Docket No. UW-170924 - Vol. I

Hand v. Rainier View Water Company, Inc.

December 18, 2017



COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



Page 1	Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; DECEMBER 18, 2017
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	2 1:30 P.M.
Sarah Hand,) DOCKET NO. UW-170924	3000
) Complainant,)	4 PROCEEDINGS
) vs.)	
)	 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then let's be on the record in Docket UW-170924, captioned Sarah Hand v.
Rainier View Water Company,) Inc.,)	 Rainier View Water Company, Inc. I am Gregory J. Kopta,
	 9 the administrative law judge who will be presiding over
, Respondent.)	10 this matter, and we are here today on Monday, December
PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I	11 18th, 2017, for a prehearing conference.
Pages 1-23	12 Let's begin by taking appearances, and we'll
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA	13 start with those who are in the room. Because I have
December 18, 2017	14 filings from all of you, I just need your name and law
1:30 p.m.	15 firm, if applicable, and who you represent.
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	16 Mr. Finnigan.
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest	17MR. FINNIGAN: Richard Finnigan representing18Rainier View Water Company.
Olympia, Washington 98504	19 JUDGE KOPTA: And on the phone for Staff?
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	20 MR. ROBERSON: Assistant attorney general
	21 Jeff Roberson, on behalf of Staff.
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840	22 JUDGE KOPTA: And for Ms. Hand?
Seattle, Washington 98101	23 MR. MALDEN: Nigel Malden, and I'm here with
(206) 287-9066 Seattle (360) 534-9066 Olympia	24 my paralegal, Anna Lee.
(800) 846-6989 National www.buellrealtime.com	25 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you.
Page 2	Page 4
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	1 Mr. Malden, if you would make sure you are close to the
3 GREGORY J. KOPTA Washington Utilities and	2 phone when you're talking, you're a little bit faint.
4 Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW	3 MR. MALDEN: Okay. I've actually got you on 4 speakerphone. I'll take you off speakerphone.
5 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1160	4 speakerphone. I'll take you off speakerphone. 5 JUDGE KOPTA: That's probably going to be
6 7 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	6 helpful.
8 JEFF ROBERSON (via bridge line) Assistant Attorney General	7 MS. HAND: Gretchen Hand is also on the
9 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 40128	8 phone.
10 Olympia, Washington 98504	9 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you,
(360) 664-1188 11 jroberso@utc.wa.gov	10 Ms. Hand.
12 FOR THE COMPLAINANT:	11 MS. HAND: Sarah Hand is also on the phone.
13 NIGEL S. MALDEN (via bridge line)	12 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we have you
14 Nigel Malden Law, PLLC 711 Court A, Suite 200	13as well. And you're you will be represented by14counsel; is that correct, Ms. Hand?
15 Tacoma, Washington 98402 (253) 627-0393	15 MS. HAND: Yes.
16 nm@nigelmaldenlaw.com 17	16 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you.
FOR RAINIER VIEW WATER COMPANY, INC.	17 First thing is usually interventions. I
RICHARD A. FINNIGAN 19 2112 Black Lake Boulevard SW	18 haven't received any petitions to intervene nor have I
Olympia, Washington 98512 20 (360) 956-7001	19 heard from anybody on the phone who wishes to intervene,
rickfinn@localaccess.com	20 so I'm assuming that there are none. And hearing
ALSO PRESENT:	21 nothing, there are no interventions, so the parties
22 SARAH HAND (via bridge line)	22 stand as they are currently represented.
23 GRETCHEN HAND (via bridge line) ANNA LEE (via bridge line)	23The next issue is discovery. Do the parties24believe that they need to have the Commission's
24 * * * *	25 discovery rules available?
25	
25	

