

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of PUGET SOUND ENERGY, for (i) Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc., and (ii) a Declaratory Order Approving the Methodology for Allocating Costs Between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services

PREHEARING CONFERENCE - VOLUME II Pages 39-71 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DENNIS J. MOSS

1:38 p.m. October 13, 2015

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

REPORTED BY: ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED) FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.:

JASON KUZMA Perkins Coie 10885 NE Fourth Street, Suite 700 Bellevue, Washington 98004-5579 (425) 635-1416 jkuzma@perkinscoie.com

ERIC ENGLERT Project Manager Puget Sound Energy, Inc. 10885 N.E. 4th Street Bellevue, Washington 98004 (425) 456-2312 eric.englert@pse.com

FOR NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS:

TOMMY BROOKS (appearing telephonically) Cable Huston 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, Oregon 97204-1136 (503) 224-3092 tbrooks@cablehuston.com

APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: DENNIS J. MOSS Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1184 dmoss@utc.wa.gov

FOR WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION: PATRICK J. OSHE, Assistant Attorney General; BRETT P. SHEARER, Assistant Attorney General; CHRISTOPHER CASEY, Assistant Attorney General; THOMAS SCHOOLEY, Assistant Director-Energy Regulation; DAVID GOMEZ, Assistant Power Supply Manager. 1400 So. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504. Contact info for each listed.

FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: SIMON J. FFITCH, Senior Assistant Attorney General 600 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000, TB-14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 389-2055 simonff@atg.wa.gov

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 13, 2015 1:38 P.M. -oOo- PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE MOSS: All right. Well, let's be on the record then. Good afternoon, everybody. We are convened here at the Commission in the -- as soon as I scroll through here, I'll get the docket number -- no, I won't -- UG-151 -- MR. KUZMA: 633. JUDGE MOSS: -- 633, styled The Matter of the Petition of the Puget Sound Energy for Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc. -- MR. KUZMA: Your Honor, it's 663. I'm sorry. JUDGE MOSS: 663. All right. Stand corrected. Thank you. -- and a Declaratory Order Approving the Methodology for Allocation of Costs Between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services. So this is -- the purpose of our gathering this afternoon is to have a status conference,

Page 43

1 basically, to bring me up to speed on how you all have
 2 been progressing with your technical conferences, and to
 3 discuss whether we need to establish further formal
 4 processes or can continue as we have been doing.
 5 Since we have Mr. Brooks on the phone, we'll
 6 just take a quick run around the room and call the roll,
 7 so to speak. Go ahead.
 8 MR. KUZMA: This is Jason Kuzma from Perkins
 9 Coie on behalf of Puget Sound Energy.
 10 MR. ENGLERT: I'm Eric Englert from Puget
 11 Sound Energy.
 12 MR. FFITCH: Simon ffitch for the Public
 13 Counsel office.
 14 MR. GOMEZ: David Gomez, Commission Staff.
 15 MR. SCHOOLEY: Tom Schooley, Commission
 16 Staff.
 17 MR. OSHIE: Pat Oshie, Attorney General's
 18 Office, representing Commission Staff.
 19 MR. SHEARER: And I'm Brett Shearer,
 20 Attorney General's Office with Commission Staff.
 21 MR. CASEY: Christopher Casey, Assistant
 22 Attorney General for Staff.
 23 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Staff's
 24 triple-teaming today so we know we're in trouble. When
 25 the lawyers outnumber the witnesses, it's always

Page 44

1 trouble.
 2 All right. Who wants to bring me up to date
 3 on the status of things in this docket? Mr. Kuzma?
 4 MR. KUZMA: Well, I'll start. We've had
 5 three conferences that were scheduled. I think that
 6 progress has been made. I think that, you know, we
 7 haven't reached any conclusions at this point. I think
 8 the company is still hopeful that progress can continue
 9 to be made, although I do know that at the last meeting
 10 Mr. Oshie had mentioned that Staff may have some more
 11 policy-related or legal-related questions that it might
 12 need to take up with the Commission.
 13 MR. OSHIE: And this is Pat Oshie. And just
 14 to follow up, it is true, your Honor, I think there are
 15 some questions that, you know, Staff is not in -- we
 16 have not fully analyzed, but they deal with questions of
 17 the jurisdiction of the Commission to -- you know, to
 18 the -- or the necessity, probably better to say, of the
 19 Commission to approve PSE's entry into this new
 20 enterprise.
 21 And you know, there's always the issue of
 22 the merger commitments, and there is a restriction that
 23 I believe would be triggered here requiring Commission
 24 approval should the -- should either -- I believe it's
 25 either Puget Holdings or Puget Energy wish to create a

