# Docket Nos. TV-190593 and TV-190594 (Consolidated) - Vol. I

In re Application of Dolly, Inc.

November 18, 2019



1325 Fourth Avenue • Suite 1840 • Seattle, Washington 98101

206.287.9066

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



	cket Nos. 1 v-190095 and 1 v-190094 (Consolida)	.eu)	- VOI. I 11/10/2018
	Page 1		Page 3
1	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1	APPEARANCES
2	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
3		3	GREGORY J. KOPTA
4	In re Application of ) DOCKETS TV-190593 and ) TV-190594 (Consolidated)	4	CRESCRI 6. ROLLIN
5	DOLLY, INC. )	5	
6	for a permit to operate ) as a motor carrier of )	6	FOR COMMISSION STAFF:
7	household goods and a ) permit to operate as a )	7	DANIEL LI TEIMOURI
8	motor freight common ) carrier )*Caption Continued*	8	SALLY BOWN Attorney General's Office PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1189 daniel teimouri@utc wa gov
9	DEFLICATION CONFEDENCE VOLUME I	9	ဂျွန်ကျာရှိသူ Washington 98504
10	PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I	10	daniel teimouri@utc.wa.gov sally.brown@utc.wa.gov
11	Pages 1-17	11	sally.blown@utc.wa.gov
12	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA	12	FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:
13	Nevember 40, 2040	13	(Via bridge) NINA SUETAKE
14	November 18, 2019	14	Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 430-2422 ninas@atg.wa.gov
15	1:00 p.m.	15	(206) 430-2422
16	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	16	Tillias@atg.wa.gov
17	621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98503	17	FOR DOLLY, INC.:
18		18	(Via bridge) DONNA BARNETT
19	REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	19	10885 NE 4th Street, Suite 700
20	Puell Peolitime Penerting 11.0	20	Perkins Coie 10885 NE 4th Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004 (425) 635-1419
21	Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue Suite 1840	21	dbarhett@perkinscole.com
22	Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066   Seattle	22	* * * *
23	(360) 534-9066   Olympia	23	
24	(800) 846-6989   National	24	
25	www.buellrealtime.com	25	
	Page 2		Page 4
1	In re Application of )	1	LACEY, WASHINGTON; NOVEMBER 18, 2019
2	DOLLY, INC. )	2	1:00 P.M.
3	for a permit to operate ) as a motor carrier of )	3	000
4	household goods and a ) permit to operate as )	4	PROCEEDINGS
5	a motor freight common ) carrier )	5	
6		6	JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be on the record in
7		7	Dockets TV-190593 and TV-190594, which have been
8		8	consolidated are and are in regard to the application
9		9	of Dolly, Inc.
10		10	My name is Gregory J. Kopta. I am the
11		11	administrative law judge that the Commission has
12		12	assigned to preside in this proceeding, and we are here
13		13	for a prehearing conference.
14		14	Let's begin by taking appearances beginning
15		15	with the Company.
16		16	MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judge Kopta. This
17		17	is Donna Barnett representing Dolly. I'm at Perkins
18		18	Coie, and is that all you need for appearance or do you
19		19	want longer form?
20		20	JUDGE KOPTA: I think that's fine for these
21		21	purposes.
22		22	MS. BARNETT: Thanks. I also did just file
23		23	a notice of appearance in a hard copy by the web
23			
24		24	portal.
		24 25	JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Then we will rely