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 5		Page 7
1	MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is	1	MR. MALDEN: It is, but I remain really
2	Richard Finnigan. I would so ask.	2	confused since it was not me that initiated the
3	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will make	3	complaint. It was the WUTC that on its own motion
4	them available. And since we are having discovery, is	4	initiated the complaint asserting it had jurisdiction.
5	there a need for a protective order?	5	And I'm really unclear on how it is how I'm supposed
6	MR. MALDEN: This is Nigel speaking for	6	to go about that, determining what the scope of that
7	Ms. Hand. I'd have to see discovery to know whether	7	jurisdiction is, and I just don't really quite
8	there's a need for a protective order.	8	understand it. I didn't file the complaint, first
9	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, usually a protective	9	complaint. I was told the WUTC had no jurisdiction. If
10	order would be issued if there is a need for	10	the WUTC wishes to assert jurisdiction, should it not be
11	confidential information as defined under RCW 80.04.095.	11	the one to determine and say what it is deciding? What
12	So I don't know. That would probably be the Company	12	it is asserting jurisdiction over?
13	that would have those kinds of concerns. But we don't	13	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, Mr. Malden, and just for
14	need to decide that today. It may be that as discovery	14	when you next speak, if you would get closer to the
15	progresses, if there is a need, then I can receive a	15	phone because we are having a hard time hearing you. We
16	request and we can enter an order at that time.	16	initiated this proceeding in response to a complaint
17	Is that acceptable, Mr. Finnigan?	17	that we received from Ms. Hand. And in response to that
18	MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, it is.	18	complaint, the Commission initiated this adjudication.
19	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then that's what	19	I recognize that there is a history, that this did come
20	we'll do.	20	before the Commission in an open meeting. Subsequently,
21	The next and last issue that I have on my	21	Ms. Hand filed a complaint in superior court. And
22	list is the schedule in this case. As the parties are	22	during the course of the proceedings before the Court,
23	aware, I had requested briefing on the Commission's	23	the Court dismissed this the case there because
24	jurisdiction and ability to provide remedies to	24	the believed that the Commission has primary
25	Ms. Hand, and I received responses from all three	25	jurisdiction over at least some of the issues that
	Page 6		Page 8
1	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the	1	Page 8 Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that
1 2		1 2	
	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what		Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication.
2	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward.	2 3 4	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware
2 3	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this	2 3 4 5	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were
2 3 4	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that	2 3 4	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the
2 3 4 5 6 7	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm
2 3 4 5 6	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be sure I have a clear understanding of what issues are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for me to write up another complaint and address it, then so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be sure I have a clear understanding of what issues are involved in this matter, so that would be my primary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for me to write up another complaint and address it, then so be it. I'm just reluctant to get into a long process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be sure I have a clear understanding of what issues are involved in this matter, so that would be my primary concern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for me to write up another complaint and address it, then so be it. I'm just reluctant to get into a long process which is going to end in the WUTC once again saying oh,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be sure I have a clear understanding of what issues are involved in this matter, so that would be my primary concern. JUDGE KOPTA: And I share your concern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for me to write up another complaint and address it, then so be it. I'm just reluctant to get into a long process which is going to end in the WUTC once again saying oh, we don't have jurisdiction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	parties. It seems as if there is consensus that the Commission has jurisdiction, but there is not consensus, or at least I would like to have a better sense, of what the issues are that we will be litigating going forward. I know the Company had recommended that we dismiss this case and initiate a new one with the issues raised that have been raised by Ms. Hand in superior court that have been deferred back to the Commission essentially by the superior court. I don't know that we need to do that, but my inclination would be to have Ms. Hand or her counsel file a revised complaint so that we cover the issues that are properly before the Commission in light of superior court's decision. Mr. Finnigan, does that accord with your understandings? MR. FINNIGAN: I would have no objection to that procedure. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. FINNIGAN: My concern is I want to be sure I have a clear understanding of what issues are involved in this matter, so that would be my primary concern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Hand raised in her complaint. In response to that action, the Commission initiated this particular adjudication. So from my perspective, I am not fully aware of the Court's decision or all of the issues that were presented to the Court in terms of which ones the Commission has primary jurisdiction over, and I'm relying on you and the other parties to make sure that whatever issues the Commission has primary jurisdiction over are presented for adjudication. So as Mr. Finnigan indicated earlier, my interest is to make sure that we are covering those issues. And I believe as the party who is initiated this proceeding way back when, that it would be incumbent on you to inform the Commission what issues you wish for us to adjudicate. MR. MALDEN: Well, okay. Like I say, it's odd to me, because I think the WUTC has stated in writing it doesn't have jurisdiction to decide the issue that needs to be decided. But if the parties wish for me to write up another complaint and address it, then so be it. I'm just reluctant to get into a long process which is going to end in the WUTC once again saying oh,

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 11
1	determination that I am prepared to make at this point,	1	MR. ROBERSON: The 29th is a Monday.
2	Mr. Malden. That's why I asked for the briefing, to at	2	JUDGE KOPTA: So let's make it the 29th. I
3	least from an initial point of view, determine what the	3	would hope that we would be able to establish other
4	parties' views are on what the Commission's jurisdiction	4	procedural schedule guidelines at this point.
5	is. And as I read the response that you provided as	5	Am I being overly optimistic, Mr. Finnigan?
6	well as the response that the Company and Commission	6	MR. FINNIGAN: I don't think so. I mean,
7	Staff provided, there is agreement that there are at	7	the question I had in my mind driving over here this
8	least some issues that are within the Commission's	8	afternoon was whether we're going to have prefiled
9	jurisdiction.	9	testimony. And if that's the case, it's obvious we can
10	So I don't think that the issue that we have	10	set up the schedule for that and and proceed. I
11	before us is whether or not the Commission has	11	think that would be the preferred way to do it. I think
12	jurisdiction. It is instead, what is the extent of the	12	that helps discovery makes discovery shorter and
13	Commission's jurisdiction and what remedies can we	13	keeps everybody focused on the issues.
14	provide if it is demonstrated that the Company is	14	JUDGE KOPTA: I would agree that that is my
15	somehow operating in violation of Commission statues,	15	preferred outcome.
16	rules, or orders.	16	Mr. Malden, I recognize that you don't
17	So what I would like from you is to present	17	regularly practice before the Commission, so I'm not
18	in a complaint the issues that you believe the	18	sure how familiar you are with our procedures. But
19	Commission has jurisdiction over and the issues that you	19	often in or generally in cases such as this, we will
20	would like the Commission to render a determination on.	20	have testimony that is prefiled on behalf of each of the
21	MR. MALDEN: Okay.	21	parties. Usually the complainant would file their
22	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will need	22	testimony first and then after a period of time,
23	a time frame for that. When do you expect that you	23	responsive testimony would also be filed, and then we
24	would be able to submit that for filing?	24	schedule a hearing for cross-examination on that
25	MR. MALDEN: How about ten days?	25	prefiled testimony. Are you familiar at all with that
	Page 10		Page 12
1	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. So that would be	1	type of process?
2			
	January 7th? Which is on the weekend, so it would be	2	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony,"
3	January 7th? Which is on the weekend, so it would be January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I	2 3	
	-	1	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony,"
3	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I	3	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit?
3 4	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar.	3 4	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like
3 4 5	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct.	3 4 5	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is
3 4 5 6	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right.	3 4 5 6	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the
3 4 5 6 7	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine.	3 4 5 6 7	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down
3 4 5 6 7 8	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will	3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes. MR. FINNIGAN: Is the default. I I I	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater. And we know from that, as I put in my brief,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes. MR. FINNIGAN: Is the default. I I I would like to stay with the default, please, under the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater. And we know from that, as I put in my brief, that there is a very, very serious problem when the DOH
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes. MR. FINNIGAN: Is the default. I I I would like to stay with the default, please, under the Commission's rules.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater. And we know from that, as I put in my brief, that there is a very, very serious problem when the DOH has no idea of what's going on, and I couldn't possibly
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes. MR. FINNIGAN: Is the default. 1 1 1 would like to stay with the default, please, under the Commission's rules. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then that would be	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater. And we know from that, as I put in my brief, that there is a very, very serious problem when the DOH has no idea of what's going on, and I couldn't possibly bring that information to you other than through live
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	January 8th, I think. Monday, January 8th. Am I I don't have a calendar. MR. FINNIGAN: That is correct. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. MR. MALDEN: That would be fine. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will anticipate or let's put it this way, we will adopt that date as the date by which you will file a revised complaint. Mr. Finnigan, how much time would you like to respond? Or would you like an opportunity to respond? MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yeah. Yes, I would. I'm trying to remember what the rule is on that. Isn't it 20 days? JUDGE KOPTA: 20 days is the default, yes. MR. FINNIGAN: Is the default. I I I would like to stay with the default, please, under the Commission's rules. JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then that would be the 28th, although, again, not having a calendar, I	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MALDEN: You say "prefiled testimony," do you mean a declaration or affidavit? JUDGE KOPTA: Well, it's something like that. It's actually testimony in Q and A format that is essentially what your witness would say if you asked the questions live. So it's just simply written down instead. MR. MALDEN: The problems that I have with this that I can see right now is I have to rely on the testimony of State employees who, number one, aren't willing to cooperate with me and number two, even if they were willing, they wouldn't without a lawyer. And I'm referring to specifically, for example, the DOH employees. And their testimony is critical because they're going to tell you, the DOH is going to tell you, that we're not aware of a single complaint forwarded by the WUTC or by Rainier View groundwater. And we know from that, as I put in my brief, that there is a very, very serious problem when the DOH has no idea of what's going on, and I couldn't possibly bring that information to you other than through live testimony where I have the ability to subpoena

