# Docket No. UE-200115 - Vol. II

## In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy

July 6, 2020



COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

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



### Docket No. UE-200115 - Vol. II - 7/6/2020

Page 68	Page 70
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	1 REMOTE APPEARANCES (Continued)
	2 3 FOR SIERRA CLUB:
In the Matter of the Application of ) DOCKET UE-200115	4 JESSICA YARNALL LOARIE SIERRA CLUB ENVIRONMENTAL LAW PROGRAM
PUGET SOUND ENERGY, )	5 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
)	Oakland, California 94612 6 jessica.yarnall@sierraclub.org
For an Order Authorizing Sale of All) of Puget Sound Energy's Interests in)	7 FOR NRDC: 8 KATHERINE WHITE TUDOR
Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget)	AMANDA LEVEN
Sound Energy's Interest in Colstrip)	9 2417 Capitol Way South Olympia, Washington 98501
Transmission System )	10 kate@whitetudor.com 11 FOR NWEC AND RNW:
REMOTE VIDEO STATUS CONFERENCE	12 IRION SANGER SANGER LAW P.C.
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW J. O'CONNELL	13 1041 SE 58th Place
VOLUME II Pages 68-107	Portland, Oregon 97215 14 irion@sanger-law.com
	15 FOR AVISTA: 16 MICHAEL G. ANDREA
	JASON THACKSTON
July 6, 2020	17 PATRICK D. EHRBAR AVISTA CORPORATION
2:04 p.m.	18 1411 E. Mission Avenue, MSC-27 Spokane, Washington 99220
	19 michael.andra@avistacorp.com
	FOR PACIFICORP:
	21 AJAY KUMAR
	22 PACIFICORP 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 2000
	23 Portland, Oregon 97232
REPORTED BY: CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, RPR, CCR 2121	ajay.kumar@pacificorp.com 24
	25
Page 69	Page 71
1 REMOTE APPEARANCES	
2 FOR PSE:	1 REMOTE APPEARANCES (Continued)
3 JASON KUZMA DAVID S. STEELE	2 FOR PGE:
4 PERKINS COIE LLP 10885 NE 4th Street, Suite 700	3
5 Bellevue, Washington 98004-5579	4 DOUGLAS C. TINGEY 4 PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
jkuzma@perkinscoie.com 6 dsteele@perkinscoie.com	121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC1301
7 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	5 Portland, Oregon 97204 doug.tingey@pgn.com
8 JOE M. DALLAS	6
9 ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	FOR MICROSOFT: 7
10 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION DIVISION	TYLER C. PEPPLE
P.O. Box 40128 11 Olympia, Washington 98504	8 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, P.C. 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450
joe.dallas@utc.wa.gov	9 Portland, Oregon 97201 tcp@dvclaw.com
13 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	10
14 LISA W. GAFKEN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL	11
	12 13
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000	12 13 14
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov	12 13 14 15 16
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN	12 13 14 15 16 17
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 Iisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH 20 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450	12 13 14 15 16 17 18
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH 20 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 21 Portland, Oregon 97201 blc@dvclaw.com	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH 20 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 21 Portland, Oregon 97201 blc@dvclaw.com 22	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH 20 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 21 Portland, Oregon 97201 blc@dvclaw.com 22	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 15 WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT 16 800 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 17 lisa.gafken@atg.wa.gov 18 FOR AWEC: 19 BRENT L. COLEMAN CORINNE MILINOVICH 20 DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC 1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 21 Portland, Oregon 97201 blc@dvclaw.com 22 23 24	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

1 (Pages 68 to 71)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 72		Page 74
1			
1 2	REPORTED REMOTELY FROM KITSAP COUNTY, WASHINGTON	1	MS. TUDOR: This is Kate White Tudor
3	JULY 6, 2020, 2:04 P.M. -000-	2	representing the Natural Resources Defense Council, and
4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Good afternoon. I am	3	I am accompanied by my colleague, Amanda Leven. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Northwest
5	Andrew J. O'Connell, an Administrative Law Judge from	4	
6	the Utilities and Transportation Commission. Today is	6	Energy Coalition and Renewable Northwest. Mr. Sanger?
7	Monday, July 6, 2020, and the time is approximately	7	MR. SANGER: Sorry. This is Irion Sanger on behalf of the Northwest Energy Coalition and Renewable
8	2:00 p.m. We're here for Docket UE-200115, which is	8	Northwest.
9	Puget Sound Energy's sale of certain coal strip assets.	9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
10	We're here for a status conference regarding	10	MR. SANGER: And I was going to say Jeff
11	PSE's May 28th Notice of Intent to supplement its	11	Fox and Wendy Gerlitz may be on the phone as well.
12	application. That filing has not yet been received and	12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
	<ul> <li>the deadline for testimony responding to PSE's initial</li> </ul>		MS. GERLITZ: This is Wendy Gerlitz. I am
14	filing is coming up on July 17th, 2020.	13 14	on the phone. I was keeping myself on mute.
15	At the status conference, I want to discuss	15	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
16	timing for filing of that supplemental application and	16	For Avista?
17	possible changes to the procedural schedule in order to	17	MR. ANDREA: This is Mike Andrea, in-house
18	accommodate responses to the supplemental application.	18	counsel for Avista. And with me on the phone is Pat
19	Before we get to that, let's go ahead and	19	Ehrbar and Jason Thackston for Avista.
20	take short appearances from each of the parties and	20	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
21	their representatives. Let's start with Puget Sound	21	For PacifiCorp?
22	Energy.	22	MR. KUMAR: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	MR. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.	23	This is Ajay Kumar for PacifiCorp.
24	This is David Steele with Perkins Coie. And	24	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
25	with me, also, is my colleague, Jason Kuzma, also with	25	For Portland General Electric?
	Page 73		Page 75
1	Perkins Coie on the line for PSE today.	1	MR. TINGEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	2	Doug Tingey for Portland General Electric.
3	And for the Commission Staff?	3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
4	MR. DALLAS: This is Joe Dallas on behalf of	4	And for Microsoft?
5	Commission Staff.	5	MR. PEPPLE: Good afternoon. This is Tyler
6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Public Counsel?	6	Pepple for Microsoft Corporation.
7	MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa	7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I have some
8	Gafken, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of Public	8	questions for PSE and the other parties. But before I
9	Counsel.	9	get to those, have the parties discussed any agreed
10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for the Alliance of	10	changes that could be made to the procedural schedule?
11	Western Energy Consumers.	11	Mr. Dallas?
12	MR. COLEMAN: Good afternoon. Brent Coleman	12	MR. DALLAS: We we have discussed
13	of Davison Van Cleve on behalf of AWEC.	13	possible changes, but I am not aware of any agreed-to
14	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for	14	change by all the parties.
15	MR. COLEMAN: I believe that my colleague,	15	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And Staff is the
16	Corinne Milinovich, is also on the line.	16	party that contacted the Commission to set up the status
17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	17	conference.
18	And that's also for AWEC. Okay.	18	Can you please summarize for me the the
19	MR. COLEMAN: That's correct.	19	reasons for requesting that we get together to talk
20	JUDGE O'CONNELL: For the Sierra Club,	20	about the procedural schedule? Mr. Dallas?
21	please?	21	MR. DALLAS: Yes, Your Honor. So as
22	MS. YARNALL LOARIE: This is Jessica Yarnall	22	discussed in my e-mail last week, Talen Montana has
23	Loarie representing the Sierra Club.	23	become a purchaser in this transaction. Staff has
24	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Natural Resources	24	discussed this topic with every non-investor owned
25	Defense Council?	25	utility party in this docket. And through these

2 (Pages 72 to 75)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 76		Page 78		
1		1			
2	discussions, every party has voiced a concern over the lack of a supplemental filing pertaining to Talen's	1 2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.		
		1	I do have some specific questions that I'd		
3	involvement. Generally, parties have stated they cannot	3	like to have input from all of the parties, each party,		
4	provide a complete recommendation to the Commission on	4	if they have an opinion that they want to share.		
5	this transaction without a supplemental filing and	5	But first, I have a couple questions,		
6	additional time for discovery.	6	Mr. Steele, for PSE. I need to understand, and the		
7	PSE has made some assurances that the	7	commissioners want to understand more about this		
8	fundamentals of this transaction are still valid, and	8	supplemental filing and why it has taken so long since		
9	they have committed to filing supplemental testimony on	9	you filed your notice on May 28th. Why it's taken so		
<ul> <li>this topic; however, several parties are unwilling to</li> <li>form a recommendation based on these assurances and</li> </ul>		10 long since then.			
11			11 And then I also want to know when you expect 12 to have it filed and well, let me leave it there.		
			to have it filed and well, let me leave it there.		
13 transaction has changed.		13 14	Go ahead, Mr. Steele.		
	14         Staff shares some of the concerns expressed		MR. STEELE: Thank you, Your Honor.		
15	by the parties, and this is because staff has learned	15	The the current status is Talen Northwest		
16	that some important aspects of this case are uncertain,	16	and Northwestern are currently working out the details		
17	and these uncertainties are not reflected in any current	17	if Talen exercises its right of first refusal as part of		
18	testimony.	18	this transaction.		
19	And we can discuss some of these	19	PSE is pushing both of them to resolve the		
20	uncertainties in more detail if the Commission would	20	details of that right of first refusal between them and		
21	find it helpful. But, generally, because of these	21	remains hopeful that this will be resolved in the very		
22	uncertainties, Staff at this time would not be able to	22	near future.		
23	provide the Commission with the complete recommendation	23	We understand, and in speaking with them,		
24 25	on the responsive testimony date. And this is simply because the record doesn't reflect the current realities	24 25	have reason to believe that that that agreement		
20	because the record doesn't reliect the current realities	25	between them on Talen's right of first refusal will be		
	Page 77		Page 79		
1	of the transaction.	1			
			completed in the next week or so, at which point PSF		
	And Staff believes that the Commission needs		completed in the next week or so, at which point PSE will file its supplemental filing which will include a		
2	And Staff believes that the Commission needs complete and comprehensive testimony to render a	2	will file its supplemental filing which will include a		
3	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a	2 3	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all		
3 4	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current	2 3 4	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document		
3 4 5	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it	2 3 4 5	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And		
3 4 5 6	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission.	2 3 4 5 6	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them.		
3 4 5 6 7	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status	2 3 4 5 6 7	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. As to why it's taking so along; the parties,		
3 4 5 6 7 8	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them.</li> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have</li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them.</li> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them.</li> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties, as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing an end and that should be resolved in the near future.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing conference to just kind of revisit the schedule and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing conference to just kind of revisit the schedule and to see if any changes need to be made due to unforeseen	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing an end and that should be resolved in the near future.</li> <li>As I said, the the framework, though, of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing conference to just kind of revisit the schedule and to see if any changes need to be made due to unforeseen changes that had occurred after our first pre-hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing an end and that should be resolved in the near future. <ul> <li>As I said, the the framework, though, of the transaction PSE has filed will not be changing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing conference to just kind of revisit the schedule and to see if any changes need to be made due to unforeseen changes that had occurred after our first pre-hearing conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing an end and that should be resolved in the near future.</li> <li>As I said, the the framework, though, of the transaction PSE has filed will not be changing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	complete and comprehensive testimony to render a decision in this docket. And due to the current uncertainties in the docket, staff does not believe it can provide this testimony to the commission. So so we decided to to hold the status conference to see what's the best way forward to accommodate a supplemental filing to allow parties to conduct discovery of the supplemental filing and to ensure the commission has the best information to render a decision in accordance with the applicable legal standards. There there is general agreement among the non-company parties that a change needs to be made, but we don't have a specific proposal for the Commission. But it's my my understanding that that this meeting could almost serve as a second pre-hearing conference to just kind of revisit the schedule and to see if any changes need to be made due to unforeseen changes that had occurred after our first pre-hearing conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>will file its supplemental filing which will include a supplemental application, provides testimony, and all other necessary supporting documentation to document the the agreement between them and between PSE. And so PSE is simply waiting for them. <ul> <li>As to why it's taking so along; the parties,</li> <li>as we understand it, are still working on the details between themselves.</li> <li>As we understand it, this does not have anything to do with the sort of framework of the proposed transaction that PSE's filed with the Commission months ago. This is simply between them.</li> <li>And the reason for their delay, frankly, Your Honor, is between them.</li> <li>PSE, I think, understands some of it, but it's it's sort of between them to work out those details. But again, we're hopeful that they are nearing an end and that should be resolved in the near future.</li> <li>As I said, the the framework, though, of the transaction PSE has filed will not be changing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

