight the fact that the ratepayer is not at risk of beauge overcharged, even if a the interim rates are subject to fund, what we add of a al well of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because it we factor in what we add of a law of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because it we factor in what we add of a law of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because it we factor in what we add or at law of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because it we factor in what we add or at law of the terms contested by saft in their testimony, we we add or at law of the terms contested by saft in their testimony. 16 O And in that capacity, are your amiliar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated or an about 900,00, at that is sall higher than what we add or a law of the terms contested by saft in their testimony, we we we add for in interim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit 80 depicting? 17 A has related to this, I am involved with interactions with saft requests, and coming to a mutually agared consensus or conclusion. 9 Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can you wak us through some of the adhered mark. Saft in the shear that the start with the test speriod for the parties, please. 18 Mr. Wonderlick's tite and your relationship to 2 Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can you wak u	3	follows:	3	Q Could you please give us some background and
5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 A. Cartainly, Trooky whe main purpose of 7 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Vandenburg, You've spelled 7 7 8 your name, Ithink, for the record. 6 7 9 So could you please. 7 7 10 Connections, please. 7 7 11 a har a prioring analyst. 11 7 12 Q. And in that capacity, are you familiar with the company recognizes 9 13 oparations and economics of Washington regulated 7 14 companies at Waste Connections? 11 15 A. I am. 14 the interim crimesized by staff in their testimony, and we take out all staff 16 Q. And could you describe what your job duties 15 So really, gain, it's the higher rhan. what we isseed for. 17 are, briefly, for the record? 14 So really, gain, it's the higher rhan. what we isseed is no risk to ratepayers or being overcharged in this process. 12 responding to data request, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 2 Before we get to that is still higher rhan. what we isso we get long that was during the exhibit is responding to data request, and coming the maryour relationship to underick is the prioring manager. </th <th>4</th> <th></th> <th>4</th> <th></th>	4		4	
6 BY ATTORNEY WILEY: 6 this exhibit is really to highligh the fact that the fill of doing vertors regions, please. 7 Q Good ferroom, Mr. Vandenburg, You've spelled your name, I think, for the record. 7 This exhibit is really to highligh the fact that the fill of the your name, I think, for the record. 9 So could you please tell us your title at Waste 6 This exhibit is really to highligh the fact that the fill of the your name, I think, for the record. 11 A lam a pricing analyst. 10 asked for at level of about 390,000, at that you the level of about 390,000, at that you that we asked for in iterim rates. And went, hat we asked for in iterim rates. And went, hat we asked for in iterim rates. And went, hat we asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for at leve asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for at leve asked for in iterim rates. And even, I think if we look proteend and and you relationship to 10 A not could you describe were and analy the doit bottom line, can you you walk us through now of the entries in this axhibit for backgout at the protein and ease. 7 2 A Yeah. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 7	5	DIRECT EXAMINATION	5	A Certainly. I would say the main purpose of
Q Good aftermoon, Mr. Vandenburg. You've spelled 7 ratepayer is not at risk of being overcharged, even if B your name, I think, for the record. 8 they were to move away; that while the company recognizes 10 Connections, please tell us your tile at Waste 9 the were to move away; that while the company recognizes 11 A I am a pricing analyst. 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 12 Q. And in that capacity, are you familiar with the saked for at a level of about stimony, and we take out all 13 operations and economics of Washington regulated 13 of the inters contaistical by staff in their testimony, we 14 companies at Waste Connections? 14 the vert as the bipher rate. There 15 A I am. 15 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 16 Q And could you describe So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 17 rais worked for in interin rates, and even, it hink if 18 A screated to fink company recognizes 19 preparation of these rate filling, builting together the 19 preparation of these rate filling, builting together the 19 A And for the record, could you describe	б	BY ATTORNEY WILEY:	6	
8 your name, I think, for the record. 8 they were to move away, that while the company recognizes. 10 Connections, please. 10 asked for at level of about 990,000, at that point the operations and economics of Washington regulated companies at Waste Connections? 11 <th>7</th> <th>Q Good afternoon, Mr. Vandenburg. You've spelled</th> <th>7</th> <th></th>	7	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Vandenburg. You've spelled	7	
10 Connections, please. 10 asked for at a level of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 11 0 And in that capacity, are you familiar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated 11 12 0 And in that capacity, are you familiar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated 11 13 0 And could you describe what your job duties 11 14 are, briefly, for the record? 11 11 15 A strelated to this, I am involved in the financials that ultimately go into the LG model. 11 11 17 minvolved with interactions with staff 20 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 18 are don'd to the record? 21 You walk us through some of the entries in this subibly for background, not just for the indge, but for the record and for the partices plants. 21 21 minvolved with interactions his staff 22 Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 23 arestording to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 23 24 24 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 25 A veah.	8	your name, I think, for the record.	8	
10 Connections, please. 10 asked for at a level of about 990,000, at that point the ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 11 A I am a pricing analyst. 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 12 O And in that capacity, are you familiar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 13 operations and economics of Washington regulated 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 14 companies at Waste Connections? 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 15 A lam. 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 15 A at an out of weshington regulated 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 16 companies at Waste Connections? 11 ratepayers are not at risk, because if we factor in what 16 A and at the record? 11 ratepayers are not at risk. 11 responding to data requestion and were were state were vere state were vere were state were vere state were vere s	9	So could you please tell us your title at Waste	9	that the interim rates are subject to refund, what we
12 Q And in that capacity, are you familiar with the operations and economics of Washington regulated operations and economics of Washington regulated companies at Waste Connections? 13 of the items contested by staff in their testimory, and we take out all of the items contested by staff in their testimory, we wasted for in interim rates. And even, I think if we load at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for. 18 A And could you describe what your job duties are, briefly, for the record? 13 of the items contested by staff in their testimory, and we take out all of the items contested by staff in their testimory, we wasted for in interim rates. And even, I think if we load at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for. 18 A Are fasted to this, I am involved with the fill goesther the prinoperation of these retailings, putting together the prinoperation of these retailings, putting together the is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this process. 21 The involved with interactions with staff 20 22 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 21 Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can you walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit 30 depicting? 23 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick? 21 D Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can you walk us through to record, culd you describe what you as a this teshibit 30 depicting? 24 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick? A So yeah, I can walk throught, roy you can ask me questos on as we go along. But	10	Connections, please.	10	-
13 operations and economics of Washington regulated 13 of the items contested by staff in their testimony, we 14 companies at Waste Connections? at lam. 14 of the items contested by staff in their testimony, we 15 A lam. Q And could you describe what your job duties we've asked for in interim rates. And even, I think if 16 Q And could you describe what your job duties in interim rates. And even, I think if 17 are, briefly, for the record? A As related to this, I am involved in the in interim rates. And even, I think if 19 preparation of these rate filings, putting together the in orisk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 12 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 20 21 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 21 C Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 22 You walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit 20 you walk us through some of the interies in this exhibit 23 Mr. Wonderlick? 21 C Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 24 Q And for the record, could you describe 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 24 A So yeah, I can walk throu	11	A I am a pricing analyst.	11	-
14 companies at Waste Connections? 14 still the result of that is still higher than what 15 A lam. a. And could you describe what your job duties we've asked for in interim rates. And even, I think if 16 A And could you describe what your job duties we've asked for in interim rates. And even, I think if 17 a. A scleated to this, I am involved in the is an rake this BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for. 18 A scleated to this, I am involved in the these rate filings, putting together the in involved with theractions with staff 19 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 21 Mr. Wonderlick? Example Q Before we get to the kind of bottom line, can 22 You walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit for the record, could you describe 23 for the record, could you describe 24 24 A for the record, could you describe 25 7 Ar Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick? 1 8 No. tonly does he oversee and manage the pricing manager. 2 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing and case. 5 9 Q What role di	12	Q And in that capacity, are you familiar with the	12	we proposed in our March testimony, and we take out all
15 A lam. 15 we've asked for in interim rates. And even, I think if 16 Q And could you describe what your job duties 16 we've asked for in the interim rates. And even, I think if 18 A As related to this, I am involved in the 18 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 19 preparation of these rate fillings, putting together the 19 is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 21 Tresponding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 2 Q Before weg to that kind of bottom line, can 23 agreed consensus or conclusion. 2 Q Before weg to that kind of bottom line, can 24 Tresponding to data requests, and coming to a mutually 23 agreed consensus or conclusion. 2 25 Mr. Wonderlick? 2 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 2 A Yeah, Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing 3 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing data requestion as we go along. But ordinarily we start 4 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 4 A Yeah, Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please?	13	operations and economics of Washington regulated	13	
16 Q. And could you describe what your job duties 16 we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we asked for. 17 a. A srelated to this, I am involved in the 17 asked for. 18 A. Srelated to this, I am involved in the 17 asked for. 19 preparation of these rate filings, putting together the 17 is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 20 minvolved with interactions with staff 18 Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 21 minvolved with interactions with staff 16 Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 22 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 21 Gefore we get to that kind of bottom line, can 23 agreed donsensus or conclusion. 22 You walk us through some of the entries, hease. For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 24 A Areah. Mr. Wonderlick? 21 What is the intent of its depiction, please? A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask 3 so are involved in filing and various activities in 5 its what was eamed. A thet test period revouwe that was filed in March. So 4 preparation of this filing, and then as well as the preparation of	14	companies at Waste Connections?	14	still the result of that is still higher than what
17 are, briefly, for the record? 17 asked for. 18 A st related to this, I am involved in the 18 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 18 Disposition of the strate fillings, putting together the 18 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 19 preparation of these strate fillings, putting together the 18 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 21 I'm involved with interactions with staff 20 Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 23 agreed consensus or conclusion. 21 Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can 24 Q And for the record, could you describe 24 With Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 25 25 Wr. Wonderlick? 26 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 26 A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask 36 and case. 21 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 4 department which files in the State of Washington, we 3 38 or en involved in filings and various activities in 31 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. A I was involved along with some coworker	15	A I am.	15	-
18 A as related to this, I am involved in the 18 So really, again, it's the higher rate. There 19 preparation of these rate fillings, putting together the is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 21 I'm involved with interactions with staff 12 22 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually 22 23 agreed consensus or conclusion. 23 24 Q And for the record, could you describe 24 25 Mr. Wonderlick? 25 Mr. Wonderlick? 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 26 A Yeah. Mt. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 26 3 So not nly does he oversee and manage the pricing 3 4 department which files in the State of Washington, we 3 3 as are involved in filings and various activities in 5 16 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 7 7 And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. 7 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 11 Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 10 12	16	Q And could you describe what your job duties	16	we look at Exhibit BS-11, it is also higher than what we
19 preparation of these rate filings, putting together the 19 is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 20 financials that ultimately go into the LG model. 19 is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this 21 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can you waik us through some of the entries in this exhibit for background, not just for the judge, but for the record and for the parties, please. 22 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to Page 39 Page 41 1 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to Page 41 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 3 A Vaah role did you have in preparing the Olympic 0 What tole did you have in preparing the Olympic 10 Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 1 4 A That's our filicial testimony, official position. 12 A I was involved along with some coworkers in the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the preparatin of this filing, and then as well as the propo	17	are, briefly, for the record?	17	asked for.
20 financials that ultimately go into the LG model. 20 process. 21 I'm involved with interactions with staff 20 grocess. 21 I'm involved with interactions with staff 20 grocess. 22 Q And for the record, could you describe 21 you walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit 23 G And for the record, could you describe 24 for background, not just for the judge, but for the record and for the parties, please. 24 Mr. Wonderlick? 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 25 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 26 A So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 3 A do he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. 1 Mark toce did you have in preparing the Olympic 36 processal filing that was submitted on or about September 10 C Excuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March 11 5 a That's our official testimony, official position. 13 12 A I was involved along with Mr. Wonderlick, for updating the results of operations, calc	18	A As related to this, I am involved in the	18	So really, again, it's the higher rate. There
21I'm involved with interactions with staff21QBefore we get to that kind of bottom line, can you walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit for background, not just for the judge, but for the record and for the parties, please.23QAnd for the record, could you describe Q2324QAnd for the record, could you describe Wr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to2425For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting?26Mr. Wonderlick's2527A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we als oare involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.136And sone's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.337And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.338QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September tis, 2023?339AI was involved along with some coworkers in the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the primary point of contact during the informal data request period.331AI was involved along with Mr. Wonderlick, for responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderli	19	preparation of these rate filings, putting together the	19	is no risk to ratepayers of being overcharged in this
22 responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually agreed consensus or conclusion. 22 you walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit for background, not just for the judge, but for the record and for the parties, please. 23 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 23 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 24 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 23 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 25 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 3 No tonly does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 3 And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. 1 And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that twas submitted on or about September 15, 2023? 1 0 Men tole did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 15, 2023? 1 0 1 <td< th=""><th>20</th><th>financials that ultimately go into the LG model.</th><th>20</th><th>process.</th></td<>	20	financials that ultimately go into the LG model.	20	process.
23 agreed consensus or conclusion. 23 for background, not just for the judge, but for the record and for the parties, please. 24 Q And for the record, could you describe 24 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 25 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 23 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? Page 39 Page 41 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 2 A So peah, I can walk through it, or you can ask 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing 4 department which files in the State of Washington, we 4 with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So 6 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 6 And then there's an adjustment in there for a 7 And case. 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 11 15, 2023? A I was involved along with some coworkers in the 9 Q The position (finical primarity for the record what you're 12 A I was involved along with Mr. Wonderlick, for 19 G The opening testimony of – 16 Q And during that time,	21	I'm involved with interactions with staff	21	Q Before we get to that kind of bottom line, can
24 Q And for the record, could you describe 24 record and for the parties, please. 25 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? 1 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 24 record and for the parties, please. 1 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to Page 39 Page 41 1 Mr. Wonderlick's 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. A do he's managed and overseen this particular filing and so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and cales. A What role did you have in preparing the Olympic The based off that 10 Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 10 A the informal data request period. A that's our official testimony, official position. 12 A l was involved along with some coworkers in the primary point of contact during that time, have you been the responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment? A Yes.	22	responding to data requests, and coming to a mutually	22	you walk us through some of the entries in this exhibit
25 Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to 25 For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting? Page 39 1 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 2 A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we stat 3 department which files in the State of Washington, we duestions as we go along. But ordinarily we stat me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we stat 6 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 6 And then there's an adjustment in there for a 7 And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. 7 And then there's an adjustment in there for a 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 Then based off that 10 Disposal filing that was submitted on on about September 10 Q Excuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March 14 preparation of this filing, and then as well as the 13 A That's our official testimony of - 16 Q And during that time, have you been the 16 A Yeah. C Excuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March 17 period. 11 A I was involved along with Mr. Wonderlick, for 11 A The opening testimony of - </th <th>23</th> <th>agreed consensus or conclusion.</th> <th>23</th> <th>for background, not just for the judge, but for the</th>	23	agreed consensus or conclusion.	23	for background, not just for the judge, but for the
Page 39 Page 41 1 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 2 A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned. 3 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. 6 And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period. 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 Then based off that 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 Then based off that 11 15,2023? 1 A That's our official testimony, official primary point of contact during the informal data request period. 12 A I was involved along with Some coworkers in the primary point of contact during the informal data request period. 13 A That's our official testimony of 16 Q And during that time, have you been the responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment? 14 A Yes. 17 Q Aky. In that regard, can you please look at the sproiceding? 4 Yes. This the result of that was part of our official testimony	24	Q And for the record, could you describe	24	record and for the parties, please.
1 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned. 6 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. Mat tole did you have in preparing the Olympic G Mat hen there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period. 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic 9 Then based off that 10 Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 10 Q Excuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March 11 15, 2023? 1 19 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're 11 12 A I was involved along with some coworkers in the period. 13 A That's our official testimony, official 14 primary point of contact during the informal data request period. 14 That's our official testimony of 16 Q And during that time, hav	25	Mr. Wonderlick's title and your relationship to	25	For instance, what is Exhibit 30 depicting?
1 Mr. Wonderlick? 1 What is the intent of its depiction, please? 2 A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager. 3 So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned. 6 the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case. Mat tole did you have in preparing the Olympic Then based off that 9 Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic Then based off that Q Excuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March 11 15, 2023? A I was involved along with some coworkers in the Then based off that 12 A I was involved along with some coworkers in the 13 A That's our official testimony, official 14 primary point of contact during the informal data request Preportion. Q The opening testimony of 16 Q And during that time, have you been the 16 A Yeah. A Correct. 19 other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the 19 Q All right.				
2A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager.2A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned.33also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.3Mat test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned.6the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.9Q What role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 119And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.10Disposal filing, and then as well as the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the period.9A That's our official testimony, official position.1115, 2023?19 filing, can you point of contact during the informal data request period.10Q The opening testimony of -16Q And during that time, have you been the proposed rates adjustment?11Q The opening testimony of -17A Yes.12A Yes.1319other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?1420Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for this proceeding?24A Correct. <tr< th=""><th></th><th>Page 39</th><th></th><th>Page 41</th></tr<>		Page 39		Page 41
3So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing department which files in the State of Washington, we also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.3me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So it's what was earned.7And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.6And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.8and case.7dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September91115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're talking about?12AI was involved along with some coworkers in the period.13A14primary point of contact during the informal data request period.14Position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?18A19QAll right.20A20QNes.21A21AYes.20A22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for 2423A24 <th>1</th> <th>Mr. Wonderlick?</th> <th>1</th> <th>What is the intent of its depiction, please?</th>	1	Mr. Wonderlick?	1	What is the intent of its depiction, please?
4department which files in the State of Washington, we4with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So5also are involved in filings and various activities in5it's what was earned.6the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.6And then there's an adjustment in there for a7And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing7dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the8and case.7dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic9Then based off that10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're1212AI was involved along with some coworkers in the13AThe opening testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.1515period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16AYeah.17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q- the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20A Yes.QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at	2	A Yeah. Mr. Wonderlick is the pricing manager.	2	A So yeah, I can walk through it, or you can ask
5also are involved in filings and various activities in the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily. And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.5it's what was earned.7And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.6And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 117And then there's an adjustment in there for a dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 15, 2023?10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're talking about?1112AI was involved along with some coworkers in the primary point of contact during the informal data request period.13AThat's our official testimony, official position.16QAnd during that time, have you been the responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?18ACorrect.20AYes.20AYes.Yes. This the result of that was part of our official testimony in March; resulted in a request for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.21AYes.21QCan you point out in the record where that this procee	3	So not only does he oversee and manage the pricing	3	me questions as we go along. But ordinarily we start
6the states of Alaska, Oregon, and California, primarily.6And then there's an adjustment in there for a7And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.7dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September9710Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're1112AI was involved along with some coworkers in the primary point of contact during the informal data request13AThat's our official testimony, official position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16AYeah.16QAnd during that time, have you been the updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.21AYes.20AYes.21AYes.22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for 2423QCan you point out in the record where that exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.	4	department which files in the State of Washington, we	4	with the test period revenue that was filed in March. So
7And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing and case.7dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the test period.9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September9Then based off that10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September 1110QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March12AI was involved along with some coworkers in the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13AThat's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?18ACorrect.20AYes.20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for 2423QCan you point out in the record where that exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.	5	also are involved in filings and various activities in	5	it's what was earned.
8and case.8test period.9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic9Then based off that10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're12AI was involved along with some coworkers in the12talking about?13preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13AThat's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16A17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q- the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20AYes.20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30. </th <th>6</th> <th></th> <th>6</th> <th>And then there's an adjustment in there for a</th>	6		6	And then there's an adjustment in there for a
9QWhat role did you have in preparing the Olympic9Then based off that10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're12AI was involved along with some coworkers in the12talking about?13preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13AThat's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16A17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20proposed rates adjustment?20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22GCan you point out in the record where that23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.24		And so he's managed and overseen this particular filing		dump fee filing that occurred after submissions after the
10Disposal filing that was submitted on or about September10QExcuse me, Mr. Vandenburg. When you say March1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're12AI was involved along with some coworkers in the12talking about?13preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13AThat's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16A17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20AYes.20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				test period.
1115, 2023?1119 filing, can you clarify for the record what you're12A I was involved along with some coworkers in the12talking about?13preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13A That's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15Q The opening testimony of16Q And during that time, have you been the16A Yeah.17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18A Correct.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19Q All right.20A Yes.20A Yes. This the result of that was part of21A Yes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23Q Can you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.	9			
12A I was involved along with some coworkers in the preparation of this filing, and then as well as the primary point of contact during the informal data request12talking about?14primary point of contact during the informal data request13A That's our official testimony, official15period.15Q The opening testimony of16Q And during that time, have you been the updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?16A Yeah.20A Yes.19Q All right.21A Yes.20A Yes. This the result of that was part of our official testimony in March; resulted in a request for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for 2424Q Can you point out in the record where that exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				
13preparation of this filing, and then as well as the13AThat's our official testimony, official14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16A17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20AYes.20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				
14primary point of contact during the informal data request14position.15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16A17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20AYes.20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.		-		-
15period.15QThe opening testimony of16QAnd during that time, have you been the16AYeah.17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20proposed rates adjustment?20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				-
16QAnd during that time, have you been the16AYeah.17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20proposed rates adjustment?20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				•
17responsible person, along with Mr. Wonderlick, for17Q the18updating the results of operations, calculations, and18ACorrect.19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the19QAll right.20proposed rates adjustment?20AYes. This the result of that was part of21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.		•		
18updating the results of operations, calculations, and other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?18A Correct.20proposed rates adjustment?20A Yes. This the result of that was part of21A Yes.20A Yes. This the result of that was part of22Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23Q Can you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				
19other fiscal impacts of the current rate level and the proposed rates adjustment?19Q All right.20A Yes. This the result of that was part of21A Yes.22Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for this proceeding?24this proceeding?				
20proposed rates adjustment?20A Yes. This the result of that was part of21A Yes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23Q Can you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.				
21AYes.21our official testimony in March; resulted in a request22QOkay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.		-		
22Q Okay. In that regard, can you please look at22for a \$1.6 million revenue increase, or 12.88 percent.23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23Q Can you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24				
23the exhibit that's been identified as Exhibit JW-30 for23QCan you point out in the record where that24this proceeding?24exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.			1	
24 this proceeding? 24 exhibit is, please, on Exhibit 30.			1	
25 A Toelleve we provided a PDF. But it is below				-
	20	bo you have that in none of you on a screen,	25	A i believe we provided a FDF. But it is below

