

Docket No. UT-140597 - Vol. III

**Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v.
Qwest Corporation d/b/a CenturyLink QC**

April 3, 2019



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 173

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) Docket No. UT-140597
Complainant,)
vs.)
QWEST CORPORATION, D/B/A,)
CENTURYLINK, QC,)
Respondent.)

HEARING, VOLUME III
Pages 173-204
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE GREGORY J. KOPTA

April 3, 2019
9:30 a.m.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest
Olympia, Washington 98504

REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358

Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 287-9066 | Seattle
(360) 534-9066 | Olympia
(800) 846-6989 | National
www.buellrealtime.com

Page 175

1 A P P E A R A N C E S (Cont.)
2 ALSO PRESENT:
3 SUSIE PAUL
4 Commission Investigator
5
6
7 * * * * *
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 174

1 A P P E A R A N C E S
2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
3 GREGORY J. KOPTA
4 Utilities and Transportation
5 Commission
6 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW
7 Olympia, Washington 98504
8 (360) 664-1160
9
10 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:
11 SALLY BROWN
12 Senior Assistant Attorney General
13 PO Box 40128
14 Olympia, Washington 98504
15 (360) 664-1193
16 sallyb@atg.wa.gov
17 HARRY FUKANO
18 Assistant Attorney General
19 PO Box 40128
20 Olympia, Washington 98504
21 (360) 586-5522
22 harry.fukano@utc.wa.gov
23 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:
24 (Via bridge)
25 LISA GAFKEN
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 464-6595
lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov
FOR CENTURYLINK:
LISA ANDERL
Associate General Counsel
1600 - 7th Avenue, Room 1506
Seattle, Washington 98191
(206) 345-1574
lisa.anderl@centurylink.com

Page 176

1 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; APRIL 3, 2019
2 9:30 A.M.
3 --o0o--
4 P R O C E E D I N G S
5
6 JUDGE KOPTA: Then let's be on the record in
7 Docket UT-132234, captioned Washington Utilities and
8 Transportation Commission versus CenturyTel of Inter
9 Island, Inc, d/b/a CenturyLink, Docket UT-140597, which
10 is captioned Washington Utilities and Transportation
11 Commission versus Qwest Corporation, d/b/a CenturyLink
12 QC, and Docket UT-170042, captioned In the Matter of the
13 Notice of Transaction and Application of CenturyLink for
14 an -- well, for a whole bunch of stuff involving level
15 3.
16 MS. BROWN: That works.
17 JUDGE KOPTA: I'm Gregory J. Kopta, the
18 administrative law judge who is presiding, and we are
19 here to discuss competing motions having to do with
20 access to confidential information provided in those
21 dockets, or at least two out of three of those dockets.
22 Let's start by taking appearances beginning
23 with the Company.
24 MS. ANDERL: Good morning, Your Honor. Lisa
25 Anderl, in-house attorney representing CenturyLink. And

Page 177

1 I've provided my full contact information on my business
 2 card to the court reporter.
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Thank you.
 4 And for Staff?
 5 MS. BROWN: Sally Brown, Senior Assistant
 6 Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Commission
 7 Staff.
 8 MR. FUKANO: Harry Fukano, Assistant
 9 Attorney General, appearing on behalf of Commission
 10 Staff.
 11 JUDGE KOPTA: And anyone on the bridge line
 12 wishing to make an appearance?
 13 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, this is Lisa Gafken,
 14 Assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of
 15 Public Counsel.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Anyone else? Hearing nothing,
 17 we will proceed.
 18 All right. First I wanted to clarify, as I
 19 understand it, we are now only talking about Dockets
 20 UT-140597 and UT-170042; is that correct? I'm seeing
 21 head nods.
 22 Is that your understanding, Ms. Anderl?
 23 MS. ANDERL: I've been advised by Staff that
 24 they are no longer seeking information in the 1-3
 25 docket.

Page 178

1 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Then at least we've
 2 narrowed the scope a little bit.
 3 Also, I have read the pleadings and it
 4 appears that there is not a dispute as to what
 5 CenturyLink has provided in its motion, which is that
 6 what Staff is requesting is outside the bounds of the
 7 protective orders that were issued in those two dockets;
 8 is that correct? Is Staff contesting whether that is an
 9 issue?
 10 MR. FUKANO: No, we would I think both agree
 11 as to that point.
 12 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. So then really
 13 what it boils down to it seems to me is Staff wants its
 14 expert witness to be able to review certain confidential
 15 information that was provided in those dockets and has
 16 proposed a couple of ways of doing that. And also,
 17 yesterday, I have received and have all the parties
 18 received a list from Staff of the documents that it
 19 seeks at this point for its experts to review in
 20 conjunction with the investigation that Staff is
 21 undertaking of a recent 911 outage involving the
 22 company; is that correct, Mr. Fukano?
 23 MR. FUKANO: That is correct.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Um...
 25 MS. ANDERL: Your Honor, if I can just

Page 179

1 clarify. It's not established on the record that
 2 CenturyLink provision of 911 was impaired or
 3 interrupted.
 4 JUDGE KOPTA: I was not intending to say one
 5 way or the other. I was simply referencing that that's
 6 the subject matter of the investigation.
 7 MS. ANDERL: I just want to be really
 8 careful.
 9 JUDGE KOPTA: Understood, and I accept and
 10 appreciate that clarification. Ms. Anderl, do you --
 11 have you had a chance to consult with your client about
 12 the list of documents that Staff wants to have its
 13 expert be able to review?
 14 MS. ANDERL: Not -- not really. We -- we
 15 got it at 3:30 yesterday afternoon, and I had no time to
 16 reach out to anybody. Most people are in time zones to
 17 the East. But I'm very familiar with all of the
 18 documents and very familiar with and -- and -- and
 19 comfortable with the position that the Company would
 20 take on those documents.
 21 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. And as I
 22 understand it from Staff's pleading, there is a
 23 nondisclosure agreement in place between the Company and
 24 Staff; is that true?
 25 MS. ANDERL: No, there is a nondisclosure

Page 180

1 agreement in place between the Staff and its expert.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: I see. So there is nothing
 3 between the Company and Staff?
 4 MS. ANDERL: Not other than the protective
 5 orders in these closed dockets, that's right. No,
 6 there's no protective order in the hidden docket,
 7 181051.
 8 JUDGE KOPTA: Have there been any
 9 discussions between the Company and Staff about entering
 10 into such an agreement?
 11 MS. ANDERL: I offered -- before filing my
 12 motion to enforce the protective agreement, I offered to
 13 work through documents on a document-by-document basis,
 14 but until I got this yesterday, I had not received a
 15 response to that offer.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. And from Staff's
 17 perspective -- well, I'm not going to ask that you
 18 negotiate with the Company as we're sitting here this
 19 morning. That doesn't make sense.
 20 MS. ANDERL: Well, Your Honor, I'm -- I'm
 21 kind of happy to cut to the chase on some of this if you
 22 would like?
 23 JUDGE KOPTA: I -- I would like, because
 24 I'm -- I'm not really comfortable with any of the
 25 options that are before me right now so...

Page 181

1 MS. ANDERL: Okay. So here you go. I had
 2 my whole long argument prepared, and I won't give it
 3 unless you want it, but needless to say, in both of
 4 these dockets there were countless -- well, not
 5 countless, because we can count them, but confidential
 6 documents filed, many of which were made a part of the
 7 Commission's record. Many more of which were provided
 8 in discovery and not made a part of the record, but
 9 which would be available to the expert if the protective
 10 order will modify per Staff's request.
 11 And many of those, particularly in the
 12 merger docket, have absolutely no bearing on even the
 13 provision of telecommunication service much less the
 14 provision of 911. There's information in there about
 15 our pro forma adjusted revenue, EBITDA, Capex, debt
 16 levels, free cash flow, their access line counts,
 17 there's broadband penetration numbers.
 18 That is all very sensitive business
 19 information. It is inconceivable to me that Staff's
 20 expert would have a need to see any of that. And, in
 21 fact, none of that information is on the document that
 22 Mr. Fukano just provided. So that's good.
 23 Nevertheless, as I said, modifying the protective order
 24 in the way that Staff requests would -- would not
 25 protect against disclosure of that.