Page 45

1 subsidiary to provide an unregulated function.
 2 So these are all interrelated issues that
 3 we're still analyzing. And we've learned a lot more.
 4 We really appreciate the Company being willing to hold
 5 the technical conferences. I think they've been very
 6 productive. Lots of questions asked. It's triggered
 7 other either questions at the technical conference or
 8 within -- you know, from the -- you know, the typical
 9 discovery process.
 10 And I think that Staff has found it very
 11 productive overall. I found it personally productive to
 12 be able to sit in a meeting, have a much better
 13 understanding of what the Company's proposing and why
 14 it's doing it, and the -- and the relationship, if you
 15 will, between the service that's proposed for TOTE and
 16 the implications for regulated core customers of the
 17 company.
 18 So we've -- you know, that's where we have
 19 basically left it. I addressed with the -- with the
 20 Company and others that were on the line the question of
 21 whether the service proposed for TOTE is jurisdictional
 22 to the Commission. Is this really another -- a
 23 different kind of service?
 24 And there's no need to go into that here,
 25 your Honor, unless you -- I think some of the issues --

Page 46

1 I'm not sure if they're -- if the -- even at a high
 2 level, they require some disclosure of the details of
 3 the contract that's proposed and the service that's
 4 proposed. It generally is confidential.
 5 So -- but we are just -- without being too
 6 much of a repeater on this, we're still analyzing it and
 7 we'll need a little bit more time, and the other
 8 pressing events, like the Avista rate case procedure,
 9 which we're all very busy writing the brief, responsive
 10 brief for the Commission Staff on that matter.
 11 JUDGE MOSS: And are you optimistic that
 12 these legal issues are something that can be resolved
 13 outside of a decision process by the Commission? Or is
 14 this something you can come to us, the Commission, at
 15 some point and say, well, we've discussed all these
 16 issues and this is the way we think it is and --
 17 MR. OSHIE: Well, I'd like to think that we
 18 can -- you know, that we can -- that Puget and Staff, as
 19 an example -- I mean, I can't speak for Public Counsel,
 20 of course, or NWIGU, or any other party that may be --
 21 that may be interested in this matter.
 22 But I do think we can -- you know, we can
 23 figure out the -- you know, the character of the
 24 service. We think we better understand that, and I
 25 guess the question is, can we come to an agreement as to

Page 47

1 how the enterprise would be treated by the Commission.
 2 That's the Commission's decision
 3 ultimately --
 4 JUDGE MOSS: Sure.
 5 MR. OSHIE: -- but we can make a
 6 recommendation and --
 7 JUDGE MOSS: That's --
 8 MR. OSHIE: So hopefully we can get there
 9 without having to file a -- you know, basically a motion
 10 to dismiss based on some concerns we may have about the
 11 Commission's jurisdiction in this area.
 12 JUDGE MOSS: Well, I'll hear from Mr. ffitch
 13 and Mr. Brooks here in just a moment, but I just would
 14 say that to the -- my goal, my hope, I should say, not
 15 so much a goal, but would be that you all would be able
 16 to come to some common understanding about these things
 17 and present that common understanding in some form or
 18 another that would at least substantially narrow things
 19 in this proceeding.
 20 When I first read the petition, it's a
 21 pretty big petition. It has a lot of elements to it. I
 22 came away from the first prehearing conference
 23 understanding a little better, I think, what was being
 24 proposed. And I'm sure that you all have developed a
 25 much higher level of understanding after you've had