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 13		Page 15
1	And so I don't know that I'm comfortable	1	Department of Health, then I think it's incumbent upon
2	with I mean, what I would ask is whether we can have	2	you to obtain that information. We can discuss whether
3	a hearing where we subpoena witnesses and they testify	3	that would be in the form of prefiled testimony or live
4	live and they're subject to both direct and cross.	4	testimony. We certainly do not want to encourage or
5	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, we have engaged in that	5	incur have you incur expenses that are unnecessary,
6	process in the past. It is somewhat difficult, but it	6	and it may be that, rather than prefiled testimony, that
7	is possible. There's also through the discovery	7	we would have live testimony. I have not made a
8	process, you are entitled to seek to depose any	8	decision on that, but ultimately, you will need to
9	witnesses, even third parties, although that is	9	provide the witnesses and the information that the
10	generally not allowed, to obtain the information that	10	Commission needs to make a determination.
11	you need to support your case.	11	MR. MALDEN: Yes, I definitely understand
12	MR. MALDEN: Well, the problem with that is	12	that obligation. I'm just saying if I have the option,
13	the idea of shifting to the consumer the cost of	13	if I have the ability to compel testimony by subpoena to
14	depositions of government officials makes no sense to	14	the hearing, then that's how I want to do it. Because
15	me, especially when the WUTC is telling us up front that	15	if I have to submit written summaries of what people
16	the most they can do is maybe order a partial refund of	16	might say, I mean, that is not consistent with due
17	the water bill. It's not reasonable for me to incur	17	processes rights of citizens in this country.
18	thousands of dollars going around taking depositions of	18	I cannot I cannot get Department of
19	State employees. I shouldn't have to do that.	19	Health or other State government employees to cooperate
20	You know, if I could call up the DOH and	20	voluntarily in something like this. They're all going
21	they would talk to me on the phone and they answer	21	to require a subpoena to testify, whether it be at a
22	questions and commit to doing the declaration, I would	22	deposition or at a hearing. And what I'm suggesting is
23	be very happy to do it that way, but I know they won't.	23	I'd rather not have the consumer, citizen, incur the
24	They're not going to talk to any member of the public in	24	cost of the deposition, thousands of dollars gone. I
25	a case like this unless they have an AG present. And	25	think it would be much fairer and much more appropriate
	Page 14		Page 16
1	Page 14 it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect	1	Page 16 to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a
1 2		1 2	
	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect		to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my
2	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would	2	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very
2 3	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and	2 3 4 5	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time.
2 3 4 5 6	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who	2 3 4 5 6	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where
2 3 4 5 6 7	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate.	2 3 4 5 6 7	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying
2 3 4 5 6	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point,	2 3 4 5 6	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and it's unfortunate, but I don't really see a way around it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed? MR. FINNIGAN: My preference remains the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and it's unfortunate, but I don't really see a way around it because if you don't do it, then I don't know who else	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed? MR. FINNIGAN: My preference remains the prefiled testimony route. If we go another route for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and it's unfortunate, but I don't really see a way around it because if you don't do it, then I don't know who else would.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed? MR. FINNIGAN: My preference remains the prefiled testimony route. If we go another route for live testimony, we'd have to have dates for witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and it's unfortunate, but I don't really see a way around it because if you don't do it, then I don't know who else would. So at this point, I leave it up to you. If	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed? MR. FINNIGAN: My preference remains the prefiled testimony route. If we go another route for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it's absurd with this entire system designed to protect the consumer that these are the roadblocks that are put up. And I don't want to agree to spend all that money to secure deposition testimony. I think that I would like, if I can, to have [inaudible] served subpoenas and compel the testimony of government employees who otherwise will not cooperate. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, at this point, Mr. Malden, I have no knowledge about what the Department of Health would do in these circumstances. So I'm I recognize that you have much more familiarity with these issues than I do, having ventured to superior court, but that is one of the aspects of adjudication or litigation that is rather inescapable. You have the burden to prove that the Company is not acting lawfully, and if you need the testimony of employees of another government agency to make to carry that burden, then it is up to you to to be able to do that. And I recognize that it is an expense and it's unfortunate, but I don't really see a way around it because if you don't do it, then I don't know who else would.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to have power of subpoena tell an individual to attend a hearing in Olympia and testify live, and I'd be very happy to make sure that I'm efficient, I'm quick with my questions, I'm totally prepared and so we're not wasting time. But I'm trying to avoid the situation where we have to personally spend thousands of dollars trying to compel testimony in a deposition format to present, because I think that live testimony's better and is far more economical for a consumer face-to-face for a situation like this. JUDGE KOPTA: Well, again, I don't know what the Department of Health's response will be. So I'm not willing at this juncture to assume that they would not cooperate. But, Mr. Finnigan, you have been listening to this exchange, do you have anything to contribute in terms of what the Company's preference would be in terms of how we proceed? MR. FINNIGAN: My preference remains the prefiled testimony route. If we go another route for live testimony, we'd have to have dates for witness lists, we'd have to have time to take discovery of