3 (Pages 76 to 79)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

### Docket No. UE-200115 - Vol. II - 7/6/2020

	Page 80		Page 82		
1	All other aspects as we understand it and	1	And I agree, Your Honor, it would be		
2	we're highly confident will not be changing. So the	2	difficult to commit to a date not knowing when they will		
3	proposed transactions as filed will not be changing.	3	resolve it exactly and if that deadline, you know		
4	And we're confident this will be reflected in our	4	if PSE could have any control of that deadline.		
5	supplemental filing, which we're hopeful should be very	5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think I		
6	soon.	6	understand.		
7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	7	So the the procedural position that we're		
	8 So these details that Talen and Northwestern		placed in is if we feel like the Commission is		
9	are working out, what I what I think I'm hearing is	8	going to afford the responding parties the opportunity		
10	that PSE isn't really in the middle of those	10	to respond to the supplemental application and that's		
	discussions. And I'm I'm wondering if PSE is feeling		going to present some scheduling difficulties as far as		
12			<ol> <li>going to present some scheduling difficulties as far as</li> <li>our current time line and our current schedule.</li> </ol>		
13	those discussions have gone; is that correct?	13	At our prehearing conference, PSE had		
14	MR. STEELE: That's correct, Your Honor.	14	emphasized its desire to have a resolution to this		
15	We PSE has had regular discussions with with each	15	matter before the end of 2020. But I'm curious now that		
16	of them. And have done PSE is doing what it can to	16	Talen has exercised its right of first refusal, it seems		
17	sort of prod those along. The parties, I think,	17	like that has probably lengthened the time line for the		
18	understand the timing of this proceeding, and PSE has	18	entire closing of the transaction.		
19	certainly conveyed that to them. And and we have	19	What is the current status on PSE's		
20	reason to believe, based on our most recent	20	expectation for how long this transaction is going to		
21	communications with them, that they are nearing the	21	take to to close and be done with on the business		
22	conclusion of working out that right of first refusal	22	side? Mr. Steele?		
23	between them and and sort of how the two parties are	23	MR. STEELE: PSE still believes that the		
24	going to resolve that. And so once we receive that,	24	best course is for the parties to operate under the		
25	then PSE will file its materials right away.	25	current procedural schedule that was initially ordered		
	Dama 01				
	Page 81		Page 83		
1	And so we have at this point, frankly,	1	Page 83 in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for		
1 2		1 2	5		
	And so we have at this point, frankly,	1	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for		
2	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of	2	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement		
2 3	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will	2 3	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any		
2 3 4	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file.	2 3 4	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it		
2 3 4 5	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first	2 3 4 5	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any		
2 3 4 5 6	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental	2 3 4 5 6	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed.		
2 3 4 5 6 7	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission	2 3 4 5 6 7	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns;		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now?		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final green light from Talen and Northwestern. We're hopeful,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final green light from Talen and Northwestern. We're hopeful, and as I stated, based on our last communications with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. So I and the Commissioners, we have to		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final green light from Talen and Northwestern. We're hopeful, and as I stated, based on our last communications with them, we are highly confident that it should be resolved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. So I and the Commissioners, we have to decide whether keeping the current deadline for		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final green light from Talen and Northwestern. We're hopeful, and as I stated, based on our last communications with them, we are highly confident that it should be resolved in the next week or two. But we do not know of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. So I and the Commissioners, we have to decide whether keeping the current deadline for responsive testimony and affording another chance for		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And so we have at this point, frankly, have those materials largely ready. We're sort of waiting on the final details from them and then we will file. JUDGE O'CONNELL: When I when I first considered the situation we find ourselves in procedurally, myself and, you know, we at the Commission thought perhaps a deadline for filing the supplemental application might be necessary. But now I want to voice concern and slight frustration that it sounds like setting a deadline for that supplemental application might be it might not be worth it, because the details you need might not be complete by whatever deadline we set. But my question is how confident are you that within the next two weeks those details are going to be set and PSE would be able to file its supplemental application? MR. STEELE: PSE, to be candid, does not know when that date will be that we'll have the final green light from Talen and Northwestern. We're hopeful, and as I stated, based on our last communications with them, we are highly confident that it should be resolved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in this docket. And and, frankly, the reason for that, Your Honor, is the the terms of the agreement with Northwestern require the parties to close the proceeding in 2020. And so PSE contractually can't agree to any procedural changes to the schedule that could extend it beyond December 31st of 2020 without jeopardizing the transaction as as currently filed. And so I think PSE understands the concerns from the parties and appreciates their concerns; however, PSE cannot agree to extend the schedule or change the schedule in a way that would push it beyond 2020 and and would jeopardize being able to close the deal in 2020. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this call still connected? JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry. This is Andrew O' Connell. I think I was on mute. Can everyone hear me now? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. So I and the Commissioners, we have to decide whether keeping the current deadline for		

4 (Pages 80 to 83)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Page 84	Page 86
1 or whether we should move the response testimony until 1 I was able to talk to	atoff briefly about
	-
2after the supplemental application is filed.2this. I think from Staff's pe3I've heard from PSE that it prefers for the3to have responsive testimo	-
4 current schedule to be maintained. However, I think at 4 supplemental testimony. A	
5 least some minor modification is warranted. And I want 5 why. But a lot of our testim	
6 to hear from all of the other parties on that decision 6 assumptions that aren't in t	-
7 and your thoughts on the filing of response testimony 7 we file testimony and then	
	to do, I'm assuming, another
9 procedural deadlines. 9 round of testimony. And if	-
10 So I'd like to start with 10 it limits Staff's capacity to r	
11 MR. STEELE: Your Honor, this is David 11 parties analyze the suppler	•
12 Steele again on behalf of PSE. 12 So I I think it mak	
	estimony after the supplemental
comment was in reviewing the procedural schedule, the 14 filing. And I think we're will	
15 one place that we believe there may be some flexibility 15 solutions, like expedited dis	
	on the procedural schedule.
17 the discovery deadline, which is September 25th, 2020. 17 But I think just seria	-
	ances given by PSE, and to put
19 option to consider would be to push the response 19 it in perspective, I don't know	
20 testimony currently due for July 17th back a few weeks, 20 want. But we don't have a	final sales agreement with
and correspondingly push the rebuttal testimony back a 21 Talen on it. The transmissi	ion component is subject to a
22 few weeks as well into September. 22 current arbitration that coul	ld be going on for for a
23 And we we feel that would give the 23 prolonged period, and that	's one-third of the deal.
24 parties more time to prepare response testimony. It 24 There's currently a	new vote share agreement
25 would give PSE, hopefully, the time to file the 25 that's being negotiated bet	ween the three parties, and
Page 85	Page 87
1 supplemental application and materials. The only sort 1 that vote share agreement	goes to one of the major
2 of net result is it would be less discovery on the back 2 benefits in the transaction.	And and we really don't
3 end. 3 know as PSE said, these	e are still being negotiated.
4 But based on the current schedule, the data 4 So what we file may not be	e helpful at all to the
5 request time period is shortened to five days. So it's 5 Commission. And and the	hat's Staff's concerns. And I
6 a it's a pretty quick turnaround time; and so that 6 think those concerns are a	lso echoed by some of the
7 may be one option is to shift things a bit, and and 7 other parties.	
	d be Staff's preference.
	ing to make some concessions
10Mr. Steele.10to to try to fit to try to fit	
11 And that is an option that the Commission is 11 calendar year, the final dec	
-	LL: Okay. Thank you.
13 Commission when we do not have an agreed proposal, 13 Public Counsel, ple	
	od afternoon. Thank you.
	with Public Counsel. A
16 parties. This is where I encourage the parties to 16 lot of what I had to say has	
17 consider compromise on all of your parts in order to 17 there are a couple of things	00
	se we don't have the
19isn't perfect.19transaction in front of us.20So let me start with asking for, again,20situation just in a from a	
20 So let the start with asking for, again, 20 situation just in a from a 21 Staff's perspective on options for affording a response 21 looks like the filing date min	-
21 Start's perspective on options for anording a response 21 looks like the hing date mig 22 to whatever supplemental application, including the 22 forward with developing tes	-
	is that that testimony deadline
	e I never want to be put in that
	e doesn't move, and we haven't

5 (Pages 84 to 87)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 88		Page 90	
1	finished what we need to get finished.	1	periods that are necessary in order to to get this	
2	In this case, you know, I tried to take that	2	case to the finish line simply because there is a little	
3	same path where we're pushing to get it done, but	3	bit of a hiccup that shouldn't hinder Washington's	
4	frankly, we just can't.	4	ability to evaluate the transaction. And I'll stop	
5	As Mr. Dallas indicated, a lot of what we	5	there. Thank you.	
	6 would be filing would be incomplete and we wouldn't have		JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	
	7 a recommendation on the transaction. A lot of the		Next I'd like to hear from AWEC.	
	8 moving pieces that he mentioned just just now are, I		MR. COLEMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Good	
9	think, that we're concerned about the voting rights, the	8	afternoon. Thank you.	
10	transmission issues, those things. So at best, their	10	Brent Coleman for AWEC. And I would echo	
11	testimony would be incomplete. It would be a lot of	11	many of the concerns that have been expressed by	
12			Mr. Dallas and Ms. Gafken.	
13			I think from AWEC's perspective with with	
14			due respect to the company, you know, that the	
15	assurances that the fundamentals of the transaction	14 15	characterization that it's just a second person coming	
16	remain the same. And one approach what I take to	16	into the transaction and fundamentally everything is the	
17	this sort of thing is, okay, trust but verify. And	17	same, you know, I think there are elements with respect	
18	we don't have anything to verify with, and that's	18	to the details and the future that are that may not	
19	concerning.	19	be the same simply because you have two parties involved	
20	I want to talk a little bit about what a	20	instead of one.	
21	perfect world would look like from Public Counsel's	21	And from the standpoint of of filing	
22	perspective in terms of how we move forward. We're also	22	testimony, as has been mentioned, on something that	
23	open to some creative suggestions, but I think there's	23	isn't the fact pattern in front of us any longer, you	
24	some fundamental pieces that need to be incorporated in	24	know, is a concern from a resource expense standpoint, a	
25	whatever the solution is.	25	resource investment standpoint. And to turn around and	
	Page 89		Page 91	
1	Page 89 You know, once we get the supplemental	1	Page 91 file testimony on what turns out to be the you know,	
1 2		1 2	2	
	You know, once we get the supplemental		file testimony on what turns out to be the you know,	
2	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a	2	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge.	
2 3	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at	2 3	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be	
2 3 4	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully	2 3 4	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to	
2 3 4 5	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened.	2 3 4 5	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been	
2 3 4 5 6	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after	2 3 4 5 6	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did.	
2 3 4 5 6 7	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate	2 3 4 5 6 7	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between them, that they are details that matter in this case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we certainly would be willing to do whatever is necessary	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between them, that they are details that matter in this case because they affect the voting rights and whatnot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we certainly would be willing to do whatever is necessary from a reasonable standpoint to effectuate making sure	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between them, that they are details that matter in this case because they affect the voting rights and whatnot. So that piece is difficult and and makes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we certainly would be willing to do whatever is necessary from a reasonable standpoint to effectuate making sure the timing gets done as necessary with respect to, you	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between them, that they are details that matter in this case because they affect the voting rights and whatnot. So that piece is difficult and and makes it such that maybe we can't set specific dates at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we certainly would be willing to do whatever is necessary from a reasonable standpoint to effectuate making sure the timing gets done as necessary with respect to, you know, turning the discovery responses around or whatever	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You know, once we get the supplemental filing, we need to be able to look at it and then do a couple rounds of discovery. We would like to have at least two rounds of discovery built in, and hopefully that response time will be shortened. I I have in mind, kind of, 45 days after PSE files, the supplemental testimony is the appropriate time period for when response testimony would be filed. That's assuming a 10-day response period, so that can be shortened a bit. But I think two rounds of discovery is really important and then the ability to get the discovery and then incorporate it into the testimony. So there does need to be a little bit of time. And I don't think, you know, two weeks is probably enough. Let's see. What else? We also agree that the timing really is out of PSE's control. They are waiting on parties who are not part of this this proceeding to finish up documents that are details as they put it between them, that they are details that matter in this case because they affect the voting rights and whatnot. So that piece is difficult and and makes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	file testimony on what turns out to be the you know, the real factual framework is a bit of a challenge. So I think our our preference would be similar to what has been stated before with respect to filing testimony after the supplemental filing has been presented and the actual factual landscape is before us. I'm not sure that I have the specifics in mind as Ms. Gafken did. But that would be our preference is to to not have a round of testimony that is based on assumptions and suppositions, but is actually something that we can then dive into the real facts and provide substantive and beneficial information to the Commission to make to make their decision on on the true decision or, excuse me, on the true facts and the true transaction that's actually being presented. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for the Sierra Club. MR. COLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I can add, we certainly would be willing to I apologize. But we certainly would be willing to do whatever is necessary from a reasonable standpoint to effectuate making sure the timing gets done as necessary with respect to, you	