8 (Pages 38 to 41)

	Page 42		Page 44
1	the total period revenue. It's labeled Proposed Increase	1	by the commission; is that correct?
2	per Company's March 18 but I believe that should have	2	A Yes, that's my understanding.
3	been March 19 Testimony.	3	Q Okay.
4	Q Thank you.	4	A And so yeah, when we factor all of that in and
5	A Yeah. So then below that we have labeled less	5	we take the proposed increase per company's I'll call
6	items contested in staff testimony. So these are the	6	it the proposed increase per company's March 18 testimony
7	items that staff explicitly contests in their testimony,	7	of 1.6 million, we subtract out all the contested
8	and they are the contested op ex, operating expenses,	8	expenses, plus the estimated Laredo Gallagher margin on
9	amount totals.	9	contested matters.
10	So these numbers are transposed from or	10	We come up with an increase as calculated by
11	transferred, not transposed; hopefully, they're not	11	the company of staff's contested matters of a million 38
12	transposed transferred from staff's testimony. And	12	in an increase in revenue.
13	where there is disagreement, I'll say between staff's	13	And the company asked for 989,000.
14	testimony and what is in the company's position in their	14	So again, trying to highlight the fact that we
15	March 19 filing, we went with the company's position.	15	asked for 990. Staff's result is resulting in more.
16	And that is attempted to be explained, or that	16	There's at least a \$50,000 difference. And so we don't
17	variance is attempted to be explained, I think, in page 2	17	believe, again, that the ratepayers are at risk of
18	of the PDF.	18	overpaying and thus being entitled to their fair refund.
19	So we have the amount total for the company,	19	Q Why did the company not just propose the
20	and then we have presented an allocator, which just means	20	staff's recommended revenue requirement in its petition
21	that depending on the type of expense, how that gets	21	for interim rate relief?
22	assigned to regulated and nonregulated activity, we come	22	A I would say twofold. Again, we recognize that
23	up with a contested regulated amount, or the amount that	23	we bear I would say bear the burden, bear some of the
24	regulated ratepayers are responsible for. And so we add	24	burden of those whole process. And we did not want
25	all that up and we're over 500,000, around 500,000.	25	like, we didn't want to run the risk of overcharging
	Page 43		Page 45
1	And from there, we move on to the estimated LG	1	customers. We don't think that's fair to them.
2	margin on contested matters. And basically that is not	2	So we tried to provide a safety net to factor
3	only do we get the not only do we get revenue to cover	3	in any potential unforeseen circumstances as well as
4	the expenses, but to earn a fair and reasonable margin on	4	again, not overcharging customers.
5	top of that. And so that's what that 53,000 represents.	5	Q And what is page 2 of Exhibit JW-30 showing
6	Q Mr. Vandenburg, if I could interrupt for the	6	further, please?
7	judge's benefit particularly, could you explain what the	7	A Yeah, this primarily is a reconciliation with
8	LG methodology is and why that line item is pertinent to	8	staff members' contested issues and what the company
9	the overall revenue requirement calculation?	9	proposed in their official testimony in March of 2014.
10	A Yeah. That line item is pertinent because it's	10	We believe staff was using numbers in their
11	yeah, it's profit we get with our revenue. We would	11	testimony that were from the company's original filing
12	not only lose out on revenue to cover the expense dollar	12	back in September of '23, which again has been superseded
13	for dollar, but the operating ratio to the profit on top	13	by the March 2024 filing.
14	of that.	14	And so really, it's to hopefully relieve any
15	And so when we're looking at the LG amongst	15	confusion and provide clarity as to why the numbers used
16	other factors, we're looking at our revenue, our expenses	16	in this exhibit may differ from what is in staff's
17	for regulated areas, our average foot value, those	17	testimony.
18	things. And that gets factored into revenue requirement.	18	Q Did the company also provide with its petition
19	And the comparison between the company's test	19	an exhibit demonstrating the price-out or revenue spread
20	period revenue and what it should be earning to cover all	20	of the proposed interim rates?
21 22	of its expenses is really that proposed increase. And	21	A I believe we provided the tariff that, yeah,
22	Q What is the LG, just simply for the record, please? Can you just divine that?	22	are associated with our ask for interim rates.
23 24	A Laredo Gallagher (phonetic) model.	23	Q And to the best of your knowledge, is that
25	Q And that's a methodology by which rates are set	24	Exhibit B-2 the petition for interim rates?
25	s and that our moundariously by which hates are set	25	A To the best of my knowledge, yes.
		1	

9 (Pages 42 to 45)

	Page 46		Page 48
1	ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you. I have no	1	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect.
2	further questions at this point, your Honor.	2	And I think, you know, one of the areas
3	I tender the witness and offer Exhibit	3	that, you know, I just want to clarify, you know, before
4	JW-30. Oh, you've already admitted that. Sorry.	4	we move on, is try to get a better understanding for you
5	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. I was on mute.	5	to elaborate, you know and I think you cross
6	My apologies.	6	referenced it that you're focused more on the undue
7	ATTORNEY WILEY: No problem.	7	hardship prong; but what Murrey's believes is the
8	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I said yes, I believe we	8	extraordinary circumstances or the emergent reasons that
9	stipulated to that, and it's reflected as admitted in the	9	would warrant this interim rate relief, because I think
10	record. Thank you.	10	you've talked more about those other prongs, but not
11	And do we have any cross from commission	11	specifically what those emergent conditions would be.
12	staff?	12	ATTORNEY LUHRS: Well, your Honor, as
13	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have no cross for	13	indicated, harm to owners certainly exists in the form of
14	Mr. Vandenburg.	14	the \$100,000 that's lost on a monthly basis to
15	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And any	15	shareholders, which we deem to satisfy that standard,
16	redirect?	16	your Honor.
17	ATTORNEY WILEY: No, your Honor.	17	I think that that reality is also
18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I do have just	18	inequitable. So it's just the financial losses, your
19	one kind of housekeeping matter. When I was reviewing	19	Honor, satisfy those standards.
20	through the documents, I noted that Exhibit JW-7C, that's	20	ATTORNEY WILEY: Right.
21	cross referenced in the exhibit, was submitted to us in a	21	ATTORNEY LUHRS: And again, to reference
22	PDF format. And I want to know if you could identify	22	the fact that it's not the mere reality that 13 years has
23	anywhere in the record if that was ever submitted in an	23	passed, which shall alone be dispositive, but it's just
24	actual Excel version native format.	24	the realities of what that passage of time means:
25	ATTORNEY WILEY: I think Mr. Vandenburg	25	Inflationary pressures, increases in costs, fuel costs,
	Deres 47		Domo 40
_	Page 47		Page 49
1	could probably acknowledge that or address it. I believe	1	labor costs, et cetera.
2	it was. We did have a problem with some of the internal		
		2	The reality is that there is a very
3	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far	3	different economic environment which prevails today than
4	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format.	3 4	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial
4 5	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that?	3 4 5	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor.
4 5 6	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge,	3 4 5 6	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the
4 5 6 7	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some	3 4 5 6 7	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several
4 5 7 8	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy	3 4 5 6 7 8	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to
4 5 7 8 9	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of
4 5 7 8 9 10	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows:
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know we can supply it.</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from the finding that interim relief is appropriate here to
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know we can supply it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, and just to</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from the finding that interim relief is appropriate here to date.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know we can supply it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, and just to clarify, we have the PDF format. But I think we want to</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from the finding that interim relief is appropriate here to date. So I cannot imagine more protection for
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know we can supply it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, and just to clarify, we have the PDF format. But I think we want to insure that we have that Excel format on record as well.</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from the finding that interim relief is appropriate here to date. So I cannot imagine more protection for ratepayers than a right to refund, in fact, a requirement
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>work paper page numberings that we corrected. But as far as I'm aware, it was submitted in native format. Mr. Vandenburg, am I incorrect on that? THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it was. And if it is missing somewhere or for some reason it was not provided in Excel, I'm more than happy to provide that, because I know I would want that. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. So at this juncture in going through the records, if we could have that resubmitted in that native Excel format, I would just request that Murrey's counsel do that. And if we could do that, you know, and provide a copy to all parties, say, within five business days of today's date, or I guess that would make it around July 25. Would that work? ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, it would, your Honor. And we should have it. And I don't know if it's just missing from the docket or wasn't filed. But I know we can supply it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, and just to clarify, we have the PDF format. But I think we want to</pre>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	different economic environment which prevails today than was the case 13 years ago, as indicated in the financial submissions that are part of the record, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And I guess the only other point and I heard it reiterated several times in the argument that it would be set up to actually refund the customer base; but just to kind of get further elaboration on how you feel that's also consistent with public interest? ATTORNEY LUHRS: Certainly, your Honor. So it's codified in the rule. So 480-07-520 (6), which contemplates interim rates, reads in part as follows: Interim rates subject to refund granted pursuant to this section shall be limited to those companies that demonstrate; and then it goes on to spell out the standard. And so it is a mandate that a refund be made to ratepayers if the general rate case diverges from the finding that interim relief is appropriate here to date. So I cannot imagine more protection for

10 (Pages 46 to 49)

	Page 50	Page 52
1	provision of the administrative code.	1 A My name is Benjamin Sharbono. My last name is
2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: But I guess to clarify	2 spelt S-H-A-R-B-O-N-O.
3	in one other piece, have there been in light of just	3 Q Who employs you?
4	the financial circumstances, is there concerns of any	4 A I am employed by the Washington Utilities and
5	service interruptions to your customer base?	5 Transportation Commission.
6	ATTORNEY WILEY: If I can answer that	6 Q And what position do you hold at the
7	because I've represented them for decades, your Honor.	7 commission?
8	The answer is to our knowledge there	8 A I am a Regulatory Analyst 3.
9	isn't, but the prolonged inability to recoup any profit	9 Q How long have you held that position with the
10	margin does portend of problems down the road.	10 commission?
11	And one other point I wanted to make in	11 A I have been a Regulatory Analyst 3 for
12	answer to your earlier question, which is solid waste	12 (inaudible).
13	industry is the only one that I find in the general rate	13 ATTORNEY WILEY: I'm having trouble
14	case rules for the commission for energy, for water, for	14 hearing him. I don't know what the problem is, your
15	pilotage that even provides for interim rates in the	15 Honor, but maybe it's just my ancient ears. But I
16	general rate case for paper rule. That's significant.	16 haven't had that problem with any other witness.
17	In addition, I agree with Mr. Roberson the	17 ATTORNEY ROBERSON: He is a little faint.
18	codification of concept is very important. I think the	18 Mr. Sharbono, can you just speak up a
19	fact that this recognizes an industry that is subject to	19 little bit?
20	interim rate relief is very significant, and makes it	20 THE WITNESS: I can try, but it's probably
21	very different than the utility, phone, and energy cases	21 not going to help much with the mic (inaudible).
22	that staff is relying upon.	22 ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Well, I guess we'll do
23	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you so much for	23 what we can.
24	answering each of those questions.	24 Q (By Attorney Roberson) Have you received any
25	Let's see. So Mr. Roberson, if you're ready	training or education to enable you to carry out your
	Page 51	Page 53
1	to proceed to your witness, Mr. Sharbono, I can go ahead	1 duties as a Regulatory Analyst 3?
2	and swear him in.	2 A Yes, I have.
3	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Absolutely.	3 Q And could you please describe those?
4	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. If you would,	4 A I hold a bachelors of arts in accounting as
5	please, Mr. Sharbono.	
б	F ,	5 well as a masters in business administration.
7	THE WITNESS: Sharbono.	 well as a masters in business administration. I have also attended the (inaudible) school as
'		
8	THE WITNESS: Sharbono.	6 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as
	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies.	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last
8	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time.	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called
8 9	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission.
8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in.	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am.
8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal?
8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth,	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company
8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it.	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste company.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours.	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours. BENJAMIN SHARBONO, witness herein, having been duly	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on several filings from this company and the other companies
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours. BENJAMIN SHARBONO, witness herein, having been duly sworn on oath, testified as	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on several filings from this company and the other companies that they have (inaudible).
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours. BENJAMIN SHARBONO, witness herein, having been duly sworn on oath, testified as	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on several filings from this company and the other companies that they have (inaudible). Q Are you familiar with the general rate case
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours. BENJAMIN SHARBONO, witness herein, having been duly sworn on oath, testified as follows:	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on several filings from this company and the other companies that they have (inaudible). Q Are you familiar with the general rate case filed by Murrey's in Docket TG-230778?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Sharbono. JUDGE BONFRISCO: My apologies. THE WITNESS: Got it right the first time. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, if you would please raise your right hand and I'll swear you in. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESS: I affirm it. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. The witness is yours. BENJAMIN SHARBONO, witness herein, having been duly sworn on oath, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION	 I have also attended the (inaudible) school as well as received on-the-job training for the last approximately eight years as I have worked for the commission. Q Are you familiar with the companies called Murrey's Disposal? A I am. Q How are you familiar with Murrey's? A Murrey's Disposal is a regulated company regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission as a solid waste section of the regulatory services division of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. And I have worked on several filings from this company and the other companies that they have (inaudible). Q Are you familiar with the general rate case

11 (Pages 50 to 53)

	Page 54	Page 56
1	A I am assigned as the lead staff in Docket	1 Murrey's itself, does Murrey's – I believe you may have
2	TG-230778.	2 answered this. Does Murrey's have any names that it
3	Q Are you familiar with the petition for interim	3 carries business on under in Washington?
4	rate relief that Murrey's filed in that same docket?	4 A Murrey's Disposal operates under the trade name
5	A Yes.	5 of Olympic Disposal.
6	Q How are you familiar with the petition?	6 Q Is Olympic a separate corporate entity?
7	A As the lead staff of the docket in question, I	7 A No.
8	(inaudible) and review all documents (inaudible) into the	8 Q Does Olympic have a separate certificate on
9	docket to reveal and see what is contained within it and	⁹ file with the commission authorizing it to engage in
10	(inaudible) petition for (inaudible).	10 business as a solid waste collection company?
11	ATTORNEY WILEY: He's fading out, your	11 A No.
12	Honor, at the end of every sentence.	12 Q So then does Murrey's have a single certificate
13	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Mr. Sharbono, is there a	13 that covers all of its operations including the Olympic
14	way to maybe adjust the speaker just to get it a little	14 operations?
15	closer, if you could just speak maybe a little louder?	15 A Yes.
16	THE WITNESS: Is this any better?	16 Q Okay. I'd like to talk about Murrey's
17	JUDGE BONFRISCO: It's still a little	17 petition. What hardships does Murrey's identify in its
18	quiet. Sorry.	18 petition as justifications for interim rate relief?
19	THE WITNESS: (Inaudible).	19 A The petition identifies the erosion of rates
20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: It's a little muffled.	20 over the period of time since its last rate filing, the
21	My apologies.	21 loss of the nonregulated city contract, and the mill
22	ATTORNEY WILEY: Mr. Roberson, I'm fine	22 hauls cases that were before the commission.
23	with you translating. I know that you'll do it	23 Q Did staff engage in discovery to investigate
24	accurately so that I don't have to hold up the process.	24 the events and factors that Murrey's claims led to it
25	But he's fading out at the end of every sentence.	25 filing this petition for interim rate relief?
	Page 55	Page 57
1	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I'm having a little	1 A Yes.
2	trouble with it too, so.	2 Q And how did staff do that?
3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: There's always an issue	3 A Staff requested data requests from the company
4	with technology, right?	4 on questions that would identify and verify various
5	ATTORNEY WILEY: Thank you post-COVID,	5 factors within their request.
6	huh?	6 Q Would you please turn to the exhibit marked
7	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Are we post-COVID? I	7 BS-13?
8	have a hearing tomorrow, and half the people have COVID.	8 A Yes.
9	ATTORNEY WILEY: I know. Including the	9 Q Would you please identify that exhibit?
10	president.	10 A This exhibit is the company's responses to
11	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Yeah.	11 commission staff's data requests 21 through 31.
12	ATTORNEY WILEY: Judge, how long have you	12 Q And generally, what are the topics of those
13	been at the commission? Recently I assume, right?	13 data requests, very generally?
14	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I am new. I started on	14 A The general topics of these data requests are
15		15 information or questions related to the company's
16 17	ATTORNEY WILEY: Congrats.	16 financial health, if there's an emergency, hardship, or
17 18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you. Okay. Benjamin, welcome back.	17 inequity. 18 Q And is that a true and correct copy of Murrey's
18	THE WITNESS: Can you hear me now?	18QAnd is that a true and correct copy of Murrey's19responses to staff's data requests?
20	ATTORNEY WILEY: That's better.	20 A Yes.
20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: That's much better.	20 A res. 21 Q I'd like to turn now to the specific claims of
22	Thank you.	hardship. The first thing I'd like to talk about is the
23	ATTORNEY WILEY: I'll to have to tell them	 loss of the city contract. Would you please explain what
25	that I actually need a real microphone.	24 the city contract was?
24		
24 25		A The city contract was for a contract to provide
	Q (By Attorney Roberson) Turning back to	25 A The city contract was for a contract to provide

12 (Pages 54 to 57)