Page 48

1 these three technical conferences, and I'm not going to
 2 ask you to try to educate me to that today.
 3 But having said that, then I'll ask
 4 Mr. ffitch, you're here in the room, so you get the next
 5 turn to speak, if you will.
 6 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, your Honor.
 7 Simon ffitch for the Public Counsel office.
 8 I would agree with Staff counsel's description of the
 9 process as being productive and useful for -- hopefully
 10 for all parties. It's been quite detailed. Our expert
 11 has participated along with us in the discussions.
 12 And we have been conducting discovery in the
 13 case, I think, as well as staff. We issued another
 14 round of discovery yesterday, so we're sort of not done
 15 yet with our analysis.
 16 I would say that the -- while they've been
 17 productive discussions, the -- I guess the more we get
 18 into the details, the -- you know, to some extent, we
 19 have more questions. We're still -- it seems that the
 20 plot seems to thicken a bit as we get more information
 21 and understand more about it.
 22 So I don't think we've reached -- as others
 23 have said, we haven't reached conclusions yet on the
 24 case. We see the same issues that Staff has identified,
 25 that Mr. Oshie's identified, whether it's a regulated

Page 49

1 service, the applicability of the merger conditions to
 2 the proposal.
 3 You know, we're also still wrestling with
 4 the notion of, what is this exactly? Is it -- are we
 5 being asked for preapproval here? Are we being asked to
 6 have sort of a form of prudence decision at this point?
 7 JUDGE MOSS: And I'll stop you there and
 8 say, it's my understanding that that is not the case.
 9 MR. FFITCH: Well, that is correct. On
 10 paper, that is -- that's certainly the representation of
 11 the -- of the Company.
 12 However, the nature of the request itself
 13 and the filings that have been made make it difficult --
 14 still get you into a gray area of, okay, if we're not
 15 doing that, what are we doing, and what is the purpose
 16 being served by this proceeding? So --
 17 JUDGE MOSS: Do we need to take a break?
 18 Let's pause.
 19 (Brief pause in the proceedings.)
 20 JUDGE MOSS: Okay, Mr. ffitch. Again,
 21 apologies for the interruption. If you would go ahead.
 22 MR. FFITCH: I think, your Honor, I had just
 23 essentially concluded listing some of the general issues
 24 that we see.
 25 In terms of next steps, I think there might

Page 50

1 be some value in adopting a schedule at this point with
 2 some room in it for the kinds of discussions that were
 3 suggested by Staff, but giving us some sort of a working
 4 end point. I don't know if that's essential, but maybe
 5 we can hear from Staff about what they think about that
 6 or -- or whether we just schedule further conferences.
 7 I guess that would be workable also.
 8 But partly, I'm just, I think, perhaps --
 9 you know, sticking inflexibly with plan A that was
 10 discussed at the opening prehearing conference, which is
 11 if we get to the 13th and we don't have everything
 12 resolved, then maybe we need to adopt a schedule, so I
 13 guess that's at least a potential topic today.
 14 JUDGE MOSS: Sure.
 15 MR. FFITCH: So --
 16 JUDGE MOSS: Well, let's hear from
 17 Mr. Brooks.
 18 MR. BROOKS (by phone): Thank you, Judge
 19 Moss.
 20 I don't know that I'm in a different
 21 position than any of the other parties. I do think that
 22 the discussions have been really productive, and
 23 especially compared to some recent dockets. I think
 24 we've done a lot of work in a very short period of time,
 25 so that I think everyone has kind of kept their end of

Page 51

1 the bargain on that. It went very well.
 2 We had an expert as well attend a couple of
 3 the discussions for us and, quite frankly, either
 4 we're -- you know, we're struggling a little bit to
 5 figure out exactly -- you know, we're analyzing the
 6 information that's been given to us.
 7 And kind of like Simon said, the plot
 8 thickens, because we're really trying to understand both
 9 the impact to our members and then just sort of the
 10 general policy discussions that are here as well. And I
 11 think we've got to make some major decisions about which
 12 of the -- these areas we want to weigh in on, if at all,
 13 like the legal issues that may be threshold issues or
 14 not.
 15 So it's -- you know, I think we still need a
 16 little bit more time to figure that out. I think, you
 17 know, having a firm schedule right now to kind of anchor
 18 our efforts would go a long way to help all the parties,
 19 because at some point we're going to need a record to be
 20 developed on our end as well. And having some mileposts
 21 to help do that would probably help us -- push us in
 22 that direction.
 23 But we're still here and still at the table
 24 and trying to get this done, you know, as expeditiously
 25 as we can.