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
-			
1	quicker route, and I couldn't say whether or not it		JUDGE KOPTA: You are welcome to contact me
2	would be more or less expensive for the complainants,	2	or my legal assistant to check on dates if if you
3	but the complainants are the ones that brought the	3	need to do that, and certainly we would rather you do
4	complaint, and they it's it's going to be their	4	that so that we don't go back and forth saying well, you
5	obligation to put on a case.	5	know, pick another date because that one doesn't work.
6 7	And it's my company my client's right to	6	So yes, if you get to that point, if you can agree on a
	be able to be prepared for whatever case they put on. So if we don't go the prefiled testimony route, we'll	8	hearing date. But if not, if you have individual
8 9	need to come up with an alternative schedule that's got	9	proposals, then please contact us to make sure that the hearing room and I am available on whatever date it is
10	firm dates for witness lists, firm dates for reply	10	that you propose.
11	witness lists, and time to take discovery in the interim	11	MR. FINNIGAN: Okay.
12	so that everybody's equally prepared for a live hearing	12	JUDGE KOPTA: Haven't heard anything from
13	if that's the route we go.	13	Mr. Roberson. Are you have anything to contribute,
14	So I don't see it the reason you didn't	14	Mr. Roberson?
15	hear from me earlier was I was trying to figure out how	15	MR. ROBERSON: I do not. I don't think
16	in the world this the route of live testimony would	16	Staff has any particular format preference, so I'll talk
17	be any cheaper than prefiled testimony, and I wasn't	17	to Staff and then I'll speak to the other parties.
18	coming up with any strong answers so	18	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then that's how we
19	JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I am not either, because	19	will proceed.
20	I certainly can anticipate if there are third-party	20	Mr. Malden, does that make sense to you?
21	witnesses such as employees of the Department of Health,	21	MR. MALDEN: The only thing I wasn't sure on
22	that there would would necessarily involve some	22	is when you asked for an additional document to be filed
23	discovery, and it may be that the Company would initiate	23	on January 8th. Do you mean that's confirmation of
24	the deposition. But whether the Company initiated the	24	whether or not Mr. Finnigan and I have agreed on a plan,
25	deposition or the complainants did, there would still be	25	and if we haven't, then we submit our own by January
	Page 18		
	Fage 10		Page 20
1	5	1	
1 2	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be		8th?
	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness	1 2 3	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would
2	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be	2	8th?
2 3	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say.	2 3	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or
2 3 4	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be	2 3 4	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are
2 3 4 5	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going	2 3 4 5	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will
2 3 4 5 6	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route.	2 3 4 5 6	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide.
2 3 4 5 6 7	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th. Mr. Finnigan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be set?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th. Mr. Finnigan? MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, do you have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be set? JUDGE KOPTA: That is entirely up to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th. Mr. Finnigan? MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, do you have any dates where you know the hearing room and your schedule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be set? JUDGE KOPTA: That is entirely up to the parties. I do not have any preconceived notion of when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th. Mr. Finnigan? MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, do you have any dates where you know the hearing room and your schedule would not allow you to appear? I would hate to pick a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be set? JUDGE KOPTA: That is entirely up to the parties. I do not have any preconceived notion of when the hearing will be. I don't know how long you will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a deposition. I was a litigator myself, and I would be very loathe to walk into a hearing room with a witness who I had no idea what he or she was going to say. So I don't know that there are going to be any cost savings, as Mr. Finnigan points out, with going a live route as opposed to the prefiled testimony route. But my belief at this point is that we're not going to resolve that today. So what I'm going to have the parties do is to confer outside of this hearing room and see if they can agree on a format and schedule for this case. I would ask that they provide anything that they can agree on to me by the time that the revised complaint is filed on January 8th. If you cannot agree, then I would ask for proposals from each party as to how they would prefer to proceed and what deadlines should be established, including a proposed evidentiary hearing date. So both of those, whatever you are able to agree with, and if necessary your individual proposals, I would ask that you would file those by Monday, January 8th. Mr. Finnigan? MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, do you have any dates where you know the hearing room and your schedule	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	8th? JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, on January 8th I would like either an agreed schedule from the parties or individual schedules from each party as to what you are proposing that the Commission adopt and then I will decide. MR. MALDEN: Okay. And the agreed schedule, that would end with the last item, the date of the hearing, right? JUDGE KOPTA: It can, yes. I mean, often we will have post-hearing briefing, but that can await another date. At this point, I would just like to know the hearing date and any prefiled testimony filing dates. Or if we're going to have the live testimony or you're proposing live testimony, that there be times when witness lists are submitted and other prehearing deadlines are established; is that clear? MR. MALDEN: If I may ask one form of question on that. In general, are you thinking how far down the road are we thinking this hearing would be set? JUDGE KOPTA: That is entirely up to the parties. I do not have any preconceived notion of when

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Docket No. UW-170924 - Vol. I - 12/18/2017