Page 182

1 I do not understand why Staff wants its
 2 expert to see the compliance reports or the diversity
 3 audits filed in Docket 140597. I do not understand the
 4 relevance of any of the NORS outage reports.
 5 I do, however, agree that the root cause
 6 analysis, the last document on the list filed on or
 7 about February 12th, 2019, regarding the December 27th
 8 and 28th network event is something that if they are
 9 conducting an investigation into that network event,
 10 their expert should see.
 11 It was filed, you know, basically for
 12 convenience in the merger docket, because there was no
 13 place else to put it. If, you know, Docket 181051 were
 14 a novel informal public docket, you could issue a
 15 protective order in that, maybe you still can do that.
 16 And we would be happy to file that root cause analysis
 17 in that docket thereby allowing Staff's expert access to
 18 that.
 19 The other two documents that are at issue
 20 are the confidential version of the settlement agreement
 21 in the merger docket. I'm -- I didn't have time to
 22 review that, but in my recollection is that, the
 23 confidential information did not have any bearing on 911
 24 or the military department. And so I don't know why
 25 we'd need a confidential version of the settlement

Page 183

1 agreement with attachments to be provided to the expert.
 2 And with regard the Washington State
 3 Military Department, amendment M, that is confidential.
 4 It's a provision between the Company and Military. I
 5 think Military asked for it to be confidential. With
 6 Military's consent, we would obviously refile it in the
 7 181051 docket if a -- if a protective order were issued
 8 there, and we wouldn't object to that.
 9 So boils down to Staff is proposing 30
 10 documents with a caveat that the list is potentiality
 11 subject to change. We would agree to two of them.
 12 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. And from your
 13 perspective, you would want a protective order to be
 14 able to do that as opposed to a nondisclosure agreement
 15 between you and Staff, for example?
 16 MS. ANDERL: That's right. I think a
 17 protective order is -- I'm not sure a nondisclosure
 18 agreement, a public entity can even enter into that and
 19 have it be enforceable. If somebody were to submit a
 20 request for public records, I think a protective order
 21 gives us more protection.
 22 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. Let's hear from
 23 Staff. What's -- you've heard from what the Company
 24 has -- has said. I'm loath to get into a back and forth
 25 in terms of how necessary these documents are since

Page 184

1 there are at least two that the Company has agreed are
 2 appropriate to provide to your expert and relay the
 3 issue. Before me at the moment is whether and under
 4 what circumstances the Commission can do something to
 5 allow that I guess is the easiest way to say it. But
 6 I'll let you respond, Mr. Fukano.
 7 MR. FUKANO: Well, I believe that the
 8 Commission has two possible methods of doing that, as
 9 I've detailed in my motion. And I think the -- the
 10 protective orders in Dockets UT-170042 and UT-140597
 11 form the basis for CenturyLink's objection in this
 12 matter. And those both -- orders both state absent a
 13 protective order, a significant risk exists that
 14 confidential information might become available to
 15 persons who have no legitimate need for that information
 16 and that in -- that injuries to the information
 17 provider may result.
 18 The language of the protective order suggest
 19 that the limitation on access to confidential
 20 information serves two purposes; first, that it will
 21 prevent access to persons who have no legitimate need
 22 for that information; and second and relatedly, to
 23 prevent such persons from disclosing that sensitive
 24 information thereby causing injury to the provider.
 25 Staff would argue that Mr. Roach does have a

Page 185

1 legitimate need to review that information filed in
 2 docket -- in this docket and that sufficient safeguards
 3 have been and will be put in place to preserve the
 4 confidentiality of that information.
 5 So it's further detailed in the pending
 6 stage of the motion, the Commission has hired Mr. Glenn
 7 Roach to act as a consultant for the purpose of Docket
 8 UT-181051, and as part of this arrangement, Mr. Roach
 9 will be responsible for preparing a report related to
 10 the December 2019 991 service outage, assisting Staff
 11 with discovery requests and preparing testimony in
 12 addition to other matters. Given that Mr. Roach will
 13 participate extensively in the investigation and
 14 potential hearing in Docket UT-181051, Staff would
 15 maintain that Mr. Roach does have a legitimate need to
 16 review the information.
 17 Secondly, Staff would contend that there are
 18 sufficient safeguards to preserve confidentiality of
 19 CenturyLink information for three reasons; first, as
 20 discussed earlier, Staff has entered into a
 21 nondisclosure agreement with Mr. Roach, the terms of
 22 which are detailed in Appendix B, which prohibit
 23 Mr. Roach from disclosing any of the information that
 24 Staff provides him.
 25 Second, Staff would anticipate and support

Page 186

1 the Commission issuing an additional protective order in
 2 Docket 181 as we've been discussing to provide
 3 additional confidentiality protection on the same terms
 4 of similar terms as those already entered into Docket
 5 UT-17 and UT-14.
 6 And third, Staff would like to clarify that
 7 the independent consultant would not have any unfettered
 8 access to rummage through the Commission SharePoint
 9 internal system. Rather, Staff would not intend to
 10 allow the independent consultant to go on a fishing
 11 expedition through the materials that it would be -- he
 12 would be able to access anything he wanted. That
 13 material would have to come through Staff and be
 14 provided to the independent consultant.
 15 And while Staff would be amenable to either
 16 alternative suggested in its motion, it would prefer to
 17 modify the protective order, and we would prefer that
 18 for three reasons. The first would be that it would
 19 avoid duplicative, accumulative refileing of the same
 20 information.
 21 The second would be that modification of the
 22 protective order would permit Staff to add- --- to
 23 provide the consultant with additional confidential
 24 information if that information was determined to be
 25 relevant after reviewing the information that Staff has

Page 187

1 already requested.
 2 And third, as a general matter, Staff would
 3 prefer to review the information that it already
 4 possesses rather than requesting that information,
 5 because the Company -- rather than asking the Company
 6 for -- for a State company for documents because the
 7 request to the Company presents the Company an
 8 opportunity to essentially characterize or influence
 9 Staff's review of those documents. That is, a company
 10 is given additional opportunity to lobby Staff about the
 11 content of those documents. And this is not, to
 12 clarify, a reflection on CenturyLink but just a general
 13 investigative concern that Staff has presented.
 14 And so in summary, it doesn't appear as
 15 though it is an issue as to whether Mr. Roach could
 16 access the confidential information, but it appears to
 17 be how Mr. Roach will access that confidential
 18 information. Staff would assert that the Commission
 19 should modify the protective order in Docket 14 and 17
 20 to permit Mr. Roach to review the confidential
 21 information as Mr. Roach has a legitimate need to access
 22 the information, and Commission safeguards will be put
 23 in place to maintain confidentiality of CenturyLink's
 24 information. In the alternative, we would request a
 25 subpoena under the statutory authority as listed in my

Page 188

1 motion.
 2 MS. ANDERL: Your Honor, if I may respond?
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: In just a moment.
 4 I have a couple of concerns. One is, the
 5 protective order in both of those dockets requires
 6 confidential information to be returned to the person
 7 who provided it except for counsel records, which are
 8 exhibits, and the Commission will have whatever is on
 9 file. So theoretically, and I won't ask whether this is
 10 in true practice, it's not possible to rummage through
 11 files for discovery, because all of that information
 12 should have been destroyed or returned.
 13 The more pressing issues are, Staff is
 14 asking me to do something the Commission has never done
 15 before, and that is to modify a protective order to
 16 allow someone who is not involved in the actual dockets
 17 to review confidential information, or alternatively, to
 18 enter a protective order in a docket that is not yet an
 19 adjudication, which the Commission has consistently
 20 declined to do in other circumstances, for example, in
 21 Integrated Resource Plan dockets.
 22 So I'm a little bit uncomfortable going that
 23 step. I understand your arguments, Mr. Fukano, and I
 24 understand Staff's desire for its expert to be able to
 25 review this information. I'm just not comfortable at