Page 52

1 JUDGE MOSS: All right.
 2 Well, in general, I will say that I am
 3 encouraged by what I'm hearing today. It sounds as
 4 though everyone is participating in good faith and is
 5 trying to move towards some common understanding at
 6 least about all of this.
 7 It also sounds to me that there are some
 8 legal and policy issues at the threshold, I suppose, is
 9 as good a way to put it as any. And so it's important
 10 that the parties focus on that.
 11 And as I understood the original petition
 12 and the discussion we had at our first prehearing
 13 conference, the PSE itself has some flexible views, or
 14 some views about there being some flexibility in how
 15 this is approached.
 16 As I recall, the petition suggests that at
 17 least parts of this could be treated as
 18 non-jurisdictional, but there's a preference to go the
 19 jurisdictional route. So these are things that
 20 certainly there's room for discussion, there's room for
 21 seeing if there can be some common ground reached on
 22 those types of issues.
 23 As far as the facts are concerned, the --
 24 sort of the prospect that I see there, at least in terms
 25 of getting something resolved quickly, would be -- I've

Page 53

1 sort of been thinking of it in terms of the way we
 2 approach accounting petitions, in that we sometimes will
 3 look at a matter that's in some ways complex in terms of
 4 the data, the accounting and what have you, and we
 5 basically put it on hold with the idea being that, well,
 6 the basic outline of things is thus in terms of
 7 jurisdiction and organization and approach, but we're
 8 not going to decide and don't need to decide at this
 9 juncture how this is all going to wash out in terms of
 10 treatment and rates.
 11 That's how we do it with deferred
 12 accounting, as you know. We put that prudence
 13 determination off to another day and, of course, the
 14 Company is at some risk in doing things like that.
 15 The Commission will decide, however, at a
 16 later date if and when and in what manner the Company
 17 will be allowed to recover, and to what degree the
 18 Company will be allowed to recover costs from general
 19 rate payers.
 20 So that's another area where there is, from
 21 my perspective at least, some flexibility in this whole
 22 process. The parties can decide, PSE in particular,
 23 just how far you need us to go as a Commission at this
 24 juncture.
 25 Obviously, the farther you wish us to go,

Page 54

1 the more complicated the process becomes, and perhaps
 2 the more protracted it becomes, particularly if there
 3 are disputes about the facts.
 4 But again, my sense is that you don't
 5 necessarily need to go that far at this juncture.
 6 MR. KUZMA: No. I think for Puget, the two
 7 issues were the petition, and remain that Puget would
 8 like to offer this as a regulated service pursuant to
 9 the contract filed. That's one issue. So that gets to
 10 the question of the jurisdiction, I think, that the
 11 Commission staff and Public Counsel have raised.
 12 And the second one is that we would agree
 13 upon a methodology for the allocation of costs and
 14 revenues similar to -- I think in the workshops we
 15 discussed, you know, Exhibit No. SEF-4 as maybe a
 16 framework for that. But those are the two issues that
 17 we filed and we still remain with that.
 18 As far as prudence costs, the actual costs,
 19 we don't have any actual costs right now -- well, we
 20 have some, but not -- you know, a small fraction of what
 21 they would be ultimately.
 22 JUDGE MOSS: Sure. Sure.
 23 MR. KUZMA: And so we understand that that
 24 will be for a later date.
 25 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. And I think, again, this

Page 55

1 is -- this is consistent with what I had understood that
 2 the Company's looking for at this juncture.
 3 And turning to the second issue there, the
 4 allocation of costs, even there, what -- as I understand
 5 it, what you're looking for is something fairly high
 6 level, which is to say the Commission is going to -- or
 7 doesn't have any plans to change the factors or the
 8 means or the bases upon which it typically allocates
 9 costs. Direct costs are directly assigned as a
 10 principle that we're all familiar with.
 11 And you apparently want something -- PSE
 12 wants something to give it a level of comfort that the
 13 Commission doesn't have something else cooking in the
 14 background that we're going to spring on the world
 15 full-blown from the head of Zeus.
 16 I guess I can't speak to that today, but I'm
 17 not really aware of anything going on like that. But if
 18 that's the sort of thing you're looking for, I think if
 19 the parties can be clear among themselves that that's
 20 what we're doing, and can present something in that way
 21 to the Commission that's demonstrating a common
 22 understanding, it will be a lot easier, then, for the
 23 Commission to put some stamp of approval on something
 24 like that. And so I would encourage you all to
 25 continue. I feel somewhat optimistic that you'll