	Page 58		Page 60
1	nonregulated solid waste services to the City of Port	1	A In 2021.
2	Angeles, Washington, for the collection of solid waste	2	Q The order dissolving the dispute, did either
3	materials and their disposal.	3	the commission or the Superior Court stay it?
4	Q And when did the city terminate the contract?	4	A No.
5	A February of 2022.	5	Q When did Murrey's begin providing the service
6	Q When Murrey's filed its general rate case, did	6	that Waste Management had provided the mills?
7	it identify the loss of the contract as a substantial	7	A In July 2021.
8	factor in its request for rate relief?	8	Q Would the authorization of interim rates here
9	A No.	9	fund ongoing litigation?
10	ATTORNEY WILEY: Objection to the form of	10	A No.
11	that question. Your Honor, I don't know how it can do	11	Q To your knowledge, does Murrey's have any
12	that specifically. When he said did they identify, is he	12	ongoing debt payments or other expenses stemming from the
13		13	concluded mill hauls litigation?
14	referring to a form, or what is he referring to?	14	A Not to my knowledge.
	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I can rephrase.	15	
15 16	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, if you would	16	Q Did Murrey's see an increase in ratepayers after the conclusion of the mill hauls litigation?
16 17	rephrase, thank you. Q (By Attorney Roberson) Did Murrey's offer	17	A Yes.
17 18	testimony about the loss of the city contract when it	18	Q How many?
18 19		19	A Two.
19 20	filed its general rate case? A No.	20	
		20	Q And what types of customers?A They recovered two customers that were for
21	Q Did Murrey's receive any compensation for the	21	
22	loss of the city contract?	23	paper mills and the hauling of waste from those paper mills.
23 24	A Yes. And how much componention did it receive?	24	Q Did Murrey's see an increase in revenue after
24 25	Q And how much compensation did it receive?	25	the conclusion of the case?
20	A Approximately \$2 million.		
	Page 59		
	i dge by		Page 61
1	Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation	1	Page 61 A Yes.
1 2	-	1 2	
	Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation		A Yes.
2	Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers?	2	A Yes.Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind
2 3	Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers?A Not that I'm aware of.	2 3	A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions.
2 3 4	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to 	2 3 4	A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate
2 3 4 5	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? 	2 3 4 5	A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case?
2 3 4 5 6	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or 	2 3 4 5 6	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the 	2 3 4 5 6 7	A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Iitigation that you referenced. Can you please explain 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls litigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls litigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls litigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Ilitigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls litigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Ilitigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Itigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Iltigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the customers to Murrey's Disposal. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Itigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the customers to Murrey's Disposal. Q When did Murrey's file the complaint asking the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission? A No. Q And why not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Itigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the customers to Murrey's file the complaint asking the commission to order Waste Management to cease and desist? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission? A No. Q And why not? A The company requested a six-month extension
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls Itigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the customers to Murrey's file the complaint asking the commission to order Waste Management to cease and desist? A In 2020. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission? A No. Q And why not? A The company requested a six-month extension onto the effective or the due dates of the initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Did Murrey's allocate any of that compensation to ratepayers? A Not that I'm aware of. Q And what was the basis for the decision not to allocate any of that to ratepayers? A That was a non-regulated entity, or non-regulated contract. So as far as I'm aware, the company would have no reason to need to allocate any of that to ratepayers. Q I'd like to turn next to the mill hauls litigation that you referenced. Can you please explain kind of the disputed issue in the mill hauls litigation? A The dispute issue in the mill hauls litigation was that another company, Waste Management of Washington, was providing service to customers that were within the territory of Murrey's Disposal, and that the company had requested the commission to step in and force the company to cease and desist and allowed them to return the customers to Murrey's file the complaint asking the commission to order Waste Management to cease and desist? A In 2020. Q And when did the commission enter the order 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A Yes. Q The last thing I'd like to talk about is kind of material changes to Murrey's economic conditions. When did Murrey's Olympic file its last general rate case? A Murrey's DBA Olympic filed their last general rate case in 2011. Q Are you aware of any settlement in which Murrey's Olympic agreed to stay out and not file a rate case after it filed that last rate case? A No. Q So Murrey's could have filed a rate case at any time, correct? A Yes. Q Did the commission order Murrey's to file the data necessary for a rate case before Murrey's filed the rate case docketed at 230778? A Yes. Q And did Murrey's file that information as initially required by the commission? A No. Q And why not? A The company requested a six-month extension

13 (Pages 58 to 61)

,	Page 62	Pag	re 64
1	put together the rate case, as well as to get additional	1 Q And does staff have access to that system	and
2	data.	2 to those reports?	
3	Q What amount of time elapsed between when the	3 A Yes.	
4	commission issued the order requiring Murrey's to make	4 Q Has Murrey's filed those reports over the la	ist
5	that compliance filing and the date when it submitted the	5 decade or so?	
6	general rate case which is the one here docketed at	6 A Yes.	
7	230778?	7 Q Have you looked at those reports for Murre	y's?
8	A Approximately two years.	8 A Yes.	
9	Q Do you know the typical length of time for a	9 Q How many years worth of reports did you lo	ocate?
10	solid waste company in terms of what it needs to prepare	10 A I have six years of reports that I was able to	
11	a general rate case?	11 locate.	
12	ATTORNEY WILEY: Objection. Foundation.	12 Q Would you please turn to the exhibit marke	d
13	Q (By Attorney Roberson) Mr. Sharbono, have you	13 BS-12?	
14	reviewed solid waste company rate cases?	14 A Yes.	
15	A Yes.	15 Q Would you please identify that exhibit?	
16	Q Have you reviewed more than a few?	16 A These are the six years that staff was able to	
17	A Yes.	17 find of the annual reports, actual forms that and	
18	Q How many?	18 these are the regulatory fee calculation schedules fro	m
19	A Ballpark figure would be somewhere around	19 those reports.	
20	40-ish.	20 Q So that's not the complete report; it's just a	
21	Q Are you familiar with what it takes to file a	single page from each of the reports over the last	SIX
22	general rate case?	22 years?	
23 24	A Yes.	 A Yes. This is the non-confidential page report that the companies fill out for the regulatory fee 	
24	Q How long does it normally take a solid waste collection company to file a rate case?	that the companies fill out for the regulatory feecalculation.	
	·····		
	Page 63	Pag	re 65
1	ATTORNEY WILEY: Objection to the form of	1 Q Is that a true and correct copy of the	
2	the question.	2 regulatory fee calculation page of Murrey's annu	al
3	Are you asking how long an average	3 reports for the last six years?	
4	interval between rate case filings is, or are you asking	4 A Yes.	
5	what a private company requires in terms of time to	5 Q What do the annual reports show concern	-
6	prepare and submit a rate case?	6 Murrey's gross intrastate revenues for the last si	ix
7	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I can rephrase.	7 years?	
8	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead and	8 A It shows that the company has seen continu	
9	rephrase.	9 increases in the gross intrastate operating revenue	ever :
10	Q (By Attorney Roberson) How long does it	10 the last six years.	
11	normally take a solid waste collection company to prepare	11 Q And ballpark, over the last six years, about	It
12	and file a rate case?	12 how much has the company's revenue grown?	
13 14	A From the companies I've spoken to, it takes approximately six months.	 A About 20 million. ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, can I just 	et
14	Q I'd like to turn now to Murrey's and Olympic's	15 say that the exhibits speak for themselves. We call	
16	financial state, if that's okay. The solid waste	16 make those extrapolations. And it's clear there has	
17	collection companies file annual reports with the	17 increases consecutively.	3 Deen
18	commission?	18 I don't know how much longer we're going	
19	A Yes.	19 to analyze these, but they do speak for themselves	
20	Q Do those annual reports show a company's gross	20 JUDGE BONFRISCO: I do want to clarify	
21	intrastate revenues?	the record, you know, on the first objection that you	
22	A Yes.	22 raised, I went ahead and allowed staff to proceed of	
23	Q Where are those reports stored?	23 that.	
24	A Those reports are stored in the commission's	24 You know, the second, you know, allowed	
25	annual report tracking system.	25 him to reframe.	

14 (Pages 62 to 65)

	Docket No. 10-2307		5. 11 1716/2021
	Page 66		Page 68
1	Now on your most recent objection, could	1	submitted model.
2	you just clarify that for the record?	2	Q And I'm hoping you have it in front of you.
3	ATTORNEY WILEY: My objection is that the	3	It's an Excel spreadsheet. Would you please turn to the
4	exhibits speak for themselves. And we don't need to	4	exhibit marked B S-11?
5	extrapolate, you know, conclusions from some things that	5	A Yes.
6	are clear on their face.	6	Q Would you please identify that exhibit?
7	JUDGE BONFRISCO: I'm going to overrule	7	A This is the staff's working the staff's
8	that objection.	8	working book for the company's rate case based on the
9	You can go ahead and proceed,	9	company's model that they have submitted.
10	Mr. Roberson.	10	Q Is that a true and correct copy of the exhibit?
11	Q (By Attorney Roberson) Roughly what is the	11	A Yes.
12	increase over the last six years?	12	Q At the end of your review, did you determine
13	A Rough increase over the last six years is	13	whether Olympic was generating that revenue?
14	approximately 20 million dollars.	14	A Yes.
15	Q And that was my last question on the subject,	15	Q Was it?
16	so let's move on.	16	A Yes.
17	Did you review Murrey's rate filing, the one	17	Q As part of your discovery which we talked about
18	docketed in 230778?	18	above, did staff look for evidence that Murrey's faced
19	A Yes.	19	emergency or undue hardship?
20	Q What does the Regulatory Analyst 3 do when	20	A Yes.
21	reviewing a rate filing?	21	Q And did Murrey's produce any minutes in which
22	A A regulatory analyst reviews the rate filing by	22	the company took steps to deal with an emergency or
23	taking the company's submitted information and reviewing	23	hardship?
24	the income statements, balance sheets, depreciation, and	24	A Yes.
25	asset lists and other documents that are required to be	25	Q It produced minutes?
	Page 67		Page 69
1	submitted in or by the WAC 408-07-420 (4) in particular.	1	A No, the company did not produce.
2	The staff then goes through those materials,	2	Staff requested that the company submit them if
3	identifies what accounts and materials the company would	3	they were available.
4	need to provide in order to validate and prove the	4	Q So then to be clear, did they produce any
5	materials, which may include things like the general	5	minutes?
6	ledger, where we go through each individual item and see	6	A No.
7	if the amounts there make sense and if there are any	7	Q Did Murrey's produce a plan for dealing with
8	questionable items.	8	any emergency?
9	Staff then requests from the company, through	9	A No.
10	informal data requests, additional information and/or	10	Q Was Murrey's able to produce any evidence the
11	records in order to verify and review those materials.	11	company was at risk of a credit downgrade?
12	Staff then makes revenue adjustments in order	12	A No.
13	revenue and expense adjustments to reflect the policies,	13	Q Did Murrey's produce any evidence that the
14	practices, and rules or statutory requirements in order	14	company was at risk of insolvency?
15	to make a recommendation of revenue requirements and	15	A No.
16	rates to the commission for fair and just reasonable and	16	Q Did it produce any evidence that the company
17	sufficient rates for the company.	17	was at risk of bankruptcy?
18	Q Did you perform those steps when you reviewed	18	A No.
19	Murrey's rate filing docketed in 230778?	19	Q Did Murrey's offer anything to show that it
20	A Yes.	20	would be unable to continue to provide regulated
21	Q And did you use any tools when you performed	21	services?
22	that review?	22	A No.
23	A Yes.	23	Q Did it identify any expenses that it was
24 25	Q And what are those tools?	24	refraining from incurring or planning on refraining from incurring?
25	A The tools used by staff are the company's	25	incurring?
		1	

15 (Pages 66 to 69)

	Page 70		Page 72
1	A No.	1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	Q Did it identify any investments that it was not	2	BY ATTORNEY WILEY:
3	making or planning on not making?	3	Q Mr. Sharbono, good afternoon. How long did you
4	A No.	4	say you've been with the commission?
5	Q Did it identify any large investments that it	5	A Approximately eight years.
6	needed to make before the commission issues its final	6	Q And in that time, have you been in the your
7	order in this matter?	7	current section, the water and transportation section the
8	A No.	8	whole time?
9	Q Did Murrey's show you any other evidence that	9	A Yes.
10	would indicate a financial emergency, undue hardship, or	10	Q And how long have you been a rate analyst in
11	inequity?	11	that section for, please?
12	A No.	12	A Approximately 6.5 years.
13	Q The last topic I would like to cover with you	13	Q Okay. And before that, were you in charge of
14	is the requested remedy. When is the commission's final	14	annual report formatting for the commission?
15	order due in this matter?	15	A That is also including that.
16	A The commission's final order is due November 1.	16	Q So you by also including that, are you
17	Q So how far from today, roughly speaking?	17	saying you did both jobs in that 6.5 year period?
18	A Approximately 3.5 months.	18	A Yes.
19	Q Does that fact concern staff?	19	Q When did you stop doing the annual report
20	A Yes.	20	review and compilation?
21	Q And why so?	21	A I stopped doing that in approximately 2019.
22	A Staff believes that having multiple rate	22	Q And is that when you started to do water
23	increases over a shortened period of time will result in	23	company and solid waste company audits exclusively?
24	rate instability. In other words, customers will	24	A That would be when I did them exclusively, yes.
25	essentially see multiple rate increases in rapid	25	Q And that was during the period, then,
			- ···· ····· ····· ······ ············
	Page 71		Page 73
1	succession, which customers generally do not like.	1	afterwards was the COVID period and the remote working
2	Q Okay. Does staff consider the grant of interim	2	period that encompassed that; is that correct?
3	rate subject to refund a neutral remedy?	3	A Yes.
4	A No.	4	Q Okay. How many contested solid waste cases
5	Q And why not?	5	have you been involved in?
6	A Due to the fact that it's in a neutral remedy,	6	And by that, I mean that are adjudicated
7	the customer that is charged the rate, if there is an	7	formally by the administrative law division.
8	issue with that rate, would be the one that receives the	8	A This is the first.
9	benefits of receiving payment back.	9	Q So you've never testified before in a WUTC
10	However, under the conditions that this is,	10	proceeding; is that correct?
11	we're looking at a 3.5 month period, and it is possible	11	A Not in a formal proceeding, no.
12	that customers who have paid a rate may end up leaving	12	Q When you talked about looking at the annual
13	the area or otherwise not being the ones to receive the	13	reports for Murrey's Disposal, did you happen because
14	benefits if there was a rate if there was a return on	14	of the contrast to the Spokane case, did you happen to
15	those rates from overcollection.	15	look at the Waste Management annual reports?
16	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have no further	16	A No.
1 0		1 4 -	

Q Have you ever seen the G237, which is Waste Management's G Certificate annual reports? A Yes.

Q And isn't it true that their revenues greatly exceed that of Olympic Disposal as reported under G237? A Yes.

- 22 23 Q What percentage of overall revenues is Olympic 24 Disposal within the Murrey's Disposal operation, based on
- 25 your knowledge of this rate case and the separation

16 (Pages 70 to 73)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

questions.

Mr. Roberson.

JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you,

ATTORNEY WILEY: Yes, I do, your Honor.

Do you have any cross?

But he covered a lot of ground.

We're going to hop around a little bit. I apologize.

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

17

18

19

20

21

	Page 74		Page 76
1	that's required by the commission staff of different	1	have actually signed the protective order and
2	tariff divisions?	2	confidentiality agreement to a breakout room, if that's
3	A Repeat the question, please.	3	how we typically do this for this confidential session.
4	Q Yes. I'm asking you the first part of the	4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to
5	question is what percentage of Murrey's overall reported	5	interject for a moment.
6	annual revenues, which you've indicated could be as much	6	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Sure.
7	as 65 million recently, what percentage does Olympic	7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Typically when we
8	Disposal represent of that 65 million?	8	go into these breakout sessions, we usually have a court
9	A Needing to refer to Exhibit BS-11C, and using	9	reporter present. And it's not something that's being
10	the operating expenses or operating revenues that were	10	recorded and then sent to them later to transcribe. I'm
11	reported in staff's exhibit	11	not sure how that works in this instance.
12	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Judge Bonfrisco, just	12	JUDGE BONFRISCO: So maybe if we I want
13	so that we're clear, Mr. Sharbono, is this confidential	13	to make sure we make it a closed session so that it's not
14	information?	14	on the record, just for the confidential purpose of any
15	THE WITNESS: Yes. That would be,	15	of the specific financials that are cross referenced that
16	actually, confidential information. It's on a	16	might be proprietary.
17	confidential report.	17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can go ahead and
18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you for flagging	18	pause the recording.
19	that, Mr. Roberson.	19	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay.
20	At this point, we would need to go off the	20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And open up a
21	record if we were going to review the specifics on any	21	breakout room. I think what might be easiest is to just
22	proprietary and confidential information with respect to	22	go ahead and create a breakout room that anyone can join
23	that.	23	and then letting people join, because I don't have that
24	And looking at who we have here,	24	list of the staff who have signed confidentiality
25	Mr. Roberson, I believe the majority of our participants	25	agreements or not just staff, but parties. And I want
	Page 75		Page 77
1	have signed a protective order. But I think at this	1	to just make sure that no one incidentally gets put in
2	point, it's best that we go into a closed session so that	2	there that shouldn't. Would that work?
3	we can address this.	3	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes, because I'm looking
4	ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Yes. I can say with	4	really quick just at the records. And I think at this
5	some confidence that Mr. Lone (phonetic) has not signed	5	juncture, if we maybe if we just do the breakout room
6	the confidentiality agreement. I'm not sure about	6	for, you know, legal counsel and myself legal counsel
7	Mr. Savall (phonetic), Mr well, Mr. Callahan hasn't.	7	for both sides, myself, and then leave the other parties
8	So a closed session is probably the way to go.	8	here until we rejoin, is that the easiest way to do it
9	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay.	9	Ryan?
10	ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, would you	10	ATTORNEY SYKES: Your Honor, public
11	like to do that at the end of my I don't have that	11	counsel would request to be part of the closed session.
12	many more questions. I'm just wondering what would be	12 13	We've signed confidentiality agreements.
13 14	most expedient. And I'm not seeing who's all on the call,	14	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Then we would want to include public counsel on that.
	u		
	so Lapprociate Mr. Poberson identifying that		
15 16	so I appreciate Mr. Roberson identifying that.	15	And is this Tad speaking? Sorry.
16	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead,	16	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is
16 17	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono.	16 17	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes.
16 17 18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the	16 17 18	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank
16 17 18 19	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality.	16 17 18 19	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert.
16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality. ATTORNEY WILEY: He has signed, yes.	16 17 18 19 20	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert. Yes. So Ryan, if you could set the you
16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality. ATTORNEY WILEY: He has signed, yes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And what about	16 17 18 19 20 21	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert. Yes. So Ryan, if you could set the you know, the breakout room for it would be Mr. Roberson,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality. ATTORNEY WILEY: He has signed, yes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And what about Mr. Steven Peters (phonetic)?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert. Yes. So Ryan, if you could set the you know, the breakout room for it would be Mr. Roberson, our witness Sharbono, our public counsel, our staff
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality. ATTORNEY WILEY: He has signed, yes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And what about Mr. Steven Peters (phonetic)? MR. PETERS: I have not signed anything.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert. Yes. So Ryan, if you could set the you know, the breakout room for it would be Mr. Roberson, our witness Sharbono, our public counsel, our staff counsel, Murrey's counsel, and, you know, you can that
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Sharbono. THE WITNESS: Mr. Savall has signed the confidentiality. ATTORNEY WILEY: He has signed, yes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. And what about Mr. Steven Peters (phonetic)?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ATTORNEY SYKES: No, your Honor, this is Robert Sykes. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Robert Sykes. Thank you, Robert. Yes. So Ryan, if you could set the you know, the breakout room for it would be Mr. Roberson, our witness Sharbono, our public counsel, our staff

17 (Pages 74 to 77)