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 this point how the Commission can best accommodate that. 2 And with those reservations, Ms. Anderl, 3 would you like to respond to what Mr. Fukano said? 4 MS. ANDERL: Yes, Your Honor. I've been 5 trying to keep my -- level-headed about this, but, you 6 know, frankly, I am outraged by Staff's behavior so far. 7 I mean, we have I think already multiple violations of 8 this protec- -- these protective orders, which very 9 clearly in paragraph 7 state that no confidential 10 information distributed or obtained in this protec- -- 11 under this protective order may be requested and 12 reviewed, used or disclosed by any party or counsel 13 except for purposes of this proceeding. 14 To the extent that we are already this far 15 along, that all of these outage reports have been 16 identified, I have to assume that Staff attorneys 17 reviewed them. These -- the two attorneys who sit 18 before you today, one of them I have no record of having 19 received an attorney Exhibit A in the docket. The 20 other, Ms. Brown, filed an attorney Exhibit A in January 21 of this year. 22 So it is clear that the -- but there's no, 23 of course, ability for us to object to the attorney 24 exhibits, only the expert exhibits. But the dockets 25 long closed have now been already opened by Staff and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 record that although I included the NORS report and 2 other information to the request for Staff, I viewed 3 those through the SharePoint internal system and did not 4 view the content of those documents. And so I do not 5 know necessarily what those documents contain because I 6 have not signed a required confidentiality measures, but 7 I had those identified by Staff as being potentially 8 responsive to their investigation. 9 And I'd like to further add that Staff does, 10 under RCW 80.04.070, have the right to inspect the books 11 of any public service company, which would include 12 CenturyLink in this case. My request for a protective 13 order in that matter would be to help preserve any 14 confidentiality and add additional protection on top of 15 that. But I do believe that Staff would have the right 16 to access that information. 17 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and that's true. And 18 obviously, RCW 80.04.095 specifically grants the 19 Commission the ability to review, to receive 20 confidential information, which implicitly means that 21 Staff can review that information. And there's always 22 been a bit of a debate about the necessity for Staff to 23 file the -- submit signature pages to the protective 24 orders since they already have the right to look at that 25 information. But that's a matter for a debate at</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 information has been analyzed for purposes not of that 2 docket, but for purposes of a new investigation. 3 I find this to be outrageous and really 4 disconcerting. Staff's recommendation that you now 5 retroactively modify the protective order to somehow 6 sanction what they did is something that would be, I 7 think, horrible precedent. It would have an extremely 8 chilling effect on any company's ability or willingness 9 to disclose confidential information in a proceeding 10 with any degree of confidence that it would be properly 11 protected. 12 I think that you should deny Staff's motion 13 to modify the protective order, you should deny Staff's 14 motion for an investigative subpoena, and I'm -- as I 15 said, I am, in spite of being angry about this, willing 16 to work with Staff on those two documents that I believe 17 are incontrovertibly relevant to the investigation. 18 Fine, let's figure out how to protect them, but beyond 19 that, I do not believe that -- I do not believe that 20 Staff should be given any of the relief that it asks 21 for. 22 JUDGE KOPTA: All right. 23 MR. FUKANO: I have a brief response. 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, you may. 25 MR. FUKANO: I'd like to clarify for the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 another day at another time. 2 I'm going to ask a practical question of 3 Staff and that's, if you don't get this information, 4 what happens? I mean, Staff can look at it, but the 5 expert can't. And so I know that much, but what -- 6 how -- how is that going to or will it impair Staff's 7 investigation not to have the expert, your expert, 8 review this information? 9 MS. PAUL: Yes, as an investigator, that's 10 what I do and I investigate; however, I don't have the 11 technical expertise that we have contracted and the 12 assistance is necessary for us to have for me to be able 13 to do a thorough investigation and understand all the 14 issues. 15 JUDGE KOPTA: And -- 16 MS. BROWN: May I add something, Your Honor? 17 JUDGE KOPTA: Yes, you may. 18 MS. BROWN: That is a gross understatement. 19 If -- if the Commission Staff's expert witness is denied 20 access to exhibits that were filed in previous dockets 21 that are now closed, that will have a very negative 22 effect on Commission Staff's investigation of the 23 CenturyLink 911 outage. 24 JUDGE KOPTA: If you were conducting this 25 investigation in the absence of these other dockets, are</p>

Page 193

1 these the sorts of documents that you would be asking
 2 for as part of your investigation?
 3 MS. PAUL: Yes.
 4 JUDGE KOPTA: When you investigated the
 5 previous incident involving 911, were these documents
 6 that you -- same type of documents that you requested
 7 from the Company?
 8 MS. PAUL: I believe so, yes, but that was
 9 from regulatory services. But yes, we did request those
 10 documents.
 11 MS. ANDERL: Your Honor, I -- I would
 12 absolutely object. These NORS reports only started
 13 being filed in the 170 docket. They were never provided
 14 to Commission Staff on -- to my recollection in the 2014
 15 911 outage. The circuit diversity audit and the FCC
 16 compliance reports that were filed in the 911 docket
 17 were filed after that docket was closed as part of the
 18 settlement agreement. So these documents I do not
 19 believe are similar to what was requested in prior
 20 investigations.
 21 MS. BROWN: That's -- that's -- Your Honor,
 22 that's wholly irrelevant. These are called outage
 23 reports. Central to this whole investigation in the
 24 CenturyLink 911 outage. I know Ms. Anderl went on at
 25 length about that these documents are in her -- in her

Page 194

1 view are irrelevant to Staff's investigation and perhaps
 2 not -- would not be likely to lead to the discovery of
 3 admissible evidence. That's not what we're here to
 4 discuss this morning.
 5 The issue is whether or not Commission
 6 Staff's expert, hired expert, is able to have access --
 7 well, no, let me rephrase that.
 8 The question is not whether or not this
 9 particular -- Mr. Glenn Roach, the Commission Staff's
 10 expert, will have access to these records. That's a
 11 given. That will happen. The question is -- is how,
 12 the means by which that will occur.
 13 JUDGE KOPTA: And when.
 14 MS. BROWN: Well, and when, sure. So I
 15 mean, if we wait until this is no longer a hidden
 16 docket, Commission Staff can propound data requests on
 17 CenturyLink for every single one of these dockets -- on
 18 every single one of these documents, not just two that
 19 the Company is going to deign to -- to allow that
 20 Commission Staff may share with its expert.
 21 So it may -- it will elongate the
 22 proceeding, but I personally have no heartburn about
 23 that, because the Federal Government is also
 24 investigating this outage. So it's a que- -- it's a
 25 question of -- of when, but not -- not if. And if the

Page 195

1 Commission chooses to hamper Commission Staff's
 2 investigation that -- talk about horrible precedent and
 3 having a chilling effect. That would be the ultimate
 4 outcome.
 5 And it seems to me that there are -- there
 6 are methods, the protective orders by their own terms
 7 include a provision for modification of the existing
 8 protective orders. And let's not overlook the
 9 administrative law permits investigative subpoenas. So
 10 that's -- that's another path to victory here. I -- I
 11 can see this is somewhat problematic because we haven't
 12 had a prehearing conference in UT-181051, but we're not
 13 there yet.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: I know, and -- and that's what
 15 I'm wrestling with is, I -- I take your point, that it
 16 is a practical issue of when, not if, and yet at the
 17 same time, doing what Staff has requested would be
 18 something different than the Commission has done before,
 19 and I have to keep in mind how that will play out in the
 20 future if -- if we do what you've asked.
 21 Let's go off the record for a moment.
 22 (A break was taken from
 23 9:58 a.m. to 10:57 a.m.)
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Let's be back on the record.
 25 After some discussion off the record and some