Page 56

1 continue to make good progress.
 2 Now, in terms of what we should do going
 3 forward, I'm prepared to work with you to develop a
 4 schedule with various process steps and what have you,
 5 or if you wish, we can talk about some near term dates
 6 for you all to continue these discussions in whatever --
 7 the most useful and productive manner you can conceive.
 8 It sounds like the gatherings have been useful. You've
 9 had three. And I'm sure there's been a lot of
 10 communication outside of those as well.
 11 But what do the parties think? Mr. ffitch
 12 suggested we may want to go with a schedule. Mr. Brooks
 13 endorsed that idea.
 14 What does Staff think about that?
 15 MR. OSHIE: Well, your Honor, we are
 16 prepared to offer a schedule, and we've forwarded that
 17 to, I believe, Mr. ffitch at his request. So we were
 18 able to -- at least to circulate an option. And I don't
 19 know, Mr. Kuzma, if you have received a copy.
 20 MR. KUZMA: No.
 21 MR. OSHIE: And my apologies for that.
 22 So what Staff is looking at is a filing date
 23 for responsive testimony of the 15th of December 2015.
 24 PSE rebuttal filing would follow approximately 30 days
 25 later on the 15th of January 2016. There is a -- what

Page 57

1 Staff was proposing, then, would be a hearing on the
 2 merits and any other issues that would be scheduled for
 3 January 29th, 2016, so approximately two weeks later.
 4 And I know that Mr. ffitch has -- I think
 5 he'll, of course, raise his -- any issues he wishes to,
 6 but I know he has some concerns about a two-week
 7 turnaround for the hearing after rebuttal testimony is
 8 filed.
 9 We -- and we have left open the opportunity
 10 for -- you know, as to when a brief would be submitted
 11 to the Commission by the parties. And that's just a --
 12 we didn't -- at this point we don't have a suggested
 13 date, your Honor.
 14 JUDGE MOSS: Okay.
 15 And Mr. ffitch, any concerns about the
 16 schedule?
 17 MR. FFITCH: The only concern was alluded
 18 to. We felt that the two-week time period between
 19 rebuttal and hearing was a little tight, especially
 20 because the -- you know, typically there's a requirement
 21 to get the cross-exhibits to the bench and other parties
 22 a few days ahead of the hearing, so that means that
 23 there's only a week and a half to analyze the rebuttal
 24 and do discovery on it.
 25 So we would propose just moving the hearing

Page 58

1 date into the following week, and just allow a little
 2 bit more working time for the parties to get ready for
 3 the hearing and analyze rebuttal. Because sometimes
 4 rebuttal is pretty straightforward and other times
 5 there's -- you know, it takes some time to analyze and
 6 even does require you to do follow-up discovery, so --
 7 JUDGE MOSS: Well, Mr. Kuzma, I'll let you
 8 speak for the Company here, but I gathered from our
 9 earlier discussions that the end date is the more
 10 important consideration than any intervening dates. And
 11 so rather than move a hearing date back, I would be more
 12 inclined to move up the date for rebuttal testimony,
 13 compressing your time for that.
 14 If this is something we're going to work
 15 with -- now, of course, I want to hear from you
 16 generally on this as well. Perhaps I should first hear
 17 from Mr. Brooks and ask if he's had an opportunity to
 18 think about the schedule.
 19 MR. BROOKS: We have, your Honor, and the
 20 dates work. I think that Public Counsel's approach of
 21 having a little bit more time between rebuttal and the
 22 hearing makes sense, and we were kind of going where you
 23 were, which was, well, let's just move the rebuttal up a
 24 week earlier.
 25 And I don't want to ruin Mr. Kuzma's -- all

Page 59

1 of his holidays, but like you said, we understand the
 2 end date might be the more important one.
 3 JUDGE MOSS: All right.
 4 Now, Mr. Kuzma, let me hear from the Company
 5 on this.
 6 MR. KUZMA: Well, I think from the Company's
 7 perspective, I don't know in this proceeding whether the
 8 traditional rebuttal testimony, responsive testimony
 9 hearing is necessarily the most effective way of
 10 proceeding.
 11 In my mind, there's -- from what I've heard
 12 from other parties, a lot of it has to do with policy
 13 issues. Puget has filed for a regulated service.
 14 Parties are welcome to take whatever position they have
 15 with respect to that filing, but that's the only --
 16 that's the only option that's before the Commission at
 17 this time.
 18 And if it becomes an issue of whether the
 19 Commission has jurisdiction and then if it does have it,
 20 if it should then offer to take that jurisdiction,
 21 that's something that doesn't need to have a hearing or
 22 testimony. That's more of a legal issue with policy
 23 basis that could be addressed through maybe a filing of,
 24 you know, statement of facts and law followed up with
 25 some briefing on the issue.