	Page 78	Page 80
1	this.	1 cases, with solid waste rate cases, I assume you
2	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That works. Let me	2 understand that many companies have shared routes between
3	go ahead and pause the recording for now, and then we can	3 regulated and nonregulated territory, correct? Same
4	start moving people into that session.	4 equipment, regulated and nonregulated service?
5	(Pause in recorded proceedings)	5 A Yes.
6	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Are you do you	6 Q Okay. The you testified you looked at about
7	have further cross testimony?	7 you've had experience with approximately 40 rate
8	ATTORNEY WILEY: I have further cross,	8 cases. And is that the basis of your projection that it
9	your Honor.	9 takes about six months to prepare a rate case?
10	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Go ahead and	10 A Having spoken with several companies within
11	proceed.	11 those 40, yes.
12	(Overlapping speech)	12 Q And could you identify which companies those
13	Q (By Attorney Wiley) Mr. Sharbono, you	13 were that you spoke with to find out how long an average
14	testified that the company, when it prevailed ultimately	14 preparation period takes?
15	in the complaint case, picked up two additional	15 A Offhand I could not.
16	customers. Is it also true that the corollary is that	16 Q Okay. And do you know if that interval would
17	during that time the company was losing those customers,	17 be affected by the size of the company, the nature of the
18	it lost revenue?	18 operations, whether it was recycling, special services?
19	A My understanding as an accountant would be yes,	19 I assume you would acknowledge that the length
20	they'd lose revenue from those customers in the period of	20 of time to prepare an extensive rate case, particularly
21	time that the customers were being serviced by a	21 one that is more than a decade since the last one, would
22	different company.	22 take a considerable period of time?
23	Q Do you happen to know how long that period of	A Please repeat the question.
24	time was?	24 Q Yeah. I'm sorry. It was a little compound to
25	A I do not.	bin with. First of all, do you acknowledge that the
1 2	Q Are you aware did you ever look at the complaint or the data request that described the	 length of time to prepare a rate case would be affected by the size of the company, the nature of its operations
3	chronology at all?	3 and likely the geography?
4	A I read through the data request. I did not	4 A I would agree that is likely the case.
5	review the orders.	5 Q So it's would it be fair to say it's very
6 7	Q Okay. And would it surprise you to learn that	6 difficult to project with accuracy how long the typical 7 company would take to prepare a rate case?
8	it was between five to ten years in general? A It would not surprise me if that were the case.	 7 company would take to prepare a rate case? 8 It would be often longer than six months or
9	Q You testified that there was some delay in the	 possibly shorter than six months?
10	company being able to file the general rate case that the	10 A In my experience, and from those that I have
11	commission had asked it to file. Are you aware why there	11 talked to, it is usually six months, maybe seven months
12	was delay?	12 at most. And part of that is due to the test year must
13	A The initial delay was, in my understanding, so	13 remain fresh because if it becomes too old, the process
14	that the company could collect additional data and get	14 would have to restart due to a stale test year.
15	their materials put together.	15 Q And you can't identify any companies that you
16	Q Were you aware of any need to reroute its	16 spoke to to arrive at that, again, correct?
17	entire operational system because of the loss of that	17 A Not off the top of my head. I'd have to go
18	contiguous city contract?	18 back over several years and through mostly phone calls
19	A I would need to review the materials in order	19 and in-person discussions.
20	to verify.	20 Q You indicated that you didn't see any
21	Q Would you accept that rerouting had to occur	21 company-prepared minutes that addressed the state of
22	when the contiguous city contract was lost?	22 Olympic Disposal's operations. Are you aware whether
23	A Subject to verification, I could agree that	23 they produced minutes generally about operational issues,
24	that may be the case.	24 and was their response that indicated they don't
25	Q And based on your experience with solid waste	25 routinely do that?

18 (Pages 78 to 81)

	Page 82	Page 84
1	A That was the response that the company	1 Q Mr. Sharbono, I've got to interrupt excuse
2	provided.	2 me. I've got interrupt you because we're making a record
3	Q And have you asked in your data requests	3 here.
4	anything specifically about hardship and inequity in	4 A Mm-hm.
5	comparison to the, for instance, Spokane case facts?	5 Q My question was, did not the two extension
6	Did you ever formulate a question asking for	 periods that staff initially requested before suspension
7	contrast about hardship and inequity experienced by	 extend the overall ultimate relief date that the company
8	Olympic similar to that by – that's reported in the	8 would benefit from in getting adjusted rates?
9	Spokane case?	9 A My statement stands, that the
10	A No.	10 Q Is that yes?
11	Q Your Honor, I'm just checking my notes.	11 A staff did not request; the company proposed
12	Oh, Mr. Sharbono, when the company filed in	12 the extensions.
13	September of 2015, did the staff ask for any extensions	12 Inelextensions. 13 Q So now you're testifying that staff didn't
14	of the completion of it for the completion of its audit?	
15	A Can you repeat the question?	15 requested extensions?
16	Q Yes. When the company filed this TG-230778,	16 A It was the company that stated that they wanted
17	September of 2015, did the staff request any extensions	17 to suspend, and that then they switched to extensions
18	of its audit period?	18 rather than suspending immediately.
19	A This case was filed in September of 2023.	19 Q My question, though, Mr. Sharbono, is did the
20	Q Yes.	20 staff want and request the extensions of the 60 days, 30
21	A Not 2015.	21 and 30?
22	Q (Inaudible).	22 ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Objection. This seems
23	A And yes, staff did request that the company	23 asked and answered.
24	extend on two occasions before entering into suspension.	24 ATTORNEY WILEY: Well, he's gone back
25	Q Okay. And in that period, which would be 60	25 JUDGE BONFRISCO: Sustained. Objection
	Page 83	Page 85
1	days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days?	
1 2		
	days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days?	1 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the
2	days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days,	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this.
2 3	days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes.	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the
2 3 4	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted
2 3 4 5	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question.
2 3 4 5 6	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you,
2 3 4 5 6 7	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I 	1sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the2record. I believe the witness has addressed this.3ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the4record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted5himself, which is why I asked the followup question.6So that's all I have.7JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you,8Mr. Wiley.9Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for10Mr. Sharbono?11ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple12of questions, your Honor.13JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect.141515REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for the issues that will be addressed in the rest of the 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for the issues that will be addressed in the rest of the hearing process, that the they wanted to go to a 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases? A Yes. Q And he asked you about lost revenue, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for the issues that will be addressed in the rest of the hearing process, that the they wanted to go to a wanted to go formal. 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases? A Yes. Q And he asked you about lost revenue, correct? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for the issues that will be addressed in the rest of the hearing process, that the they wanted to go to a wanted to go formal. 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases? A Yes. Q And he asked you about lost revenue, correct? A Yes. Q The company wouldn't have had expenses for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 days, correct, in 2023, yes or no, correct, 60 days? A That would have been an extension of 60 days, yes. Q And during that time, the company gets no relief for its requested rate increase, does it? A No. Q And that then would be tacked on to your concern about 3.5 months between now and when the commission decides this case, would it not? A No. Q It wouldn't? Wouldn't that be a period that extends the overall time that this company has to wait to get a rate adjustment, because if you hasn't asked for the extensions, it could have proceeded in adjudication in October, correct? A Staff I can go review the emails that I have. So subject to check, staff and the company the company stated in October that without the adjustment for the issues that will be addressed in the rest of the hearing process, that the they wanted to go to a wanted to go formal. 	 sustained. Sorry. It is asked and answered for the record. I believe the witness has addressed this. ATTORNEY WILEY: Okay. Your Honor, if the record is clear on that, fine. I thought he contradicted himself, which is why I asked the followup question. So that's all I have. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wiley. Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for Mr. Sharbono? ATTORNEY ROBERSON: I have just a couple of questions, your Honor. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Q Mr. Sharbono, do you remember when Mr. Wiley was asking you about the mill hauls cases? A Yes. Q And he asked you about lost revenue, correct? A Yes. Q The company wouldn't have had expenses for serving the mills during that period, correct?

19 (Pages 82 to 85)

· · · · ·	Page 86		Page 88
1	period for which they lost those customers was five to	1 further wi	tnesses scheduled, correct?
2	ten years, correct?		ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Not for this portion
3	A He did.	3 of the pro	-
4	Q They could have well, could Murrey's have		would like to make one comment, which is
5	filed the rate case at any point during those five or ten		aff would very much like to brief the issues and
6	years?	-	at briefing before you issue the order, so I
7	A Yes.		to make sure we're providing for that space.
8	Q Did it?	-	uld ask that you set just a deadline that you
9	A No.		cceptable. Again, I think we can turn the
10	Q Okay. Do you remember he was asking you about		ind in seven days, if that works.
11	the length of time it normally takes to prepare a solid		UDGE BONFRISCO: So seven days from now
12	waste general rate case?		let me just pull up a calendar. So are we
13	A Yes.		t, like, a Monday, July 29? Would that work?
14	Q In your direct testimony, you were asked about	-	nat would work.
15	the company's extending the filing date for its	15 Q O	kay. And then I know, Mr. Wiley, you wanted
16	compliance filing. Do you remember that?		end in a reply. Are you wanting, what, another
17	A Yes.		ys out from that July 29?
18	Q Do you remember how long an extension the		TTORNEY WILEY: That sounds fine, your
19	company wanted in order to prepare its general rate case?	19 Honor.	
20	A Yes.	20 J	UDGE BONFRISCO: So that would put us at
21	Q How long was it?		e around August 6. Does that look right to
22	A Six months.	22 you?	5
23	Q Mr. Wiley asked you about the minutes produced	•	TTORNEY WILEY: That sounds fine, your
24	by the company. And so is it your understanding that the	24 Honor.	
25	company doesn't generally take minutes of its, kind of,	25 J	UDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. Perfect. Thank
	Page 87		Page 89
1	5		5
	board meetings?	1 you for d	arifying that for the record
1 2	board meetings? A That is my understanding.	-	arifying that for the record. nd I do want to thank you all for your
2	A That is my understanding.	2 A	nd I do want to thank you all for your
	A That is my understanding.Q Does that create concerns on staff's part,	2 A 3 testimony	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take
2 3	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works 	2 A 3 testimony	nd I do want to thank you all for your
2 3 4	A That is my understanding.Q Does that create concerns on staff's part,	 A testimony this under briefs. 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those
2 3 4 5	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis?	 2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take
2 3 4 5 6	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. 	 2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take methods. 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those nd in lieu of that, given that it's going
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. 	 2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take mean 8 as well as 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those nd in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, 	 2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take measures 8 as well as 9 just like to 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those nd in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. 	 2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take measures 8 as well as 9 just like to 	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, 	2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take m 8 as well as 9 just like to 10 ten-day re 11 willing to	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any 	2 A 3 testimony 4 this under 5 briefs. 6 A 7 to take m 8 as well as 9 just like to 10 ten-day re 11 willing to 12 ((nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? 	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take magnetic to take magnetic	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct.	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take mail8as well as9just like to10ten-day re11willing to a12(a)13JI14A	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take m8as well as9just like to10ten-day re11willing to of12((13))14A15JI16M	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. r. Wiley?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record.	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take model8as well as9just like to10ten-day res11willing to of12((13JI14A15JI16M17A	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going a about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take model8as well as9just like to10ten-day red11willing to a12((13JI14A15JI16M17A18Absolutel	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going a about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take model8as well as9just like to10ten-day red11willing to a12((13JII14A15JII16M17A18Absolutel19A	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going a about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would o request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order soon. 	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take m8as well as9just like to10ten-day re11willing to a12((13JII14A15JII16M17A18Absolutel19A20question,	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. r. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take magnetic to take magnetic	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would or equest that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for any, was that August 5 or August 6?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order soon. 	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take magnetic to take magnetic	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would orequest that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for any, was that August 5 or August 6? ust wanted to make sure that I jotted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order soon. SCHEDULING DISCUSSION JUDGE BONFRISCO: But before we adjourn, I'd like to request and one last thing I just want to	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take mage8as well as9just like to10ten-day red11willing to a12(mage)13Ju14A15Ju16M17A18Absolutel19A20question,21the comparison23it down comparison	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would orequest that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for any, was that August 5 or August 6? ust wanted to make sure that I jotted orrectly, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order soon. SCHEDULING DISCUSSION JUDGE BONFRISCO: But before we adjourn, I'd like to request and one last thing I just want to confirm. And I'm going to back up. My apologies. My	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take magnetic to take magnetic	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going a about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would request that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for any, was that August 5 or August 6? ust wanted to make sure that I jotted prectly, your Honor. TTORNEY WILEY: 6th, I think she said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A That is my understanding. Q Does that create concerns on staff's part, given the way kind of contemporaneous recordkeeping works for prudence analysis? A Yes. ATTORNEY ROBERSON: Okay. Actually, that's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay, Mr. Roberson. And at this point, I just want to confirm, I don't believe public counsel submitted for any testimony today, correct? ATTORNEY SYKE: That is correct. JUDGE BONFRISCO: Okay. I just want to clarify that for the record. So basically, I want to thank you all for your testimony today. At this juncture, I am going to take all of this under advisement and issue an order soon. SCHEDULING DISCUSSION JUDGE BONFRISCO: But before we adjourn, I'd like to request and one last thing I just want to	2A3testimony4this under5briefs.6A7to take magnetic to take magnetic	nd I do want to thank you all for your today. And like I said, I am going to take advisement and look forward to reviewing those and in lieu of that, given that it's going e about seven to ten days to get the transcript review the supplemental materials, I would orequest that the parties waive the standard equirement. Is that something the parties are do? Overlapping speech) JDGE BONFRISCO: Sorry. Go ahead. TTORNEY ROBERSON: Staff is willing. JDGE BONFRISCO: Thank you, Mr. Roberson. Ir. Wiley? TTORNEY WILEY: Yes, your Honor. y. TTORNEY LUHRS: And your Honor, quick clarification. For the briefing deadline for any, was that August 5 or August 6? ust wanted to make sure that I jotted orrectly, your Honor.

20 (Pages 86 to 89)

	Page 90	
1	ATTORNEY LUHRS: Okay.	
2	JUDGE BONFRISCO: Let me just make sure	
3	I'm counting the seven.	
4	So yeah, that looks like that would be	
5	seven days from the 29th. So August 6, that's correct.	
6	ATTORNEY LUHRS: Thank you, your Honor.	
7	JUDGE BONFRISCO: You're welcome. Does	
8	any go ahead.	
9	ATTORNEY WILEY: Your Honor, I just wanted	
10	to clarify. On that native document you want, that's	
11	JW-7C, and you want it by July 25 as I	
12	JUDGE BONFRISCO: That is correct.	
13	Basically five business days from today, which I believe	
14	that is correct.	
15	So I guess with that, does any of the	
16	parties have any other further questions?	
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).	
18	JUDGE BONFRISCO: No? Okay. With that, I	
19	just want to thank you all for coming here today and for	
20	all your time.	
21	And with that, we're off the record. And	
22	I hope you have a wonderful afternoon. Thank you.	
23	(Proceedings concluded at 3:32 p.m.)	
24		
25		
	Page 91	
-		
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
4) ss COUNTY OF KING)	
5 6	COUNTY OF KING)	
6 7	Elizabeth Patterson Harvoy a Cartified	
8	I, Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, a Certified Court Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter	
8 9	within and for the State of Washington, do hereby	
9 10	certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing legal	
11	recordings were transcribed under my direction; that I	
12	received the electronic recording in the proprietary	
13	format; that I am not a relative or employee of any	
14	attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor	
15	financially interested in its outcome.	
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my	
17	hand this 29th day of July, 2024.	
18		
19	~~~	
20	COLOR OF COLOR	
21		
22	Elizabeth Salesatury	
22 23		
22 23 24	Elizabeth Patterson Harvey, CCR 2731	
23		
23 24		

21 (Pages 90 to 91)

				Fage 92
	52.5	27.22.21.9.22.12	40.9	62.12 62.1 7 10
A	53:5	27:22 31:8 32:12	49:8	62:13 63:1,7,10
AAG 13:24	administrative	87:5	arguments 15:9	65:14 66:3,11
ability 40:4	10:13 13:17 15:3	analyst 38:11 52:8	20:7 27:20	71:16,21 72:2
able 31:17 64:10,16	27:7 31:15 50:1	52:11 53:1 66:20	arrive 81:16	74:12 75:4,10,20
69:10 79:10	59:24 73:7	66:22 72:10	arts 53:4	77:10,16 78:8,13
Absolutely 51:3	admission 16:11,13	analyze 65:19	asked 33:6 40:10	84:22,24 85:3,11
89:18	admitted 16:25	ancient 52:15	40:15,17 44:13,15	85:16 87:7,13
accept 79:21	17:2 46:4,9	and/or 67:10	79:11 82:3 83:13	88:2,18,23 89:14
acceptable 88:9	admittedly 29:18	Angeles 58:2	84:23 85:1,5,20	89:17,19,24 90:1
access 64:1	adoption 22:3	annual 63:17,20,25	85:25 86:14,23	90:6,9 91:14
accountant 78:19	adverse 30:12	64:17 65:2,5	asking 16:4 19:21	audit 82:14,18
accounting 53:4	adversely 27:6	72:14,19 73:12,15	59:20 63:3,4 74:4	audits 72:23
accounts 67:3	advisement 87:18	73:18 74:6	82:6 85:18 86:10	August 88:21 89:21
accuracy 81:6	89:4	answer 30:17 50:6	assertion 23:16	89:21 90:5
accurate 18:5	affirm 37:18 51:11	50:8,12	asserts 25:13	authority 25:9,14
accurately 54:24	51:14	answered 56:2	asset 66:25	authorization 60:8
acknowledge 47:1	afternoon 13:4,23	84:23 85:1	assigned 32:24	authorizing 56:9
80:19,25	30:24 38:7 51:24	answering 50:24	42:22 54:1	available 17:18
actions 33:17	72:3 90:22	anticipate 18:20	associated 29:13	69:3
activities 39:5	ago 24:24 49:4	19:20	45:22	Avenue 11:12
activity 42:22	agree 50:17 79:23	apologies 21:1 46:6	assume 55:13 80:1	average 43:17 63:3
actual 46:24 64:17	81:4 85:25	51:7 54:21 87:24	80:19	80:13
add 35:14 42:24	agreed 38:23 61:9	apologize 71:22	attempted 42:16,17	avoid 33:8
addition 15:9 50:17	agreement 75:6	appeal 23:2,3	attended 53:6	avoiding 33:7
additional 20:3,19	76:2	appearances 13:19	attorney 11:5,11	award 25:18
62:1 67:10 78:15	agreements 76:25	appearing 13:25	12:12,14,15,16	awarded 28:4
79:14	77:12	14:5	13:23 14:4,12	aware 14:16 15:18
address 14:10,10	ahead 18:12 30:2	apply 27:25	15:6 16:14,16,19	16:10 17:5 47:4
15:14 27:21 47:1	37:4 51:1 63:8	appreciate 21:6	16:22 17:3,7,10	59:3,7 61:8 79:1
75:3	65:22 66:9 75:16	36:14,23 75:15	18:8,13,16 19:2,9	79:11,16 81:22
addressed 81:21	76:17,22 78:3,10	appropriate 49:21	19:12,20 20:4,21	B
83:19 85:2	89:13 90:8	approximately	20:24 21:2,5,15	b 12:18 14:24 68:4
adjourn 87:22	aiming 23:22	53:8 58:25 62:8	21:19,23 24:18	B-12 12:23 16:8
adjudicated 73:6	Alaska 39:6	63:14 66:14 70:18	30:3,24 35:5,8,10	B-12 12:23 10:8 B-13 12:24 16:8
adjudication 32:8	allocate 59:1,5,8	72:5,12,21 80:7	35:23 36:1,5,10	B-13 12.24 10.8 B-2 45:24
83:14	allocator 42:20	area 24:20 71:13	36:13,15,18,19,22	b-2 45:24 bachelors 53:4
adjudicatory 10:11	allow 15:23	areas 43:17 48:2	37:24 38:6 46:1,7	back 26:17 36:8
13:18	allowed 59:18	argue 34:16	46:13,17,25 47:18	37:2 45:12 55:18
adjust 54:14	65:22,24	argued 25:4,11	47:25 48:12,20,21	55:25 71:9 77:24
adjusted 84:8	allowing 16:2	27:11,22	49:12 50:6 51:3	81:18 84:24 87:24
adjustment 39:20	amount 42:9,19,23	argues 30:4	51:23 52:13,17,22	backdrop 25:25
41:6 83:13,18	42:23 62:3	arguing 32:10 34:5	52:24 54:11,22	background 14:16
adjustments 67:12	amounts 67:7	argument 12:5,6	55:1,5,7,9,11,12	24:16 40:3,23
67:13	Amy 10:14 13:16	21:7,9,22,24	55:16,20,23,25	balance 66:24
administration	analysis 25:15	27:25 30:16,23	58:10,14,17 62:12	ballpark 62:19
				vanpair 02.19