Page 196

1 consultation that I made with the Commissioners,
 2 ultimately, we've decided to take this matter under
 3 advisement, and we will issue an order resolving the
 4 issues that have been presented in Staff's request.
 5 But just so I understand, counsel for Staff
 6 or Ms. Paul, have there been other circumstances in
 7 which Staff has used an expert in an investigation
 8 before it's become an adjudication; do you know?
 9 MS. BROWN: This is Sally with A -- Sally
 10 Brown with the AG's office. I have been trying to think
 11 of other examples and not coming up with any. No,
 12 it's -- it's typically, for example, in rate cases, we
 13 hire a cost of money expert, but that expert gets
 14 underway with his or her investigation once the
 15 prehearing conference has been held and the protective
 16 order has been entered. But it would be an --
 17 unfortunate, I think, if the ultimate outcome is that
 18 the Commission cannot hire experts in investigations no
 19 matter how complex they are if the Commission lacks the
 20 necessary or requisite expertise on its own Staff.
 21 So that's a -- you know, you may ultimately
 22 see a series of motions to amend complaints. For
 23 example, we might wind up with a fifth amended
 24 complaint. So it's -- it's awkward and unwieldy, and I
 25 appreciate your consideration of and taking it

Page 197

1 seriously.
 2 JUDGE KOPTA: Would you consider an expert
 3 witness that Staff has retained to be the equivalent or
 4 actually Staff for that limited purpose?
 5 MS. BROWN: Well, I considered that earlier
 6 today, in fact, thinking that perhaps we could argue
 7 that the consultant is an extension of Commission Staff.
 8 However, the agreements that we've entered into with --
 9 and typically when we enter into agreements with
 10 consultants and expert witnesses as we have with
 11 Mr. Roach, there's an express provision that states that
 12 he or -- he or her, they're not extensions of Commission
 13 Staff in the sense that they're employees or substitutes
 14 for or stand in shoes of. So I have not been able to
 15 resolve that in my mind, but I also went there.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Yeah, okay. Well, I mean,
 17 obviously this statute says the Commission and Public
 18 Counsel and to the extent that an expert can be
 19 considered as just another member of Staff of the
 20 Commission for that limited purpose. That was the
 21 question that came up in terms of our discussions.
 22 MS. BROWN: Right, and -- and I appreciate
 23 the -- the interesting issues that are raised and the
 24 issues of first impression, but I also have very present
 25 to mind that I would like the Commission to have present

Page 198

1 to mind the fact that CenturyLink -- that CenturyLink
 2 been a regulated company in this jurisdiction by this
 3 Commission for decades. CenturyLink knows what it's
 4 like to provide discovery responses and response to data
 5 requests. CenturyLink's no need to fight
 6 unsophisticated to these proceedings before the
 7 Commission.
 8 And so I will use the word "unfortunate,"
 9 but it's very disappointing that -- that we're even
 10 here. I mean, I'm shocked we're even here, but we are
 11 where we are and that's going to be the tone of this
 12 litigation going forward. Thank you.
 13 JUDGE KOPTA: Okay. Does CenturyLink have a
 14 view in terms of whether an expert witness that Staff
 15 has retained would be considered Staff for purposes of
 16 the statute?
 17 MS. ANDERL: Yes, we do, and I don't think
 18 they would be. I think the contracts indicate they're
 19 independent contractors, and I -- I don't see how the
 20 mantle of Staff could kind of encompass that. I mean, I
 21 kind of, you know -- well, I'll leave it at that.
 22 JUDGE KOPTA: And is it your view -- your
 23 position also that Commission Staff, even though these
 24 documents are part of the Commission's records, anyone
 25 who is not involved in that particular case and signed

Page 199

1 the protective order would not be able to look at those
 2 confidential documents?
 3 MS. ANDERL: Well, you know, the -- the
 4 protective order's pretty clear that the information is
 5 only to be used for purposes of that proceeding. I
 6 suppose it's a little bit gray and I -- I mean, I don't
 7 want to weaken my -- my position by admitting to a gray
 8 area, but, you know, if there's a new employee,
 9 obviously they have to have some way to get
 10 institutional knowledge, right? And that's knowing the
 11 history of some of the dockets in the case. Do they
 12 need to see the confidential information? I don't know.
 13 Does the Staff educating themselves on confidential
 14 information in a closed docket technically violate the
 15 protective order? I think it does.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and this is not an issue
 17 that we've had to grapple with until now that I'm aware
 18 of.
 19 MS. ANDERL: Right, and so, you know, I'm --
 20 I'm disappointed that -- that Staff is, you know, so
 21 annoyed at me, because everybody agrees that this is a
 22 case of first impression. So it's not like -- not like
 23 we're just kind of throwing up barriers willy-nilly,
 24 this is a -- really an area that's, you know,
 25 unexplored. And like I said, I was really surprised to

Page 200

1 see that the expert Exhibit Bs come in, and so it's kind
 2 of what prompted the whole thing.
 3 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, we -- we have had
 4 situations in which interested parties have requested
 5 access to confidential information, IRPs being the one
 6 that immediately come to mind. And in those
 7 circumstances, the Company generally works out an NDA
 8 with those individuals.
 9 And I understand that CenturyLink doesn't
 10 want to do that in this instance and that is your right.
 11 And at least at this point, it's not something that we
 12 would compel the Company to do if -- assuming we would
 13 have the ability or the legal authority to do that.
 14 MS. ANDERL: Well, and nobody asked us to do
 15 that.
 16 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, what I was going to say
 17 is, you referenced earlier that you would be willing to
 18 work with Staff on the three documents that you agree
 19 are germane to the investigation, and I would encourage
 20 you to continue to do that pending what the Commission
 21 decides. And I would hope that there would be some
 22 level of cooperation between Staff and the Company. I'm
 23 not going to cast dispersions on either side, but I
 24 would hope that there would be some way to work out at
 25 least some of these things so that we can move forward

Page 201

1 and be as efficient and effective as we can be.
 2 MS. ANDERL: Well, we are certainly willing
 3 to do that, but I was seeing head shakes on the other
 4 side of the counsel table in terms of whether we can
 5 work together so --
 6 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I'm -- I'm simply --
 7 MS. BROWN: This is absolutely ridiculous,
 8 Your Honor. I'm very sorry we're even in the room here
 9 today, but since we are, in terms of cooperation, since
 10 CenturyLink has already indicated willingness to provide
 11 the three documents, I would urge the Company to do that
 12 as soon as possible. And we'll pass that along to the
 13 Commission's selected expert witness.
 14 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, and if that actually
 15 does happen, then I would ask that you let us know that
 16 that has happened, that there has been that cooperation
 17 and that at least some of the documents are no longer at
 18 issue.
 19 MS. ANDERL: Well, and, Your Honor, if I
 20 might suggest, because, you know, I just have no
 21 interest in getting into a protracting war on this,
 22 entertaining as that might be, if the Commission unhides
 23 the docket, we would be willing to file those three
 24 documents as confidential under the rule in that docket.
 25 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, still the -- there still

Page 202


1 is the issue of the fact that they're confidential, and
 2 the expert would not have access to them unless there is
 3 some agreement between the Company and that expert or
 4 the Company and Staff on behalf of that expert to be
 5 able to review that information and retain its
 6 confidentiality. So that's where the cooperation I
 7 think really the rubber meets the road.
 8 MS. ANDERL: Sure, and I think the Company
 9 would be willing to entertain that -- the notion of
 10 receiving a letter from Staff signed by Staff and the
 11 expert stating that they would agree to handle the
 12 information in a manner as if it were protected by a
 13 protective order, something like that. I think that's
 14 something we did actually work out with Ms. Gafken as
 15 she alluded to years ago where Public Counsel just said
 16 we'll treat this as if it were under a protective order.
 17 That's our -- that's our pledge.
 18 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, whatever you all can
 19 work out, the Commission would be appreciative of on --
 20 on several levels so I just --
 21 MS. ANDERL: Well, like I said, the only way
 22 I think we can do that, though, is to unhide the docket,
 23 because right now we can't file anything in that docket.
 24 JUDGE KOPTA: Well, I will leave that to you
 25 to work out with Staff. And in the meantime, as I say,

Page 203

1 we will take -- at least I see your motion to enforce
 2 the protective order as moot at this point because
 3 there's no disagreement that what Staff is asking for
 4 was not consistent with the protective orders. So
 5 really the motion before me right now is to amend the
 6 protective order, or in the alternative, to issue a
 7 protective order in the new docket. And that is the
 8 determination that I'm taking under advisement.
 9 All right. Is there anything more that we
 10 need to talk about today? Hearing nothing, we are
 11 adjourned.
 12 (Adjourned at 11:09 a.m.)
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 204