6 (Pages 88 to 91)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 92	Page 94		
1	back. And I apologize for interrupting.	1 Northwest Energy Coalition and Renewable		
2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: No, that's fine. The	2 Northwest support most of the comments that have been		
3	limitations of having a virtual status conference is	3 submitted so far.		
4	I can't read faces to know whether someone is done	4 We don't believe that we can fully		
5	talking. So apologies for those limitations. And I	5 understand or accurately describe PSE's application at		
6	will try to pause, because I understand that people	6 this time, which means that it's not possible for		
7	might be thinking about what they are saying.	7 Renewable Northwest or Northwest Energy Coalition to		
8	So let me, at this point, turn to the Sierra	8 take a position on it without having the actual		
9	Club. Ms. Yarnall Loarie, are you there?	<ul> <li>9 application before us.</li> </ul>		
10	MS. YARNALL LOARIE: Yes, I am. Sierra Club	10 When PSE files a supplemental application,		
11	shares a lot of the concerns that have already been	11 we would like PSE to fully explain how the addition of		
12	articulated by Mr. Dallas, Ms. Gafken, and AWEC. This	12 Talen changes or does not change the parties' voting		
13	is not the same transaction. We need the ability to	13 rights when you have another voting party and whether it		
14	analyze updated testimony, time for, you know,	14 will impact the continued operation of both Coal Strip 3		
15	discovery, looking at the vote sharing agreements, how	15 and 4.		
16	that impacts potentially, you know, other units at coal	16 Similarly, we hope that PSE will explain how		
17	strip that Talen isn't a regulated entity. We're not	17 the transmission aspects of the accusation may or may		
18	sure how this impacts new there is a new PPA, it	18 not change, including the impact on PSE and the Pacific		
19	sounds like, at issue, and of course the transmission	19 Northwest's ability to access low-cost Montana wind.		
20	concern.	20 We're we're hopeful that PSE will file		
21	We certainly support a delay in the schedule	this soon, and we also are willing to work with the		
22	to allow, you know, updated filing of these issues to	22 limited constraints of the schedule. Our preference,		
23	analyze those filings. And, you know, I want to point	23 our strong preference would be that a date be set for		
24	out I think Ms. Gafken said this the UTC should	the supplemental application, and then a date for		
25	have the ability to analyze this transaction to the best	testimony flowing from that. And if PSE does not make		
	Page 93	Page 95		
1	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a	Page 95 1 or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another		
1 2	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> </ol>		
	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> </ol>		
2	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> </ol>		
2 3	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 6	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 6 7	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues,	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> </ol>		
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor.	<ol> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> </ol>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery.	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher speed than usual so we can keep this on track.	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> <li>From Portland General Electric.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher speed than usual so we can keep this on track. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> <li>From Portland General Electric.</li> <li>MR. TINGEY: This is Doug Tingey, and we</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher speed than usual so we can keep this on track. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Sanger, for Northwest Energy Coalition	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> <li>From Portland General Electric.</li> <li>MR. TINGEY: This is Doug Tingey, and we</li> <li>have the same position as Avista and PacifiCorp. We'll</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher speed than usual so we can keep this on track. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Sanger, for Northwest Energy Coalition and Renewable Northwest.	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> <li>From Portland General Electric.</li> <li>MR. TINGEY: This is Doug Tingey, and we</li> <li>have the same position as Avista and PacifiCorp. We'll</li> <li>work with whatever the Commission decides.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of its abilities. And, you know, I think this is a different transaction. So maybe the parties have the ability to negotiate a date that allows the UTC to perhaps have that additional time. And, of course, we are all working under conditions right now with COVID that are not usual. There are child care issues, there's school issues, there's resource constraints, and I just wanted to flag those as well. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And for NRDC. MS. WHITE TUDOR: Thanks, Your Honor. Yes, we share the concerns and the thoughts of our colleagues about having a better opportunity to develop testimony when we actually know what the deal contains. Likewise, happy to work with an expedited schedule for discovery. We think that shortening the discovery response times makes sense and hope to allow for a thorough exchange of information, perhaps at a higher speed than usual so we can keep this on track. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Sanger, for Northwest Energy Coalition	<ul> <li>or is unable to make that date, that we schedule another</li> <li>prehearing conference, scheduling conference to address</li> <li>scheduling issues.</li> <li>We think it would not be productive for the</li> <li>workload of the parties or the Commission to have</li> <li>testimony filed at this point when we don't even know</li> <li>what we'd be testifying regarding.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And from Avista, Mr. Andrea.</li> <li>MR. ANDREA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mike</li> <li>Andrea for Avista. Avista doesn't have a position on</li> <li>the schedule. We will work with whatever schedule works</li> <li>for the Commission, Commission staff, and the other</li> <li>parties.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>From PacifiCorp. Mr. Kumar?</li> <li>MR. KUMAR: Thank you, your Honor.</li> <li>PacifiCorp takes pretty much the same</li> <li>position as Avista. We have no position on this issue.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.</li> <li>From Portland General Electric.</li> <li>MR. TINGEY: This is Doug Tingey, and we</li> <li>have the same position as Avista and PacifiCorp. We'll</li> </ul>		

7 (Pages 92 to 95)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

### Docket No. UE-200115 - Vol. II - 7/6/2020

	Page 96	Page 98
1	And last. From Microsoft.	1 those frameworks and understands the parties' concerns.
2	MR. PEPPLE: Thank you, Your Honor.	2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
3	Microsoft's position is largely aligned with	3 So is there anyone else who would like to
4	the other non-utility parties. We don't think it would	4 weigh in?
5	be productive to file testimony at this time given that	5 MR. DALLAS: Your Honor, this is Joe Dallas.
6	we don't have a full picture of the transaction. I	6 I also want to make one more note that Staff wants the
7	won't continue and repeat the other party's statements,	7 Commission to be aware of due to a recent directive from
8	but we're generally along with them.	8 the Governor. Staff can only work 32 hours a week
9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	9 through the month of July, and and it's it's
10	I think I've got a pretty good picture of	10 unsure if that's going to be continued into August, but
11	how all the parties are thinking about this situation.	11 Staff wanted the Commission to be aware of the
12	Mr. Steele, I'd like to hear from PSE one	12 limitation they can work.
13	more time.	13 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
14	MR. STEELE: In what regard, Your Honor, can	14 Yes, we'll keep that in mind.
15		15 I am of a mind to encourage the parties to
16	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Is there	16 communicate and reach or attempt to reach some agreement
17	MR. STEELE: Is there a question I can	17 on some dates going forward. I realize that with me on
18	address?	18 the line and the format that we're taking in this
19	JUDGE O'CONNELL: I wanted to give you a	19 discussion doesn't lend itself very well to reaching a
20	chance to respond to some of the thoughts that the other	20 consensus on any of those changes.
21	parties provided. And I think that will help me and the	21 I am willing to, after we adjourn this
22	Commissioners consider what we need to do.	discussion conference or the status conference, to allow
23	MR. STEELE: Sure. Yeah. PSE fully	23 the parties to stay on the line to discuss if that would
24	understands the parties' concerns and appreciates the	be beneficial for you. And if it would be beneficial,
25	difficulty with filing response testimony without	then I would afford a short amount of time, a day or so,
	Page 97	Page 99
1	_	
1 2	vithout feeling like they have the transaction in front of them.	
	without feeling like they have the transaction in front	1 for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of
2	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them.	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> </ol>
2 3	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> </ol>
2 3 4	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing,	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents.	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the	<ul> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> <li>ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like</li> <li>to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach</li> <li>agreement.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> <li>ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like</li> <li>to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach</li> <li>agreement.</li> <li>Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?</li> </ol>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably	<ol> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> <li>ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like</li> <li>to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach</li> <li>agreement.</li> <li>Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and	<ul> <li>for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of</li> <li>agreement and designate a representative to let me know.</li> <li>Is there in wanting to afford you that</li> <li>opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if</li> <li>it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something</li> <li>that the Commission just needs to decide, please go</li> <li>ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like</li> <li>to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach</li> <li>agreement.</li> <li>Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?</li> <li>MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October.	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year.	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them.</li> <li>We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents.</li> <li>I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October.</li> <li>The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year.</li> </ul>	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work with the parties to put together a a schedule that	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,21because I think, frankly, they are the ones that are in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work with the parties to put together a a schedule that that would allow the parties to respond in the way that	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,21because I think, frankly, they are the ones that are in22the rock and the hard place with this. I do think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work with the parties to put together a a schedule that that would allow the parties to respond in the way that they would like to and and complete this proceeding	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,21because I think, frankly, they are the ones that are in22the rock and the hard place with this. I do think that23in some regards we may just need a Commission decision.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work with the parties to put together a a schedule that that would allow the parties to respond in the way that they would like to and and complete this proceeding in 2020.	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,21because I think, frankly, they are the ones that are in22the rock and the hard place with this. I do think that23in some regards we may just need a Commission decision.24We've tried. We have talked about what we could or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	without feeling like they have the transaction in front of them. We understand that that things have changed. PSE does not believe that that the substantive framework of the transaction is changing, and and PSE is highly confident that will be reflected in the filing. But PSE understands that that parties want to see the documents. I think from PSE's perspective, the the best outcome is to, as I mentioned, slide the response testimony deadline back. I think you could probably move move the response testimony and rebuttal and even the discovery deadline back, you know, perhaps up to up to October. The dates that PSE could not agree to are are those October dates just because it it already is very tight in trying to get a Commission order in closing in by calendar year. And so PSE understand the parties' concerns and appreciates them and very much would like to work with the parties to put together a a schedule that that would allow the parties to respond in the way that they would like to and and complete this proceeding	1for the parties to perhaps come to some sort of2agreement and designate a representative to let me know.3Is there in wanting to afford you that4opportunity, I'd like to hear from the parties if5it's if that would not be helpful. If it's something6that the Commission just needs to decide, please go7ahead and voice that and tell me or, otherwise, I'd like8to give you the opportunity to talk and perhaps reach9agreement.10Mr. Dallas? Mr. Steele?11MS. GAFKEN: This is Lisa Gafken.12JUDGE O'CONNELL: Sorry, Ms. Gafken. Go13ahead.14MS. GAFKEN: Yeah. Others may have a15different viewpoint and maybe things have changed.16We've actually spent a bit of time, the parties; we've17talked about this. I think there's a little bit of a18rock in a hard place with just the timing, and we may19need the Commission just to decide.20I would defer to Puget on that a little bit,21because I think, frankly, they are the ones that are in22the rock and the hard place with this. I do think that23in some regards we may just need a Commission decision.

8 (Pages 96 to 99)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 100		Page 102		
1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Steele or Mr. Dallas,	1	could, please, e-mail me tomorrow to let just to a		
2	any input?	2	very short par sentence informing me whether the		
3	MR. DALLAS: Yeah. I'm communicating go	3	parties have reached any agreement; is that acceptable?		
4	ahead, Mr. Steele.	4	MR. DALLAS: Yes, Your Honor.		
5	MR. STEELE: No. Go ahead, Joe.	5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.		
6	MR. DALLAS: I'm communicating to Staff now,	6	So I am I'm prepared to bring this status		
7	7 and I think Lisa has some points. I think we're		conference to a conclusion.		
8	•		Is there anyone else who needs to say		
9			something before we adjourn?		
10			10 MR. SANGER: Just to confirm, Judge		
11	11 something the Commission needs to decide.		11 O'Connell, are you leaving it open for the rest of us to 12 stav on to discuss?		
12			stay on to discuss?		
13	13 willing to meet if the other parties think it would be		JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes. I'm going to leave		
14	productive, but I I think Staff would just echo what	14	the conference bridge line available. The conference		
15	Public Counsel said.	15	bridge line should not turn off when I disconnect. But		
16	MR. STEELE: Your Honor, this is David	16	I am not going to stay on the line so that the parties		
17	Steele from Perkins Coie for PSE.	17	can have a free flow of discussion.		
18	I don't know if the parties have talked	18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your Honor, I have		
19	specific dates yet; and so PSE is certainly willing to	19	just one related to that I have one sort of		
20	do that sort of in alignment with with the	20	administrative question, and I apologize if this isn't		
21	constraints that I've already articulated that PSE can't	21 22	in your scope.		
22 23	agree to any adjustments of those October dates. It would have to be sort of between now and October, if we	22	But there are certain times where in the		
23	could if we could push or adjust those filing	24	last three-plus months where I've been on calls like this, and there seems to be like a time window of the		
25	deadlines. And that's that's the framework PSE can	25	conference call and suddenly it will say like a		
23		23			
	Page 101				
	idge ivi		Page 103		
1	operate.	1	Page 103 computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has		
1 2		1 2			
	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where		computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected.		
2	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not	2	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something		
2 3 4 5	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But	2 3 4 5	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here?		
2 3 4 5 6	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if	2 3 4 5 6	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in		
2 3 4 5 6 7	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful.	2 3 4 5 6 7	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense?		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business tomorrow, I'd like to designate a representative to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the conference line, he will turn it off.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business tomorrow, I'd like to designate a representative to from the parties just to inform me whether there has or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the conference line, he will turn it off. I do want to convey the information to the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business tomorrow, I'd like to designate a representative to from the parties just to inform me whether there has or has not been an agreement of any of the dates from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the conference line, he will turn it off. I do want to convey the information to the parties that this status conference was scheduled for,		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business tomorrow, I'd like to designate a representative to from the parties just to inform me whether there has or has not been an agreement of any of the dates from the parties. And then the Commission will either consider that or will make a decision within the next couple days.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected. Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here? Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question. I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the conference line, he will turn it off. I do want to convey the information to the parties that this status conference was scheduled for, at most, lasting until 3:30. It's currently ten til 3:00. I do not think that there will be a		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operate. And if you know, if if other parties disagree with that, then we may be at the point where Ms. Gafken and Mr. Dallas feels that we are. I'm not sure about that from all the parties' perspective. But PSE is certainly willing to engage with the parties if other parties agree that will be helpful. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Well, this is what I'm inclined to do right now. The we're going to make a decision quickly on what we're going to do because of the upcoming testimony deadline. And I want to be respectful of the parties' resources so that they know if they need to finish responsive testimony or whether it's going to be delayed. However, I am going to afford, you know, 24 hours for the parties to discuss either on this conference line after we adjourn or through e-mail. And by the end of the day by the close of business tomorrow, I'd like to designate a representative to from the parties just to inform me whether there has or has not been an agreement of any of the dates from the parties. And then the Commission will either consider that or will make a decision within the next couple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>computerized voice will come on and say, "Your call has ended. Please hang up." And then everything is disconnected.</li> <li>Is that do you know if that's something that we're facing here?</li> <li>Is there, like, a time window for this in addition to your departure, is there a time window, or do we have is it going to shut down at three o'clock or 3:30 automatically, just for purposes of expectations and scheduling. Does that make sense?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, I understand your question.</li> <li>I thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has included in our conversation box the information that there should not be a "time-out" and that he will stay he will keep the line active. So Mr. Smith is a representative from our records center. If the parties would indicate to him when you are done with the conference line, he will turn it off.</li> <li>I do want to convey the information to the parties that this status conference was scheduled for, at most, lasting until 3:30. It's currently ten til 3:00.</li> </ul>		