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

65:11	35:9,18,25 36:3,7	business 13:9 24:12	86:5,12,19	89:1
bankruptcy 23:13	36:12,14,23 37:8	33:10 47:15 53:5	cases 31:11 34:12	clarity 45:15
23:16,20 33:15	37:12,16,22 46:5	56:3,10 90:13	34:17 50:21 56:22	clear 14:21 31:9,21
69:17	46:8,15,18 47:10		62:14 73:4 80:1,1	65:16 66:6 69:4
base 49:9 50:5	47:22 48:1 49:6	C	80:8 85:18	74:13 85:4
based 41:9 68:8	50:2,23 51:4,7,9	C 11:1 12:1 91:1,1	causes 31:20	climate 24:1 30:11
73:24 79:25	51:15 54:13,17,20	calamity 23:17	CCR 10:24 91:23	closed 75:2,8 76:13
basically 15:11,18	55:3,14,17,21	calculated 44:10	cease 59:18,21	77:11
37:2 43:2 87:16	58:15 63:8 65:20	calculation 12:23	certainly 15:7	closer 54:15
90:13	66:7 71:18 74:12	43:9 64:18,25	21:15 24:6,18	closing 16:3 18:17
basis 24:6 48:14	74:18 75:9,16,21	65:2	26:23 28:5 30:1	Cluhrs@william
59:4 80:8	75:24 76:6,12,19	calculations 39:18	40:5 48:13 49:12	11:17
bear 44:23,23,23	77:3,13,18 78:6	calendar 88:12	certificate 56:8,12	code 50:1
behalf 13:25 14:5	78:10 84:25 85:7	California 39:6	73:18	codification 50:18
believe 14:9 34:5	85:13 87:9,14,22	call 44:5 75:14	Certified 91:7	codified 49:13
35:5 41:25 42:2	88:11,20,25 89:13	Callahan 75:7	certify 91:10	Colin 11:4 14:1
44:17 45:10,21	89:15,25 90:2,7	called 53:10	cetera 49:1	colin.obrien@atg
46:8 47:1 56:1	90:12,18	calls 81:18	chance 16:3,4	11:5
74:25 85:2,25	book 68:8	capacity 38:12	changes 32:12 61:3	colleague 14:1
87:11 90:13	bottom 40:21	captioned 13:8	charge 72:13	17:17
believes 33:17 48:7	Box 11:6	carrier 31:23	charged 71:7	collect 79:14
70:22	breakout 19:17	carries 56:3	check 83:17	collection 31:3
Bell 24:21 31:8,11	76:2,8,21,22 77:5	carry 52:25	checking 82:11	56:10 58:2 62:25
benefit 43:7 84:8	77:21	carrying 33:10	Christopher 11:17	63:11,17
benefits 71:9,14	Brian 12:11 17:17	case 13:7 15:21,24	14:7	come 27:17 42:22
Benjamin 12:13	37:6,8 38:1	17:18 22:4,10,12	chronology 79:3	44:10 77:24
32:23 51:18 52:1	brief 10:11 13:17	22:16,18,24 24:5	circumstances	coming 38:22 87:25
55:18	14:25 18:17,21	24:10,20,23,24,25	25:23 45:3 48:8	90:19
best 40:4 45:23,25	19:6,8 26:4 34:16	24:25 25:8,8,12	50:4	Commence 12:4
47:6 75:2	88:5,10	26:14,18,21 27:16	citation 25:12 35:2	comment 88:4
better 18:19 48:4	briefed 25:4	27:17 28:6,11,12	35:21	comments 17:4
54:16 55:20,21	briefing 88:6 89:20	28:14,25 29:3,4,6 29:7,19,21,23	cited 26:18 28:11	commission 10:2,4
Bijan 15:3	briefly 38:17	30:6 32:14 34:3,4	cites 25:14	10:17 11:2 12:6
bin 80:25	briefs 89:5	34:18,23 35:3,19	city 27:5 33:20	13:9,13,22 15:23
bit 52:19 71:22	bringing 15:8	39:8 49:4,20	56:21 57:23,24,25	16:5 25:17,20,22
board 87:1	broad 25:18	50:14,16 53:22,25	58:1,4,18,22	28:18 30:8,23
Bonfrisco 10:14	BS-11 19:15 40:16	58:6,19 60:25	79:18,22	31:2,10,13 32:3,7
13:4,16,24 14:2,8	BS-11(c) 16:8 BS-11C 12:25 17:2	61:5,7,10,10,12	claiming 33:19 claims 29:14 33:20	32:9,12,14 34:19 44:1 46:11 50:14
14:13 15:11 16:17		61:16,17 62:1,6		52:5,7,10 53:9,16
16:20 17:6,9 18:1 18:4,8,11,15,25	74:9 BS-12 17:1 64:13	62:11,22,25 63:4	56:24 57:21 clarification 89:20	53:19 55:13 56:9
18:4,8,11,13,23	BS-12 17:1 64:15 BS-13 17:1 57:7	63:6,12 68:8	clarify 41:11 47:23	56:22 57:11 59:17
20:10,22 21:1,3	burden 28:8 44:23	73:14,25 78:15	48:3 50:2 65:20	59:21,23 60:3
21:10,17,20 24:17	44:24	79:8,10,24 80:9	48.3 50.2 05.20 66:2 87:15 90:10	61:15,20 62:4
30:2,18,25 35:1,7	burning 34:14	80:20 81:1,4,7	clarifying 20:1 35:2	63:18 67:16 70:6
50.2,10,25 55.1,7	541 ming 34.14	82:5,9,19 83:9	Garnying 20.1 55.2	05.10 07.10 70.0
	I		l	

				Paye 94
72:4,14 74:1	compilation 72.20	considerable 80:22	37:13 89:23	79.16 17 20 21
79:11 83:9	compilation 72:20 Complainant 10:5	consistent 49:11	cost 32:17	78:16,17,20,21 86:1
commission's 36:16	complaint 59:20	constitute 31:22	costs 24:12 29:10	cut 30:1
63:24 70:14,16	78:15 79:2	constitutes 31:13	29:13 32:6,20	cut 50.1
,		consumers 23:3	48:25,25 49:1	D
companies 26:2 27:14 38:14 49:16	complete 64:20 completion 82:14	contact 14:9 39:14	counsel 11:9,11	D 11:10 12:1,1,18
53:10,20 63:13,17	82:14	contacted 17:24	13:25 15:21 16:21	d/b/a 10:8 14:6
64:24 80:2,10,12	compliance 25:10	contained 54:9	18:5,5 20:18	data 38:22 39:14
81:15	62:5 86:16	contemplates 49:14	30:21 35:20 37:2	57:3,11,13,14,19
company 10:7 12:5	compound 80:24	contemporaneous	47:13 77:6,6,11	61:16 62:2 67:10
14:3 16:14,25	concept 22:20	87:4	77:14,22,23,23	79:2,4,14 82:3
21:22 22:24 24:22	50:18	contested 40:13	87:11 91:14	date 14:11 47:16
25:2 26:7 28:3,3	concern 70:19 83:8	42:6,8,23 43:2	counting 90:3	49:22 62:5 84:7
28:16,20,22 29:1	concerning 65:5	44:7,9,11 45:8	COUNTY 91:5	86:15
29:15 31:4 33:1,9	concerns 15:8,16	73:4	couple 17:4 26:24	dated 15:1
33:14,16,22,25	26:20 50:4 87:3	contests 42:7	85:11	dates 61:24
40:8 42:19 44:11	concluded 60:13	context 20:8,9	course 23:15 24:14	David 11:16 14:4
44:13,19 45:8,18	90:23	contiguous 79:18	25:4 27:9 28:13	day 91:17
53:14,16,20 56:10	conclusion 38:23	79:22	court 14:20 60:3	days 19:5 47:16
57:3 59:8,14,16	60:16,25	continual 65:8	76:8 91:8	83:1,1,2 84:20
59:17 61:23 62:10	conclusions 66:5	continue 69:20	cover 43:3,12,20	88:10,11,17 89:7
62:14,25 63:5,11	conditions 48:11	contract 27:6 33:21	70:13	90:5,13
65:8 67:3,9,17	61:3 71:10	33:22 56:21 57:23	covered 71:23	dba 12:20 61:6
68:22 69:1,2,11	conducting 14:14	57:24,25,25 58:4	covers 56:13	deadline 88:8 89:20
69:14,16 72:23,23	conference 14:6	58:7,18,22 59:7	COVID 55:8 73:1	deal 68:22
78:14,17,22 79:10	confidence 75:5	79:18,22	coworkers 39:12	dealing 69:7
79:14 80:17 81:2	confidential 12:25	contradicted 85:4	create 76:22 87:3	debt 60:12
81:7 82:1,12,16	16:9 19:16,22	contrast 73:14 82:7	creation 23:1	decade 64:5 80:21
81.7 82.1,12,10	74:13,16,17,22	Conversely 22:15	credit 33:14 69:11	decades 50:7
82:23 83:4,12,17 83:18,24 84:7,11	76:3,14	copy 47:15 57:18	cross 15:25 21:12	decided 25:6 28:13
84:14,16 85:22	confidentiality	65:1 68:10	30:19 35:3 36:24	83:24
86:19,24,25 89:21	75:6,19 76:2,24	corollary 78:16	46:11,13,21 48:5	decides 83:9
company's 42:2,14	77:12	corporate 56:6	71:20 76:15 78:7	decision 22:9 25:21
42:15 43:19 44:5	confirm 21:8 87:10	correct 14:11 19:8	78:8	32:7 59:4
44:6 45:11 57:10	87:24	35:4 36:9 37:9	Cross-Examinati	deem 48:15
57:15 63:20 65:12	confusion 45:15	41:18 44:1 57:18	12:15 72:1	deemed 15:2,13
66:23 67:25 68:8	Congrats 55:16	61:13 65:1 68:10	cross-examine	deeming 13:15
68:9 86:15	Connections 38:10	73:2,10 80:3	15:23	define 31:13
company-prepar	38:14	81:16 83:1,1,15	current 30:10	defined 31:15
81:21	consecutively	85:20,23,24 86:2	39:19 72:7	defines 31:25 35:12
comparison 12:21	65:17	87:12,13 88:1	customer 49:9 50:5	definitely 15:14
43:19 82:5	consensus 38:23	90:5,12,14	71:7	delay 79:9,12,13
compensation	consent 13:15	corrected 35:14	customers 45:1,4	delayed 34:12
29:14 33:22 58:21	consider 22:6 25:21	47:3	59:15,19 60:20,21	demonstrate 23:19
58:24 59:1	25:23 71:2	correctly 35:2	70:24 71:1,12	26:3 49:17
JU.2-T JJ.1		concerty 55.2	10.27/1.1,12	demonstrated 30:7
	I			

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

demonstrating	73:13,21,24,24	E 11:1,1 12:1,1,1	entertain 18:23	46:21 57:6,9,10
45:19	73:13,21,24,24	12:18,18 91:1,1	entire 79:17	64:12,15 68:4,6
demonstrative 20:6	Disposal's 14:24	e-mail 14:10	entities 32:1	68:10 74:9,11
denial 26:14	81:22	earlier 26:18 50:12	entitled 23:4 44:18	exhibits 16:8,11,13
				, ,
denied 15:2,13 19:4	dispositive 48:23	early 17:13	entity 27:17 28:15	17:1,12 20:6
department 39:4	dispute 24:20 59:13	earn 30:9 43:4	56:6 59:6	65:15 66:4
depending 42:21	60:2	earned 41:5	entries 40:22	existing 27:3 31:16
depends 21:11	disputed 59:12	earning 30:5 43:20	environment 49:3	exists 48:13
depicting 40:25	dissolving 60:2	ears 52:15	equipment 80:4	expedient 75:13
depiction 41:1	distinguishable	easiest 76:21 77:8	erosion 56:19	expedited 18:22
depreciation 66:24	34:17,24 35:20	77:25	espoused 26:23	expense 42:21
derived 34:9	distinguishes 34:3	economic 49:3 61:3	28:5,6	43:12 67:13
describe 38:16,24	divergence 22:12	economics 38:13	essence 25:2 30:4	expenses 29:13,15
53:3	diverges 49:20	education 52:25	essentially 70:25	33:7,8 42:8 43:4
described 79:2	divine 43:23	effective 61:24	established 23:25	43:16,21 44:8
designated 17:12	division 11:6 33:3,3	effectively 28:2	25:1	60:12 69:23 74:10
desire 34:14	53:18 73:7	effort 14:19	estimated 43:1 44:8	85:22
desist 59:18,21	divisions 74:2	eight 53:8 72:5	et 49:1	expensive 24:11
detailed 24:14	divulge 19:21	either 26:8 60:2	evening 17:13	experience 79:25
deterioration 34:9	docket 10:6 13:7	elaborate 48:5	event 31:19	80:7 81:10
determination	32:13 34:19 36:5	elaboration 49:10	events 33:19 56:24	experienced 34:8
26:22	36:8,10 47:20	elapsed 62:3	eventually 83:22	82:7
determine 68:12	53:23 54:1,4,7,9	electronic 91:12	evidence 33:4,12	experts 25:17
differ 45:16	docketed 61:17	eliminate 26:15	33:14 34:3 68:18	explain 16:4 40:4
difference 44:16	62:6 66:18 67:19	Elizabeth 10:24	69:10,13,16 70:9	43:7 57:23 59:11
different 49:3	document 90:10	91:7,23	evolution 25:24	explained 42:16,17
50:21 74:1 78:22	documents 46:20	emails 83:16	ex 42:8	explicitly 34:20
differently 32:2	54:8 66:25	emergency 26:4,8	exact 31:6	42:7
difficult 33:24 81:6	doing 13:9 72:19	27:3 31:4,14,16	exactly 26:1 27:2	extend 82:24 83:24
direct 12:12,14	72:21	33:1 35:12 57:16	Examination 12:9	84:7
38:5 51:22 86:14	dollar 43:12,13	68:19,22 69:8	12:12,14,16 38:5	extending 86:15
direction 91:11	dollars 66:14	70:10	51:22 85:15	extends 83:12
disagreement	doorstep 23:13	emergent 48:8,11	example 28:18	extension 61:23
42:13	downgrade 33:15	emphasize 23:8	exceed 73:21	83:2 84:5 86:18
discovery 56:23	69:11	employed 52:4	Excel 46:24 47:8,12	extensions 82:13,17
68:17	due 29:10 61:24	91:14	47:24 68:3	83:14 84:12,14,15
Discussion 12:7	70:15,16 71:6	employee 91:13	exclusively 72:23	84:17,20
87:21	81:12,14	employs 52:3	72:24	extensive 80:20
discussions 81:19	duly 38:1 51:18	enable 52:25	excuse 27:5 41:10	extensive 80.20 extent 31:8 32:10
disjunctive 26:6	dump 41:7	encompassed 73:2	84:1	extraordinary 32:5
disposal 10:7,8	duties 33:11 38:16	energy 50:14,21	exhibit 16:6,7,7,25	32:21 48:8
12:20,20 13:9,10	53:1	engage 56:9,23	19:15,23 39:23,23	extrapolate 66:5
12:20,20 13:9,10	dwiley@williams	engage 50.9,25 ensure 15:16	40:4,6,16,22,25	extrapolations
53:11,14 56:4,5	11:16	enter 59:23	40.4,0,10,22,23	65:16
	11.10	entering 82:24		03.10
58:3 59:16,19	E	entering 82:24	45:19,24 46:3,20	F
		l	l	

	Pag	е	9	6
--	-----	---	---	---

				Faye 90
F 12:1 91:1	filed 29:4 34:13	following 15:19	23:3 24:10 26:14	granting 27:13
face 66:6	41:4 47:20 53:23	follows 38:3 49:14	27:9,20 29:6	28:8,19
faced 29:10,12	54:4 58:6,19 61:6	51:20	49:20 50:13,16	great 36:4
68:18	61:10,12,16 64:4	followup 85:5	53:22 57:14 58:6	greater 29:22
faces 33:1	82:12,16,19 86:5	foot 43:17	58:19 61:4,6 62:6	greatly 73:20
facing 23:10,16,17	files 31:23 39:4	force 59:17	62:11,22 67:5	gross 27:3,4 63:20
23:20 33:13,18	filing 32:24 39:7,10	foregoing 91:10	79:7,10 86:12,19	65:6,9
fact 22:6,20 23:7,9	39:13 41:7,11	form 27:14 28:16	generally 57:12,13	,
23:18 25:16 26:10	42:15 45:11,13	30:13 32:5,21	71:1 81:23 86:25	ground 71:23 grown 65:12
28:11 31:12 32:11	56:20,25 62:5		generated 29:21	0
	,	48:13 58:10,13 63:1	-	growth 33:2
32:22 33:6 40:6 44:14 48:22 49:24	66:17,21,22 67:19 86:15 16	formal 73:11 83:21	generating 68:13	guess 20:2 21:11,12 30:25 34:15 37:1
	86:15,16	83:23	geography 81:3	
50:19 70:19 71:6	filings 38:19 39:5 53:20 63:4		getting 84:8 Gibbs 11:18	47:16 49:6 50:2
factor 27:1,21 31:7		formally 73:7		52:22 90:15
40:11 44:4 45:2 58:8	fill 64:24	format 46:22,24	give 16:3 20:8 21:13 35:24 37:19	Н
	final 70:6,14,16	47:4,12,23,24		H 12:18
factored 43:18	finally 25:22 31:25	91:13	40:3 51:12	half 55:8
factors 25:1,3,5,15	34:2	formatting 72:14	given 18:18 29:20	hand 20:25 37:17
25:19,20,24 26:6	finances 24:1	former 15:2	32:22 87:4 89:6	51:10 91:17
26:23,25 31:6	financial 23:13,17	forms 64:17	glad 15:7	happen 73:13,14
35:12 43:16 56:24	30:10,11 48:18	formula 25:19	go 18:12 19:16,17	78:23
57:5	49:4 50:4 57:16	formulate 82:6	30:2 37:4 38:20	happy 30:16 47:8
facts 29:4 82:5	63:16 70:10	forward 27:17 89:4	41:3 51:1 63:8	hardship 26:4,8,10
factually 34:3,23	financially 27:23	Foundation 62:12	66:9 67:6 74:20	27:3 31:4,14,19
fading 54:11,25	91:15	fresh 81:13	75:2,8,16 76:8,17	31:22 33:13,18,20
fails 23:3	financials 38:20	front 39:25 68:2	76:22 78:3,10	, ,
faint 52:17	76:15	frontline 29:12	81:17 83:16,20,21	34:1 35:13 48:7
fair 28:7 43:4 44:18	find 50:13 64:17	fuel 24:12 48:25	83:23 89:13 90:8	57:16,22 68:19,23
45:1 67:16 81:5	80:13	full 22:7,13 26:19	goes 49:17 67:2	70:10 82:4,7
fairly 23:25	finding 49:21	30:13 32:7	going 13:20 14:14	hardships 56:17
familiar 38:12	fine 54:22 85:4	fund 60:9	14:15 15:20,22	harkening 26:17
53:10,13,22,25	88:18,23	funds 22:19 23:1,2	18:6 20:10,25	harm 31:20 48:13
54:3,6 62:21	finished 34:25	23:5	21:12 33:4 36:7	Harvey 10:24 91:7
far 29:22 47:3 59:7	first 15:21 27:1	further 31:12 45:6	36:17 37:19 47:11	91:23
70:17	37:3,5 51:8 57:22	46:2 49:10 71:16	52:21 65:18 66:7	hauling 60:22
February 58:5	65:21 73:8 74:4	78:7,8 88:1 90:16	71:22 74:21 87:17	hauls 33:21,24
fee 12:23 41:7	80:25		87:24 89:3,6	56:22 59:10,12,13
64:18,24 65:2	fiscal 23:25 39:19	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}_{12} 1 72 19}$	good 13:4,23 30:24	60:13,16 85:18
feel 15:16 49:10	five 33:2 47:15 79:7	G 12:1 73:18	37:15 38:7 51:24	head 81:17
Fifth 11:12	86:1,5 90:13	G237 73:17,21	72:3	health 30:11 57:16
figure 62:19	five-day 15:13	Gallagher 43:24	grant 22:2 24:7	healthy 27:23 33:1
file 14:25 56:9	flagging 74:18	44:8	31:3 34:20 71:2	hear 55:19
59:20 61:4,9,15	floor 21:3	gathered 22:1	granted 22:11,17	heard 49:7
61:19 62:21,25	focused 48:6	general 11:5,11	23:21 28:15 32:9	hearing 13:15,18
63:12,17 79:10,11	follow-up 30:18	12:24 20:12 22:4	35:16 49:15	14:14,21 15:19
		22:10,12,17,24		16:2 32:4 52:14
	1	1	1	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