1 CERTIFICATE
 2
 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 ability.
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14 Tayler Garlinghouse
 15 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25



<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>a.m 173:16 176:2 195:23,23 203:12</p> <p>ability 189:23 190:8 191:19 200:13 204:9</p> <p>able 178:14 179:13 183:14 186:12 188:24 192:12 194:6 197:14 199:1 202:5</p> <p>absence 192:25</p> <p>absent 184:12</p> <p>absolutely 181:12 193:12 201:7</p> <p>accept 179:9</p> <p>access 176:20 181:16 182:17 184:19,21 186:8 186:12 187:16,17 187:21 191:16 192:20 194:6,10 200:5 202:2</p> <p>accommodate 189:1</p> <p>accumulative 186:19</p> <p>accurate 204:9</p> <p>act 185:7</p> <p>actual 188:16</p> <p>add 191:9,14 192:16</p> <p>add- 186:22</p> <p>addition 185:12</p> <p>additional 186:1,3 186:23 187:10 191:14</p> <p>adjourned 203:11 203:12</p> <p>adjudication 188:19 196:8</p> <p>adjusted 181:15</p> <p>administrative 173:13 174:2 176:18 195:9</p>	<p>admissible 194:3</p> <p>admitting 199:7</p> <p>advised 177:23</p> <p>advisement 196:3 203:8</p> <p>afternoon 179:15</p> <p>AG's 196:10</p> <p>ago 202:15</p> <p>agree 178:10 182:5 183:11 200:18 202:11</p> <p>agreed 184:1</p> <p>agreement 179:23 180:1,10,12 182:20 183:1,14 183:18 185:21 193:18 202:3</p> <p>agreements 197:8,9</p> <p>agrees 199:21</p> <p>allow 184:5 186:10 188:16 194:19</p> <p>allowing 182:17</p> <p>alluded 202:15</p> <p>alternative 186:16 187:24 203:6</p> <p>alternatively 188:17</p> <p>amenable 186:15</p> <p>amend 196:22 203:5</p> <p>amended 196:23</p> <p>amendment 183:3</p> <p>analysis 182:6,16</p> <p>analyzed 190:1</p> <p>Anderl 174:21 176:24,25 177:22 177:23 178:25 179:7,10,14,25 180:4,11,20 181:1 183:16 188:2 189:2,4 193:11,24 198:17 199:3,19 200:14 201:2,19 202:8,21</p> <p>angry 190:15</p>	<p>annoyed 199:21</p> <p>anticipate 185:25</p> <p>anybody 179:16</p> <p>appear 187:14</p> <p>appearance 177:12</p> <p>appearances 176:22</p> <p>appearing 177:6,9 177:14</p> <p>appears 178:4 187:16</p> <p>Appendix 185:22</p> <p>Application 176:13</p> <p>appreciate 179:10 196:25 197:22</p> <p>appreciative 202:19</p> <p>appropriate 184:2</p> <p>April 173:15 176:1</p> <p>area 199:8,24</p> <p>argue 184:25 197:6</p> <p>argument 181:2</p> <p>arguments 188:23</p> <p>arrangement 185:8</p> <p>asked 183:5 195:20 200:14</p> <p>asking 187:5 188:14 193:1 203:3</p> <p>asks 190:20</p> <p>assert 187:18</p> <p>assistance 192:12</p> <p>Assistant 174:8,12 174:16 177:5,8,14</p> <p>assisting 185:10</p> <p>Associate 174:21</p> <p>assume 189:16</p> <p>assuming 200:12</p> <p>attachments 183:1</p> <p>attorney 174:8,12 174:16,17 176:25 177:6,9,14 189:19 189:20,23</p> <p>attorneys 189:16 189:17</p>	<p>audit 193:15</p> <p>audits 182:3</p> <p>authority 187:25 200:13</p> <p>available 181:9 184:14</p> <p>Avenue 173:22 174:17,22</p> <p>avoid 186:19</p> <p>aware 199:17</p> <p>awkward 196:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>B 185:22</p> <p>back 183:24 195:24</p> <p>barriers 199:23</p> <p>basically 182:11</p> <p>basis 180:13 184:11</p> <p>bearing 181:12 182:23</p> <p>beginning 176:22</p> <p>behalf 177:6,9,14 202:4</p> <p>behavior 189:6</p> <p>believe 184:7 190:16,19,19 191:15 193:8,19</p> <p>best 189:1 204:9</p> <p>beyond 190:18</p> <p>bit 178:2 188:22 191:22 199:6</p> <p>boils 178:13 183:9</p> <p>books 191:10</p> <p>bounds 178:6</p> <p>Box 174:8,12</p> <p>break 195:22</p> <p>bridge 174:15 177:11</p> <p>brief 190:23</p> <p>broadband 181:17</p> <p>Brown 174:7 176:16 177:5,5 189:20 192:16,18 193:21 194:14 196:9,10 197:5,22 201:7</p>	<p>Bs 200:1</p> <p>Buell 173:21</p> <p>bunch 176:14</p> <p>business 177:1 181:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 174:1 175:1 176:4 204:1,1</p> <p>called 193:22</p> <p>Capex 181:15</p> <p>captioned 176:7,10 176:12</p> <p>card 177:2</p> <p>careful 179:8</p> <p>case 191:12 198:25 199:11,22</p> <p>cases 196:12</p> <p>cash 181:16</p> <p>cast 200:23</p> <p>cause 182:5,16</p> <p>causing 184:24</p> <p>caveat 183:10</p> <p>CCR 173:20 204:14</p> <p>Central 193:23</p> <p>CenturyLink 173:8 174:20 176:9,11 176:13,25 178:5 179:2 185:19 187:12 191:12 192:23 193:24 194:17 198:1,1,3 198:13 200:9 201:10</p> <p>CenturyLink's 184:11 187:23 198:5</p> <p>CenturyTel 176:8</p> <p>certain 178:14</p> <p>certainly 201:2</p> <p>Certified 204:6</p> <p>certify 204:8</p> <p>chance 179:11</p> <p>change 183:11</p> <p>characterize 187:8</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>chase 180:21 chilling 190:8 195:3 chooses 195:1 circuit 193:15 circumstances 184:4 188:20 196:6 200:7 clarification 179:10 clarify 177:18 179:1 186:6 187:12 190:25 clear 189:22 199:4 clearly 189:9 client 179:11 closed 180:5 189:25 192:21 193:17 199:14 come 186:13 200:1 200:6 comfortable 179:19 180:24 188:25 coming 196:11 Commission 173:2 173:4,18 174:4,6 175:3 176:8,11 177:6,9 184:4,8 185:6 186:1,8 187:18,22 188:8 188:14,19 189:1 191:19 192:19,22 193:14 194:5,9,16 194:20 195:1,1,18 196:18,19 197:7 197:12,17,20,25 198:3,7,23 200:20 201:22 202:19 Commission's 181:7 198:24 201:13 Commissioners 196:1 company 176:23 178:22 179:19,23 180:3,9,18 183:4</p>	<p>183:23 184:1 187:5,5,6,7,7,9 191:11 193:7 194:19 198:2 200:7,12,22 201:11 202:3,4,8 company's 190:8 compel 200:12 competing 176:19 Complainant 173:5 complaint 196:24 complaints 196:22 complex 196:19 compliance 182:2 193:16 concern 187:13 concerns 188:4 conducting 182:9 192:24 conference 195:12 196:15 confidence 190:10 confidential 176:20 178:14 181:5 182:20,23,25 183:3,5 184:14,19 186:23 187:16,17 187:20 188:6,17 189:9 190:9 191:20 199:2,12 199:13 200:5 201:24 202:1 confidentiality 185:4,18 186:3 187:23 191:6,14 202:6 conjunction 178:20 consent 183:6 consider 197:2 consideration 196:25 considered 197:5 197:19 198:15 consistent 203:4 consistently 188:19</p>	<p>consult 179:11 consultant 185:7 186:7,10,14,23 197:7 consultants 197:10 consultation 196:1 Cont 175:1 contact 177:1 contain 191:5 contend 185:17 content 187:11 191:4 contesting 178:8 continue 200:20 contracted 192:11 contractors 198:19 contracts 198:18 convenience 182:12 cooperation 200:22 201:9,16 202:6 Corporation 173:8 176:11 correct 177:20 178:8,22,23 cost 196:13 counsel 174:15,21 177:15 188:7 189:12 196:5 197:18 201:4 202:15 count 181:5 countless 181:4,5 counts 181:16 COUNTY 204:4 