	Page 21		Page 23
1	take. That's really something I look to the parties to	1	CERTIFICATE
2	provide me. I mean, I can certainly have my own ideas	2	
3	about how long it might be, but you are much better	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	informed than I am at this stage.	4	COUNTY OF THURSTON
5	MR. MALDEN: Okay.	5	
б	JUDGE KOPTA: All right, then. Is there	6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
7	anything further that we need to address today?	7	Reporter, in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
8	MR. FINNIGAN: No, Your Honor.	8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
9	MR. MALDEN: Actually, I guess one question	9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
10	that I have about the testimony. We actually do have	10	
11	deposition transcripts taken to DOH employees. In those	11	
12	depositions, Rainier View did have an attorney present	1.0	
13	at the time of those depositions, but it wasn't in the	12	SDIC4
14	context of this administrative hearing. I guess one	13 14	
15	question I might have is whether those depositions can	14	
16	be used in lieu of submitted statements that you	16	Jaylon Graningheuse Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
17	described earlier.	17	Tayler Ganinghouse, COR 0000
18	JUDGE KOPTA: As far as I'm concerned, it's	18	
19	a possibility to have depositions be a substitute for	19	
20	prefiled testimony as long as the witness is then	20	
21	available during the evidentiary hearings for	21	
22	cross-examination on that testimony.	22	
23	MR. MALDEN: Okay. All right. Well, that	23	
24	actually might be a solution for me to discuss with	24	
25	Mr. Finnigan, then. Okay. I appreciate it.	25	
	Page 22		
1	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. I will leave that		
2	to your discussion, and hearing nothing further, we are		
3	adjourned. Thank you.		
4	(Adjourned at 1:59 p.m.)		
5			
б			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16 17			
17 18			
10 19			
20			
20			
22			
23			
24			
25			

6 (Pages 21 to 23)

Page 24

				T dyc 2
Α	appropriate 15:25	C 2:1 3:4 23:1,1	complainant 1:5	D
ability 5:24 12:23	asked 9:2 12:6	calendar 10:4,23	2:12 11:21	$\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ 3:4
15:13 23:9	19:22	call 13:20	complainants 17:2	date 10:10,10 18:17
able 9:24 11:3	aspects 14:13	captioned 3:7	17:3,25	18:25 19:5,7,9
14:18 17:7 18:18	assert 7:10	carry 14:18	complaint 6:12 7:3	20:8,12,13
absurd 14:1	asserting 7:4,12	case 5:22 6:6 7:23	7:4,8,9,16,18,21	dates 16:22 17:10
	assistant 2:8 3:20	11:9 13:11,25	8:1,21 9:18 10:11	
acceptable 5:17 6:25	19:2	14:24 17:5,7	12:17 17:4 18:13	17:10 18:23 19:2 20:14
	assume 16:14	18:11	concern 6:20,23,24	
accord 6:15	assuming 4:20	cases 11:19	concerned 21:18	day 10:24
accurate 23:9	attend 16:1	CCR 1:20 23:16	concerns 5:13	days 9:25 10:17,18
acting 14:16	attorney 2:8 3:20	certainly 15:4	confer 18:9	deadlines 18:16
action 8:2	21:12	17:20 19:3 21:2	conference 1:11	20:17
additional 19:22	available 4:25 5:4	Certified 23:6	3:11	December 1:15 3:1
address 8:21 21:7		certify 23:8	confidential 5:11	3:10
adjourned 22:3,4	19:9 21:21	v		decide 5:14 8:19
adjudicate 8:16	Avenue 1:22	cheaper 17:17	confirmation 19:23	20:6
adjudication 7:18	avoid 16:6	check 19:2	confused 7:2	decided 8:20
8:3,10 14:14	await 20:11	circumstances	consensus 6:1,2	deciding 7:11
administrative	aware 5:23 8:4	14:10	consistent 15:16	decision 6:14 8:5
1:13 2:2 3:9	12:17	citizen 15:23	consumer 13:13	15:8
21:14	<u> </u>	citizens 15:17	14:2 15:23 16:10	declaration 12:3
adopt 10:9 20:5		clear 6:21 20:17	contact 19:1,8	13:22
affidavit 12:3	back 6:8 8:14 19:4	client's 17:6	context 21:14	default 10:18,19,20
afternoon 11:8	behalf 3:21 11:20	close 4:1	contribute 16:17	deferred 6:8
AG 13:25	belief 18:7	closer 7:14	19:13	defined 5:11
agency 14:17	believe 4:24 8:13	come 7:19 17:9	cooperate 12:12,25	definitely 15:11
agree 11:14 14:3	9:18 14:25	comfortable 13:1	14:7 15:19 16:15	demonstrated 9:14
18:10,12,14,18	believed 7:24	coming 17:18	correct 4:14 10:5	Department 14:10
19:6	best 23:9	Commission 1:2,17	cost 13:13 15:24	15:1,18 16:13
agreed 19:24 20:3,7	better 6:3 16:9 21:3	2:4,7 6:2,8,13	18:5	17:21
agreement 9:7	bill 13:17	7:18,20,24 8:2,7,9	counsel 4:14 6:11	depose 13:8
allow 18:24	bit 4:2	8:15 9:6,11,15,19	country 15:17	deposition 14:4
allowed 13:10	Black 2:19	9:20 11:17 14:24	COUNTY 23:4	15:22,24 16:8
alternative 17:9	Boulevard 2:19	15:10 20:5	course 7:22	17:24,25 18:1
Anna 2:23 3:24	Box 2:9	Commission's 4:24	court 2:14 6:7,9	21:11
answer 13:21	bridge 2:8,13,22,23	5:23 9:4,8,13	7:21,22,23 8:6	depositions 13:14
answers 17:18	2:23	10:21	14:13	13:18 21:12,13,1
anticipate 10:9	brief 12:19	commit 13:22	court's 6:14 8:5	21:19
17:20	briefing 5:23 9:2	company 1:7 2:17	cover 6:12	described 21:17
anybody 4:19	20:11	3:8,18 5:12 6:5	covering 8:12	designed 14:1
U U	bring 12:22	9:6,14 14:15 17:6	critical 12:15	designed 14:1 determination 9:1
appear 18:24	brought 17:3	17:23,24	cross 13:4	
appearances 3:12	Buell 1:21	Company's 16:18	cross-examination	9:20 15:10
applicable 3:15	burden 14:15,18	company \$ 10.16 compel 12:24 14:6	11:24 21:22	determine 7:11 9:3
appreciably 16:25	·	15:13 16:8	currently 4:22	determining 7:6
appreciate 21:25	C	13.13 10.0	currency 7.22	amicuit 13:6
appreciate 21:25	C	13.13 10.8		difficult 13:6