<u> </u>	_		_	
55:8 83:20	67:3	69:24,25	27:14,18 28:4,8	jotted 89:22
held 23:15 52:9	identify 14:18	INDEX 12:9	28:15,19 31:1,3	judge 10:13 13:4
help 52:21	46:22 56:17 57:4	indicate 28:14	32:4,15 34:7,22	13:17,23 14:2,8
hereto 91:14	57:9 58:7,12	70:10	35:15 40:9,15	14:13 15:3,11
hereunto 91:16	64:15 68:6 69:23	indicated 48:13	44:21 45:20,22,24	16:17,20 17:6,9
higher 40:14,16,18	70:2,5 80:12	49:4 74:6 81:20	48:9 49:14,15,21	18:1,4,8,11,15,25
highlight 26:24	81:15	81:24	50:15,20 54:3	19:7,10,13,24
40:6 44:14	identifying 75:15	indicates 26:11	56:18,25 60:8	20:10,22 21:1,3
highlighted 28:22	II 10:11	28:25	71:2	21:10,17,20 24:17
30:8	imagine 49:23	individual 67:6	interject 76:5	30:2,18,24 35:1,7
historically 24:20	immediately 84:18	industry 50:13,19	internal 47:2	35:9,18,25 36:3,7
hold 52:6 53:4	impact 30:12	inequitable 48:18	interrupt 43:6 84:1	36:12,14,23 37:8
54:24	impacted 22:9 27:6	inequity 26:5,8,11	84:2	37:12,16,22 40:23
Honor 14:4,12 15:7	impacts 39:19	27:4 31:5,14 32:1	interruptions 50:5	46:5,8,15,18
16:15 17:10 18:3	important 22:5	34:6 35:13 57:17	interval 63:4 80:16	47:10,22 48:1
19:2,9 20:4 21:6	23:8 26:1 50:18	70:11 82:4,7	intrastate 63:21	49:6 50:2,23 51:4
21:15,19,23 22:2	in-person 81:19	inflationary 27:9	65:6,9	51:7,9,15 54:13
22:5,23 24:16	inability 50:9	48:25	investigate 56:23	54:17,20 55:3,12
26:19,25 29:24,25	inaudible 52:12,21	informal 39:14	investments 33:7,9	55:14,17,21 58:15
30:3,15 36:2,15	53:6,21 54:8,8,10	67:10	70:2,5	63:8 65:20 66:7
37:24 46:2,17	54:10,19 82:22	information 14:9	involved 17:17	71:18 74:12,18
47:19 48:12,16,19	90:17	17:5 19:22 57:15	28:13 38:18,21	75:9,16,21,24
49:5,12 50:7	incidentally 77:1	61:19 66:23 67:10	39:5,12 73:5	76:6,12,19 77:3
52:15 54:12 58:11	include 67:5 77:14	74:14,16,22	involves 32:6	77:13,18 78:6,10
65:14 71:21 75:10	includes 25:17	initial 61:24,25	issue 13:10 14:18	84:25 85:7,13
77:10,16 78:9	including 29:12	79:13	22:9 23:10 24:19	87:9,14,22 88:11
82:11 85:3,12	55:9 56:13 72:15	initially 21:14	29:4,19,22 33:3	88:20,25 89:13,15
88:19,24 89:17,19	72:16	61:20 84:6	55:3 59:12,13	89:25 90:2,7,12
89:23 90:6,9	income 34:9 66:24	initiated 15:19	71:8 87:18 88:6	90:18
hop 71:22	incorporate 31:10	insolvency 33:15	issued 22:14 34:19	judge's 43:7
hope 17:22 90:22	incorporated 31:9	69:14	62:4	judicial 27:8
hopefully 42:11	incorrect 47:5	instability 70:24	issues 15:9 18:17	July 10:12 13:1,5
45:14	increase 22:25	instance 40:25	18:18 45:8 70:6	47:17 55:15 60:7
hoping 68:2	31:23 32:16 33:23	76:11 82:5	81:23 83:19 88:5	88:13,17 90:11
hospital 17:15	33:23 34:15 41:22	insurance 29:14	item 43:8,10 67:6	91:17
hospitalized 17:12	42:1 43:21 44:5,6	insure 47:24	items 40:13 42:6,7	jumped 15:4
housekeeping	44:10,12 60:15,24	intent 41:1	67:8	juncture 21:18
46:19	66:12,13 83:5	interactions 38:21		47:11 77:5 87:17
Hughes 15:3	increased 24:12,13	interest 23:3 49:11	J	June 15:1
huh 55:6	32:20	83:25	Jeff 11:3 13:24	justifications 56:18
	increases 48:25	interested 91:15	jeff.roberson@ut	justified 32:17
<u> </u>	65:9,17 70:23,25	interim 12:21	11:4	JW-30 12:20 16:7
idea 18:24 21:13	increasing 29:10,13	13:11 15:1,20	job 38:16	16:25 39:23 45:5
identified 31:7	32:6	22:3,25 23:24	jobs 72:17	46:4
39:23 83:24	incurring 33:7,8	25:2,18,19 26:19	Joe 17:10	JW-7C 46:20 90:11
identifies 56:19			join 76:22,23	
	1		1	

Kastner 11:18 let's 13:19 50:25 looks 90:4 marked 16:7,8,9 81:2 34:8 35:12 40:21 letting 76:23 Loop 10:17 68:4 Mm-h 46:19 49:9 59:12 level 39:19 40:10 lose 43:12 78:20 lose 43:12 78:20 masters 53:5 model 61:2 86:25 87:4 LG 38:20 43:1,8,15 78:17 material 61:3 material 61:3 momel know 14:13 15:7,14 43:22 loss 27:5 31:21 58:3 67:2,3,5,11 Mond 18:12 19:15,17,25 ligh 19:3 50:3 57:23 58:7,18,22 mothi motel 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 21:9 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 limit 21:9 19:17 23 mothi mothi 65:24 66:5 77:6 list 66:25 louder 54:15 means 42:20 48:24 motion 77:21.23 78:23 literally 31:22 Luhrs 11:17 14:7 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 60:11,14 73:25 litigated 24:19 21:15,19.23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 1abeled 42:1,5 loci16 main 40:5 77:25 main 40:5 77:25 meet 13:21	ent 76:5 ay 88:13
Kastner 11:18 let's 13:19 50:25 looks 90:4 marked 16:7,8,9 81:2 34:8 35:12 40:21 66:16 88:21 looming 31:16 marked 16:7,8,9 19:15 57:6 64:12 missin 34:8 35:12 40:21 level 39:19 40:10 lose 43:12 78:20 lose 43:12 78:20 masters 53:5 model 61:2 86:25 87:4 59:25 LG 38:20 43:1,8,15 78:17 material 61:3 material 61:3 momel 18:12 19:15,17,25 lieu 18:16 89:6 33:20,22 56:21 79:15,19 89:8 momel 20:11,16 21:11 limit 21:9 19:17 f8:14 21:7 46:19 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 21:9 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 47:9,14,19,20 lima 31:11 40:21 lost 22:19 48:14 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 list 66:25 list 66:25 literally 31:22 lubor 54:15 means 42:20 48:24 motion 77:21,23 78:23 litegate 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 49:12 89:19 90:1 33:37,9 70:3,3 84:22 meet 13:21	1,23 86:23,25 ng 47:7,20 nm 17:6 84:4 1 38:20 43:24 ,9 ent 76:5 lay 88:13
kind 31:12 33:25 66:16 88:21 looming 31:16 19:15 57:6 64:12 missin 34:8 35:12 40:21 letting 76:23 loop 10:17 68:4 Mm-h 46:19 49:9 59:12 level 39:19 40:10 lose 43:12 78:20 masters 53:5 model 61:2 86:25 87:4 59:25 LG 38:20 43:1,8,15 78:17 material 61:3 68:1, know 14:13 15:7,14 43:22 lose 27:5 31:21 58:3 67:2,3,5,11 Mond. 18:12 19:15,17,25 lieu 18:16 89:6 33:20,22 56:21 79:15,19 89:8 mooreg 20:11,16 21:11 light 19:3 50:3 57:23 58:7,18,22 matter 13:13 14:23 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 lime 31:11 40:21 lost 22:19 48:14 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 81:1 54:23 55:9 58:11 likt 17:23 list 66:25 lot 71:23 mean 17:22 28:2 86:2 65:24 66:5 77:6 fitigat0 27:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 movin movin 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 movin 35:16 murfi 60:11,14 73:25 65:17,1	m 17:6 84:4 138:20 43:24 ,9 ent 76:5 lay 88:13
Initial of the second secon	m 17:6 84:4 138:20 43:24 ,9 ent 76:5 lay 88:13
A:10 49:9 59:12 level 39:19 40:10 lose 43:12 78:20 masters 53:5 model 61:2 86:25 87:4 LG 38:20 43:1,8,15 78:17 material 61:3 68:1, know 14:13 15:7,14 43:22 loss 27:5 31:21 33:20,22 56:21 79:15,19 89:8 momel 20:11,16 21:11 light 19:3 50:3 57:23 58:7,18,22 matter 13:13 14:23 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 limited 49:16 losses 48:18 70:7,15 month 43:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 list 16:6,7 76:24 list 66:25 louder 54:15 means 42:20 48:24 motorb 60:14 metariag 28:17 30:3 48:12,21 motef 44:12 86:1 metariag 34:18,21 71:2,23 78:23 litigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 metariag 34:18,21 motorb 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 30:3 48:12,21 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 mather 40:5 77:25 mather 40:5 77:25 meting 34:18,21 movin 1ack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 30:3 48:12,21 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8	38:20 43:24 ,9 ent 76:5 lay 88:13
61:2 59:25 Josing 26:12 31:24 material 61:3 68:1, KING 91:5 LG 38:20 43:22 Joss 27:5 31:21 58:3 67:2,3,5,11 Monde 18:12 19:15,17,25 light 19:3 50:3 57:23 58:7,18,22 matterial 13:1 14:23 20:11,16 21:11 light 19:3 50:3 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:22 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 43:8,10 78:18 79:17 18:14 21:7 66:2 43:8,10 78:18 70:7,15 month 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:1 mean 17:22 86:1 mean 17:22 86:2 morni 62:9 65:18,21,24 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 10:71:23 73:6 morni motion 72:1,23 78:23 litigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:12 73:6 morni motion 80:16 litigation 27:8 39:13,24 60:16 litigation 27:8 30:3 4	,9 ent 76:5 ay 88:13
	ent 76:5 ay 88:13
Kink 071.3 15:7,14 43:22 loss 27:5 31:21 58:3 67:2,3,5,11 Mondi 18:12 19:15,17,25 lieu 18:16 89:6 i3:20,22 56:21 57:23 58:7,18,22 morey 20:11,16 21:11 limit 21:9 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 morth 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 49:16 losses 48:18 morth 47:9,14,19,20 lime 31:11 40:21 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 moth 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 moth 86:1 65:24 66:5 77:6 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 71:23 73:6 morni 65:24 66:5 77:6 literally 31:22 luhrs 11:17 14:7 mean 17:22 28:2 86:2 77:21,23 78:23 litigated 24:19 30:3 48:12,21 motion movia 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 movin movia 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 30:3 48:12,21 movin meeting 34:18,21 movia 1abeled 42:1,5 fo:16 main 40:5 77:25 main 40:5 77:25 main 40:5 77:25 main 40:5 77:25 meeting 34:18,21 movin 1acey 10:18 54:14,15,17,20 <t< td=""><td>ay 88:13</td></t<>	ay 88:13
Inite Trib 10.11,17 lieu 18:16 89:6 33:20,22 56:21 79:15,19 89:8 money 18:12 19:15,17,25 light 19:3 50:3 157:23 58:7,18,22 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 22:1 27:4 35:20 limit 21:9 19:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 49:16 losses 48:18 70:7,15 month 47:9,14,19,20 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 81:1 54:23 55:9 58:11 link 17:23 86:1 mean 17:22 28:2 73:6 62:9 65:18,21,24 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 71:23 morth moth 65:24 66:5 77:6 lists 66:25 litigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 80:16 88:15 litigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 motio 60:11,14 73:25 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meeting 34:18,21 movin 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 main 40:5 77:25 merits 23:4 16:6 1aber 29:11 49:1 little 52:17,19 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 meeting 34:18,21 32:2 1accy 10:18 54:14,15,17,20	•
10:12:17:13:13:12:12 light 19:3 50:3 57:23 58:7,18,22 matter 13:13 14:23 month 20:11,16 21:11 limit 21:9 1imit 21:9 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 37:2,3,14 46:22 limit 21:9 limit 21:9 19:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 65:24 66:5 77:6 list 16:6,7 76:24 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 71:23 mean 17:22 28:2 86:22 65:24 66:5 77:6 list 66:25 literally 31:22 lot 71:23 means 42:20 48:24 motion 80:16 88:15 litegate 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 meeting 34:18,21 move 2 45:25 47:6 50:8 60:16 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 11itigation 27:8 34:22 35:17 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meeting 34:18,21 movin 12 bloed 29:11 49:1 little 52:17,19 main 40:5 77:25 majority 74:25 meeting 34:18,21 movin 13 27:12 locate 64:9,11 olded 29:17 33:7.9 70:3,3 84:2 meetis 23:4 16:6	ダイス・IX
22:11,10 limit 21:9 79:17 18:14 21:7 46:19 month 22:1 27:4 35:20 limit 21:9 listed 49:16 losses 48:18 70:7,15 month 47:9,14,19,20 line 31:11 40:21 losses 48:18 lost 22:19 48:14 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 81:1 54:23 55:9 58:11 link 17:23 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 71:23 mean 17:22 28:2 86:22 65:24 66:5 77:6 lists 66:25 louder 54:15 means 42:20 48:24 motion 77:21,23 78:23 litigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 45:25 47:6 50:8 ditigation 27:8 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 90:6 meetings 87:1 multip 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 meits 23:4 16:6,2:7 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 maingority 74:25 meting 39:3 metics 23:4 16:6,2:7 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 manage 39:3 matge 39:3 metric-based 29:14 37:2 laredo 43:24	n 26:12 71:11
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
47:9,14,19,20 line 31:11 40:21 lost 22:19 48:14 matters 43:2 44:9 70:13 48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 81:11 54:23 55:9 58:11 link 17:23 86:1 mean 17:22 28:2 86:22 62:9 65:18,21,24 list 16:6,7 76:24 lot 71:23 73:6 morni 65:24 66:5 77:6 lists 66:25 louder 54:15 means 42:20 48:24 motion 77:21,23 78:23 litegant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 80:16 88:15 litigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 49:12 89:19 90:1 35:16 multip 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 meret 28:25 48:22 12:20 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 main quicty 74:25 mertis 23:4 16:6 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 main quicty 74:25 mertis 23:4 16:6 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:22	v
48:2,3,3,5 52:14 43:8,10 78:18 79:22 85:20 44:11 81:11 54:23 55:9 58:11 link 17:23 86:1 mean 17:22 28:2 86:22 65:24 66:5 77:6 list 66:25 lot 71:23 73:6 morni 77:21,23 78:23 literally 31:22 Luhrs 11:17 14:7 mechanism 22:18 move 2 80:16 88:15 litigated 24:19 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 60:11,14 73:25 litigation 27:8 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meeting 87:1 multip 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 mere 28:25 48:22 12:20 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 maing 23:16 32:7 met 13:11 27:22 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 managed 39:7 metric-based 29:14 37:2 129:1 70:5 long 18:21 24:9 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	8 80:9 81:8,9
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,
62:9 65:18,21,24 list 16:6,7 for 71:23 73:6 morning 65:24 66:5 77:6 lists 66:25 louder 54:15 meenas 42:20 48:24 motion 77:21,23 78:23 literally 31:22 Luhrs 11:17 14:7 meetanism 22:18 motion 80:16 88:15 litigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 26:10 28:7 66:10 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 60:11,14 73:25 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meetings 87:1 multip 1abeled 42:1,5 60:16 M main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 30:7,970:3,384:2 12:20 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 making 23:16 32:7 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 managed 39:7 managed 39:7 metric-based 29:14 37:2 1arge 27:12 long 18:21 24:9 28:12,14,17,24 37:2 53:1	
02.9 03.16,21,24 lists 66:25 louder 54:15 means 42:20 move 24 65:24 66:5 77:6 literally 31:22 Luhrs 11:17 14:7 mechanism 22:18 move 2 80:16 88:15 litigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin 45:25 47:6 50:8 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meetings 87:1 multip 1 1 59:13,24 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 30:5 14:22 labeled 42:1,5 60:16 1 main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 12:20 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 10:25 14:22 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 43:25 34:3, large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 long 18:21 24:9 28:12,14,17,24 methodology 43:8 32:24	
Ibital constraints Interally 31:22 Luhrs 11:17 14:7 mechanism 22:18 move 2 80:16 88:15 Itigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 45:25 47:6 50:8 Itigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 60:11,14 73:25 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 movin L 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meeting 87:1 multip 33:21,24 59:11,12 59:13,24 60:9,13 60:16 meet 14:2 25:3 14:22 Iabeled 42:1,5 60:16 meeting 87:1 multip 59:13,24 60:9,13 60:16 meet 14:2 25:3 14:22 Iabeled 42:1,5 Ittle 52:17,19 main 40:5 77:25 meeting 87:1 multip 1acey 10:18 54:14,15,17,20 main 40:5 77:25 meret 23:24 48:22 12:20 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 meet 13:11 27:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:3 matage 39:3 43:25 34:3, large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	ing 17:14,14
11121,25 160.25 1itigant 28:13 20:24,25 21:4,5 meet 14:2 25:3 40:8 80:16 88:15 1itigated 24:19 31:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 meeting 34:18,21 66:10 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 90:6 meeting 34:18,21 movin 1 1 1 1 1 90:6 meeting 87:1 multip 1 1 59:13,24 60:9,13 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 mere 28:25 48:22 12:20 1 1 54:14,15,17,20 main 40:5 77:25 meet 13:11 27:24 1 1 1 27:24 1 1 27:24 1 1 1 27:24 1 1 1 1 1 1 27:24 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 27:24 1 </td <td></td>	
knowledge 45:23 litigated 24:19 21:15,19,23 24:18 26:10 28:7 66:10 45:25 47:6 50:8 34:22 35:17 30:3 48:12,21 movin 35:16 muffle 60:11,14 73:25 1itigation 27:8 30:3 48:12,21 35:16 muffle 1 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 35:16 muffle 1 33:21,24 59:11,12 90:6 meetings 87:1 multip 1 1 59:13,24 60:9,13 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 mere 28:25 48:22 12:20 1 1 54:14,15,17,20 majority 74:25 metrits 23:4 16:6 1 1 55:1 71:22 80:24 maxing 23:16 32:7 methodology 43:8 32:24 1 1 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 1 1 37:2 34:32 34:32 1 1 1 1 1 1<:1	20:12 32:19
Anomicuige 43.2534:22 35:1730:3 48:12,21meeting 34:18,21movin45:25 47:6 50:834:22 35:1730:3 48:12,2149:12 89:19 90:135:16mulfip60:11,14 73:2533:21,24 59:11,1290:690:6meetings 87:1multip1abeled 42:1,560:161611ttle 52:17,19main 40:5 77:25mere 28:25 48:2212:201abor 29:11 49:11ittle 52:17,1954:14,15,17,20main 40:5 77:25meret 28:25 48:2212:201ack 27:555:1 71:22 80:24making 23:16 32:7met 13:1127:241ag 27:12locate 64:9,1133:7,9 70:3,3 84:2met 13:1127:241arge 28:3,16,20,21Lone 75:5manage 39:343:2534:3,1arge 28:3,16,20,21Lone 75:5Iong 18:21 24:982:12,14,17,24mic 52:2153:111arge 27:23 29:1852:9 55:12 62:2428:12,14,17,24microphone 14:1754:4	43:1 48:4
49:12 89:12 89:19 90:1 35:16 muffle 1	
Solution Solution <th< td=""><td>0</td></th<>	0
L59:13,24 60:9,13 60:16members' 45:8 mere 28:25 48:22Murrelabeled 42:1,5 labor 29:11 49:160:16 little 52:17,19main 40:5 77:25 majority 74:25members' 45:8 merely 27:12 30:5MurreLacey 10:18 lack 27:554:14,15,17,20 55:1 71:22 80:24main 40:5 77:25 majority 74:25merely 27:12 30:514:24 merely 27:12 30:5lag 27:12 Laredo 43:24 44:8 29:1 70:5locate 64:9,11 lodged 29:1733:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 manage 39:3 manage 39:3methodology 43:8 43:2532:24 metric-based 29:14large 28:3,16,20,21 29:1 70:5Lone 75:5 long 18:21 24:9 52:9 55:12 62:24Management 26:18 28:12,14,17,24metric-based 29:14 mic 52:2137:2 mic 52:21	ed 54:20
M mere 28:25 48:22 12:20 labeled 42:1,5 60:16 main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 30:5 14:24 lack 27:5 54:14,15,17,20 making 23:16 32:7 merts 23:4 16:6, lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:3 matric-based 29:14 37:2 large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	ple 70:22,25
labeled 42:1,3 00.10 main 40:5 77:25 merely 23:23 48:22 12:20 labor 29:11 49:1 little 52:17,19 main 40:5 77:25 merely 27:12 30:5 14:24 lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 making 23:16 32:7 met 13:11 27:22 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:3 43:25 34:3, large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 mic 52:21 53:1	ey's 10:7
Lacey 10:18 54:14,15,17,20 majority 74:25 merits 23:4 16:6, lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 making 23:16 32:7 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:3 metric-based 29:14 37:2 29:1 70:5 long 18:21 24:9 28:12,14,17,24 mic 52:21 53:11 large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	0 13:9 14:5
lack 27:5 55:1 71:22 80:24 making 23:16 32:7 met 13:11 27:24 lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 met hodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 long 18:21 24:9 managed 39:7 metric-based 29:14 37:2 large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	4 15:19,21
lag 27:12 locate 64:9,11 33:7,9 70:3,3 84:2 methodology 43:8 32:24 large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:3 43:25 34:3, large 27:12 long 18:21 24:9 Management 26:18 37:2 large 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	,21 18:5
Ing 27:12 Iocate 6 (1),11 manage 39:3 inctification (1),11 Laredo 43:24 44:8 lodged 29:17 manage 39:3 43:25 34:3, large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 manage 39:7 metric-based 29:14 37:2 29:1 70:5 long 18:21 24:9 Management 26:18 mic 52:21 53:11 larger 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	4 31:1 32:10
Large 28:3,16,20,21 Lone 75:5 managed 39:7 metric-based 29:14 37:2 29:1 70:5 long 18:21 24:9 28:12,14,17,24 mic 52:21 53:1 larger 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	4,25 33:13,19
Inige 2013,10,20,21 Inite 101 Init 101 Inite 101 Inite 101	,5,12 35:20
larger 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	47:13 48:7
larger 27:23 29:18 52:9 55:12 62:24 28:12,14,17,24 microphone 14:17 54:4	1,13,14,23
	56:1,1,2,4,12
law 10:13 13:17 63:3,10 72:3,10 29:7,9,19,23 34:4 55:24 56:10	6,17,24 57:18
04 6 0 10 00	,17,21 59:1
	6,19,20 60:5
	1,15,24 61:3
	,6,9,12,15,16
73 10	9 62:4 63:15
	,7 65:2,6
	,, 65:2,6 7 67:19 68:18
	1 69:7,10,13
	9 70:9 73:13
	, 10., 15.15
length 62:9 80:19 71:11 73:12 74:24 45:13 minutes 21:16 86:4	4 74.5 77.23
1000000000000000000000000000000000000	4 74:5 77:23
margin 43:2,4 44:8	