couple 178:16 188:4 course 189:23 court 177:2 cut 180:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 176:4 d/b/a 173:8 176:9 176:11 data 194:16 198:4 day 192:1</p>	<p>debate 191:22,25 debt 181:15 decades 198:3 December 182:7 185:10 decided 196:2 decides 200:21 declined 188:20 degree 190:10 deign 194:19 denied 192:19 deny 190:12,13 department 182:24 183:3 desire 188:24 destroyed 188:12 detailed 184:9 185:5,22 determination 203:8 determined 186:24 different 195:18 disagreement 203:3 disappointed 199:20 disappointing 198:9 disclose 190:9 disclosed 189:12 disclosing 184:23 185:23 disclosure 181:25 disconcerting 190:4 discovery 181:8 185:11 188:11 194:2 198:4 discuss 176:19 194:4 discussed 185:20 discussing 186:2 discussion 195:25 discussions 180:9 197:21</p>	<p>dispersions 200:23 dispute 178:4 distributed 189:10 diversity 182:2 193:15 docket 173:4 176:7 176:9,12 177:25 180:6 181:12 182:3,12,13,14,17 182:21 183:7 185:2,2,7,14 186:2,4 187:19 188:18 189:19 190:2 193:13,16 193:17 194:16 199:14 201:23,24 202:22,23 203:7 dockets 176:21,21 177:19 178:7,15 180:5 181:4 184:10 188:5,16 188:21 189:24 192:20,25 194:17 199:11 document 181:21 182:6 document-by-do... 180:13 documents 178:18 179:12,18,20 180:13 181:6 182:19 183:10,25 187:6,9,11 190:16 191:4,5 193:1,5,6 193:10,18,25 194:18 198:24 199:2 200:18 201:11,17,24 doing 178:16 184:8 195:17 Drive 173:18 174:4 duplicative 186:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 174:1,1 175:1,1 176:4,4 204:1,1</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>earlier 185:20 197:5 200:17 easiest 184:5 East 179:17 EBITDA 181:15 educating 199:13 effect 190:8 192:22 195:3 effective 201:1 efficient 201:1 either 186:15 200:23 elongate 194:21 employee 199:8 employees 197:13 encompass 198:20 encourage 200:19 enforce 180:12 203:1 enforceable 183:19 enter 183:18 188:18 197:9 entered 185:20 186:4 196:16 197:8 entering 180:9 entertain 202:9 entertaining 201:22 entity 183:18 equivalent 197:3 essentially 187:8 established 179:1 event 182:8,9 Evergreen 173:18 174:4 everybody 199:21 evidence 194:3 example 183:15 188:20 196:12,23 examples 196:11 Exhibit 189:19,20 200:1 exhibits 188:8 189:24,24 192:20</p>	<p>existing 195:7 exists 184:13 expedition 186:11 expert 178:14 179:13 180:1 181:9,20 182:2,10 182:17 183:1 184:2 188:24 189:24 192:5,7,7 192:19 194:6,6,10 194:20 196:7,13 196:13 197:2,10 197:18 198:14 200:1 201:13 202:2,3,4,11 expertise 192:11 196:20 experts 178:19 196:18 express 197:11 extension 197:7 extensions 197:12 extensively 185:13 extent 189:14 197:18 extremely 190:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>F 204:1 fact 181:21 197:6 198:1 202:1 familiar 179:17,18 far 189:6,14 FCC 193:15 February 182:7 Federal 194:23 fifth 196:23 fight 198:5 figure 190:18 file 182:16 188:9 191:23 201:23 202:23 filed 181:6 182:3,6 182:11 185:1 189:20 192:20 193:13,16,17</p>	<p>files 188:11 filing 180:11 find 190:3 Fine 190:18 first 177:18 184:20 185:19 186:18 197:24 199:22 fishing 186:10 flow 181:16 foregoing 204:8 form 184:11 forma 181:15 forth 183:24 forward 198:12 200:25 Fourth 173:22 frankly 189:6 free 181:16 Fukano 174:11 177:8,8 178:10,22 178:23 181:22 184:6,7 188:23 189:3 190:23,25 full 177:1 further 185:5 191:9 future 195:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 176:4 Gafken 174:16 177:13,13 202:14 Garlinghouse 173:20 204:6,14 general 174:8,12,16 174:17,21 177:6,9 177:14 187:2,12 generally 200:7 germane 200:19 getting 201:21 give 181:2 given 185:12 187:10 190:20 194:11 gives 183:21 Glenn 185:6 194:9 go 181:1 186:10</p>	<p>195:21 going 180:17 188:22 192:2,6 194:19 198:11,12 200:16,23 good 176:24 181:22 Government 194:23 grants 191:18 grapple 199:17 gray 199:6,7 Gregory 173:13 174:3 176:17 gross 192:18 guess 184:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>hamper 195:1 handle 202:11 happen 194:11 201:15 happened 201:16 happens 192:4 happy 180:21 182:16 Harry 174:11 177:8 harry.fukano@u... 174:14 head 177:21 201:3 hear 183:22 heard 183:23 hearing 173:11 177:16 185:14 203:10 heartburn 194:22 held 196:15 help 191:13 hidden 180:6 194:15 hire 196:13,18 hired 185:6 194:6 history 199:11 Honor 176:24 178:25 180:20 188:2 189:4 192:16 193:11,21</p>	<p>201:8,19 hope 200:21,24 horrible 190:7 195:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>identified 189:16 191:7 III 173:11 immediately 200:6 impair 192:6 impaired 179:2 implicitly 191:20 impression 197:24 199:22 in- 184:16 in-house 176:25 incident 193:5 include 191:11 195:7 included 191:1 inconceivable 181:19 incontrovertibly 190:17 independent 186:7 186:10,14 198:19 indicate 198:18 indicated 201:10 individuals 200:8 influence 187:8 informal 182:14 information 176:20 177:1,24 178:15 181:14,19,21 182:23 184:14,15 184:16,20,22,24 185:1,4,16,19,23 186:20,24,24,25 187:3,4,16,18,21 187:22,24 188:6 188:11,17,25 189:10 190:1,9 191:2,16,20,21,25 192:3,8 199:4,12 199:14 200:5</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>202:5,12 injuries 184:16 injury 184:24 inspect 191:10 instance 200:10 institutional 199:10 Integrated 188:21 intend 186:9 intending 179:4 Inter 176:8 interest 201:21 interested 200:4 interesting 197:23 internal 186:9 191:3 interrupted 179:3 investigate 192:10 investigated 193:4 investigating 194:24 investigation 178:20 179:6 182:9 185:13 190:2,17 191:8 192:7,13,22,25 193:2,23 194:1 195:2 196:7,14 200:19 investigations 193:20 196:18 investigative 187:13 190:14 195:9 investigator 175:3 192:9 involved 188:16 198:25 involving 176:14 178:21 193:5 IRPs 200:5 irrelevant 193:22 194:1 Island 176:9 issue 178:9 182:14</p>	<p>182:19 184:3 187:15 194:5 195:16 196:3 199:16 201:18 202:1 203:6 issued 178:7 183:7 issues 188:13 192:14 196:4 197:23,24 issuing 186:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>J 173:13 174:3 176:17 January 189:20 judge 173:13 174:2 176:6,17,18 177:3 177:11,16 178:1 178:12,24 179:4,9 179:21 180:2,8,16 180:23 183:12,22 188:3 190:22,24 191:17 192:15,17 192:24 193:4 194:13 195:14,24 197:2,16 198:13 198:22 199:16 200:3,16 201:6,14 201:25 202:18,24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>keep 189:5 195:19 kind 180:21 198:20 198:21 199:23 200:1 know 182:11,13,24 189:6 191:5 192:5 193:24 195:14 196:8,21 198:21 199:3,8,12,19,20 199:24 201:15,20 knowing 199:10 knowledge 199:10 204:9 knows 198:3</p>	<p>Kopta 173:13 174:3 