9 (Pages 100 to 103)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	Page 104	Page 106
-	_	
1	automatically generated, it would happen at 3:30. But	1 MR. DALLAS: Thank you.
2	we do not expect that to happen.	2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. This is last call
3	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.	3 for any anything that has not yet been said. Okay.
4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Anything else from any of	4 Thank you.
5	the parties?	5 Thank all of you for taking the time today 6 to be available. Thank you for providing the
6 7	MS. WHITE TUDOR: Actually, yes. I did	
8	review the previous scheduling order this is Kate White Tudor with the NRDC which noted that 30 days	<ul> <li>7 perspectives from each of your parties. We will be</li> <li>8 adjourned and off the record.</li> </ul>
9	after that March order we were to start filing paper	9 And if the parties would like to, they can
10	copies for all information in this case. And I guess I	10 have this conference line to use for their discussion
11	would suggest that given that the shutdown continues in	11 purposes. And I will be off of that call. Okay. Thank
12	many parts of our State that perhaps it would make sense	12 you all.
13	for us to continue filing on an electronic basis.	13 We are adjourned.
14	Is that something that's suitable for	14
15	discussion in this forum, or should I discuss that with	15 (The hearing concluded at 2:59 p.m.)
16	others?	16
17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you for bringing	17 - <b>o0o</b> -
18	that to my attention.	18
19	I I will in any decision the	19
20	Commission makes, as to the procedural schedule, I will	20
21	clarify that whether we will continue to allow electric	21
22	only or whether we would require paper. So thank you	22
23	for bringing that to my attention. I will make sure to	23
24	include that in any decision we make.	24
25	MR. DALLAS: Your Honor, this is Joe Dallas.	25
	Page 105	Page 107
1	And I wanted to bring up something, and I wanted to see	1 CERTIFICATE
2	if maybe the Commission could give me give some	2
3	feedback.	3 STATE OF WASHINGTON )
4	My thoughts are it's inherently difficult to	) ss.
5	set a new procedural schedule because we don't know when	4 COUNTY OF KITSAP )
6	PSE will have its updated application. And during our	
7	meeting, there was a thought of setting a tentative date	<ul> <li>I, CRYSTAL R. McAULIFFE, a Certified Court</li> <li>Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby</li> </ul>
8	for supplemental testimony and basing the schedule off	<ul> <li>Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby</li> <li>certify that the foregoing transcript of the status</li> </ul>
9	that.	<ul> <li>bearing, having been duly sworn on JULY 6, 2020, is true</li> </ul>
10	And I wanted to know if the Commission could	10 and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and
11	give us any feedback on that. Is this something the	11 ability.
12	Commission has done in the past? Is this something they	12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
13 14	would be open to? Any any commentary on that would	13 and seal this 15th day of July, 2020.
14 15	be helpful in our in our in our discussions coming	14
	up.	15 Auntal meanible O
In	JUDGE O'CONNELL. The Commission will be	16 Cuptal MANYE
16 17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: The Commission will be open to setting a deadline for the filing of the	
17	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the	17 CRÝSTAL R. McAULIFFE, RPR. CCR #2121
17 18	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from	18
17	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while	18 19
17 18 19	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from	18 19 20
17 18 19 20	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while we can expect to to have somebody from PSE by a certain date, if we set a deadline that the Commission	18 19
17 18 19 20 21	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while we can expect to to have somebody from PSE by a	18 19 20 21
17 18 19 20 21 22	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while we can expect to to have somebody from PSE by a certain date, if we set a deadline that the Commission would expect that any agreed deadline, if PSE is unable	18 19 20 21 22
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while we can expect to to have somebody from PSE by a certain date, if we set a deadline that the Commission would expect that any agreed deadline, if PSE is unable to meet it, that PSE inform the Commission and propose	18 19 20 21 22 23
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	open to setting a deadline for the filing of the supplemental application. From what I've heard from PSE, though, that date would be speculative. And while we can expect to to have somebody from PSE by a certain date, if we set a deadline that the Commission would expect that any agreed deadline, if PSE is unable to meet it, that PSE inform the Commission and propose that we have another status conference to discuss how	18 19 20 21 22 23 24

10 (Pages 104 to 107)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				5
A	agreed 75:9 85:13	96:24 97:20	86:18 88:12 91:10	Capitol 70:9
abilities 93:1	105:22	approach 88:16	basing 105:8	care 93:7
<b>ability</b> 89:11 90:4	agreed-to 75:13	appropriate 83:25	<b>basis</b> 104:13	case 76:16 88:2
92:13,25 93:3	agreement 77:13	89:7	behalf 73:4,8,13	89:21 90:2 104:10
94:19 107:11	78:24 79:5 83:2	approximately 72:7		caveat 84:13
<b>able</b> 76:22 81:17	86:20,24 87:1	arbitration 86:22	<b>believe</b> 73:15 77:5	<b>CCR</b> 68:24 107:17
	98:16 99:2,9	articulated 92:12	78:24 80:20 84:15	center 103:17
83:13 86:1 89:2	101:21 102:3	100:21	94:4 97:4	certain 68:7 72:9
acceptable 102:3	agreements 92:15	asking 85:20	believes 77:2 82:23	102:22 105:21
access 94:19	ahead 72:19 78:13	aspects 76:16 80:1	<b>Bellevue</b> 69:5	certainly 80:19
accommodate	85:24 99:7,13	94:17	beneficial 91:13	91:20,21 92:21
72:18 77:9	100:4,5	assets 72:9	98:24,24	97:25 100:8,12,19
accompanied 74:3	Ajay 70:21 74:23	<b>Assistant</b> 69:9,14	<b>benefits</b> 87:2	101:6
accurate 107:10	•••	73:8	best 77:8,11 82:24	<b>Certified</b> 107:6
accurately 94:5	ajay.kumar@pa 70:23	assuming 86:8 89:9	88:10 92:25 97:10	certify 107:8
accusation 94:17	aligned 96:3	U	107:10	·
achieve 85:18	0	<b>assumptions</b> 86:6 88:12 91:11	<b>better</b> 93:14	<b>challenge</b> 91:2 <b>chance</b> 83:24 96:20
active 103:16	<b>alignment</b> 100:20			
actual 91:6 94:8	<b>Alliance</b> 73:10	<b>assurances</b> 76:7,11	<b>beyond</b> 83:7,12	<b>change</b> 75:14 77:14
add 84:13 91:19	allow 77:9 92:22	86:18 88:15	<b>bit</b> 80:12 85:7	79:22 83:12 94:12
addition 94:11	93:19 97:22 98:22	attempt 98:16	88:14,20 89:10,13	94:18
103:7	104:21	attention 104:18,23	90:3 91:2 99:16	<b>changed</b> 76:13 97:4
additional 76:6	allows 93:3	<b>Attorney</b> 69:9,9,14	99:17,20	99:15
93:4	<b>Amanda</b> 70:8 74:3	69:15 73:8	blc@dvclaw.com	changes 72:17
<b>address</b> 95:2 96:18	amount 98:25	August 98:10	69:21	75:10,13 77:20,21
<b>adjourn</b> 98:21	analyze 86:11	Authorizing 68:6	<b>box</b> 69:10 103:14	83:6 94:12 98:20
101:17 102:9	92:14,23,25	automatically	Brent 69:19 73:12	changing 79:21
adjourned 106:8	<b>Andrea</b> 70:16	103:9 104:1	90:10	80:2,3 97:5
106:13	74:17,17 95:9,10	<b>available</b> 102:14	<b>bridge</b> 102:14,15	characterization
<b>adjust</b> 100:24	95:11	106:6	<b>briefly</b> 86:1	90:15
adjustments	<b>Andrew</b> 68:11 72:5	<b>Avenue</b> 69:16	bring 102:6 105:1	<b>child</b> 93:7
100:22	83:17	70:18	<b>bringing</b> 104:17,23	<b>clarify</b> 104:21
administrative	<b>answer</b> 77:25	Avista 70:15,17	<b>built</b> 89:4	<b>Cleve</b> 69:20 71:8
68:11 72:5 102:20	apologies 92:5	74:16,18,19 95:9	business 82:21	73:13
affect 89:22	apologize 91:20	95:11,11,19,23	101:18	<b>close</b> 82:21 83:3,13
afford 82:9 98:25	92:1 102:20	aware 75:13 98:7	<b>buyer</b> 79:23	101:18
99:3 101:15	appearances 69:1	98:11		<b>closing</b> 82:18 97:18
affording 83:24	70:1 71:1 72:20	<b>AWEC</b> 69:18 73:13	C	<b>Club</b> 70:3,4 73:20
85:21	applicable 77:12	73:18 90:7,10	C 71:3,7 107:1,1	73:23 91:18 92:9
afternoon 72:4	application 68:4	92:12	calendar 87:11	92:10
73:7,12 75:5	72:12,16,18 79:3	AWEC's 90:13	97:18	<b>coal</b> 72:9 79:24
87:14 90:9	81:9,12,18 82:10		California 70:5	92:16 94:14
<b>ago</b> 79:13	83:25 84:2 85:1	B	call 83:15 102:25	Coalition 74:5,7
agree 82:1 83:5,11	85:22 94:5,9,10	back 84:20,21 85:2	103:1 106:2,11	93:23 94:1,7
89:17 97:15	94:24 105:6,18	92:1 97:11,13	calls 102:23	<b>Coie</b> 69:4 72:24
100:22 101:7	appreciates 83:10	<b>based</b> 76:11 80:20	<b>candid</b> 81:19	73:1 100:17
		81:22 85:4 86:5	<b>capacity</b> 86:10	
	1	I	I	I