Tage 55				
mute 14:16 46:5	noted 30:25 32:3	71:18 72:13 73:4	80:18 81:2,22	page 12:3,10,19
mutually 38:22	46:20	75:9,21,24 76:19	opportunity 15:25	42:17 45:5 47:3
mutuany 50.22	notes 82:11	77:13 78:6,10	19:5 20:11 21:6	64:21,23 65:2
N	notice 32:3	79:6 80:6,16	21:24 22:13 26:15	PAGES 10:9
N 11:1 12:1,1,18	November 70:16	82:25 85:3,7,13	30:16	paid 71:12
name 13:16,24	number 12:19 13:7	86:10 87:7,9,14	opposition 25:11	paper 47:3 50:16
37:10 38:8 51:25	14:10 27:1,22	88:15,25 90:1,18	28:22	60:22,22
51:25 52:1,1 56:4	36:10	old 81:13	order 23:20 32:13	paragraph 35:14
names 56:2	numberings 47:3	Olympia 11:7	32:13 34:19 35:11	parent 28:3,16,20
native 46:24 47:4	numberings 47.5 numbers 42:10	Olympic 10:8	35:13,14 36:6	28:21 29:1
47:12 90:10	45:10,15	12:20 13:10 14:6	59:21,23 60:2	part 19:25 41:20
nature 18:18 80:17	43.10,15	22:16,19 23:12,15	61:15,25 62:4	49:5,14 68:17
81:2	0	23:17,19 24:1,2,4	67:4,11,12,14	74:4 77:11 81:12
necessary 25:3	O 12:1,1	26:9,12,22 27:12	70:7,15,16 75:1	87:3
61:16	O'Brien 11:4 14:1	27:17,22 28:21	76:1 79:19 86:19	
need 14:17 18:23	o0o- 13:2	29:4,10,12,18	87:18 88:6	participants 74:25 particular 21:8
19:16 21:12,14	oath 38:2 51:19	30:5,9 33:3 39:9	orders 35:11 79:5	39:7 67:1
23:19 26:7 55:24	object 14:17	56:5,6,8,13 61:4,6	ordinarily 41:3	particularly 19:3
59:8 66:4 67:4	objection 12:24	61:9 68:13 73:21	•	26:10 30:12 43:7
74:20 79:16,19	17:21 18:9 58:10		Oregon 39:6	80:20
needed 70:6	62:12 63:1 65:21	73:23 74:7 81:22	original 45:11	
Needing 74:9	66:1,3,8 84:22,25	82:8	outcome 91:15	parties 13:20 14:15
needs 17:24 26:22	observation 17:15	Olympic's 22:1	outset 23:9	16:12 40:24 47:15
62:10	obvious 34:7	26:14,15 27:6,13	overall 43:9 73:23	75:25 76:25 77:7
neither 25:19	occasions 82:24	63:15	74:5 83:12 84:7	89:9,10 90:16
net 33:3 45:2	occur 79:21	on-the-job 53:7	overcharged 40:7	91:14
neutral 32:15 71:3	occurred 27:8 41:7	once 20:13	40:19	party 16:3 20:11
71:6	occurrence 31:19	ones 71:13	overcharging	25:4
never 73:9	October 83:15,18	ongoing 60:9,12	44:25 45:4	passage 24:5 48:24
new 55:14	offer 46:3 58:17	op 42:8	overcollect 23:22	passed 48:23
Nice 14:2	69:19	open 25:23 34:18	overcollection	Patterson 10:24
noise 14:16	Offhand 80:15	34:21 35:16 76:20	71:15	91:7,23
nonse 14:16 non-confidential	office 11:5 14:7	opening 12:5,6	Overlapping 36:21	
		20:7,12,17 21:22	78:12 89:12	pay 29:16
64:23	official 41:13,13,21	30:21,23 41:15	overpaying 44:18	paying 32:20
non-regulated 59:6	45:9	operate 24:12	override 25:8	payment 71:9
59:7	Oh 18:12 46:4	operates 56:4	overrule 66:7	payments 60:12
nonregulated	82:12	operating 24:1	oversee 39:3	PDF 41:25 42:18
29:11 42:22 56:21	okay 13:4 14:8,13	29:13 42:8 43:13	overseen 39:7	46:22 47:23
58:1 80:3,4	16:20 17:10 18:4	65:9 74:10,10	owners 31:20 48:13	penalty 91:10
normally 62:24	18:11 19:13,24	operation 27:6,24	owners' 33:16	people 55:8 76:23
63:11 86:11	20:22,22 21:17,20	73:24	P	78:4
Northwest 22:24	35:9,18,25 37:22	operational 79:17		percent 41:22
24:21 25:12,16	39:22 44:3 46:15	81:23	P 11:1,1 12:1	percentage 73:23
31:7,11	46:18 48:1 49:6	operations 38:13	p.m 13:6 90:23	74:5,7
note 14:23 19:14	51:4,15 55:18	39:18 56:13,14	Pacific 24:21 31:7	Perfect 16:20 18:4
24:3	56:16 63:16 71:2		31:10	
	1	1	1	1

Pag	ae 1	100
	,	

				0
18:11 19:24 37:22	51:10,24 53:3	18:2 20:13,14	produce 68:21 69:1	prudence 87:5
48:1 51:15 77:13	57:6,9,23 59:11	21:6,14,24 32:22	69:4,7,10,13,16	public 11:9,11
85:13 88:25	64:12,15 68:3,6	33:12,13 34:2	produced 68:25	33:11 49:11 77:10
perform 67:18	72:11 74:3 80:23	76:9	81:23 86:23	77:14,22 87:11
performed 67:21	PLLC 11:18	presented 42:20	Professional 91:8	pull 36:16 88:12
performing 33:10	plus 44:8	presenting 37:3	profit 43:11,13	purpose 40:5 76:14
period 23:2 27:10	PNB 24:25 25:6,14	president 55:10	50:9	pursuant 49:15
29:7,20 34:11	25:18 26:23 28:6	presiding 13:17	project 81:6	put 62:1 77:1 79:15
39:15 41:4,8 42:1	PO 11:6	15:2	projection 80:8	88:20
43:20 56:20 70:23	point 16:12 27:4	pressures 48:25	prolonged 50:9	putting 38:19
71:11 72:17,25	30:20 39:14 40:10	pretty 31:9	promulgated 25:7	
73:1,2 78:20,23	41:23 46:2 49:7	prevailed 27:10	promulgation 25:7	Q
80:14,22 82:18,25	50:11 74:20 75:2	78:14	prong 48:7	quantitative 20:7
83:11 85:23 86:1	86:5 87:10	prevailing 49:25	prongs 48:10	question 20:4 28:16
periods 84:6	policies 67:13	prevails 49:3	pronouncing 37:11	35:2 50:12 54:7
perjury 91:10	pool 23:1	price-out 45:19	37:13	58:11 63:2 66:15
person 39:17	Port 58:1	pricing 38:11 39:2	properly 25:20	74:3,5 80:23 82:6
pertinent 15:16	portend 50:10	39:3	propose 44:19	82:15 84:5,19
43:8,10	portion 88:2	primarily 39:6 45:7	proposed 39:20	85:5 89:20
Peters 75:22,23	position 26:9 41:14	primary 39:14	40:12 42:1 43:21	questionable 67:8
petition 15:1,20	42:14,15 52:6,9	prior 16:10 87:25	44:5,6 45:9,20	questions 15:5
22:2,3,10,17	possible 71:11	private 63:5	83:22 84:11	19:21 20:3,19
23:12 26:15 27:13	possibly 81:9	probably 15:10	proposition 25:13	30:17,19 41:3
28:4,23 31:1	post-COVID 55:5	18:19 47:1 52:20	proprietary 74:22	46:2 50:24 57:4
44:20 45:18,24	55:7	75:8	76:16 91:12	57:15 71:17 75:12
54:3,6,10 56:17	potential 45:3	problem 18:25	protection 49:23	85:12 90:16
56:18,19,25	potentially 32:6	19:11 21:18 46:7	protective 75:1	quick 77:4 89:19
petitioner 25:14	powers 25:18	47:2 52:14,16	76:1	quiet 54:18
28:9,19 29:1	practical 24:10	problems 50:10	protracted 27:7	quite 29:3 34:20
phone 17:23 50:21	practices 67:14	procedural 18:14	prove 67:4	
81:18	pre-filed 16:11	procedurally 17:4	proves 22:18	R
phonetic 43:24	precedent 25:9	proceed 13:21 17:9	provide 15:25 20:9	R 11:1 12:1 91:1
75:5,7,22	31:15,21,25 34:21	18:6,12 20:3,16	20:11,11 30:21	raise 14:18 37:17
picked 78:15	precedential 35:16	37:3 51:1 65:22	31:18 36:4 45:2	51:10
piece 50:3	preclude 28:2 29:1	66:9 78:11	45:15,18 47:9,15	raised 65:22
pilotage 50:15	prefer 18:17 20:5,8	proceeded 83:14	57:25 67:4 69:20	raises 15:8
plan 69:7	preliminary 14:22	proceeding 10:11	provided 20:18	rapid 34:8 70:25
planned 33:8	preparation 38:19	15:15 18:22 26:4	24:16 35:21 41:25	rate 12:21 13:11
planning 69:24	39:13 80:14	34:22 35:17 39:24	45:21 47:8 60:6	15:1,20 22:4,12
70:3	prepare 62:10 63:6	73:10,11 88:3	82:2	22:18,25 23:25
pleadings 24:15	63:11 80:9,20	proceedings 12:3,4	provides 50:15	24:5,10 26:14
please 14:18 19:17	81:1,7 86:11,19	78:5 90:23	providing 59:15	27:18 28:4,8,19
38:9,10 39:22	prepared 20:9	process 40:20	60:5 88:7	29:5,6 30:9 31:1,3
40:3,24 41:1,24	preparing 39:9	44:24 54:24 81:13	provision 15:12	31:23 32:4,24
43:23 45:6 51:5	present 15:21,24	83:20	27:2 50:1	34:12,15,22 38:19
				39:19 40:18 44:21
	1	1	1	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

48:9 49:20 50:13	really 40:6,18	26:15 50:9	relevant 22:21	represents 23:25
50:16,20 53:22,25	43:21 45:14 77:4	recovered 60:21	35:11	43:5
54:4 56:18,20,25	reason 19:16 47:8	recycling 80:18	relief 13:12 15:1,20	request 12:21 22:6
58:6,8,19 61:4,7,9	59:8	Redacted 12:25	23:20 24:7 25:2	22:7 23:20 27:18
61:10,12,16,17	reasonable 43:4	redirect 12:16 16:1	25:18,19 26:3	29:5,17,19 39:14
62:1,6,11,14,22	67:16	46:16 85:9,15	27:14,18 28:4,8	41:21 47:13 57:5
62:25 63:4,6,12	reasons 48:8	refer 24:25 74:9	28:19 29:2,5	58:8 61:25 77:11
66:17,21,22 67:19	rebuttal 21:12	reference 36:24	30:13 31:1,3 32:4	79:2,4 82:17,23
68:8 70:22,24,25	recap 18:5	48:21	32:5,21 34:22	83:23 84:11,14,20
71:3,7,8,12,14	receive 32:18 58:21	referenced 35:3	44:21 48:9 49:21	87:23 89:9
72:10 73:25 79:10	58:24 71:13	46:21 48:6 59:11	50:20 54:4 56:18	requested 57:3
80:1,7,9,20 81:1,7	received 16:6 52:24	76:15	56:25 58:8 83:5	59:17 61:23 69:2
83:5,13 86:5,12	53:7 91:12	referring 37:15	84:7	70:14 83:5 84:6
86:19	receives 34:6 71:8	58:13,13	relieve 45:14	84:15
ratemaking 23:1	receiving 71:9	reflect 67:13	relying 35:20 50:22	requesting 22:3
ratepayer 40:7	recognize 22:6	reflected 46:9	remain 13:14 25:23	23:24 24:7 26:3
ratepayers 22:8,13	44:22	reflective 30:10	81:13	30:13
23:10,23 26:20	recognizes 40:8	refraining 69:24,24	remains 32:21	requests 22:2 38:22
30:12 32:6,16,18	50:19	reframe 65:25	remarks 23:9	57:3,11,13,14,19
33:23 40:11,19	recommendation	refund 22:7,13,22	remedy 22:15	67:9,10 82:3
42:24 44:17 49:20	67:15	23:8 26:19 30:14	32:15 70:14 71:3	required 22:20
49:24 59:2,5,9	recommended	32:11,15 40:9	71:6	61:20 66:25 74:1
60:15	44:20	44:18 49:9,15,19	remember 85:17	requirement 22:23
ratepayers' 22:22	reconciliation 45:7	49:24 71:3	86:10,16,18	43:9,18 44:20
rates 22:3,14 26:16	record 13:5 14:9,21	refunds 49:25	remote 73:1	49:24 89:10
26:19 27:15 28:15	14:23 19:16,25	regard 35:18 39:22	repeat 74:3 80:23	requirements 28:9
32:11,15 34:7,20	26:11 30:7 38:8	regards 15:15	82:15	67:14,15
35:16 39:20 40:9	38:17,24 40:24	Registered 91:8	rephrase 58:14,16	requires 25:9 63:5
40:15 43:25 45:20	41:11,23 43:22	regulated 29:11	63:7,9	requiring 62:4
45:22,24 49:14,15	46:10,23 47:24	31:18 38:13 42:22	reply 14:25 19:4,5	reroute 79:16
50:15 56:19 60:8	49:5 51:25 65:21	42:23,24 43:17	88:16	rerouting 29:10
67:16,17 71:15	66:274:2176:14	53:14,15 69:20	report 63:25 64:20	79:21
84:8	84:2 85:2,4 87:15	80:3,4	64:23 72:14,19	reserve 30:19
ratio 43:13	89:1 90:21	regulatory 12:23	74:17	resolved 59:24
read 36:7 79:4	recorded 76:10	27:12 52:8,11	reported 73:21	respect 74:22
reading 36:18,20	78:5	53:1,18 64:18,24	74:5,11 82:8	Respondent 10:9
reads 49:14	recording 13:13,15	65:2 66:20,22	reporter 14:20 76:9	11:15
ready 17:7 20:14	76:18 78:3 91:12	reiterate 35:22	91:8,8	responding 38:22
50:25	recordings 91:11	reiterated 49:7	reports 63:17,20,23	response 15:12
real 55:24	recordkeeping	rejected 32:12	63:24 64:2,4,7,9	19:7 23:11 27:11
realities 27:10	87:4	rejoin 77:8,25	64:10,17,19,21	81:24 82:1
48:24	records 19:18	related 38:18 57:15	65:3,5 73:13,15 73:19	responses 57:10,19
reality 24:8,10	47:11 67:11 75:25	relationship 38:25	73:18	responsible 39:17 42:24
28:25 48:17,22	77:4	relative 91:13	represent 74:8	
49:2	recoup 22:19 23:5	relegated 25:15	represented 50:7	rest 83:19