	SKC1103. 1 V-130333 and 1 V-130334 (Oonsolidat		
1	Page 5	-	Page 7
1	on that for your full contact information.  Commission Staff?	1	permit and a household goods permit for several years with the Commission. And the last or this this
2		2	
3	MR. TEIMOURI: Thank you, Your Honor.	3	consolidated proceeding represents the most recent
4	Daniel Teimouri, AAG, on behalf of Commission Staff.	4	attempt, and there the reason we filed or issued
5	JUDGE KOPTA: And for Public Counsel?	5	notice of intent to deny the application and the
6	MS. BROWN: We're not through here.	6	exemptions identified identified I think there's
7	JUDGE KOPTA: Oh, we're not through, okay.	7	only one exemption that Dolly would not be able to
8	MS. BROWN: Sally Brown, Senior Assistant	8	comply with without getting that exemption, but it
9	Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Commission	9	seemed that it was futile to pursue pursue, you know,
10	Staff.	10	the exemption or the permit with that one particular
11	JUDGE KOPTA: My apologies, Ms. Brown. I	11	exemption going to be denied.
12	didn't mean to cut you off.	12	So Dolly essentially just did a cost benefit
13	MS. BROWN: Thank you.	13	analysis of whether it whether they could go back and
14	JUDGE KOPTA: Public Counsel?	14	look at their operations to see if they can make any
15	MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, Your Honor. This	15	change or were there other options to try and get a
16	is Nina Suetake on behalf of Public Counsel.	16	common carrier permit or a household goods permit
17	JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Is there anyone else	17	without the exemption or whether they should pursue the
18	who wishes to make an appearance?	18	exemption. But regardless, it didn't seem possible or
19	Hearing none, ordinarily, we would deal with	19	cost effective to pursue it through the evidentiary
20	scheduling and other procedural issues in this	20	litigious proceeding that we set up this way through
21	prehearing conference, but my understanding in	21	with through an evidentiary hearing.
22	conversations with Ms. Barnett in an email exchange that	22	So they don't intend to just completely stop
23	I had with her, the Company intends to request	23	pursuing any type of permit, they are just unclear right
24	Commission authority to withdraw its application.	24	now about how they're going to proceed and didn't see
25	Is that correct, Ms. Barnett?	25	that it was fruitful to proceed it along this this
	Page 6		Page 8
1	Page 6  MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed	1	Page 8 consolidated docket.
1 2	_	1 2	_
1 2 3	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed		consolidated docket.
2	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.	2	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?
2	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here,	2	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would
2 3 4	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.	2 3 4	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?
2 3 4	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here,	2 3 4 5	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would	2 3 4 5	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time. Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the	2 3 4 5 6 7	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time. Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time. Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position and then ask other parties for their views.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a substantial amount of Commission resources both on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position and then ask other parties for their views.  So, Ms. Barnett, would give me a an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a substantial amount of Commission resources both on the Staff side and on the Commission administrative law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position and then ask other parties for their views.  So, Ms. Barnett, would give me a an explanation of why the Company is seeking to withdraw	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a substantial amount of Commission resources both on the Staff side and on the Commission administrative law division and the Commissioners. And I am loathe to stop
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position and then ask other parties for their views.  So, Ms. Barnett, would give me a an explanation of why the Company is seeking to withdraw its application and petition?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a substantial amount of Commission resources both on the Staff side and on the Commission administrative law division and the Commissioners. And I am loathe to stop this now when it's just going to restart in the near
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BARNETT: That's correct. I just filed that letter along with the notice of appearance that I just mentioned, so it has been filed. I don't think it's been served yet, but momentarily.  JUDGE KOPTA: All right. While we are here, and as I indicated to you when I spoke with you, I would like some more information about the reasons behind the Company's decision to withdraw its application. As I mentioned, Commission rules and the APA, once an adjudication has started, require a company that has applied for any Commission action to get permission from the Commission to withdraw, which the Commission will grant if it is in the public interest. But we obviously want to make sure that it is in the public interest.  And this company has a rather long history of proceedings of a similar nature before the Commission, so I would like to kind of get an idea of what the lay of the land is from the Company's position and then ask other parties for their views.  So, Ms. Barnett, would give me a an explanation of why the Company is seeking to withdraw its application and petition?  MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	consolidated docket.  JUDGE KOPTA: What does the Company anticipate that would happen in the future that would make it a more viable option for them to reapply?  MS. BARNETT: They don't know at this time.  Looking at all the exemptions that they requested, it it's clear that that some of them they don't need probably and some they can change their operations to where they don't need it, but it's unclear on whether they can change their op op operations significantly enough to where they don't need them. And so there would just have to be some more looking in at the the business's operations and the Commission's rules to see whether they're going to essentially to see how to proceed. It it's just unclear yet.  JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my concern at this point is that, as we've discussed, there have been several proceedings involving this company, and it requires a substantial amount of Commission resources both on the Staff side and on the Commission administrative law division and the Commissioners. And I am loathe to stop this now when it's just going to restart in the near future.