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

Coleman 69:19	compromise 85:17	<b>continues</b> 104:11	75:11,12,20,21	delay 79:14 92:21
73:12,12,15,19	computerized	contractually 83:5	85:24,25 88:5	delayed 101:14
90:8,10 91:19	103:1	control 80:12 82:4	90:12 92:12 98:5	departure 103:7
<b>colleague</b> 72:25	<b>concern</b> 76:1 81:10	89:18	98:5 99:10 100:1	describe 94:5
73:15 74:3	90:24 92:20	conversation	100:3,6 101:4,25	designate 99:2
		103:14		0
colleagues 93:14	concerned 88:9		102:4 104:25,25	101:19
<b>Colstrip</b> 68:7,7	concerning 88:19	<b>convey</b> 103:20	106:1	<b>desire</b> 82:14
come 99:1 103:1	<b>concerns</b> 76:14	<b>conveyed</b> 80:19	<b>data</b> 85:4	<b>detail</b> 76:20 86:19
coming 72:14 90:15	83:9,10 87:5,6	<b>copies</b> 104:10	date 76:24 81:20,25	<b>details</b> 78:16,20
105:14	90:11 92:11 93:13	Corinne 69:19	82:2 87:21 93:3	79:8,18 80:8 81:3
<b>comment</b> 84:14	96:24 97:19 98:1	73:16	94:23,24 95:1	81:13,16 89:20,21
commentary	concessions 87:9	Corporation 70:17	105:7,19,21	90:18
105:13	<b>concluded</b> 106:15	75:6	dates 89:24 97:15	develop 93:15
comments 94:2	conclusion 80:22	<b>correct</b> 73:19 80:13	97:16 98:17	developing 87:22
commission 68:2	102:7	80:14	100:19,22 101:21	<b>devise</b> 85:14
69:7 72:6 73:3,5	conditions 93:6	correspondingly	David 69:3 72:24	different 93:2
75:16 76:4,20,23	<b>conduct</b> 77:10	84:21	84:11 100:16	99:15
77:2,6,11,16,25	<b>conference</b> 68:10	Council 73:25 74:2	Davison 69:20 71:8	difficult 82:2 89:23
79:13 81:7 82:8	72:10,15 75:17	counsel 69:13,15	73:13	105:4
85:11,13,15 87:5	77:8,19,22 82:13	73:6,9 74:18	day 98:25 101:18	difficulties 82:11
87:23 91:13 95:5	92:3 95:2,2 98:22	87:13,15 100:15	107:13	difficulty 96:25
95:13,13,24 97:17	98:22 101:17	<b>Counsel's</b> 88:21	days 85:5 89:6	directive 98:7
98:7,11 99:6,19	102:7,14,14,25	<b>COUNTY</b> 72:1	101:24 104:8	disagree 101:3
99:23 100:11	103:19,21 105:24	107:4	<b>deadline</b> 72:13 81:8	disconnect 102:15
101:22 104:20	106:10	couple 78:5 87:17	81:11,14 82:3,4	disconnected 103:3
105:2,10,12,16,21	<b>confident</b> 80:2,4	89:3 101:23	83:23 84:17 87:23	discovery 76:6
105:23	81:15,23 97:6	<b>course</b> 82:24 85:12	87:25 97:11,13	77:10 84:17 85:2
commissioners	<b>confirm</b> 102:10	87:18 92:19 93:5	101:11 105:17,21	86:15 89:3,4,10
78:7 83:22 96:22	connected 83:16	<b>Court</b> 107:6	101.11 105.17,21	89:12 91:24 92:15
commit 82:2	<b>Connell</b> 83:18	<b>COVID</b> 93:6	deadlines 84:9	93:17,18 97:13
committed 76:9	consensus 98:20	<b>creative</b> 86:14	100:25 105:25	<b>discuss</b> 72:15 76:19
communicate	<b>consider</b> 84:19	88:23	<b>deal</b> 83:14 86:23	98:23 101:16
98:16	85:12,17 96:22	<b>CRYSTAL</b> 68:24	93:15	102:12 104:15
communicating	101:22	107:6,17	December 83:7	105:24
100:3,6	considered 81:6	curious 82:15	<b>decide</b> 83:23 99:6	discussed 75:9,12
communications	considering 85:12	current 76:17,25	99:19 100:11	75:22,24
80:21 81:22	constraints 93:8	77:4 78:15 82:12	decided 77:7	<b>discussion</b> 98:19,22
company 71:4	94:22 100:21	82:12,19,25 83:23	<b>decides</b> 95:24	102:17 104:15
90:14	Consumers 73:11	84:4 85:4 86:22	<b>decision</b> 77:4,12	106:10
<b>complete</b> 76:4,23	contacted 75:16	currently 78:16	84:6 87:11 91:14	discussions 76:1
77:3 81:14 97:23	contains 93:16	83:8 84:8,20	91:15 99:23	80:11,13,15
completed 79:1	continue 96:7	86:24 103:22	101:10,23 104:19	105:14
component 86:21	104:13,21		104:24	<b>dive</b> 91:12
comprehensive	continued 70:1	D	<b>Defense</b> 73:25 74:2	DIVISION 69:10
77:3	71:1 94:14 98:10	<b>D</b> 70:17	<b>defer</b> 99:20	docket 68:4 72:8
		<b>Dallas</b> 69:8 73:4,4		
		l	Ι	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	1	1	1	-	
75:25 77:4,5 83:1	exact 81:25	90:21 91:5,5	<b>further</b> 86:6	Harbor 69:20 71:8	
document 79:4	exactly 82:3	92:22 96:25 97:7	future 78:22 79:19	hard 99:18,22	
documentation	exchange 93:20	100:24 104:9,13	90:18	hear 83:19 84:6	
79:4	<b>excuse</b> 91:15	105:17		90:7 96:12 99:4	
documents 89:20	exercised 82:16	filings 86:17 92:23	G	heard 84:3 88:14	
97:8	exercises 78:17	<b>final</b> 81:3,20 86:20	<b>G</b> 70:16	105:18	
<b>doing</b> 80:16	expect 78:11 104:2	87:11	Gafken 69:14 73:7	hearing 80:9	
<b>Doug</b> 75:2 95:22	105:20,22	find 76:21 81:6	73:8 87:14,15	106:15 107:9	
doug.tingey@pg	expectation 82:20	<b>fine</b> 92:2	90:12 91:8 92:12	help 91:25 96:21	
71:5	expectations 103:9	finish 89:19 90:2	92:24 99:11,11,12	helpful 76:21 87:4	
DOUGLAS 71:3	expedited 86:15	101:13	99:14 101:4	99:5 101:7 105:14	
dsteele@perkins	93:16	finished 88:1,1	<b>general</b> 69:9,9,14	hereunto 107:12	
69:6	expense 90:24	first 77:21 78:5,17	71:4 73:8 74:25	<b>hiccup</b> 90:3	
<b>due</b> 77:4,20 84:20	<b>explain</b> 94:11,16	78:20,25 80:22	75:2 77:13 87:20	high-level 88:12	
90:14 98:7	explaining 76:12	81:5 82:16	95:21	higher 93:20	
<b>duly</b> 107:9	expressed 76:14	fit 87:10,10	GENERAL'S	highlight 87:17	
	90:11	five 85:5	69:15	highly 80:2 81:23	
E	extend 83:6,11	<b>flag</b> 93:8	generally 76:3,21	97:6	
<b>E</b> 70:18 107:1,1		flexibility 84:15	96:8	hinder 90:3	
<b>e-mail</b> 75:22	F	<b>flow</b> 102:17	generated 104:1	hold 77:7	
101:17 102:1	<b>F</b> 107:1	flowing 94:25	Gerlitz 74:11,13,13	Honor 72:23 74:22	
<b>echo</b> 90:10 100:14	<b>faces</b> 92:4	foregoing 107:8	<b>give</b> 84:23,25 96:19	75:1,21 78:14	
<b>echoed</b> 87:6	facing 103:5	<b>form</b> 76:11	99:8 105:2,2,11	79:14 80:14 82:1	
effectuate 91:22	fact 90:23	format 98:18	<b>given</b> 86:18 96:5	83:2 84:11 85:25	
<b>Ehrbar</b> 70:17 74:19	facts 91:12,15	forum 104:15	104:11	90:8 93:12 95:10	
<b>either</b> 101:16,22	factual 91:2,6	<b>forward</b> 77:8 87:22	<b>go</b> 72:19 78:13	95:17 96:2,14	
<b>electric</b> 71:4 74:25	far 82:11 94:3	88:22 98:17	85:24 86:4 99:6	98:5 100:16 102:4	
75:2 95:21 104:21	fast 80:12	Fox 74:11	99:12 100:3,5	102:18 104:25	
electronic 104:13	feedback 105:3,11	framework 79:11	<b>goes</b> 87:1	hope 93:19 94:16	
elements 90:17	feel 82:8 84:23	79:20 91:2 97:5	going 74:10 80:24	hopeful 78:21	
emphasized 82:14	feeling 80:11 97:1	100:25	81:16 82:9,11,20	79:18 80:5 81:21	
encourage 85:16	<b>feels</b> 101:4	frameworks 98:1	86:22 98:10,17	94:20	
98:15	file 79:2 80:25 81:4	frankly 79:14 81:1	101:9,10,14,15	hopefully 84:25	
<b>ended</b> 103:2	81:17 84:25 86:7	83:1 88:4 99:21	102:13,16 103:8	89:4	
Energy 68:5 72:22	87:4 91:1 94:20	free 102:17	<b>good</b> 72:4 73:7,12	hours 98:8 101:16	
73:11 74:5,7	96:5	front 87:19 90:23	75:5 87:14 90:8	huge 86:16	
93:23 94:1,7	<b>filed</b> 78:9,12 79:12	97:1	96:10		
Energy's 68:6,7	79:21 80:3 83:8	frustration 81:11	Governor 98:8	I	
72:9	84:2 89:8 95:6	<b>full</b> 96:6	green 81:21	<b>II</b> 68:12	
<b>engage</b> 101:6	files 89:7 94:10	fully 94:4,11 96:23	guess 104:10	<b>impact</b> 86:16 94:14	
<b>ensure</b> 77:11	<b>filing</b> 72:12,14,16	fundamental 88:24	H	94:18	
<b>entire</b> 82:18	76:2,5,9,12 77:9	fundamentally		impacts 84:8 92:16	
<b>entity</b> 92:17	77:10 78:8 79:2	90:16	hand 107:12	92:18	
ENVIRONMEN	80:5 81:8 84:7	fundamentals 76:8	hang 103:2	<b>impasse</b> 100:10	
70:4	86:3,11,14,17	88:15	happen 104:1,2	important 76:16	
evaluate 90:4	87:21 88:6 89:2		happy 93:16	89:11	
	I	I	I	I	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

T					
<b>in-house</b> 74:17	69:5	knowing 82:2	89:2	months 79:13	
inclined 101:9	<b>Joe</b> 69:8 73:4 98:5	knowledge 107:10	looking 92:15	102:23	
<b>include</b> 79:2 104:24	100:5 104:25	Kumar 70:21 74:22	looks 87:21	move 84:1 87:25	
<b>included</b> 103:14	joe.dallas@utc.w	74:23 95:16,17	lot 86:5 87:16 88:5	88:22 97:12,12	
including 85:22	69:11	<b>Kuzma</b> 69:3 72:25	88:7,11 92:11	moved 87:21,24	
94:18	<b>Judge</b> 68:11 72:4,5		low-cost 94:19	moving 88:8	
incomplete 88:6,11	73:2,6,10,14,17	L		MSC-27 70:18	
incorporate 89:12	73:20,24 74:4,9	<b>L</b> 69:19	M	Multnomah 70:22	
incorporated 88:24	74:12,15,20,24	lack 76:2	<b>M</b> 69:8	mute 74:14 83:18	
indicate 103:18	75:3,7,15 78:1	landscape 91:6	maintained 84:4		
indicated 88:5	80:7 81:5 82:5	largely 81:2 96:3	<b>major</b> 87:1	N	
inform 101:20	83:17,21 85:9	lasting 103:22	making 91:22	Natural 73:24 74:2	
105:23	87:12 90:6 91:17	Law 68:11 70:4,12	March 104:9	NE 69:4 70:22	
information 77:11	92:2 93:10,22	72:5	materials 80:25	near 78:22 79:19	
91:13 93:20	95:8,15,20,25	learned 76:15	81:2 85:1	nearing 79:18	
103:14,20 104:10	96:9,16,19 98:2	leave 78:12 102:13	matter 68:4 82:15	80:21	
informing 102:2	98:13 99:12 100:1	leaving 102:11	89:21	necessary 79:4 81:9	
inherently 105:4	101:8 102:5,10,13	legal 77:12	McAULIFFE	90:1 91:21,23	
initial 72:13	103:11 104:4,17	lend 98:19	68:24 107:6,17	need 77:20 78:6	
initially 82:25	105:16 106:2	lengthened 82:17	<b>means</b> 94:6	81:13 88:1,24	
input 78:3 100:2	<b>July</b> 68:15 72:2,7	let's 72:19,21 89:16	meet 100:13 105:23	89:2,13,25 91:25	
<b>Intent</b> 72:11	72:14 84:8,20	Leven 70:8 74:3	meeting 77:18	92:13 96:22 99:19	
Interest 68:7	98:9 107:9,13	light 81:21	105:7	99:23 101:13	
Interests 68:6	, 	Likewise 93:16	mentioned 88:8	needs 77:2,14	
interrupting 92:1	K	limitation 98:12	90:22 97:10	85:14,18 99:6	
investment 90:25	Kate 74:1 104:7	limitations 92:3,5	MICHAEL 70:16	100:11 102:8	
involved 90:19	kate@whitetudo	<b>limited</b> 94:22	michael.andra@	negotiate 93:3	
involvement 76:3	70:10	<b>limits</b> 86:10	70:19	negotiated 86:25	
Irion 70:12 74:6	KATHERINE 70:8	line 73:1,16 82:12	Microsoft 71:6	87:3	
irion@sanger-la	keep 93:21 98:14	82:17 90:2 98:18	75:4,6 96:1	<b>net</b> 85:2	
70:14	103:16	98:23 101:17	Microsoft's 96:3	<b>never</b> 87:24	
issue 92:19 95:19	keeping 74:14	102:14,15,16	middle 80:10	new 86:24 92:18,18	
issues 88:10 92:22	83:23	103:16,19 106:10	Mike 74:17 95:10	105:5	
93:7,7 95:3	kind 77:19,23 89:6	Lisa 69:14 73:7	Milinovich 69:19	non-company	
·	<b>KITSAP</b> 72:1	87:15 99:11 100:7	73:16	77:14	
J	107:4	lisa.gafken@atg	mind 89:6 91:7	non-investor 75:24	
<b>J</b> 68:11 72:5	know 78:11 81:7,20	69:17	98:14,15	non-utility 96:4	
Jason 69:3 70:16	81:24 82:3 86:19	little 80:12 88:14	<b>mindful</b> 89:25	Northwest 74:4,5,7	
72:25 74:19	87:3,18 88:2 89:1	88:20 89:13 90:2	minor 84:5	74:8 78:15 93:23	
<b>Jeff</b> 74:10	89:14 90:14,17,24	99:17,20	<b>Mission</b> 70:18	93:24 94:1,2,7,7	
jeopardize 83:13	91:1,24 92:4,14	<b>LLP</b> 69:4	modification 84:5	Northwest's 94:19	
jeopardizing 83:7	92:16,22,23 93:1	Loarie 70:4 73:22	modified 105:25	Northwestern	
<b>Jessica</b> 70:4 73:22	93:15 95:6 97:13	73:23 92:9,10	Monday 72:7	78:16 80:8 81:21	
jessica.yarnall@s	99:2 100:8,18	long 78:8,10 82:20	Montana 75:22	83:3	
70:6	101:2,12,15 103:4	<b>longer</b> 90:23	94:19	<b>note</b> 98:6	
jkuzma@perkins	105:5,10	look 86:14 88:21	<b>month</b> 98:9	<b>noted</b> 104:8	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

