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-○0○-
THE COURT: Let's be on the record. Good morning. We're here today for a prehearing conference in docket TE-190086, which is captioned, In the Matter Determining the Proper Carrier Classification of and Complaint for Penalties Against, Cascade Adventures, Inc.; Cascade Adventures Baker Bus LLC.

My name is a Rayne Pearson. I'm an administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission and I will be presiding in this matter.

So let's begin by taking appearances and let's start with Cascade Adventures. Is there a representative for the company present?

MR. ENGEL: Yes. Can you hear me?
THE COURT: I can. Thank you.
MR. ENGEL: Yeah. My name is Paul Engel.
I'm representing -- I'm Cascade Adventures Baker Bus. THE COURT: Are you the owner of the company?

MR. ENGEL: Yes, correct.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And for

1 Staff?

MR. FUKANO: Good morning, Judge Pearson. Harry Fukano, assistant attorney general, here on behalf of Commission Staff.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to enter an appearance today? Okay. Hearing nothing, I will also assume that there are no petitions to intervene, but $I$ will hold a couple of seconds open to allow for those petitions to be made.

Okay. Hearing none, let's proceed. So I just want to remind the parties -- and Mr. Engel, this may be new to you, but the Commission's procedural rules require electronic filing and service of all documents and I'll be waiving any requirement for paper copies in this case due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

The Commission's rules also provide for electronic service of documents so the Commission will serve the parties electronically and the parties will serve each other electronically.

So that brings us to Staff's letter submitted in response to the company's response to the motion to impose suspended penalties, indicated that Staff would like to conduct discovery. So I assume then that the parties would like to have the discovery rules available to them in this proceeding; is that correct?

MR. FUKANO: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So I will make the discovery rules available, but remind the parties that protective orders are not available under the statutes that govern this proceeding.

And I'm also aware that parties often request that any data request and responses are shared with every other party, and it would make it easier on the parties if I included such a requirement in the prehearing conference order. Is there any objection to my including that requirement?

MR. FUKANO: None from Staff.
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Engel, does that make sense to you -- I mean, as a pro se litigant, I want to make sure that you understand and that you feel free to ask me any questions about the process as we're going. You're muted right now, sir. Sorry.

MR. ENGEL: Sorry. This is pretty new to me. No. I don't know what any of that means.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Fukano, do you want to just briefly describe what data requests are and what that will look like for the company.

MR. FUKANO: Certainly. In a general
manner, a data request is a request for specific information that's relevant to the issues that will be

1 presented at the adjudication. And so Staff may --
2 would essentially send you likely an electronic e-mail

1 for response.

THE COURT: That is the standard time frame, correct. So when you get requests from Staff, you would have 10 business days -- not calendar days. It would not include weekends -- 10 business days to get your response back to them and then similarly, if you issued questions to them, they would have 10 business days to get their answers get back to you.

MR. ENGEL: I understand that. Can I ask a question real quick?

THE COURT: Absolutely.
MR. ENGEL: So this is a prehearing or whatever. Is there any way that we can -- is there any way that if it comes to light that we don't need to go any further, would this be the last one?

THE COURT: That's absolutely a possibility. So what we're going to discuss --

MR. ENGEL: Okay. Cool. Okay. That's all -- that's -- okay.

THE COURT: Yes. We're going to discuss the procedural schedule next and I don't know if the parties have had a chance to confer about a procedural schedule, but what will happen is we'll set a series of dates for various events to occur with the final date being a hearing date. And so there will be probably a

1 significant gap of time between today and when we set 2 the matter for hearing. And in that in-between time, 3 the parties can work together to attempt to reach an 4 agreed outcome in which case, we could cancel the 5 hearing and resolve all of the matters on a paper 6 record. agreement, you would memorialize it in the form of a settlement agreement which Mr. Fukano would draft up, you both would sign, and then you would submit it to me for review and I would issue an order either approving it, rejecting it, or approving it subject to conditions. But there would not be a need for a hearing in that instance.

Sometimes we do have hearings on settlements, but this is not a complex case that would require any questions, $I$ think, from me in order to resolve it if a settlement were reached.

So that's what I anticipate. Which brings us to the schedule, which is the next thing on my list. So, Mr. Fukano, have the parties had an opportunity to discuss a schedule or would you like to take a break to do that now?

MR. FUKANO: No, your Honor. I think a break would be helpful.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I'm going to do then -- for the court reporter's benefit, I'll just -do you want the court reporter to also get off of the line or is it okay if she just stops recording when we go into recess, and then $I$ will leave the meeting and you can message me to come back when you're ready.

MR. FUKANO: Staff has no concern with the court reporter staying on the line.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. All right. So the court reporter can stay on the line, but doesn't need to record anything once we are in recess until we come back on the record.

So we will be in recess and I will be available, Mr. Fukano or any other member of Staff, if you want to just shoot me a message in Microsoft Teams. When you're ready, I will rejoin the meeting.

MR. FUKANO: Understood.
THE COURT: We are in recess. Thank you.
(Whereupon a recess was had.)
THE COURT: All right. So let's be back on the record. I understand that the parties have reached an agreement on a proposed schedule, so, Mr. Fukano, do you want to read that into the record?

MR. FUKANO: Yes, Judge. So the parties have agreed that we would like to set an initial

1 settlement conference date for July 8th and that also on
2 July 8th, discovery -- date of request response time

MR. FUKANO: Yes, there would not be pre-filed testimony.

THE COURT: Okay. So it would be cross-examination exhibits and estimated times for cross-examination and an order of presentation of witnesses?

MR. FUKANO: And there would be some direct testimony, because there would be -- in the absence of pre-filed, so cross and direct.

THE COURT: So exhibits to support direct testimony as well?

MR. FUKANO: Yes.
THE COURT: Got it. Okay. Perfect. Let me just check my calendar real quick, but it's so far out I

1 can't imagine I have a conflict. Just please bear with
2 me. So August 26th you said? Is that what you said or
3 did you say the 24 th? are adjourned. Thank you, all.
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