Page 25				
direct 13:4	everybody's 17:12	forwarded 12:17	11:24 13:3 15:14	issued 5:10
discovery 4:23,25	evidentiary 18:17	Fourth 1:22	15:22 16:2 17:12	issues 6:4,6,12,21
5:4,7,14 11:12,12	21:21	frame 9:23	18:2,9,17,23,25	7:25 8:5,9,13,15
13:7 16:23 17:11	example 12:14	front 13:15	19:7,9 20:9,13,20	9:8,18,19 11:13
17:23 20:25	exchange 16:17	fully 8:4	20:24 21:14 22:2	14:12
discuss 15:2 21:24	expect 9:23	further 21:7 22:2	hearings 21:21	item 20:8
discussion 22:2	expense 14:19		helpful 4:6	
dismiss 6:5	expenses 15:5	G	helps 11:12	J
dismissed 7:23	expensive 17:2	G 3:4	history 7:19	J 1:13 2:3 3:8
Docket 1:4 3:7	extent 9:12	Garlinghouse 1:20	Honor 5:1 18:22	January 10:2,3,3
document 19:22		23:6,16	21:8	18:13,20 19:23,25
DOH 12:14,16,20	F	general 2:8 3:20	hope 11:3	20:2
13:20 21:11	F 23:1	20:19		Jeff 2:8 3:21
doing 13:22	face-to-face 16:10	generally 11:19	I	jroberso@utc.wa
dollars 13:18 15:24	faint 4:2	13:10	idea 12:21 13:13	2:11
16:7	fairer 15:25	go 7:6 16:21 17:8	18:3	judge 1:13 2:2 3:6
Drive 1:18 2:4,9	falls 10:24	17:13 19:4	ideas 21:2	3:9,19,22,25 4:5,9
driving 11:7	familiar 11:18,25	going 4:5 6:4 8:23	inaudible 14:5	4:12,16 5:3,9,19
due 15:16	familiarity 14:12	11:8 12:16,16,21	inclination 6:11	6:19,24 7:13 8:25
	far 16:9 20:20	12:25 13:18,24	including 18:17	9:22 10:1,6,8,18
E	21:18	15:20 16:25 17:4	incumbent 8:15	10:22 11:2,14
E 2:1,1 3:4,4 23:1,1	figure 17:15	18:3,4,5,7,8 20:14	15:1	12:4 13:5 14:8
earlier 8:11 17:15	file 6:12 7:8 10:10	government 12:24	incur 13:17 15:5,5	16:12 17:19 19:1
21:17	11:21 18:20	13:14 14:6,17	15:23	19:12,18 20:2,10
economical 16:10	filed 7:21 11:23	15:19	indicated 8:11	20:22 21:6,18
efficient 16:3	18:13 19:22	Gregory 1:13 2:3	individual 16:1	22:1
either 17:19 20:3	filing 9:24 20:13	3:8	18:19 19:7 20:4	juncture 16:14
employees 12:11,15	filings 3:14	Gretchen 2:23 4:7	inescapable 14:14	jurisdiction 5:24
12:24 13:19 14:6	fine 10:7	groundwater 12:18	inform 8:15	6:2 7:4,7,9,10,12
14:17 15:19 17:21	Finnigan 2:18 3:16	guess 21:9,14	information 5:11	7:25 8:7,9,19,24
21:11	3:17,17 5:1,2,17	guidelines 11:4	12:22 13:10 14:25	9:4,9,12,13,19
encourage 15:4	5:18 6:15,17,20		15:2,9	
engaged 13:5	8:11 10:5,12,15	$\frac{\mathrm{H}}{\mathrm{H}}$	informed 21:4	$\frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{L}}$
enter 5:16	10:19 11:5,6	Hand 1:4 2:22,23	initial 9:3	keeps 11:13
entire 14:1	16:16,20 18:5,21	3:7,22 4:7,7,10,11	initiate 6:6 17:23	kinds 5:13
entirely 20:22	18:22 19:11,24	4:11,14,15 5:7,25	initiated 7:2,4,16	know 5:7,12 6:5,10
entitled 13:8	21:8,25	6:7,11 7:17,21 8:1	7:18 8:2,13 17:24	10:24 12:19 13:1
equally 17:12	firm 3:15 17:10,10	happy 13:23 16:3	interest 8:12	13:20,23 14:21
especially 13:15	first 4:17 7:8 11:22	hard 7:15	interim 17:11	16:12 18:4,23
essentially 6:8 12:6	focused 11:13	hate 18:24	intervene 4:18,19	19:5 20:12,24,25
establish 11:3	foregoing 23:8	Health 14:10 15:1	interventions 4:17	knowledge 14:9
established 18:16	form 15:3 20:18	15:19 17:21	4:21	23:9 Konto 1:12 2:2 2:6
20:17	format 12:5 16:8	Health's 16:13	involve 17:22	Kopta 1:13 2:3 3:6
Evergreen 1:18 2:4	18:10 19:16	hear 17:15	involved 6:22	3:8,19,22,25 4:5,9
2:9	forth 19:4	heard 4:19 19:12	issue 4:23 5:21 8:19	4:12,16 5:3,9,19
everybody 11:13	forward 6:4	hearing 4:20 7:15	9:10	6:19,24 7:13 8:25