Page 60

1 Particularly, you know, in my mind, I don't
 2 think, you know, there's a lot of facts to be in
 3 dispute. I mean, we've submitted budgets as far as what
 4 the costs will look like, but we admit that those costs
 5 will differ, hopefully lower, but at this time we
 6 just -- that's the best information we have.
 7 And we understand that a lot of the prudence
 8 issues, which had been somewhat a part of the discussion
 9 so far, you know, that will be, and is better addressed
 10 at a later time when we actually are asking to put this
 11 into rates.
 12 JUDGE MOSS: Well, I'm inclined to be
 13 sympathetic to your view, Mr. Kuzma. It does sound to me
 14 certainly that the dominant issues that have been
 15 identified at this stage are not factual issues, that
 16 they're policy and legal issues.
 17 Now, I'm hearkening back to an earlier
 18 period of time, around the 2000/2001 timeframe, and we
 19 had a lot of merger and acquisition activity. We've had
 20 cases from time to time since then of the same nature.
 21 In the early telecommunications merger
 22 cases, we had at least two, maybe three that raised
 23 these sorts of threshold jurisdictional issues, and what
 24 we did in those cases was to take those up first. And
 25 we had a round of briefing, and everybody was able to

Page 61

1 express their views and their desired outcomes and what
 2 have you, and the Commission ruled on that and then we
 3 moved forward.
 4 Because, of course, if we had disposed of
 5 those in certain ways, everybody would have gone away
 6 and enjoyed their holidays as opposed to, you know,
 7 making me sit here and write orders during the holidays,
 8 which seems to be my fate in life.
 9 But what about -- what if we do that, what
 10 if we have a preliminary date, an early date, I would
 11 think, by which we'll either have a common position on
 12 this based on further discussions among the parties, or
 13 we'll have the parties brief their respective positions
 14 and we can decide that in the nature of a summary
 15 judgment? I see some heads nodding affirmance.
 16 MR. KUZMA: I think from Puget's
 17 perspective, that would be preferable. I think at this
 18 time, if we were to get an order stating that there
 19 isn't jurisdiction of the Commission, or the Commission
 20 has jurisdiction but would rather not -- would rather
 21 not exercise it, then that may -- that might -- that
 22 might raise into question the project itself, and there
 23 may not be need at that time to continue, or there still
 24 might be an opportunity to address some of the issues.
 25 JUDGE MOSS: Sure.

Page 62

1 MR. KUZMA: So I think that would be a
 2 preferable -- a preferable goal for Puget.
 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. I could see some sense
 4 in that. And, you know, we can -- we can acknowledge
 5 that, if it becomes necessary, if we get past these
 6 threshold issues in one manner or another, it could be
 7 necessary still to have some development of a record.
 8 Perhaps that could be by stipulated evidence. Perhaps
 9 it would have to be by contested hearing. That's -- we
 10 can't know for sure.
 11 But certainly that's a fairly efficient way
 12 to proceed. If we have those sorts of goals in mind,
 13 then we can bring the thing forward for obviously a
 14 quicker decision by the Commission if the Commission can
 15 just operate on the basis, ideally stipulated facts, or
 16 a few contested facts that can be worked out in a brief
 17 hearing.
 18 And we can -- you know, if -- if things can
 19 be boiled down to a fairly simple set of disputes, or
 20 none, of course, then we can think about just doing a
 21 live hearing and not having all the pretrial testimony
 22 and so forth. We've done that before, too. And you
 23 know, from my perspective, it's kind of fun, and it
 24 means I get to do a lot more in the hearing room.
 25 But putting that aside, it's fun -- my fun