				1 490 112	
<b>notice</b> 72:11 78:9	operate 82:24	101:7,16,20,22	89:25 92:8,23	proposed 79:12	
<b>NRDC</b> 70:7 93:11	101:1	102:3,16 103:17	95:6 101:3	80:3	
104:8	operation 94:14	103:21 104:5	<b>points</b> 100:7	<b>provide</b> 76:4,23	
<b>NWEC</b> 70:11	opinion 78:4	106:7,9	Portland 69:21	77:6 85:8 91:12	
	opportunity 82:9	parties' 94:12	70:13,23 71:4,5,9	provided 96:21	
0	93:14 99:4,8	96:24 97:19 98:1	74:25 75:2 95:21	provides 79:3	
<b>O'</b> 83:18	opposed 100:8	101:5,12	position 82:7 87:25	providing 106:6	
o'clock 103:8	option 84:19 85:7	parts 85:17 104:12	94:8 95:11,19,19	<b>PSE</b> 69:2 73:1 75:8	
<b>O'Connell</b> 68:11	85:11	party 75:16,25 76:1	95:23 96:3	76:7 78:6,19 79:1	
72:4,5 73:2,6,10	options 85:21	78:3 94:13	possible 72:17	79:5,6,16,21	
73:14,17,20,24	order 68:6 72:17	<b>party's</b> 96:7	75:13 84:18 94:6	80:10,11,15,16,18	
74:4,9,12,15,20	85:17 87:23 90:1	<b>Pat</b> 74:18	potentially 92:16	80:25 81:17,19	
74:24 75:3,7,15	97:17 104:7,9	path 88:3	<b>PPA</b> 79:24 92:18	82:4,13,23 83:5,9	
78:1 80:7 81:5	ordered 82:25	<b>PATRICK</b> 70:17	pre-hearing 77:18	83:11 84:3,12,25	
82:5 83:17,21	<b>Oregon</b> 69:21	pattern 90:23	77:21	86:18 87:3 88:14	
85:9 87:12 90:6	70:13,23 71:5,9	pause 92:6	preference 87:8	89:7 94:10,11,16	
91:17 92:2 93:10	<b>outcome</b> 97:10	<b>PC</b> 69:20	91:3,9 94:22,23	94:18,20,25 96:12	
93:22 95:8,15,20	owned 75:24	<b>people</b> 92:6	prefers 84:3	96:23 97:4,6,7,15	
95:25 96:9,16,19		<b>Pepple</b> 71:7 75:5,6	prehearing 82:13	97:19,25 100:17	
98:2,13 99:12	P	96:2	95:2	100:19,21,25	
100:1 101:8 102:5	<b>P.C</b> 70:12 71:8	perfect 85:15,19	prepare 84:24	101:6 105:6,19,20	
102:11,13 103:11	<b>p.m</b> 68:16 72:2,8	88:21	prepared 102:6	105:22,23	
104:4,17 105:16	106:15	period 84:16 85:5	present 82:11	<b>PSE's</b> 72:11,13	
106:2	<b>P.O</b> 69:10	86:23 89:8,9	presented 91:6,16	79:12 82:19 89:18	
<b>000-</b> 72:3 106:17	<b>Pacific</b> 94:18	periods 90:1	pretty 85:6 95:18	94:5 97:9	
Oakland 70:5	PacifiCorp 70:20	<b>Perkins</b> 69:4 72:24	96:10	<b>Public</b> 69:13,15	
observations 88:12	70:22 74:21,23	73:1 100:17	previous 104:7	73:6,8 87:13,15	
occurred 77:21	95:16,18,23	person 90:15	probably 82:17	88:21 100:15	
<b>October</b> 97:14,16	Pages 68:13	perspective 85:21	89:15 97:11	<b>Puget</b> 68:5,6,7 72:9	
100:22,23	<b>pan</b> 88:13	86:2,19 88:22	procedural 72:17	72:21 99:20	
<b>OFFICE</b> 69:9,15	paper 104:9,22	90:13 97:9 101:5	75:10,20 82:7,25	pulled 91:25	
okay 73:17,18 74:9	<b>par</b> 102:2	perspectives 106:7	83:6 84:9,14	purchaser 75:23	
75:7,15 82:5 85:9	part 78:17 89:19	pertaining 76:2	86:16 104:20	purposes 103:9	
87:12 88:17 90:6	parties 72:20 75:8	<b>PGE</b> 71:2	105:5	106:11	
91:17 93:10,22	75:9,14 76:3,10	<b>phone</b> 74:11,14,18	procedurally 81:7	push 83:12 84:19	
95:8,15,25 96:9	76:15 77:9,14	<b>picture</b> 96:6,10	proceeding 80:18	84:21 87:21	
98:2 102:5 104:3	78:3 79:7 80:17	<b>piece</b> 89:23	83:4 89:19 97:23	100:24	
106:2,3,11	80:23 82:9,24	<b>pieces</b> 88:8,24	prod 80:17	pushing 78:19 88:3	
<b>Olympia</b> 69:11	83:3,10 84:6,24	place 70:13 84:15	productive 95:4	put 86:18 87:24	
70:9	85:16,16 86:11,25	99:18,22	96:5 100:14	89:20 97:21	
once 80:24 89:1	87:7 89:18 90:19	placed 82:8	<b>PROGRAM</b> 70:4		
one-third 86:23	93:2 95:5,14 96:4	please 73:21 75:18	prolonged 86:23	Q	
ones 99:21	96:11,21 97:8,21	87:13 99:6 102:1	proposal 77:15	question 81:15	
	97:22 98:15,23	103:2	85:13	96:17 102:20	
<b>open</b> 88:23 102:11	<i>)1.22)0.13,23</i>	105.2	05.15		
<b>open</b> 88:23 102:11 105:13,17 <b>opening</b> 77:24	99:1,4,16 100:9 100:13,18 101:2,6	point 79:1 81:1	propose 105:23	103:12	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

				ÿ	
77:25 78:2,5	<b>REMOTELY</b> 72:1	reviewing 84:14	104:12	sort 79:11,17,22	
quick 85:6	render 77:3,11	revisit 77:19	sentence 102:2	80:17,23 81:2	
quickly 101:10	Renewable 74:5,7	right 78:17,20,25	September 84:17	84:16 85:1 88:17	
<b>1</b>	93:24 94:1,7	80:22,25 82:16	84:22	99:1 100:20,23	
R	<b>repeat</b> 96:7	93:6 101:9	serial 86:17	102:19 103:25	
<b>R</b> 68:24 107:1,6,17	<b>REPORTED</b> 68:24	rights 88:9 89:22	serve 77:18	<b>Sound</b> 68:5,6,7	
reach 98:16,16 99:8	72:1	94:13	set 75:16 81:14,17	72:9,21	
reached 102:3	Reporter 107:7	<b>RNW</b> 70:11	84:8 89:24 94:23	sounds 81:11 92:19	
reaching 98:19	representative 99:2	rock 99:18,22	105:5,21 107:12	South 70:9	
read 92:4	101:19 103:17	round 86:9 91:10	setting 81:11 105:7	<b>SPEAKER</b> 83:15	
<b>ready</b> 81:2	representatives	rounds 89:3,4,10	105:17	83:20 102:18	
<b>real</b> 91:2,12	72:21	<b>RPR</b> 68:24 107:17	<b>share</b> 78:4 86:24	104:3	
realities 76:25	representing 73:23		87:1 93:13	speaking 78:23	
<b>realize</b> 98:17	74:2	S	shares 76:14 92:11	<b>specific</b> 77:15,25	
really 80:10 86:15	request 85:5	<b>S</b> 69:3	sharing 92:15	78:2 89:24 100:19	
87:2 89:11,17	requesting 75:19	<b>sale</b> 68:6 72:9	<b>shift</b> 85:7	specificity 86:4	
<b>reason</b> 78:24 79:14	<b>require</b> 83:3 104:22	sales 86:20	short 72:20 98:25	specifics 91:7	
80:20 83:1	resolution 82:14	Salmon 71:4	102:2	speculative 105:19	
reasonable 91:22	resolve 78:19 80:24	Sanger 70:12,12	shortened 85:5	<b>speed</b> 93:21	
reasons 75:19	82:3	74:5,6,6,10 93:23	89:5,10	<b>spent</b> 99:16	
rebuttal 84:21	resolved 78:21	93:25 102:10	shortening 93:18	Spokane 70:18	
97:12	79:19 81:23	saying 92:7	<b>shut</b> 103:8	<b>ss</b> 107:3	
<b>receive</b> 80:24	<b>resource</b> 90:24,25	<b>says</b> 87:23	<b>shutdown</b> 104:11	staff 69:7 73:3,5	
received 72:12	93:8	schedule 72:17	side 82:22	75:15,23 76:14,15	
recommendation	resources 73:24	75:10,20 77:19	<b>Sierra</b> 70:3,4 73:20	76:22 77:2,5,24	
76:4,11,23 88:7	74:2 101:12	82:12,25 83:6,11	73:23 91:18 92:8	86:1 95:13 98:6,8	
record 76:25 86:6	respect 90:14,17	83:12 84:4,14	92:10	98:11 100:6,14	
106:8	91:4,23	85:4,18 86:13,16	similar 91:4	Staff's 85:21 86:2	
records 103:17	respectful 101:12	92:21 93:17 94:22	Similarly 94:16	86:10 87:5,8	
reflect 76:25	respond 82:10	95:1,12,12 97:21	simply 76:24 79:6	standards 77:13	
<b>reflected</b> 76:17	86:10 96:20 97:22	99:25 104:20	79:13 90:2,19	standpoint 90:21	
80:4 97:7	responding 72:13	105:5,8	situation 81:6	90:24,25 91:22	
<b>refusal</b> 78:17,20,25	82:9	scheduled 103:21	87:20 96:11	start 72:21 84:10	
80:22 82:16	response 84:1,7,19	scheduling 82:11	<b>skill</b> 107:10	85:20 104:9	
<b>regard</b> 96:14	84:24 85:8,21	95:2,3 103:10	<b>slide</b> 97:10	State 69:15 104:12	
<b>regarding</b> 72:10 95:7	89:5,8,9 93:19	104:7	<b>slight</b> 81:10	107:3,7	
	96:25 97:10,12	school 93:7	Smith 103:13,13,16	stated 76:3 81:22	
regards 99:23 regular 80:15	responses 72:18	<b>scope</b> 102:21 <b>SE</b> 70:13	solution 85:14	91:4	
regulated 92:17	83:25 91:24	seal 107:13	88:25	statements 96:7	
regulated 92:17 related 102:19	<b>responsive</b> 76:24	<b>Seattle</b> 69:16	<b>solutions</b> 86:15	status 68:10 72:10	
remain 88:16	83:24 86:3,13	second 77:18 90:15	somebody 105:20	72:15 75:16 77:7	
remains 78:21	101:13	see 77:8,20 89:16	somewhat 100:10	78:15 82:19 92:3	
remarks 77:24	rest 102:11	97:8 105:1	<b>soon</b> 80:6 94:21	98:22 102:6	
<b>REMOTE</b> 68:10	result 85:2	sense 86:2,12 87:20	sorry 74:6 83:17	103:21 105:24	
69:1 70:1 71:1	<b>review</b> 104:7	93:19 103:10	91:19 99:12	107:8	
07.1 / 0.1 / 1.1		20.12 100.10	l	l	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