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Page	26
. ~90	

				1 age 20
9:22 10:1,6,8,18	13:12 14:9 15:11	okay 4:3 8:17 9:21	pick 18:24 19:5	proceeding 7:16
10:22 11:2,14	19:20,21 20:7,18	19:11 20:7 21:5	plan 19:24	8:14
12:4 13:5 14:8	21:5,9,23	21:23,25	please 10:20 19:8	proceedings 7:22
16:12 17:19 19:1	matter 3:10 6:22	Olympia 1:18,23	PLLC 2:14	process 8:22 12:1
19:12,18 20:2,10	mean 11:6 12:3	2:5,10,19 3:1 16:2	point 9:1,3 11:4	13:6,8
20:22 21:6,18	13:2 15:16 19:23	once 8:23	14:8,23 18:7 19:6	processes 15:17
20:22 21:0,10	20:10 21:2	ones 8:6 17:3	20:12	progresses 5:15
	meeting 7:20	open 7:20	points 18:5	properly 6:13
L	member 13:24	operating 9:15	possibility 21:19	proposals 18:15,19
Lake 2:19	mind 11:7	opportunity 10:13	possible 13:7	19:8
law 1:13 2:2,14 3:9	Monday 3:10 10:3	opposed 18:6	possibly 12:21	propose 19:10
3:14	11:1 18:20	optimistic 11:5	post-hearing 20:11	proposed 18:17
lawfully 14:16	money 14:3	option 15:12	power 16:1	proposing 20:5,15
lawyer 12:13	motion 7:3	order 5:5,8,10,16	practice 11:17	protect 14:1
leave 14:23 22:1		13:16	preconceived 20:23	protective 5:5,8,9
Lee 2:23 3:24	Ν	orders 9:16	prefer 18:15	prove 14:15
legal 19:2	N 2:1 3:4	outcome 11:15	preference 16:18	provide 5:24 9:14
let's 3:6,12 10:9	name 3:14	outside 18:9	16:20 19:16	15:9 18:11 21:2
11:2	National 1:24	overly 11:5	preferred 11:11,15	provided 9:5,7
lieu 21:16	necessarily 17:22		prefiled 11:8,20,25	public 13:24
light 6:13	necessary 18:19	Р	12:2 15:3,6 16:21	public 13.24 put 10:9 12:19 14:2
line 2:8,13,22,23,23	need 3:14 4:24 5:5	P 2:1,1 3:4	17:8,17 18:6	17:5,7
list 5:22 16:24	5:8,10,14,15 6:10	p.m 1:16 3:2 22:4	20:13 21:20	17.5,7
listening 16:16	9:22 13:11 14:16	P.O 2:9	prehearing 1:11	Q
lists 16:23 17:10,11	14:25 15:8 17:9	Pages 1:12	3:11 20:16	question 11:7 20:19
20:16	19:3 20:25 21:7	paralegal 3:24	prepare 20:25	21:9,15
litigating 6:4	needs 8:20 15:10	Park 1:18 2:4,9	prepared 9:1 16:4	questions 12:7
litigation 14:14	new 6:6	partial 13:16	17:7,12	13:22 16:4
litigator 18:1	Nigel 2:13,14 3:23	particular 8:2	present 2:21 9:17	quick 16:3
little 4:2	5:6	19:16	13:25 16:8 21:12	quicker 17:1
live 12:7,22 13:4	nm@nigelmalde	parties 4:21,23	presented 8:6,10	quite 7:7
15:3,7 16:2,9,22	2:16	5:22 6:1 8:8,20	presiding 3:9	1
17:12,16 18:6	notion 20:23	11:21 13:9 18:9	primary 6:22 7:24	R
20:14,15	number 12:11,12	19:17 20:3,23	8:7,9	R 2:1 3:4 23:1
LLC 1:21		21:1	o.7,9 probably 4:5 5:12	Rainier 1:7 2:17
loathe 18:2	0	parties' 9:4	10:25	3:8,18 12:18
long 8:22 20:24,25	O 3:4	party 8:13 18:15	problem 12:20	21:12
21:3,20	000 3:3	20:4	13:12	raised 6:6,7 8:1
look 21:1	objection 6:17	people 15:15	problems 12:9	RCW 5:11
	obligation 15:12	period 11:22	procedural 11:4	read 9:5
M	17:5	personally 16:7	procedura 11:4 procedure 6:18	really 7:1,5,7 14:20
Malden 2:13,14	obtain 13:10 15:2	perspective 8:4	procedures 11:18	21:1
3:23,23 4:1,3 5:6	obvious 11:9	petitions 4:18	proceed 11:10	Realtime 1:21
6:25 7:1,13 8:17	odd 8:18	phone 3:19 4:2,8	-	reason 17:14
9:2,21,25 10:7	officials 13:14	4:11,19 7:15	16:19,24 18:16	reasonable 13:17
11:16 12:2,9	oh 8:23	13:21	19:19	receive 5:15
, ,		10.21		