### Page 9

- 1 reach agreement with Staff on a joint proposal to the
- 2 Commission or are we going to be looking at yet again
- 3 another litigated proceeding in which case it would not
- 4 make much sense to dismiss this one if we're just going
- 5 to take it up again in the near future.
- 6 MS. BARNETT: Understood. It's not Dolly's
- 7 intent just to file it again later. If they -- it --
- 8 it's not their intent to simply file for a household
- 9 goods carrier or household goods permit without doing
- 10 any changes in their operations to make it substantially
- 11 different, a different application. But I don't think
- 12 right now they even have any intent to file, to refile
- 13 again at all
- 14 They do hope to work with Staff and Public
- 15 Counsel on finding solutions to having them operate that
- 16 would make either filing it a joint and an -- a joint
- 17 application or at least with -- with some stipulation
- 18 and understanding. So Dolly has no intent on just
- 9 refiling again. If they do, it's going to be a
- 20 different -- it -- it's going to be substantially
- 21 different.
- 22 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay.
- 23 MS. BARNETT: I understand -- I -- I totally
- 24 hear that the administrative burden has been significant
- and it certainly has to Dolly as well. And I don't --

# Page 10

- 1 and that's one of the reasons why they're stopping now,
- 2 or hoping to stop now, because they don't want to pursue
- 3 it when it's going to be just denied and -- and -- and
- 4 they can -- they can stop that, change their operations,
- 5 or get on board with Staff and Public Counsel and -- and
- 6 make it more of a joint and not an adversarial filing.
- JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And one other
- 8 question for me at this point, I believe there is still
- 9 a pending appeal of Commission's prior action with
- LO regard to this company. Will -- would this withdrawal
- 11 of the application have any impact on those judicial
- 12 proceedings?
- 13 MS. BARNETT: No, that's a totally separate
- 14 issue, and I don't have any insight on that. Well, I
- 15 have insight, but I don't have any -- it's completely
- 16 unrelated as far as Dolly and as far as I'm concerned.
- 17 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, my -- my concern, I
- 18 suppose, is a hypothetical one, which is I wouldn't want
- 19 any representations by the Company that by withdrawing
- 20 this application they are somehow saying that the
- 1 Commission is unwilling to entertain requests for
- authority and somehow have that color the appeal in any
- 23 way, shape, or form.
- MS. BARNETT: Well, I don't think that would
- 25 be possible even if -- even if Dolly had to -- were

- 1 going to pur- -- we're going to make that
- 2 representation, we wouldn't make that representation,
- 3 but also the -- the -- the filing is closed and the
- 4 record is closed and that all we're doing now is waiting
- 5 for oral argument in that. So nothing can be added to
- 6 that case and we wouldn't even try. That's certainly
- 7 not Dolly's intent.
- 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. All right. Thank you,
- 9 Ms. Barnett.
- 10 Do we have a response from Staff?
- 11 MR. TEIMOURI: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 12 Daniel Teimouri here. You mentioned some of these
- 13 points earlier, but I would like to just express that
- 14 Staff has concern that this is the second time in six
- 15 months that the Company has applied for a permit causing
- 16 Staff and the Commission to do a lot of work, the
- 17 necessary work to respond and issue the appropriate
- 18 notices only to voluntarily withdraw at the 11th hour.
- 19 This pattern is obviously burdensome with
- 20 little or no benefit to the public interest. These
- 21 applications were made after the Commission and even the
- 22 Governor's Office made it clear to the Company that it
- 23 cannot be exempted from statutory licensing
- 24 requirements.
- 25 And so like you, we would like to know what

## Page 12

- 1 Dolly's intent is here, and Staff ask -- asks these
- 2 questions because now that the Company has withdrawn all
- 3 of its pending applications and petitions for legal
- 4 operating authority, one of Staff's additional chief
- 5 concerns is that the Company will again begin to operate
- 6 illegally as either a common carrier or a carrier of
- 7 household goods.
- 8 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Do you have
- 9 questions for Ms. Barnett specifically beyond the
- 10 ones -- I mean, just sort of the general concerns that
- 11 you've expressed?
- MR. TEIMOURI: No, not at this time.
- 13 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. And do you take a
- 14 position on the request to withdraw their application
- 15 and petition?
- MR. TEIMOURI: We would not oppose that --
- 17 that request.
  - JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Anything further?
- 19 MS. BROWN: Oh, well, speaking of work for
- 20 nothing --

18

- 21 MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, this is Nina
- Suetake from Public Counsel. Public Counsel does not
- have any objection to the Company's request to withdraw
- 24 their application and permit -- request for permit
- 25 exemption.