				<u> </u>	
stay 98:23 102:12	<b>SW</b> 69:20 71:4,8	85:25 87:12,14	95:22,22	uncertainties 76:17	
102:16 103:16	sworn 107:9	90:5,6,9 91:17	today 72:6 73:1	76:20,22 77:5	
<b>Steele</b> 69:3 72:23	<b>System</b> 68:8	93:10,22,25 95:8	106:5	understand 78:6,7	
72:24 78:6,13,14		95:15,17,20,25	tomorrow 101:19	78:23 79:8,10	
80:14 81:19 82:22	T	96:2,9 98:2,13	102:1	80:1,18 82:6 92:6	
82:23 84:11,12	<b>T</b> 107:1,1	102:5 103:13	<b>topic</b> 75:24 76:10	94:5 97:3,19	
85:10,23 96:12,14	take 72:20 82:21	104:17,22 106:1,4	track 93:21	103:11	
96:17,23 99:10	88:2,16 94:8	106:5,6,11	transaction 75:23	understanding	
100:1,4,5,16,17	taken 78:8,9	<b>Thanks</b> 93:12	76:5,8,13 77:1	77:17	
stop 90:4	takes 95:18	thing 88:17	78:18 79:12,21	understands 79:16	
<b>Street</b> 69:4 70:5,22	<b>Talen</b> 75:22 78:15	things 85:7 87:17	82:18,20 83:8	83:9 96:24 97:7	
71:4	78:17 80:8 81:21	88:10 97:3 99:15	87:2,19 88:7,15	98:1	
strip 72:9 79:24	82:16 86:21 92:17	think 79:16 80:9,17	90:4,16 91:16	unforeseen 77:20	
92:17 94:14	94:12	82:5 83:9,18 84:4	92:13,25 93:2	UNIDENTIFIED	
strong 94:23	<b>Talen's</b> 76:2 78:25	84:18 86:2,12,14	96:6 97:1,5	83:15,20 102:18	
structured 86:9	talk 75:19 86:1	86:17 87:6 88:9	transactions 80:3	104:3	
subject 86:21	88:20 99:8 100:9	88:23 89:10,14,25	transcript 107:8	Unit 68:7 69:15	
submitted 94:3	talked 99:17,24	90:13,17 91:3	transmission 68:8	79:24	
substantive 79:22	100:18	92:24 93:1,18	86:21 88:10 92:19	units 92:16	
91:13 97:5	talking 92:5	95:4 96:4,10,21	94:17	<b>unsure</b> 98:10	
suddenly 102:25	tcp@dvclaw.com	97:9,11 99:17,21	Transportation	unwilling 76:10	
suggest 104:11	71:9	99:22 100:7,7,13	68:2 69:10 72:6	upcoming 101:11	
suggestion 85:23	<b>tell</b> 99:7	100:14 103:24	tried 88:2 99:24	updated 92:14,22	
suggestions 88:23	<b>ten</b> 103:22	thinking 92:7 96:11	<b>true</b> 91:15,15,16	105:6	
<b>suitable</b> 104:14	tentative 105:7	thorough 93:20	107:9	<b>use</b> 106:10	
<b>Suite</b> 69:4,16,20	terms 83:2 88:22	thought 81:8 105:7	<b>trust</b> 88:17	usual 93:6,21	
70:5,22 71:8	testifying 95:7	thoughts 84:7	<b>try</b> 86:15 87:10,10	UTC 92:24 93:3	
suits 85:14,18	testimony 72:13	93:13 96:20 105:4	92:6	<b>Utilities</b> 68:2 69:10	
summarize 75:18	76:9,18,24 77:3,6	three 86:25 103:8	trying 97:17	72:6	
supplement 72:11	79:3 83:24 84:1,7	three-plus 102:23	<b>Tudor</b> 70:8 74:1,1	utility 75:25	
supplemental	84:20,21,24 85:8	tight 97:17	93:12 104:6,8		
72:16,18 76:2,5,9	86:3,4,5,7,8,9,13	<b>time</b> 72:7 76:6,22	<b>turn</b> 90:25 92:8	V	
76:12 77:9,10	86:18 87:22,23	82:12,17 84:16,24	102:15 103:19	<b>valid</b> 76:8	
78:8 79:2,3 80:5	88:11 89:7,8,12	84:25 85:5,6,8	turnaround 85:6	Van 69:20 71:8	
81:8,12,17 82:10	90:22 91:1,5,10	89:5,8,14,25	turning 91:24	73:13	
83:25 84:2 85:1	92:14 93:15 94:25	92:14 93:4 94:6	<b>turns</b> 91:1	<b>verify</b> 88:17,18	
85:22 86:4,7,11	95:6 96:5,25	96:5,13 98:25	<b>two</b> 79:23,25 80:23	<b>VIDEO</b> 68:10	
86:13 89:1,7 91:5	97:11,12 101:11	99:16 102:24	81:16,24 89:4,10	viewpoint 99:15	
94:10,24 105:8,18	101:13 105:8	103:6,7 106:5	89:14 90:19	virtual 92:3	
support 92:21 94:2	<b>Thackston</b> 70:16	time-out 103:15,25	<b>Tyler</b> 71:7 75:5	<b>voice</b> 81:10 99:7	
supporting 79:4	74:19	103:25		103:1	
suppositions 91:11	thank 72:23 73:2	times 93:19 102:22	$\frac{U}{UE 200115 (0.4)}$	<b>voiced</b> 76:1	
sure 91:7,22 92:18	73:14,17 74:9,12	timing 72:16 80:18	<b>UE-200115</b> 68:4	<b>VOLUME</b> 68:12	
96:23 101:5	74:15,20,22,24	89:17 91:23 99:18	72:8	<b>vote</b> 86:24 87:1	
104:23	75:1,3 78:1,14	<b>Tingey</b> 71:3 75:1,2	unable 95:1 105:22	92:15	
	80:7 83:21 85:9		uncertain 76:16	voting 88:9 89:22	