				1 age 102
restart 81:14	69:11,14,17	satisfy 25:3 26:7,22	53:18 58:1 69:21	similarly 23:22
resubmitted 47:12	road 50:10	27:18 28:7,9	80:18	28:21 32:1
result 40:14 41:20	Roberson 11:3	48:15,19	serving 85:23	simply 16:4 23:10
44:15 70:23	12:14,16 13:23,24	Savall 75:7,18	serving 85.25 session 75:2,8 76:3	28:1,7 31:21
resulted 33:21	16:16,19 17:5,19	savan 75:7,18 saying 29:25 72:17	76:13 77:11,25	43:22
41:21	17:22 18:8,13,16	says 26:2	78:4	single 56:12 64:21
resulting 44:15	19:20 20:21 30:24	Schedule 12:23	sessions 76:8	single 30.12 04.21 situated 32:1
results 39:18	35:5,8,10,23		set 20:6 43:25 49:8	situated 32.1 six 24:25 25:1,3,4
		scheduled 21:10 88:1		25:15 26:22 33:2
retroactively 23:6 return 30:10 59:18	36:15,19 46:13	schedules 64:18	77:20 88:8 91:16	
	50:17,25 51:3,23		setting 32:4	63:14 64:10,16,21
71:14	52:17,22,24 54:22	Scheduling 12:7	settlement 61:8	65:3,6,10,11
returned 23:2	55:1,7,11,25	87:21	seven 19:5 81:11	66:12,13 80:9
32:18	58:14,17 62:13	school 53:6	88:10,11,17 89:7	81:8,9,11 86:22
reveal 54:9	63:7,10 66:10,11	screen 39:25	90:3,5	six-month 61:23
revelation 19:3	71:16,19 74:12,19	SE 10:17	severance 29:15	size 80:17 81:2
revenue 26:12	74:25 75:4,15	Seattle 11:12,19	Sharbono 12:13	slew 27:13
31:21,24 33:2,4	77:21 84:22 85:9	second 31:7 35:24	19:21 32:23,25	solemnly 51:11
41:4,22 42:1 43:3	85:11,16 87:7,9	65:24	33:12 34:2 51:1,5	solid 31:3 50:12
43:9,11,12,16,18	88:2 89:14,15	section 49:16 53:17	51:6,9,18 52:1,18	53:16,17 56:10
43:20 44:12,20	Robert 11:10 77:17	72:7,7,11	54:13 62:13 72:3	58:1,2 62:10,14
45:19 60:24 65:9	77:18,19	see 17:11,25 18:1	74:13 75:17 77:22	62:24 63:11,16
65:12 67:12,13,15	robert.sykes@at	19:10 21:17 50:25	78:13 82:12 84:1	72:23 73:4 79:25
68:13 78:18,20	11:10	54:9 60:15,24	84:19 85:10,17	80:1 86:11
85:20	role 39:9	67:6 70:25 81:20	shared 80:2	soon 87:19
revenues 33:23	room 17:25 19:17	88:21	shareholders 26:11	sorry 16:17 20:24
63:21 65:6 73:20	76:2,21,22 77:5	seeing 75:14	48:15	29:25 35:7 46:4,5
73:23 74:6,10	77:21	seeking 27:14	sheets 66:24	54:18 77:15 80:24
review 32:24 54:8	Rough 66:13	seeks 30:9	shortages 29:11	85:1 89:13
66:17 67:11,22	roughly 66:11	seen 65:8 73:17	shortened 70:23	sort 22:11
68:12 72:20 74:21	70:17	seminal 24:20	shorter 34:11 81:9	sought 25:2
79:5,19 83:16	routes 80:2	send 75:25 88:16	shoulders 22:8	sounds 88:18,23
89:8	routinely 81:25	sense 28:1 67:7	show 63:20 65:5	space 88:7
reviewed 62:14,16	ruin 23:14	sent 17:23 76:10	69:19 70:9	span 24:11
67:18	rule 22:21 25:8	sentence 54:12,25	showing 34:14 45:5	sparingly 32:9
reviewing 46:19	31:9 49:13 50:16	separate 56:6,8	shown 31:12 33:1	speak 52:18 54:15
66:21,23 89:4	rules 31:11 50:14	separation 73:25	shows 31:4 33:3	65:15,19 66:4
reviews 66:22	67:14	September 39:10	65:8	speaker 54:14 76:4
right 22:22 23:7	run 44:25	45:12 82:13,17,19	shut 33:4	76:7,17,20 78:2
32:18 37:17 41:19	Ryan 77:9,20	serve 24:6 25:9	sides 77:7	90:17
48:20 49:24 51:8		34:21	signed 75:1,5,18,20	speaking 14:17,19
51:10 55:4,13	S	service 31:18 32:19	75:23 76:1,24	70:17 77:15
88:21	S 11:1 12:1	33:5,11 50:5	77:12	speaks 27:1,3
risk 22:8 23:10	S-11 68:4	59:15 60:5 80:4	significant 50:16	special 80:18
33:14,15 40:7,11	S-H-A-R-B-O-N-O	serviced 78:21	50:20	specific 29:15
40:19 44:17,25	52:2	services 29:11	similar 29:3 82:8	57:21 76:15
	safety 29:16 45:2			
	I	I	I	1

Page	1	03

specifically 27:21	23:11 27:20 42:12	subject 22:7 26:19	sustained 84:25	81:12,14
48:11 58:12 82:4	42:13 44:11,15,20	30:13 32:11,15,16	85:1	testified 38:2 51:19
specifics 74:21	45:16 57:11,19	40:9 49:15 50:19	swear 20:14 37:5	73:9 78:14 79:9
speech 36:21 78:12	68:7,7 74:11 87:3	66:15 71:3 79:23	37:17,18 51:2,10	80:6
89:12	stage 20:5,13,20	83:17	51:11	testify 15:25 17:16
speed 15:8,17	22:12	submissions 41:7	switched 84:17	32:25
spell 49:17 51:25	stake 33:16	49:5	sworn 38:2 51:19	testifying 84:13
spelled 28:9 38:7	stale 81:14	submit 63:6 69:2	SYKE 87:13	testimony 12:22
49:25	standard 23:18	88:6	Sykes 11:10 77:10	30:9 32:23 37:18
spelt 52:2	24:19 48:15 49:18	submitted 19:6	77:16,17,18	40:12,13 41:13,15
Spokane 26:18	89:9	39:10 46:21,23	system 63:25 64:1	41:21 42:3,6,7,12
28:12,24 29:3,7,9	standards 13:11	47:4 62:5 66:23	79:17	42:14 44:6 45:9
29:19,23 34:6,18	25:1 26:10 27:19	67:1 68:1,9 87:11		45:11,17 51:12
35:19 73:14 82:5	48:19	substantial 58:7	T	58:18 78:7 86:14
82:9	standing 24:6	substituted 15:17	T 12:18 91:1,1	87:12,17 89:3
spoke 17:13,14	standpoint 19:3	substituting 18:6,9	table 13:25 14:7	TG-143189-02 36:8
80:13 81:16	stands 25:13 84:9	substituting 10.0,9 substitution 17:20	tacked 83:7	TG-143889 36:5,11
spoken 17:19 63:13	start 13:21 14:22	subtract 44:7	Tad 77:15	TG-230778 10:6
80:10	17:4,18 41:3 78:4	successful 22:18	take 13:19 18:20	53:23 54:2 82:16
spread 45:19	started 55:14 72:22	23:4	26:1 40:12 44:5	TG-23778 13:7
spreadsheet 68:3	state 39:4 51:24	succession 71:1	62:24 63:11 80:22	thank 19:12,25
Square 10:17	63:16 81:21 91:3	suffering 33:25	81:7 86:25 87:18	21:5,19,23 24:17
ss 91:4	91:9	suffers 27:12	89:3,7	30:3,15 36:12,25
staff 11:2 12:6,22	stated 22:23,25	suffice 21:16	takes 62:21 63:13	37:13,24 42:4
13:22,25 15:22,24	27:2 83:18 84:16	sufficient 34:10	80:9,14 86:11	46:1,10 50:23
16:16,19 17:1	statement 16:3	67:17	talk 13:20 14:19	51:15 55:5,17,22
18:5,9,17,20	18:17 20:12,17	suggest 33:17	56:16 57:22 61:2	58:16 71:18 74:18
19:18 20:18 25:11	30:21 84:9	suggests 33:9 34:14	talked 35:15 48:10	77:18 85:7 87:8
25:12 27:11,21,22	statements 66:24	Suite 11:12,18	68:17 73:12 81:11	87:16 88:25 89:2
28:22 30:4,21,23	states 26:2 39:6	Superior 60:3	talking 20:25 41:12	89:15 90:6,19,22
32:22,24 33:6	statute 22:21	superseded 45:12	tariff 34:9,10 45:21	theme 23:11
34:16 38:21 40:13		supplemental 89:8	74:2	therewith 25:10
42:6,7 45:8,10	stay 60:3 61:9	supply 47:21	technology 55:4	they'd 78:20
46:12 50:22 54:1	stemming 60:12	support 14:25	telephone 14:10	thing 19:14 35:14
54:7 56:23 57:2,3	step 59:17	supposed 18:22	22:24 23:4 24:22	57:22 61:2 87:23
64:1,16 65:22	steps 67:18 68:22	sure 15:4 24:15	24:23	things 43:18 66:5
67:2,9,12,25	Steven 75:22	36:24 37:12 75:6	tell 38:9 55:23	67:5
68:18 69:2 70:19	stipulate 16:13,23	76:6,11,13 77:1	temporary 34:20	think 21:11,13,16
70:22 71:2 74:1	stipulated 46:9	88:7 89:22 90:2	ten 79:7 86:2,5 89:7	22:5,23 23:8
75:25 76:24,25	stipulation 16:10	surmise 29:20	ten-day 89:10	35:21 38:8 40:15
77:22 82:13,17,23	stop 32:19 72:19	surprise 79:6,8	tender 46:3	42:17 45:1 46:25
83:16,17,22 84:6	stopped 72:21	suspend 84:17	terminate 58:4	47:23 48:2,5,9,17
84:11,13,20 88:5	stored 63:23,24	suspending 84:18	terms 62:10 63:5	50:18 75:1 76:21
89:14	Street 11:18	suspension 82:24	territory 59:16	77:4 88:9,9 89:24
staff's 16:7 19:6,15	subdivision 27:23	83:23 84:6	80:3	89:25
		50.20 0 110	test 41:4,8 43:19	
	I	l	Í	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

				5
thought 85:4	42:12	underlie 33:20	verify 57:4 67:11	59:14 91:3,9
threat 31:17	transition 20:19	understand 18:21	79:20	wasn't 47:20
three 35:12	translating 54:23	80:2	Verizon 25:12,16	wash 147.20 waste 26:17 28:12
threshold 21:7	transportation	understandable	32:13 35:3	28:14,17,24 29:7
Thursday 13:5	10:2,4,17 11:6	29:20	version 46:24	29:9,19,23 31:3
time 13:6 18:21	13:8 52:5 53:15			
	53:19 72:7	understanding 17:20 44:2 48:4	versus 13:9 24:21	34:4,6,8,17,23
21:9,11,13 24:5,9			35:19	38:9,14 50:12
24:11 27:10 29:21	transposed 42:10	78:19 79:13 86:24	virtual 13:14	53:16,17 56:10
34:11,13 39:16	42:11,12	87:2,25	virtually 14:14	58:1,2 59:14,21
48:24 51:8 56:20	travel-related	undue 26:4,8,10	VOL 10:11	60:6,22 62:10,14
61:13,25 62:3,9	29:15	31:4 48:6 68:19	vs 10:6	62:24 63:11,16
63:5 70:23 72:6,8	treatment 32:1	70:10	W	72:23 73:4,15,17
78:17,21,24 80:20	tried 45:2	unfair 28:1		79:25 80:1 86:12
80:22 81:1 83:4	trouble 37:11 52:13	unforeseen 45:3	W 11:16	water 50:14 72:7
83:12 86:11 90:20	55:2	unfortunately	WA 10:24	72:22
times 37:11 49:8	true 57:18 65:1	17:12	WAC 14:24 22:21	way 15:12 54:14
title 38:9,25	68:10 73:20 78:16	UNIDENTIFIED	25:9 26:1 27:2	75:8 77:8,25 87:4
today 13:5,5,10,21	truth 37:19,20,20	76:4,7,17,20 78:2	28:6 29:2 31:2	we'll 13:20 16:2
14:5,15,20 15:4	51:12,13,13	90:17	67:1	17:25 18:12 52:22
15:10,15 16:5	try 48:4 52:20	Union 11:18	Wages 24:12	we're 13:5,15,20
18:6 21:7,10,25	trying 31:10 44:14	unique 25:23	wait 83:12	14:14 18:6 21:12
22:11,14,17 23:19	Tuesday 17:13	Unit 11:11	waiting 17:25	23:22 30:25 37:15
27:13 29:18 30:9	turn 30:20 37:2	unjustifiably 32:20	waive 89:9	42:25 43:15,16
37:19 49:3 51:12	57:6,21 59:10	updating 39:18	walk 40:22 41:2	65:18 71:11,22
70:17 87:12,17,25	63:15 64:12 68:3	use 67:21	want 16:12 17:3	74:13 84:2 88:7
89:3 90:13,19	88:9	usually 76:8 81:11	19:23 24:15 30:1	90:21
today's 13:17 47:16	turning 24:19	UTC 24:21	36:24 37:12 44:24	we've 40:15 77:12
tomorrow 55:8	55:25	Utilities 10:2,4,17	44:25 46:22 47:9	website 36:16
tools 67:21,24,25	two 29:8 34:17	11:6 13:8 52:4	47:23 48:3 65:20	Wednesday 17:14
top 43:5,13 81:17	36:17 60:19,21	53:15,18	76:4,12,25 77:14	week 18:23
topic 70:13	62:8 78:15 82:24	utilities' 31:20	84:20 87:10,14,16	welcome 55:18
topics 57:12,14	84:5	utility 24:23,24	87:23 88:7 89:2	90:7
total 42:1,19	twofold 44:22	31:17,23 50:21	90:10,11,19	went 34:18 42:15
totals 42:9	type 26:3 42:21		wanted 15:4 21:8	65:22
tracking 63:25	types 60:20	V	50:11 83:20,21	weren't 15:5
trade 56:4	typical 62:9 81:6	validate 67:4	84:16 86:19 88:15	Westlaw 36:6,8,18
traditionally 32:8	typically 76:3,7	value 43:17	89:22 90:9	WHEREOF 91:16
training 29:16	typically 70.5,7	Vandenburg 12:11	wanting 88:16	Wiley 11:16 12:12
52:25 53:7	U	17:17,23 18:2,3,7	wants 27:17	12:15 14:4,5,12
transcribe 76:10	ultimate 84:7	18:9 37:7,8,13	warrant 48:9	15:6 16:14,22
transcribed 10:24	ultimately 38:20	38:1,7 41:10 43:6	Washington 10:1,4	17:3,7,10 19:2,9
91:11	78:14	46:14,25 47:5	10:17,18 11:7,11	19:12 20:4,23,24
	unable 17:16 23:5	variance 42:17	11:12,19 13:8	
transcript 89:7	69:20	various 39:5 57:4	31:18 35:19 38:13	21:2 36:1,5,10,13
transcription 13:14	unaware 15:6 19:4	verge 23:12	39:4 52:4 53:15	36:18,22 37:24
transferred 42:11	unclear 34:4	verification 79:23	53:18 56:3 58:2	38:6 46:1,7,17,25
			55.10 50.5 50.2	l

47:18,25 48:20	87:4 88:10	100,000 26:12	3	7
50:6 52:13 54:11	worth 64:9	48:14	3 27:22 52:8,11	72 12:15
54:22 55:5,9,12	wouldn't 83:11,11	11 32:13 35:12,14	53:1 66:20	72 12.15 788 35:10
55:16,20,23 58:10	85:22	12 29:5	3.5 70:18 71:11	700 33.10
62:12 63:1 65:14	wrapping 30:4	12.88 41:22	83:8	8
66:3 71:21 72:2	write 18:19,21	13 12:4 24:4,9	3:32 90:23	800 11:12
75:10,20 78:8,13	written 19:8 35:24	26:13 27:9 29:6	3.32 90.23 30 12:6 25:6 40:25	85 12:16
84:24 85:3,8,17	wrong 36:20	29:21 34:13,19		863028 36:8
86:23 88:15,18,23	WUTC 73:9	35:13 48:22 49:4	41:24 84:20,21 31 57:11	87 12:7
89:16,17,24 90:9		143089 36:17		07 12.7
Williams 11:18	X	15 21:16 39:11	360.664.1188 11:7	9
willing 16:12,22	X 12:1,18,18	16 12:22	37 37:11	91 10:9
18:23 89:11,14		17 12:23,24,25	38 12:12 44:11	98101 11:19
window 15:13 21:8	Y	18 10:12 13:1,5	4	98104 11:12
window 15.15 21.8 wipe 33:16	yeah 39:2 41:2,16	42:2 44:6	4 67:1	98504 10:18 11:7
witness 12:10 15:23	42:5 43:10,11	19 41:11 42:3,15	40 80:7,11	989,000 44:13
17:11 20:13,14,15	44:4 45:7,21	1972 24:24	40 -ish 62:20	990 44:15
32:23 37:3,5,7,10	55:11 80:24 90:4	1)1224.24	40-151 02.20 40128 11:6	990,000 40:10
37:14,21,23 38:1	year 72:17 81:12	2	40128 11.0 408-07-420 67:1	<i>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</i>
46:3 47:6 51:1,6,8	81:14	2 27:1 42:17 45:5		
51:14,16,18 52:16	years 24:4,9,24	58:25	4100 11:18	
52:20 54:16,19	25:6 26:13 27:9	20 65:13 66:14	480-07-375 14:24	
55:19 74:15 75:18	29:5,6,8,22 33:2	2000 11:12	480-07-520 22:21	
	34:13 37:11 48:22	2004 32:13	25:7 26:2 27:19	
77:22 85:2 91:16	49:4 53:8 62:8	2004 52:15 2011 61:7	28:10 49:13	
witnesses 15:24	64:9,10,16,22	2011 45:9	480-07-526 31:2	
88:1	65:3,7,10,11	2015 28:13,25 36:6	5	
WL-863028 36:6	66:12,13 72:5,12	82:13,17,21	5 15:2 89:21	
wonderful 14:8	79:7 81:18 86:2,6	2019 72:21	50 24:24	
19:13 90:22		2010 72:21 2020 59:22	50,000 44:16	
wondering 75:12	Z	2020 59:22 2021 60:1,7	500,000 44:10	
Wonderlick 17:11	Zoom 10:15 14:15	2021 00.1,7 2022 58:5	51 12:14	
18:10 39:1,2,17		2022 38:5 2023 39:11 82:19	53,000 43:5	
Wonderlick's	0	83:1	33,000 45.5	
38:25	02 36:6	2024 10:12 13:1,6	6	
Woodland 10:17	040 35:8,9	45:13 91:17	6 22:21 26:2 27:19	
words 15:12 22:16	040788 32:13 34:19	206.464.7740 11:13	49:13 88:21 89:21	
26:7 70:24	35:6	200.404.7740 11.13 206.628.6600 11:19	90:5	
work 19:18 47:3,17	047 35:7	200.028.0000 11:19 21 12:5 57:11	6.5 72:12,17	
53:17 77:2,24	07488 35:3	21 12:5 57:11 23 45:12	60 82:25 83:1,2	
88:13,14		23 45:12 230778 61:17 62:7	84:20	
worked 53:8,19			601 11:18	
workers 29:12	1 55:15 70:16	66:18 67:19 25 47:17 00:11	621 10:17	
working 68:7,8	1.6 41:22 44:7	25 47:17 90:11 2731 10:24 01:23	65 74:7,8	
73:1	1:32 13:6	2731 10:24 91:23	6th 89:24,25	
works 76:11 78:2	10 10:9 21:16	29 88:13,17	011 07.2 4 ,23	
		29th 90:5 91:17		