#### Docket Nos. TV-190593 and TV-190594 (Consolidated) - Vol. I 11/18/2019 Page 13 Page 15 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, 1 applications, withdrawn, much work ensuing as a result 2 Ms. Suetake. Did you have anything further that you 2 of these filings. And so like you, Commission Staff is wanted to say on the issues that we've been discussing? not at all interested in sitting here a month from now MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel doing the same thing. 5 understands Staff's concerns, but to be honest, if the 5 So finally, Your Honor, I would just suggest that you consider conditioning a grant of withdrawal on 6 Company is not operating as a regulated entity and is 6 not operating in this state at all, I am concerned about 7 specific answers and perhaps some actions taken by the Commission's actual ability to require them to stay 8 8 Dolly. in this proceeding. But other than that, I -- I don't 9 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Ms. Barnett, did 10 have any additional concerns at this moment. 10 you have any responses to what Staff has raised? 11 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you, 11 MS. BARNETT: Oh, sure. I -- I didn't Ms. Suetake. realize it was as unclear and murky as -- as all that, 12 12 13 Ms. Brown, did you want to say something? because I think it's -- it is clear, at least Dolly has 13 MS. BROWN: Yes, I just want to follow up on attempted to make it very clear that it is not operating 14 14 some points that you made earlier and that Mr. Teimouri as a common carrier or household goods carrier in 15 15 just referenced himself. In terms of Staff's valid Washington State. Therefore, we are not regulated by 16 16 concerns about Dolly going forward, we have questions the Commission. They -- all the future plans are -- are 17 about Dolly's future plans and whether or not Dolly -unclear, but I think they would have the opportunity to it's Dolly's intention to wait until there's some apply as any other Company would if they think that they material legislative change, for example, or change in can meet the regulations that the Commission requires. 20 20 21 the business -- in its business plan or model 21 So -- so but as -- as far as Dolly's 22 Does Dolly plan to shut down its Washington operations right now, I don't see where -- how -- where 22 operations to pursue legislation, reapply with the same it's unclear that -- or whether it should be required 23 23 or different exemption request, change its business that Dolly change its business model or provide any 24 model to one that complies with applicable laws and 25 plans for the future when they are not operating at all Page 14 Page 16 statutes and rules. Does it agree not to operate as in Washington State. 1 either a common carrier or carrier of household goods JUDGE KOPTA: Mr. Teimouri, did you have 2 given that it now does not have and is not seeking something? 3 operating authority from the Commission. So I don't --MR. TEIMOURI: Not at this time, Your Honor. 4 I think that Ms. Barnett's doing her best here this 5 Thank you. afternoon, but she's not responding to these questions 6 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Anything further from any parties on this issue? All right. Is there directly 7 Having said that, I'm -- I have nothing 8 anything else that we need to address while we're here? 8 further to add. I'm -- I had questions about the appeal 9 Hearing nothing, I will take this under 9 itself. I wondered whether or not the Company planned advisement, and we'll make a determination and then 10 10 to seek dismissal of its appeal. Evidently the answer 11 proceed from that point. If I need any further 11 to that question is no. That's pending in Division II. information, I will request it, otherwise I will enter 12 12 So I -- I feel as though there are several questions an order. And I believe, unless there's anything 13 further, which there is not, then we are adjourned. that remain unanswered at this point. JUDGE KOPTA: Do you have any 15 15 recommendations as far as process from this point 16 (Adjourned at 1:20 p.m.) 17 forward? 17 MS. BROWN: Well, I would ask that the Bench 18 18 consider conditioning withdrawal of the pending dockets 19 19 and the pending application and request for exemption on 20 20 specific -- either specific answers or plans or 21

22

23

24

25

we've been here before with applications, made

22 something that would address some of these -- some of

you pointed out, this has been a lengthy ordeal, and

the chief concerns that Staff has concerning Dolly. As

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