176:6,17,17 177:3,11,16 178:1 178:12,24 179:4,9 179:21 180:2,8,16 180:23 183:12,22 188:3 190:22,24 191:17 192:15,17 192:24 193:4 194:13 195:14,24 197:2,16 198:13 198:22 199:16 200:3,16 201:6,14 201:25 202:18,24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>lacks 196:19 language 184:18 law 173:13 174:2 176:18 195:9 lead 194:2 leave 198:21 202:24 legal 200:13 legitimate 184:15 184:21 185:1,15 187:21 length 193:25 let's 176:6,22 183:22 190:18 195:8,21,24 letter 202:10 level 176:14 200:22 level-headed 189:5 levels 181:16 202:20 limitation 184:19 limited 197:4,20 line 177:11 181:16 Lisa 174:16,21 176:24 177:13 lisa.anderl@cent... 174:23 lisa.gafken@atg.... 174:19 list 178:18 179:12</p>	<p>182:6 183:10 listed 187:25 litigation 198:12 little 178:2 188:22 199:6 LLC 173:21 loath 183:24 lobby 187:10 long 181:2 189:25 longer 177:24 194:15 201:17 look 191:24 192:4 199:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>M 183:3 maintain 185:15 187:23 manner 202:12 mantle 198:20 material 186:13 materials 186:11 matter 176:12 179:6 184:12 187:2 191:13,25 196:2,19 matters 185:12 mean 189:7 192:4 194:15 197:16 198:10,20 199:6 means 191:20 194:12 measures 191:6 meets 202:7 member 197:19 merger 181:12 182:12,21 methods 184:8 195:6 military 182:24 183:3,4,5 Military's 183:6 mind 195:19 197:15,25 198:1 200:6 modification</p>	<p>186:21 195:7 modify 181:10 186:17 187:19 188:15 190:5,13 modifying 181:23 moment 184:3 188:3 195:21 money 196:13 moot 203:2 morning 176:24 180:19 194:4 motion 178:5 180:12 184:9 185:6 186:16 188:1 190:12,14 203:1,5 motions 176:19 196:22 move 200:25 multiple 189:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>N 174:1 175:1 176:4 narrowed 178:2 National 173:24 NDA 200:7 necessarily 191:5 necessary 183:25 192:12 196:20 necessity 191:22 need 181:20 182:25 184:15,21 185:1 185:15 187:21 198:5 199:12 203:10 needless 181:3 negative 192:21 negotiate 180:18 network 182:8,9 never 188:14 193:13 Nevertheless 181:23 new 190:2 199:8 203:7</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>nods 177:21 nondisclosure 179:23,25 183:14 183:17 185:21 NORS 182:4 191:1 193:12 Notice 176:13 notion 202:9 novel 182:14 numbers 181:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>O 176:4 o0o-- 176:3 object 183:8 189:23 193:12 objection 184:11 obtained 189:10 obviously 183:6 191:18 197:17 199:9 occur 194:12 offer 180:15 offered 180:11,12 office 174:17 196:10 okay 178:1 180:16 181:1 183:12 197:16 198:13 Olympia 173:19,23 174:5,9,13 176:1 once 196:14 opened 189:25 opportunity 187:8 187:10 opposed 183:14 options 180:25 order 180:6 181:10 181:23 182:15 183:7,13,17,20 184:13,18 186:1 186:17,22 187:19 188:5,15,18 189:11 190:5,13 191:13 196:3,16 199:1,15 202:13</p>	<p>202:16 203:2,6,7 order's 199:4 orders 178:7 180:5 184:10,12 189:8 191:24 195:6,8 203:4 outrage 178:21 182:4 185:10 189:15 192:23 193:15,22,24 194:24 outcome 195:4 196:17 outraged 189:6 outrageous 190:3 outside 178:6 overlook 195:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>P 174:1,1 175:1,1 176:4 pages 173:12 191:23 paragraph 189:9 Park 173:18 174:4 part 181:6,8 185:8 193:2,17 198:24 participate 185:13 particular 194:9 198:25 particularly 181:11 parties 178:17 200:4 party 189:12 pass 201:12 path 195:10 Paul 175:3 192:9 193:3,8 196:6 pending 185:5 200:20 penetration 181:17 people 179:16 permit 186:22 187:20 permits 195:9 person 188:6</p>	<p>personally 194:22 persons 184:15,21 184:23 perspective 180:17 183:13 place 179:23 180:1 182:13 185:3 187:23 Plan 188:21 play 195:19 pleading 179:22 pleadings 178:3 pledge 202:17 PO 174:8,12 point 178:11,19 189:1 195:15 200:11 203:2 position 179:19 198:23 199:7 possesses 187:4 possible 184:8 188:10 201:12 potential 185:14 potentiality 183:10 potentially 191:7 practical 192:2 195:16 practice 188:10 precedent 190:7 195:2 prefer 186:16,17 187:3 prehearing 195:12 196:15 prepared 181:2 preparing 185:9,11 present 175:2 197:24,25 presented 187:13 196:4 presents 187:7 preserve 185:3,18 191:13 presiding 176:18 pressing 188:13</p>	<p>pretty 199:4 prevent 184:21,23 previous 192:20 193:5 prior 193:19 pro 181:15 problematic 195:11 proceed 177:17 proceeding 189:13 190:9 194:22 199:5 proceedings 198:6 prohibit 185:22 prompted 200:2 properly 190:10 proposed 178:16 proposing 183:9 propound 194:16 protec- 189:8,10 protect 181:25 190:18 protected 190:11 202:12 protection 183:21 186:3 191:14 protective 178:7 180:4,6,12 181:9 181:23 182:15 183:7,13,17,20 184:10,13,18 186:1,17,22 187:19 188:5,15 188:18 189:8,11 190:5,13 191:12 191:23 195:6,8 196:15 199:1,4,15 202:13,16 203:2,4 203:6,7 protracting 201:21 provide 184:2 186:2,23 198:4 201:10 provided 176:20 177:1 178:5,15 181:7,22 183:1</p>	<p>186:14 188:7 193:13 provider 184:17,24 provides 185:24 provision 179:2 181:13,14 183:4 195:7 197:11 public 174:15 177:15 182:14 183:18,20 191:11 197:17 202:15 purpose 185:7 197:4,20 purposes 184:20 189:13 190:1,2 198:15 199:5 put 182:13 185:3 187:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>QC 173:8 176:12 que- 194:24 question 192:2 194:8,11,25 197:21 Qwest 173:8 176:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>R 174:1 175:1 176:4 204:1 raised 197:23 rate 196:12 RCW 191:10,18 reach 179:16 read 178:3 really 178:12 179:7 179:14 180:24 190:3 199:24,25 202:7 203:5 Realtime 173:21 reasons 185:19 186:18 receive 191:19 received 178:17,18 180:14 189:19</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>receiving 202:10 recollection 182:22 193:14 recommendation 190:4 record 176:6 179:1 181:7,8 189:18 191:1 195:21,24 195:25 records 183:20 188:7 194:10 198:24 referenced 200:17 referencing 179:5 refile 183:6 refiling 186:19 reflection 187:12 regard 183:2 regarding 182:7 regulated 198:2 regulatory 193:9 related 185:9 relatedly 184:22 relay 184:2 relevance 182:4 relevant 186:25 190:17 relief 190:20 rephrase 194:7 report 185:9 191:1 REPORTED 173:20 reporter 177:2 204:7 Reporting 173:21 reports 182:2,4 189:15 193:12,16 193:23 representing 176:25 request 181:10 183:20 187:7,24 191:2,12 193:9 196:4 requested 187:1</p>	<p>189:11 193:6,19 195:17 200:4 requesting 178:6 187:4 requests 181:24 185:11 194:16 198:5 required 191:6 requires 188:5 requisite 196:20 reservations 189:2 resolve 197:15 resolving 196:3 Resource 188:21 respond 184:6 188:2 189:3 Respondent 173:9 response 180:15 190:23 198:4 responses 