Page 63

1 not being the goal here -- I think -- what would be an
 2 early date we can think of in terms of a target, if you
 3 will, for the parties to either compose their
 4 differences, legal and policy differences or agree to
 5 disagree, what sort of timeframe? Today is, what, the
 6 13th day of October?
 7 MR. OSHIE: We have -- I believe that our
 8 reply brief in the Avista rate case is due on the 5th of
 9 November.
 10 JUDGE MOSS: Okay.
 11 MR. OSHIE: Fourth or fifth. I'd have to
 12 check on that, your Honor. Both Mr. Shearer and I are
 13 working on that matter.
 14 JUDGE MOSS: Okay.
 15 MR. OSHIE: And so -- excuse me. The
 16 initial brief is due then.
 17 JUDGE MOSS: The initial brief?
 18 MR. OSHIE: Yeah. So we would like to be
 19 able to -- I mean, you know, in the best of all worlds,
 20 we would like to focus on that. I mean, it's really
 21 the -- it's the -- it's a matter that we've been working
 22 on now for a very -- well, a very long time, which is
 23 typical of rate cases.
 24 And so we would -- we've also been devoting
 25 our attention to this matter. I think if we could have

Page 64

1 at least a couple of weeks after that brief. We're
 2 obligated to file that brief. That would at least give
 3 us some time to continue to work on this while we can,
 4 and then produce a product that we'd like to have
 5 submitted to the Commission.
 6 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. So that would suggest to
 7 me sometime around November 20th or thereafter, within a
 8 few days.
 9 MR. OSHIE: That would be acceptable.
 10 JUDGE MOSS: I don't have a calendar in
 11 front of me and my computer's acting up. It's just not
 12 a Saturday or a Sunday, is it?
 13 MR. FFITCH: It's a Friday, your Honor.
 14 That's a Friday.
 15 JUDGE MOSS: The 20th is?
 16 MR. FFITCH: The 20th.
 17 JUDGE MOSS: Is that a good day for people?
 18 How does that sound as a target date for that first
 19 step?
 20 MR. KUZMA: Would that be a simultaneous
 21 brief?
 22 JUDGE MOSS: I think so, yeah.
 23 MR. KUZMA: And then just the one round?
 24 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah.
 25 MR. KUZMA: Okay.

Page 65

1 JUDGE MOSS: I mean, these sorts of issues
 2 don't really need -- I mean, unless something comes
 3 really out of left field, in which case you can always
 4 ask leave to file a reply, if necessary.
 5 MR. KUZMA: Right.
 6 JUDGE MOSS: So let's -- let's -- okay.
 7 We'll include the date November 20th as a target for
 8 dealing with threshold issues. I'm just going to put
 9 that in my notes. I'll write something a little more
 10 eloquent in the order.
 11 And then do we -- do you wish to set dates
 12 for further conferences among yourselves, or do you want
 13 to just do that outside of this process? I mean, we can
 14 either do it in here and I can make it part of a
 15 procedural schedule, or you can decide among yourselves
 16 how you want to do it, if you want to do it.
 17 MR. KUZMA: I think Puget would like to do
 18 it. I know Commission staff had suggested that would be
 19 a good idea as far as to bring up some of these issues
 20 at a later time when they had some of the Avista
 21 briefing either done or close to done. I'm indifferent
 22 as to whether it's in an order or not.
 23 MR. SCHOOLEY: I'd like the flexibility of
 24 having us decide on our own. That would be my --
 25 MR. KUZMA: It's fine with Puget. I think

Page 66

1 we would like to have it, whether it be informal or --
 2 that's fine.
 3 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah.
 4 MR. FFITCH: I agree that we -- we are happy
 5 to participate. It's -- I can't -- I don't know that I
 6 can recommend specific dates right now. It's probably
 7 easier to work out.
 8 JUDGE MOSS: That makes sense to me.
 9 Mr. Brooks, do you have any strong feelings
 10 about it?
 11 MR. BROOKS: I don't. We'll participate and
 12 we can work out the dates.
 13 JUDGE MOSS: Yeah. Well, you know, as --
 14 it's not always the case, but in this case everyone
 15 seems to be playing good together in the sandbox. And I
 16 think we'll leave it to your own devices, then, to
 17 schedule these things and work out what works best for
 18 you all considering your other obligations.
 19 And if it -- I'm not anticipating problems.
 20 Everybody seems to be working cooperatively together,
 21 which is always my goal. It's nice to see it. It's
 22 rare enough. And I hope -- I want to encourage you all
 23 to continue that, because I do think you can make your
 24 best possible progress and your best possible outcome by
 25 doing that.