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Pag	е	27
--	-----	---	----

received 4:18 5:25	20:9 21:6,23 22:1	somewhat 13:6	Tacoma 2:15	totally 16:4
7:17	rights 15:17	South 1:18 2:4,9	take 4:4 16:23	transcript 23:8
recognize 7:19	road 20:20	South 1:18 2:4,9 Southwest 1:18	17:11 21:1	transcripts 21:11
8	roadblocks 14:2			Transportation 1:2
11:16 14:11,19		speak 7:14 19:17	taken 21:11	1:17 2:4
recommended 6:5	Roberson 2:8 3:20	speakerphone 4:4,4	talk 13:21,24 19:16	
record 3:7	3:21 11:1 19:13	speaking 5:6	talking 4:2	true 23:8
referring 12:14	19:14,15	specifically 12:14	Tayler 1:20 23:6,16	trying 10:16 16:6,7
refund 13:16	room 3:13 18:2,9	spend 14:3 16:7	tell 12:16,16 16:1	17:15
regularly 11:17	18:23 19:9	Staff 2:7 3:19,21	telling 13:15	two 12:12
reluctant 8:22	route 16:21,21 17:1	9:7 19:16,17	ten 9:25	type 12:1
rely 12:10	17:8,13,16 18:6,6	stage 21:4	terms 8:6 16:18,18	U
relying 8:8	rule 10:16	stand 4:22	testify 13:3 15:21	
remain 7:1	rules 4:25 9:16	start 3:13 18:25	16:2	ultimately 15:8
remains 16:20	10:21	State 12:11 13:19	testimony 11:9,20	unclear 7:5
remedies 5:24 9:13	<u> </u>	15:19 23:3,7	11:22,23,25 12:2	understand 7:8
remember 10:16		stated 8:18	12:5,11,15,23,24	15:11
render 9:20	S 2:1,13 3:4	statements 21:16	14:4,6,16 15:3,4,6	understanding
reply 17:10	Sarah 1:4 2:22 3:7	statues 9:15	15:7,13 16:8,21	6:21
REPORTED 1:20	4:11	stay 10:20	16:22 17:8,16,17	understandings
Reporter 23:7	savings 18:5	strong 17:18	18:6 20:13,14,15	6:16
Reporting 1:21	saying 8:23 15:12	subject 13:4	21:10,20,22	unfortunate 14:20
represent 3:15	19:4	submit 9:24 15:15	testimony's 16:9	unnecessary 15:5
represented 4:13	schedule 5:22 11:4	19:25	Thank 3:25 4:9,16	usually 4:17 5:9
4:22	11:10,24 17:9	submitted 20:16	22:3	11:21
representing 3:17	18:10,23 20:3,7	21:16	thing 4:17 19:21	Utilities 1:2,17 2:3
request 5:16	schedules 20:4	subpoena 12:23	think 8:18 9:10	UW-170924 1:4 3:7
requested 5:23	scope 7:6	13:3 15:13,21	10:3 11:6,11,11	V
require 15:21	Seattle 1:22,23	16:1	14:4 15:1,25 16:9	$\frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v} 3:7}$
resolve 14:24 18:8	secure 14:4	subpoenas 14:5	16:25 19:15	
respond 10:13,14	see 5:7 12:10 14:20	Subsequently 7:20	thinking 10:25	ventured 14:12
Respondent 1:9	17:14 18:10	substitute 21:19	20:19,20	view 1:7 2:17 3:8 3:18 9:3 12:18
response 7:16,17	seek 13:8	suggesting 15:22	third 13:9	
8:1 9:5,6 16:13	sense 6:3 13:14	Suite 1:22 2:14	third-party 17:20	21:12
responses 5:25	19:20	summaries 15:15	thousands 13:18	views 9:4
responsive 11:23	serious 12:20	superior 6:7,9,14	15:24 16:7	violation 9:15
revised 6:12 10:10	served 14:5	7:21 14:13	three 5:25	VOLUME 1:11
18:12	set 11:10 20:21	support 13:11	THURSTON 23:4	voluntarily 12:25
Richard 2:18 3:17	share 6:24	supposed 7:5	time 5:16 7:15 9:23	15:20
5:2	shifting 13:13	sure 4:1 6:21 8:8,12	10:12 11:22 16:5	vs 1:6
rickfinn@localac	shorter 11:12	11:18 16:3 19:8	16:23 17:11 18:12	W
2:20	Shorthand 23:6	19:21	21:13	walk 18:2
right 3:6,25 4:9,12	simply 12:7	SW 2:4,9,19	times 20:15	want 6:20 14:3,24
4:16 5:3,19 6:19	single 12:17	system 14:1	today 3:10 5:14	15:4,14
9:22 10:1,6,8,22	situation 16:6,11		18:8 21:7	Washington 1:1,17
12:10 17:6 19:18	skill 23:9		told 7:9	1:18,22 2:3,5,10
	solution 21:24	T 23:1,1		1.10,22 2.3,3,10
	I	1	I	1

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Page 28

				: «ge =e
2:15,19 3:1 23:3,7	1	0		
wasn't 17:17 19:21	$\frac{1}{100110}$	9		
21:13	1-23 1:12	956-7001 2:20		
wasting 16:4	1:30 1:16 3:2	98101 1:22		
water 1:7 2:17 3:8	1:59 22:4	98402 2:15		
3:18 13:17	1300 1:18 2:4	98504 1:18 2:5,10		
way 8:14 10:9	1325 1:22	98512 2:19		
11:11 13:23 14:20	1400 2:9			
16:24	18 1:15 3:1			
we'll 3:12 5:20 17:8	1840 1:22			
we're 11:8 12:17	18th 3:11			
16:4 18:7 20:14	2			
week 10:24	20 10:17,18			
weekend 10:2	20 10.17,18 200 2:14			
welcome 19:1	200 2.14 2017 1:15 3:1,11			
whoever's 16:24	201 7 1:13 3:1,11 206 1:23			
willing 12:12,13	200 1:25 2112 2:19			
16:14	253 2:15			
wish 8:16,20	287-9066 1:23			
wishes 4:19 7:10	28th 10:23			
witness 12:6 16:22	29th 10:25 11:1,2			
16:24 17:10,11				
18:2 20:16 21:20	3			
witnesses 13:3,9	3358 1:20 23:16			
15:9 17:21	360 1:23 2:5,10,20			
work 19:5				
world 17:16	4			
wouldn't 12:13	40128 2:9			
write 8:21	5			
writing 8:19	534-9066 1:23			
written 12:7 15:15	334-9000 1.23			
WUTC 7:3,9,10	6			
8:18,23 12:18	627-0393 2:15			
13:15	664-1160 2:5			
www.buellrealti 1:25	664-1188 2:10			
	7			
X	711 2:14			
Y	7th 10:2			
yeah 10:15	8			
Z	80.04.095 5:11 800 1:24			
	846-6989 1:24			
0	8th 10:3,3 18:13,20			
	19:23 20:1,2			
		l	l	l