198:4 responsible 185:9 responsive 191:8 result 184:17 retain 202:5 retained 197:3 198:15 retroactively 190:5 returned 188:6,12 revenue 181:15 review 178:14,19 179:13 182:22 185:1,16 187:3,9 187:20 188:17,25 191:19,21 192:8 202:5 reviewed 189:12,17 reviewing 186:25 ridiculous 201:7 right 177:3,18 178:12 179:21 180:5,25 183:16 183:22 190:22 191:10,15,24 197:22 199:10,19 200:10 202:23</p>	<p>203:5,9 risk 184:13 Roach 184:25 185:7,8,12,15,21 185:23 187:15,17 187:20,21 194:9 197:11 road 202:7 room 174:22 201:8 root 182:5,16 rubber 202:7 rule 201:24 rummage 186:8 188:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 174:1 175:1 176:4 safeguards 185:2 185:18 187:22 Sally 174:7 177:5 196:9,9 sallyb@atg.wa.gov 174:10 sanction 190:6 says 197:17 scope 178:2 Seattle 173:22,23 174:18,22 second 184:22 185:25 186:21 Secondly 185:17 see 180:2 181:20 182:2,10 195:11 196:22 198:19 199:12 200:1 203:1 seeing 177:20 201:3 seeking 177:24 seeks 178:19 selected 201:13 Senior 174:8 177:5 sense 180:19 197:13 sensitive 181:18 184:23 series 196:22</p>	<p>seriously 197:1 serves 184:20 service 181:13 185:10 191:11 services 193:9 settlement 182:20 182:25 193:18 shakes 201:3 share 194:20 SharePoint 186:8 191:3 shocked 198:10 shoes 197:14 Shorthand 204:6 side 200:23 201:4 signature 191:23 signed 191:6 198:25 202:10 significant 184:13 similar 186:4 193:19 simply 179:5 201:6 single 194:17,18 sit 189:17 sitting 180:18 situations 200:4 skill 204:9 somebody 183:19 somewhat 195:11 soon 201:12 sorry 201:8 sorts 193:1 South 173:18 174:4 Southwest 173:18 specifically 191:18 spite 190:15 Staff 174:6 177:4,7 177:10,23 178:6,8 178:13,18,20 179:12,24 180:1,3 180:9 181:24 182:1 183:9,15,23 184:25 185:10,14 185:17,20,24,25 186:6,9,13,15,22</p>	<p>186:25 187:2,10 187:13,18 188:13 189:16,25 190:16 190:20 191:2,7,9 191:15,21,22 192:3,4 193:14 194:16,20 195:17 196:5,7,20 197:3 197:4,7,13,19 198:14,15,20,23 199:13,20 200:18 200:22 202:4,10 202:10,25 203:3 Staff's 179:22 180:16 181:10,19 182:17 187:9 188:24 189:6 190:4,12,13 192:6 192:19,22 194:1,6 194:9 195:1 196:4 stage 185:6 stand 197:14 start 176:22 started 193:12 state 183:2 184:12 187:6 189:9 204:3 204:7 states 197:11 stating 202:11 statute 197:17 198:16 statutory 187:25 step 188:23 stuff 176:14 subject 179:6 183:11 submit 183:19 191:23 subpoena 187:25 190:14 subpoenas 195:9 substitutes 197:13 sufficient 185:2,18 suggest 184:18 201:20</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>suggested 186:16 Suite 173:22 174:17 summary 187:14 support 185:25 suppose 199:6 sure 183:17 194:14 202:8 surprised 199:25 SUSIE 175:3 SW 174:4 system 186:9 191:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>T 204:1,1 table 201:4 take 179:20 195:15 196:2 203:1 taken 195:22 talk 195:2 203:10 talking 177:19 Taylor 173:20 204:6,14 technical 192:11 technically 199:14 telecommunication 181:13 terms 183:25 185:21 186:3,4 195:6 197:21 198:14 201:4,9 testimony 185:11 Thank 177:3 198:12 themselves 199:13 theoretically 188:9 thing 200:2 things 200:25 think 178:10 183:5 183:16,20 184:9 189:7 190:7,12 196:10,17 198:17 198:18 199:15 202:7,8,13,22 thinking 197:6 third 186:6 187:2</p>	<p>thorough 192:13 three 176:21 185:19 186:18 200:18 201:11,23 throwing 199:23 THURSTON 204:4 time 179:15,16 182:21 192:1 195:17 today 189:18 197:6 201:9 203:10 tone 198:11 top 191:14 Transaction 176:13 transcript 204:8 Transportation 173:2,4,18 174:3 176:8,10 treat 202:16 true 179:24 188:10 191:17 204:8 trying 189:5 196:10 two 176:21 178:7 182:19 183:11 184:1,8,20 189:17 190:16 194:18 type 193:6 typically 196:12 197:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ultimate 195:3 196:17 ultimately 196:2,21 Um 178:24 uncomfortable 188:22 understand 177:19 179:22 182:1,3 188:23,24 192:13 196:5 200:9 understanding 177:22 understatement 192:18 Understood 179:9</p>	<p>undertaking 178:21 underway 196:14 unexplored 199:25 unfettered 186:7 unfortunate 196:17 198:8 unhide 202:22 unhides 201:22 unsophisticated 198:6 unwieldy 196:24 urge 201:11 use 198:8 UT-132234 176:7 UT-14 186:5 UT-140597 173:4 176:9 177:20 184:10 UT-17 186:5 UT-170042 176:12 177:20 184:10 UT-181051 185:8 185:14 195:12 Utilities 173:2,4,18 174:3 176:7,10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>version 182:20,25 versus 176:8,11 victory 195:10 view 191:4 194:1 198:14,22 viewed 191:2 violate 199:14 violations 189:7 VOLUME 173:11 vs 173:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>wait 194:15 want 179:7 181:3 183:13 199:7 200:10 wanted 177:18 186:12</p>	<p>wants 178:13 179:12 182:1 war 201:21 Washington 173:1 173:4,18,19,22 174:5,9,13,18,22 176:1,7,10 183:2 204:3,7 way 179:5 181:24 184:5 199:9 200:24 202:21 ways 178:16 we'll 201:12 202:16 we're 180:18 194:3 195:12 198:9,10 199:23 201:8 we've 178:1 186:2 196:2 197:8 199:17 weaken 199:7 went 193:24 197:15 wholly 193:22 willing 190:15 200:17 201:2,23 202:9 willingness 190:8 201:10 willy-nilly 199:23 wind 196:23 wishing 177:12 witness 178:14 192:19 197:3 198:14 201:13 witnesses 197:10 word 198:8 work 180:13 190:16 200:18,24 201:5 202:14,19 202:25 works 176:16 200:7 wouldn't 183:8 wrestling 195:15 www.buellrealti... 173:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>Yeah 197:16 year 189:21 years 202:15 yesterday 178:17 179:15 180:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p>zones 179:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1-3 177:24 10:57 195:23 11:09 203:12 12th 182:7 1300 173:18 174:4 1325 173:22 14 187:19 140597 182:3 1506 174:22 1600 174:22 17 187:19 170 193:13 173-204 173:12 181 186:2 181051 180:7 182:13 183:7 1840 173:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2000 174:17 2014 193:14 2019 173:15 176:1 182:7 185:10 206 173:23 174:18 174:23 27th 182:7 287-9066 173:23 28th 182:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <hr/> <p>3 173:15 176:1,15 3:30 179:15 30 183:9</p>
---	---	--	---	--

3358 173:20 204:14
345-1574 174:23
360 173:23 174:5,9
 174:13

4

40128 174:8,12
464-6595 174:18

5

534-9066 173:23
586-5522 174:13
5th 174:17

6

664-1160 174:5
664-1193 174:9

7

7 189:9
7th 174:22

8

80.04.070 191:10
80.04.095 191:18
800 173:24 174:17
846-6989 173:24

9

9:30 173:16 176:2
9:58 195:23
911 178:21 179:2
 181:14 182:23
 192:23 193:5,15
 193:16,24
98101 173:22
98104 174:18
98191 174:22
98504 173:19 174:5
 174:9,13
991 185:10