Page 67

1 So I had to remark the other day that --
 2 Melinda Davidson was letting me know she was going to
 3 cease practicing before the Commission and retire, and I
 4 was -- she gave me a nice compliment, and I said, well,
 5 I'm quite expert at making everyone unhappy. And that's
 6 not what I like to do, though. I would much prefer to
 7 be putting the Commission stamp of approval on something
 8 that makes everyone happy, so let's keep that goal in
 9 mind.
 10 I would like -- I think I will take a copy
 11 of the schedule from you, Mr. Oshie, and I'll toy with
 12 some way to present this in a prehearing order that will
 13 give a good sense of what we're trying to accomplish
 14 here today without upsetting anybody and -- but I think
 15 it is useful to have a structure.
 16 And so I'll work with these dates a little
 17 bit, consistent with what else we're planning here, and
 18 maybe I'll do some things with it in terms of timing
 19 that will lend further encouragement to the process.
 20 MR. KUZMA: So your Honor, on that note, I
 21 noted that they said January 15th, so we would
 22 presumably have an order sometime before then on the
 23 jurisdictional issue, if that is still an issue;
 24 otherwise, there might not be a need for the -- I mean,
 25 how do you --

Page 68

1 JUDGE MOSS: Right. I would anticipate, you
 2 know -- what I'm -- again, what we're hoping for on
 3 November the 20th is either you all present something or
 4 let me know that you're about to present something that
 5 exhibits a common understanding on these issues, or
 6 you're going to present briefing on that, and I would
 7 anticipate being able to turn that around pretty
 8 quickly. So I don't want to suggest a date right
 9 here -- sitting right here --
 10 MR. KUZMA: Right.
 11 JUDGE MOSS: -- without the commissioners'
 12 schedules in front of me and so forth. But I would
 13 certainly think by the middle of December --
 14 MR. KUZMA: Okay. Thank you.
 15 JUDGE MOSS: -- we would be able to
 16 accomplish something in that way.
 17 MR. KUZMA: Okay.
 18 JUDGE MOSS: And then we'll know where to go
 19 from there. And that will almost undoubtedly require
 20 some further tweaking to scheduling. I understand that.
 21 And you all understand that, too.
 22 But I think Mr. ffitich's earlier comment
 23 about having some structure here is well-taken, and we
 24 should probably go with that. So -- and I appreciate
 25 the fact that you all developed this earlier. Thank

Page 69

1 you.
 2 All right. Anything else we need to
 3 discuss? Any other questions? Concerns? Mr. ffitich?
 4 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, just in terms of
 5 the schedule dates, we did check with our consultant,
 6 and the consultant was available for that hearing date
 7 and the following week.
 8 JUDGE MOSS: The hearing on the 29th?
 9 MR. FFITCH: Yes, and also the following
 10 week if that -- if it got shifted back. So I guess I
 11 would just have a modest concern if there were major
 12 changes to the schedule that I don't know if our
 13 consultant's available or not, and that may apply for
 14 other folks, too.
 15 JUDGE MOSS: Well, and everyone has to
 16 understand that we all have to exhibit a certain degree
 17 of flexibility, and if things change and people bring
 18 that to my attention, then I'll fix it.
 19 We don't want to cut anyone off from their
 20 rights. We want to do the best possible job we can in
 21 terms of being efficient in managing these cases, but we
 22 also understand that people have other things going on,
 23 and so we'll accommodate the parties' needs.
 24 MR. FFITCH: Thank you.
 25 JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Anything else?

Page 70

1 MR. OSHIE: Not from Staff, your Honor.
 2 JUDGE MOSS: Okay.
 3 MR. KUZMA: Fine.
 4 JUDGE MOSS: All right. Well, thank you all
 5 very much for being here today, and I compliment you on
 6 your efforts thus far and encourage them to continue.
 7 MR. KUZMA: Thank you.
 8 JUDGE MOSS: We're off the record.
 9 (Hearing concluded at 2:18 p.m.)
 10
 11 -o0o-
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
COUNTY OF KING)

I, ANITA W. SELF, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify
that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to
the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
and seal this 21ST day of October, 2015.

ANITA W. SELF, RPR, CCR #3032