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					0
WWhite 70:8 74:1 93:12 104:6.82W 69:14 waiting 77:24 86:14 93:12 104:6.8 $2:0072:8$ $2:04 68:16 72:2$ 97201 69:21 71:9 97204 71:5Want 72:15 78:4.7 78:11 81:10 84:5 $9:421 97:25 98:21$ $2:59 106:15$ $97204 71:5$ 97202 471:588:20 92:23 97:8 88:20 92:23 97:8wind 94:19 window 102:24 $3:6,7$ $2:24 107:9,13$ 98:04 69:16 $98004.5759 69:5$ $98504 69:11$ $98504 69:11$ 96:19 98:11 105:1 105:1,10 wanted 84:13 93:8 96:19 98:11 105:1 105:1,10WITNESS 107:12 $97:224 107:9,13$ $97:224 107:9,13$ $98504 69:11$ $98504 69:13$ $98504 69:11$ $98504 69:11$ 96:19 198:11 105:1 105:1,10 wants 98:6 workload 95:5 workload 95:5 workload 95:5 $22t1 68:24 107:17$ $99220 70:18$ $98504 69:13$ $99220 70:18$ Washington 68:1 69:5,11,15,16 $70:9,18 72:1$ $107:3,7$ $97:22 29:35$ $97:22 29:35$ $88:22 1304:14300 103:22 3304:14300 103:22 104:1309:10 103:23309:12 209:16 133300 103:22 21 04:1309:12 209:16 146:34Washington's 90:388:22 92:17 94:2097:22 99:10100:78 101:9,10103:592:29:910100:78 101:9,10103:592:29:910$	94:12,13				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			1WTC1301 71:4	<b>825</b> 70:22	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			2	0	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		,			
want 72:15 78:4.7 78:11 81:10 84:57 $94:21 97:25 98:21$ $94:21 97:25 98:21$ $100:9,13,19 101:6$ $2000 69:16 70:22window 102:24103:6,7259 106:152000 69:16 70:2297235 70:2398004-5579 69:598004-5579 69:1199220 70:1899220 7$	0	U			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		,			
86:20 87:17,24       wind 94:19       2020 68:15 72:2.7       97232 70:23         88:20 92:23 97:8       103:6,7       72:14 82:15 83:4       98004-5579 69:5         98:61 101:11       103:6,7       72:14 82:15 83:4       103:6,7         103:20       wind wi 102:24       83:7,13,14 84:17       98004-5579 69:5         98:61 401:11       work 79:17 93:16       2101 70:5       98501 70:9         99:10       work 79:17 93:16       2101 70:5       98504 69:11         wanting 99:3       97:20,25 98:8,12       2417 70:9       98504 69:11         warranted 84:5       80:9,22 93:5       25th 84:17       2920 70:18         Washington 68:1       workload 95:5       work 88:13       3:00 103:23         way 69:20 70:9       73:22 92:9,10       394:14       3:00 103:23         Way 69:20 70:9       73:22 92:9,10       4       468:7 79:24 94:15         95:23 98:14       Yarnall 70:4 73:22       73:22 92:9,10       4       5         94:20 96:8 98:18       Z       5       5       5         99:20 97:18       Yarall 70:4 73:22       73:22 92:9,10       4       5         99:20 96:8 98:18       Z       9       5       5         99:20 96:8 98:18       Z       5					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
wanted $84:13 93:8$ 96:19 98:11 105:1 105:1,10Wondering $80:11$ work $79:17 93:16$ $94:21 95:12,24$ $24 101:16$ 2101 70:5 $121 68:24 107:17$ $24 101:16$ 98504 69:11 $99220 70:18$ wanting $99:3$ warking $99:3$ warking $99:3$ warking $99:3$ warking $99:3$ $97:20,25 98:8,12$ working $78:16 79:8$ $80:9,22 93:5$ working $78:16 79:8$ $80:9,22 93:5$ work $95:12$ work $95:12$ work $95:12$ $80:9,22 93:5$ work $81:21$ work $95:12$ work $81:21$ work $81:21$ work $81:21$ work $88:21$ work $81:21$ work $88:21$ work $88:12$ $97:22$ $73:22 92:9,10$ Yamall $70:4 73:22$ $73:22 92:9,10$ Yamall $70:4 79:24 94:15$ $40128 69:10$ $458 99:6$ $450 69:20 71:8$ $450 69:20 71:8$ $7$ $700 69:4$ $7$ $700 69:4$ $7$ $700 69:4$ $7$ $700 69:4$ $7$ $700 69:4$ $7$ <br< th=""><td></td><td>·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></br<>		·			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			· · · · · ·		
105:1,1094:21 95:12,2424 101:16wants 98:697:20,25 98:8,122417 70:9wartanted 84:580:9,22 93:525th 84:17Washington 68:1workload 95:53 $69:5,11,15,16$ works 95:123 $70:9,18 72:1$ world 88:2130 103:23Washington's 90:3wouldn't 88:63:30 103:9,22 104:1Washington's 90:3YWashington's 90:3YWashington's 90:3YWashington's 90:3YWashington's 90:3YWeil 81:20 86:8Y95:23 98:14YS2:7 86:14 88:3,0100:380:2,2,5 81:2,21YYeah 96:23 99:14Yarnall 70:4 73:2273:22 92:9,10468:7 79:24 94:1580:2,2,5 81:2,21Yeah 96:23 99:1480:2,2 92:17 94:20year 87:11 97:1894:20 96:8 98:18Z100:350weive 88:14 99:16999:16,241Webster 70:510-day 89:90885 69:4107:9103:520weik 81:16 84:20121 71:484:22 89:141300 70:584:22 89:141300 70:577Wendy 74:11,1315th 107:13Western 73:111750 69:20 71:8		e			
wanting 99:3 wants 98:697:20.25 98:8,12 97:20.25 98:8,12 working 78:16 79:8 $80:9,22 93:5$ 2417 70:9 25th 84:17 28th 72:11 78:9Washington 68:1 69:5,11,15,16 70:9,18 72:1 107:3,7workload 95:5 workload 95:53 3 94:14 3:00 103:23 3:0 103:9,22 104:13 3:00 103:23 3:0 103:9,22 104:13 3:00 103:23 3:0 104:8 3:00 103:23 3:0 104:8 3:00 103:23 3:0 104:8 3:00 103:23 3:0 104:8 3:00 104:8 3:1st 83:7 32 98:8Washington's 90:3 way 69:20 70:9 71:8 77:8 83:12 86:9 97:22 we'l 181:20 86:8 95:23 98:14 we're 72:8,10 79:18XWe're 72:8,10 79:18 80:2,4,5 81:2,21 82:7 86:14 88:3,9 95:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 103:5XWe're 72:8,10 79:18 91:6,24Yarnal 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 year 87:11 97:18Webster 70:5 week 75:22 79:1 81:24 98:8 weeks 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14 1300 70:5Yarnal 70:4 73:22 1041 70:13 10:43 98:9 1041 70:13 10:43 00 70:5Wendy 74:11,13 Western 73:1115th 107:13 15th 107:13Wester 73:1115th 107:13 15th 107:13Wester 73:1115th 107:13 15th 107:13Wester 73:1115th 107:13 15th 107:13				99220 /0:18	
wants 98:6working 78:16 79:8 $25th 84:17$ warsington 68:1workload 95:5 $301233$ 69:5,11,15,16workload 95:5workload 95:5 $09:1,17,16$ workload 95:5 $394:14$ 107:3,7workload 95:5 $30103:23$ Washington's 90:3word 88:21way 69:20 70:9X71:8 77:8 83:12X86:9 97:22Yamall 70:4 73:22we'lt 81:20 86:8Yamall 70:4 73:2295:23 98:14Yamall 70:4 73:2280:2,4,5 81:2,21Yamall 70:4 73:2280:2,4,5 81:2,21Yamall 70:4 73:2295:23 98:14Yamall 70:4 73:2299:16,24Yamall 70:1399:16,2410-day 89:900699:16,2410-day 89:904 170:13610885 69:4107:1310885 69:4107:1310885 69:4107:13Weigh 98:41411 70:18Weigh 98:41411 70:18Weigh 98:41411 70:18700 69:4	,	,			
<b>astronometry of the second section of the second </b>					
Washington $68:1$ 69:5,11,15,16 70:9,18 72:1 107:3,7 World $88:21$ world $88:21$ weigh $88:21$ weigh $98:4$ wetex $73:11$ $1750$ $66:220$ 71:83 94:14 $3:00$ 103:23 $3:30$ 103:9,22 104:1 $30$ 104:8 $3:30$ 103:9,22 104:1 $468:7$ 79:24 94:15 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $450$ 69:20 71:8 $66$ $68:15$ 72:2,7 $107:9$ $68-107$ 68:13 $107:9$ $68-107$ 68:13 $107:9$ $106 e9:4$ $77$ $700$ 69:4		9			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			<b>28th</b> 72:11 78:9		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	U		3		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		works 95:12			
Washington's 90:3 way 69:20 70:9 71:8 77:8 83:12 $86:9 97:22$ Wouldn't 88:6 wouldn't 88:63:30 103:9,22 104:1 $30 104:8$ $31st 83:7$ $32 98:8$ We'll 81:20 86:8 95:23 98:14 we're 72:8,10 79:18Y Yarnal 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 94:20 96:8 98:18 100:7,8 101:9,10 103:5Y Yarnal 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 year 87:11 97:18 $3:30 103:9,22 104:1$ $31st 83:7$ $32 98:8$ We'll 81:20 86:8 95:23 98:14 80:2,4,5 81:2,21 94:20 96:8 98:18 100:7,8 101:9,10 103:5Y Yarnal 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 year 87:11 97:18 $3:30 103:9,22 104:1$ $32 98:8$ Webster 70:5 weeks 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14 weigh 98:4O $5$ 58th 70:13 5th 69:16Weeky 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14 weeks 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14IOM 70:5 1300 70:5 1300 70:5 $6$ 68:107 68:13Weeky 73:11 84:27 98:4To:18 1750 69:20 71:8700 69:4	· ·	world 88:21			
Waiting 10:30Wold if 1:03.030:104:8 $71:8, 77:8, 83:12X31st, 83:786:9, 97:22Y32:98:8we'll 81:20, 86:8Y32:98:895:23, 98:14Yarnall 70:4, 73:22468:7, 79:24, 94:1580:2, 4, 5, 81:2, 21Yeah, 96:23, 99:14100:382:7, 86:14, 88:3, 9Yeah, 96:23, 99:14100:394:20, 96:8, 98:18100:3year, 87:11, 97:18100:7, 8, 101:9, 10Z510:3:505we've 88:14, 99:16199:16, 241Webster 70:510-day, 89:91041, 70:136684:22, 89:141300, 70:584:22, 89:141300, 70:5Weeky 98:41411, 70:18Wendy 74:11, 1315th, 107:13Wester 73:111750, 69:20, 71:8$	,	worth 81:13			
XY31st 83:771:8 77:8 83:12 86:9 97:22 we'll 81:20 86:8 95:23 98:14 $80:2,4,5 81:2,21$ $80:2,4,5 81:2,21$ $82:7 86:14 88:3,9$ $88:22 92:17 94:20$ $94:20 96:8 98:18$ $100:7,8 101:9,10$ $103:5$ 31st 83:7 $32 98:8$ 2Yarnall 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 Yeah 96:23 99:14 $100:3$ $94:20 96:8 98:18$ $100:7,8 101:9,10$ $103:5$ 31st 83:7 $468:7 79:24 94:15$ $40128 69:10$ $45 89:6$ $450 69:20 71:8$ $4th 69:4$ 294:20 96:8 98:18 $100:7,8 101:9,10$ $103:5$ 099:16,241Webster 70:5 week 75:22 79:1 $81:24 98:8$ $84:22 89:14$ $84:22 89:14$ $84:22 89:14$ $84:22 89:14$ $84:22 89:14$ Wendy 74:11,13 $84:22 89:14$ 1007:05 $107:9$ $68-107 68:13$ Wendy 74:11,13 Wester 73:1115th 107:13 $1750 69:20 71:8$ 7 700 69:4	U	<b>wouldn't</b> 88:6			
$36:9\ 97:22$ $32\ 98:8$ we'll $81:20\ 86:8$ $Y$ $95:23\ 98:14$ Yarnall $70:4\ 73:22$ $95:23\ 98:14$ Yarnall $70:4\ 73:22$ $73:22\ 92:9,10$ Yeah $96:23\ 99:14$ $80:2,4,5\ 81:2,21$ Yeah $96:23\ 99:14$ $80:2,4,5\ 81:2,21$ Yeah $96:23\ 99:14$ $80:2,4,5\ 81:2,21$ Yeah $96:23\ 99:14$ $94:20\ 96:8\ 98:18$ $100:3$ $100:7,8\ 101:9,10$ $\overline{Z}$ $94:20\ 96:8\ 98:18$ $\overline{O}$ $99:16,24$ $\overline{D}$ Webster $70:5$ $10\text{-day } 89:9$ $66$ $99:16,24$ $10885\ 69:4$ $102\ 84:22\ 89:14$ $10885\ 69:4$ $1030\ 70:5$ $68\cdot107\ 68:13$ weigh $98:4$ $1411\ 70:13$ $84:22\ 89:14$ $1300\ 70:5$ weigh $98:4$ $1411\ 70:13$ Wendy $74:11,13$ $15t\ 107:13$ Western $73:11$ $1750\ 69:20\ 71:8$	v				
ve'll 81:20 86:8 95:23 98:14 $V$ Yarnall 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,10 $4$ 4 68:7 79:24 94:15 $ve're 72:8,10 79:18$ 80:2,4,5 81:2,21 82:7 86:14 88:3,9 94:20 96:8 98:18 100:7,8 101:9,10 103:5Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 year 87:11 97:18 $40128 69:10$ 45 89:6 $ve've 88:14 99:16$ 99:16,24 $vear 87:11 97:18$ $5$ 58th 70:13 5th 69:16 $ve've 88:14 99:16$ 99:16,24 $0$ 10-day 89:9 10-day 89:9 $5$ 6 6 68:15 72:2,7 10/41 70:13 $81:24 98:8$ weeks 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14 $1007:5$ 100 70:5 $6$ 68-107 68:13 $weigh 98:4$ Wendy 74:11,13 $1411 70:13$ 15th 107:13 $7$ 700 69:4		X			
We it $3120 \ 30.3$ 95:23 98:14Yarnall 70:4 73:22 73:22 92:9,104We're 72:8,10 79:18 80:2,4,5 81:2,21 82:7 86:14 88:3,9 94:20 96:8 98:18 100:7,8 101:9,10 103:5Yeah 96:23 99:14 100:3 year 87:11 97:184 $2007, 8 101:9,10$ 103:5Z450 69:20 71:8 450 69:20 71:8We've 88:14 99:16 99:16,24Z599:16,2410-day 89:9 1041 70:13 81:24 98:86Week 75:22 79:1 81:24 98:810885 69:4 121 71:4 1300 70:56Weeks 81:16 84:20 84:22 89:14121 71:4 1300 70:568-107 68:13 7Wendy 74:11,13 Western 73:1115th 107:13 1750 69:20 71:87			32 98:8		
95:23 98:14Tarna 70.4 $75.22$ we're 72:8,10 79:1873:22 92:9,10 $80:2,4,5 81:2,21$ Yeah 96:23 99:14 $80:2,4,5 81:2,21$ 100:3 $82:7 86:14 88:3,9$ year 87:11 97:18 $94:20 96:8 98:18$ year 87:11 97:18 $100:7,8 101:9,10$ $5$ $103:5$ $0$ we've 88:14 99:16 $5$ $99:16,24$ $1$ Webster 70:5 $10-day 89:9$ $81:24 98:8$ $10885 69:4$ $10885 69:4$ $107:9$ $84:22 89:14$ $1300 70:5$ weigh 98:4 $1411 70:18$ Wendy 74:11,13 $1750 69:20 71:8$			4		
We re $72.3,10$ $79.18$ $73.22$ $92.13,10$ $80:2,4,5$ $81:2,21$ Yeah $96:23$ $99:14$ $100:3$ $82:7$ $86:14$ $88:3,9$ year $87:11$ $97:18$ $40128$ $69:10$ $94:20$ $96:8$ $98:18$ year $87:11$ $97:18$ $450$ $69:20$ $71:8$ $100:7,8$ $101:9,10$ $\overline{2}$ $\overline{5}$ $103:5$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{5}$ we've $88:14$ $99:16$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{5}$ $99:16,24$ $\overline{1}$ $\overline{5}$ Webster $70:5$ $10$ -day $89:9$ $\overline{6}$ week $75:22$ $79:1$ $1041$ $70:13$ $\overline{6}$ $81:24$ $98:8$ $10885$ $69:4$ $107:9$ weeks $81:16$ $84:20$ $121$ $71:4$ $68-107$ $68:13$ $84:22$ $89:14$ $1300$ $70:5$ $\overline{7}$ weigh $98:4$ $1411$ $70:18$ $\overline{7}$ Wendy $74:11,13$ $15th$ $107:13$ $\overline{7}$ Western $73:11$ $1750$ $69:20$ $71:8$ $\overline{9}$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	,				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
38:22 92:17 94:20       year of fir 77.16         94:20 96:8 98:18       Z         100:7,8 101:9,10       0         103:5       0         we've 88:14 99:16       0         99:16,24       1         Webster 70:5       10-day 89:9         week 75:22 79:1       1041 70:13         81:24 98:8       10885 69:4         weeks 81:16 84:20       121 71:4         84:22 89:14       1300 70:5         weigh 98:4       1411 70:18         Wendy 74:11,13       15th 107:13         Western 73:11       1750 69:20 71:8		07 11 07 10			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		<b>year</b> 8/:11 9/:18			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		7			
we've $88:14 99:16$ $99:16,24$ $38tn 70:13$ $10$ -day $89:9$ Webster 70:510-day $89:9$ $1041 70:13$ $6$ $6 68:15 72:2,7$ $1041 70:13$ 81:24 98:8 $84:22 89:14$ 10885 69:4 $121 71:4$ $1300 70:5$ $107:9$ $68-107 68:13$ weigh 98:4 Wendy 74:11,131411 70:18 $15th 107:13$ $1750 69:20 71:8$ $7$ $700 69:4$			5		
we've $88:14 99:16$ $99:16,24$ 1Webster 70:510-day $89:9$ week $75:22 79:1$ 1041 70:13 $81:24 98:8$ 10885 69:410885 69:4107:9weeks $81:16 84:20$ 121 71:4 $84:22 89:14$ 1300 70:5weigh $98:4$ 1411 70:18Wendy $74:11,13$ 15th 107:13Western $73:11$ 1750 69:20 71:8		0	<b>58th</b> 70:13		
99:16,241Webster 70:510-day 89:9week 75:22 79:11041 70:13 $81:24 98:8$ 10885 69:4weeks 81:16 84:20121 71:4 $84:22 89:14$ 1300 70:5weigh 98:41411 70:18Wendy 74:11,1315th 107:13Western 73:111750 69:20 71:8					
week 75:22 79:1       1041 70:13       6 68:15 72:2,7         81:24 98:8       10885 69:4       107:9         weeks 81:16 84:20       121 71:4       68-107 68:13         84:22 89:14       1300 70:5       7         weigh 98:4       1411 70:18       7         Wendy 74:11,13       15th 107:13       700 69:4         Western 73:11       1750 69:20 71:8       9	,	1			
week 75:22 79:1       1041 70:13       6 68:15 72:2,7         81:24 98:8       10885 69:4       107:9         weeks 81:16 84:20       121 71:4       68-107 68:13         84:22 89:14       1300 70:5       7         weigh 98:4       1411 70:18       7         Wendy 74:11,13       15th 107:13       700 69:4         Western 73:11       1750 69:20 71:8       9		<b>10-day</b> 89:9	6		
81:24 98:8       10885 69:4       107:9         weeks 81:16 84:20       121 71:4       68-107 68:13         84:22 89:14       1300 70:5			<b>6</b> 68:15 72:2,7		
84:22     89:14     1300 70:5       weigh 98:4     1411 70:18     7       Wendy 74:11,13     15th 107:13     700 69:4       Western 73:11     1750 69:20 71:8     9		<b>10885</b> 69:4	-		
weigh 98:4     1411 70:18       Wendy 74:11,13     15th 107:13       Western 73:11     1750 69:20 71:8		<b>121</b> 71:4	<b>68-107</b> 68:13		
weigh 98:4         1411 70:18         7           Wendy 74:11,13         15th 107:13         700 69:4           Western 73:11         1750 69:20 71:8         9					
Wendy 74:11,13         15th 107:13         700 69:4           Western 73:11         1750 69:20 71:8	0				
Western 73:11 1750 69:20 71:8			<b>700</b> 69:4		
I I I	whatnot 89:22		<u> </u>		
		l	l		

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC