Docket No. UE-200980 - Vol. III

WUTC v. Puget Sound Energy

April 22, 2021



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

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



Docket No. UE-200980 - Vol. III - 4/22/2021

Page 53
APPEARANCES BY VIDEOCONFERENCE CONTINUED: FOR THE PETITIONER/ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS: Brent Coleman
Alliance of Western Energy Consumers Alliance of Western Energy Consumers Image: Alliance of Western Energy Consumers Image: Alliance of Western Energy Consumers Portland, OR 97201 5 503.241.7242 Blc@dvclaw.com FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: T Lisa Gafken 8 Office of the Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 9 Seattle, WA 98104-3188 206.464.6595 10 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov 11 ALSO PRESENT: 12 Chairman Dave Danner Commissioner Ann Randall 13 Commissioner Jay Balasbas 14 Susan Free (By telephone) Jing Liu 15 William Einstein Lance Kaufman 16 Jon Piliaris Stephanie Chase 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
24 25
Page 54
1 INDEX Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission vs. 2 Puget Sound Energy No. UE-200980 Volume III 3 April 22, 2021 4 5 EXHIBITS 6 PUGET SOUND ENERGY 7 KSJ-1T 7 KSJ-1T 8 KSJ-2 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS 10 SEF-1 11 Direct Testimony of Susan E. Free (43 pages) 12 SEF-2 13 The 2015 PCA Settlement 14 SEF-4 15 SEF-5 16 SEF-6 17 SEF-7 18 SEF-8 19 SEF-7 10 SEF-7 11 NULL 12 SEF-7 13 The 2015 PCA Settlement 14 SEF-7 15 SEF-7 16 SEF-7 17 Power Cost Baseline Rate 17 SEF-8

1 (Pages 51 to 54)

		Daga	EE		Dogo 57	
		Page	22		Page 57	
1 2	EXHIBITS CONTINUED SEF-14 Updated Revenue (Surplus) Deficiency 2020 PCORC Compared to 2019 GRC			1 2 3	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS PKW-1CT Direct Testimony of Paul K. Wetherbee PKW-2 Professional Qualifications of Paul Wetherbee	
3	SEF-15 Updated Summary & Detail of Adjustments			4	PKW-3C Summary of PSE's Proposed Power Costs in Comparison with Power Costs in the 2019 GRC	
4	SEF-16 Updated Exhibit A-1 Power Cost Baseline Rate			5 6	Final Order PKW-4C Memo Summarizing Analysis & Decision to Enter	
5 6	2020 PCORC SEF-17 Updated Power Cost Baseline Rate Comparison			7	Energy Keepers Power Purchase Agreement	
7	2020 Power cost-only rate Case Original Filing vs. 2019 GRC				PKW-5C EMC Slides Presenting Energy Keepers Proposal	
8	PSE-1J Joint Testimony in support of Settlement Agreement (17 pages)			8 9	and Recommendation to Submit Offer PKW-6 EMC Slides for Renewal of 23 MW BPA Transmission Contract from Mid-C	
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS			10	PKW-7C C Slides for Renewal of 100 MW BPA	
10 11	BDJ-1T Direct Testimony (14 pages)			11	Transmission, Contract from Centralia & 94 MW BPA Transmission, Contract from Garrison, MT	
	BDJ-2 Professional Qualifications of Birud D. Jhaveri			12	PKW-8C Memo Summarizing Analysis and Decision to	
12	BDJ-3 Temperature Adjustment			13	Acquire 50 MW BPA Contract for Transmission	
13	BDJ-4 Production Factor			14	From Garrison, MT	
14	BDJ-5 Schedule 139 Green Direct Demand Portion of			15	PKW-9C EMC Slids for New 50 MW BPA Transmission Contract from Garrison, MT	
15 16	Power Costs in PCA Baseline Rate BDJ-6 Calculation of Schedule 95 Rates			16	PKW-10 EMC Slids for new 75 MW BPA Transmission Contract from Lower Snake River Beginning	
17	BDJ-7 Schedule 142 Decoupling Mechanism Fixed Power Cost Allowed Revenue & Revenue per Unit Rates			17 18	in 2024 PKW-11C Summary to Rate-Year Power Costs by Resource	
18	BDJ-8 Rate Impacts			19 20	PKW-12C Monthly Detail of Costs & Energy Produced by Aurora	
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS				PKW-13C Summary of the Rate Year Costs Not in Aurora	
20	WTE-1CT Direct Testimony (17 pages)			21	PKW-14C Rate Year Resources Input Summary	
21	WTE-2 Professional Qualifications of William Einstein			22	PKW-15C Gas Mark-to-Model and Open Transport Value	
22	WTE-3C Skookumchuck Amended & Restated			23	PKW-16C Monthly Market Gas & Power Prices	
23 24	Power Purchase Agreement WTE-4C Lund Hill Amended Power Purchase Agreement			24	PKW-17C Fixed Gas-for-Power Transportation Costs	
25	WTE-5 2017 Request for Proposal for Renewable Energy			25		
		Page	56		Page 58	
1 2	EXHIBITS CONTINUED WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy	Page	56	1 2	EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind	
2 3	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable	Page	56		EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs	
2 3 4	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy	Page	56	2	EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind	
2 3 4 5	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results	Page	56	2 3 4	EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs	
2 3 4 5 6	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results	Page	56	2 3 4 5	EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs	
2 3 4 5 6 7	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are 	
2 3 4 5 6	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda	Page	56	2 3 4 5	EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs	
2 3 5 7 8 9	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages)	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C T Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-9HC RFI Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4L 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-9HC RFI Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-1 Professional Qualifications of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT CLS-1 HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-22C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental Filing PKW-29C Power Costs Not in Aurora - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental PKW-29C Power Costs Not in Aurora - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document CLS-6HC Presentations Made to PSE's Energy Management All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-33C Mid Columbia Contracts Costs - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-8 PSE'S Revised 2019 IRP Progress Report 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental PKW-29C Power Costs Not in Aurora - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-5HC 2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-8 PSE'S Revised 2019 IRP Progress Report CLS-9C SPI Biomass PPA (Project ID#18100) 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-27C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-33C Mid Columbia Contracts Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-34C Fixed Gas for Power Transportation Costs - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-6HC 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-8 PSE'S Revised 2019 IRP Progress Report CLS-9C SPI Biomass PPA (Project ID#18100) CLS-10C BPA Peak Capacity Product (Project ID#18161) 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental PKW-20C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental PKW-32C Rate Year Power Transportation Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-34C Fixed Gas for Power Transportation Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-33C Day Ahead Wind Integration Costs - Supplemental PKW-35C Day Ahead Wind Integration Costs - Supplemental 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 WTE-6 2015 Request for Information for Renewable Energy WTE-7HC RFI Submission Results WTE-8HC RFP Submission Results WTE-9HC Green Direct EMC Presentations WTE-10C Power Purchase Agreement Approval Memoranda CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS CLS-1HCT Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages) CLS-2 Professional Qualifications of Cindy Song CLS-3 2017 IRP Document CLS-4 2018 All Resources RFP Document CLS-6HC Presentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-7HC Presentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFP CLS-8 PSE'S Revised 2019 IRP Progress Report CLS-9C SPI Biomass PPA (Project ID#18100) CLS-10C BPA Peak Capacity Product (Project ID#18161) CLS-11 WSPP Master Agreement 	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 3&4 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-27C Rate Year Power Costs by Resource - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental PKW-29C Power Costs Not in Aurora - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental PKW-33C Mid Columbia Contracts Costs - Supplemental PKW-33C Mid Columbia Contracts Costs - Supplemental PKW-34C Fixed Gas for Power Transportation Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-35C Day Ahead Wind Integration Costs - Supplemental PKW-36C Distallate Fuel Incremental Costs - Supplemental Filing 	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	WTE-62015 Request for Information for Renewable EnergyWTE-7HCRFI Submission ResultsWTE-8HCRFP Submission ResultsWTE-9HCGreen Direct EMC PresentationsWTE-10CPower Purchase Agreement Approval MemorandaCROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITSCLS-1HCTDirect Testimony of Cindy L. Song (81 pages)CLS-2Professional Qualifications of Cindy SongCLS-32017 IRP DocumentCLS-42018 All Resources RFP DocumentCLS-5HC2018 All Resources RFP Eval. Process DocumentCLS-6HCPresentations made to PSE's Energy Management Committee Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFPCLS-7HCPresentations Made to PSE's Board of Directors Subsequent to Phase 2 of the 2018 All Resources RFPCLS-8PSE'S Revised 2019 IRP Progress ReportCLS-9CSPI Biomass PPA (Project ID#18100)CLS-10CBPA Peak Capacity Product (Project ID#18161)CLS-11WSPP Master AgreementCLS-12CMSCG System PPA (Project ID#UP006)	Page	56	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 EXHIBITS CONTINUED PKW-18C Calculation of Rte Year Day-Ahead Wind Integration Costs PKW-19C Transmission Contract Costs PKW-20C Contract Costs of Mid-C Hydro Resources PKW-21C Distillate Fuel Incremental Costs PKW-22C Adjustment to Remove None-Fuel Costs that are Included in Aurora's Peaker Start Costs PKW-23C Colstrip Units 384 Fixed Fuel Costs PKW-24 Other Power Costs Chargeable to FERC Acct. 557 PKW-25CT Supplemental Direct Testimony (9 pages) PKW-26C Rate Year Power Costs - Supplemental Filing PKW-28C Aurora Costs and Energy Outputs - Supplemental PKW-29C Power Costs Not in Aurora - Supplemental Filing PKW-30C Market Energy Proces - Supplemental Filing PKW-31C Gas Mark to Model & Open Transport Value - Supplemental Filing PKW-32C Rate Year Transmission Costs - Supplemental PKW-32C Day Ahead Wind Integration Costs - Supplemental PKW-36C Distallate Fuel Incremental Costs - 	

2 (Pages 55 to 58)

		Dama (1
	Page 59	Page 61
1		1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Thursday, April 22, 2021,
2 3	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS RJR-1CT Direct Testimony of Robert J. Roberts (27 pgs.)	2 at 12:00 p.m. the videoconference Zoom settlement hearing
4	RJR-2 Professional Qualifications	 was taken before ChaRae Kent, Certified Court Reporter and Devictored Professional Department The following
5	RJR-3 Colstrip Units 3 and 4, Ownership & Operations Agreement	4 Registered Professional Reporter. The following
6	ů –	5 proceedings took place: 6
7	RJR-4C Coal Supply Agreement dated as of 12/5/2019	7 PROCEEDINGS
/	RJR-5C Presentation to the PSE Energy Management	8 JUDGE HOWARD: Today is Thursday, April 22nd at 12
8	Committee, 7/23/2019 re: Development of Coal	 9 noon. We're here today for a settlement hearing in Docket
9	Supply Contract Negotiations	10 UE-200980 which is captioned: Washington Utilities and
	RJR-6C Presentation to the PSE Energy Management	11 Transportation Commission versus Puget Sound Energy. My
10	Committee, 8/29/2019, regarding the Coal Supply Agreement	12 name is Michael Howard. I'm an administrative law judge
11	Agreement	13 with the commission. I'm joined today by Chair Dave
10	RJR-7C Summary of PSE's Analysis of the Alternate	14 Danner, Commissioner Ann Randall, and Commissioner Jay
12 13	Agreement Between Westmoreland & Talen, MT RJR-8 Summary of Test Year Production O&M Expense	15 Balasbas.
14	RJR-9 Summary of Rate Year Production O&M Expenses	16 Let's start by taking short appearances beginning
15	RJR-10 Summary of the Adjustments to Test Year Production O&M Expense in Calculating the Rate	17 with the company.
16	Year Production O&M Expense	18 MS. CARSON: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Sheree
17 18	RJR-11C Comparison of Major Maintenance of O&M Expense RJR-12 Comparison of Hydroelectric Production	19 Strom Carson with Perkins Coie, representing Puget Sound
10	RJR-12 Comparison of Wind Production O&M Expense	 20 Energy. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we have an
20		22 appearance for staff.
21 22		23 MR. DALLAS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Joe
23		24 Dallas, Assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission
24 25		25 staff.
	Page 60	
	Page 60	Page 62
1		
1 2	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF	Page 62 1 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. 2 MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS	1 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.
	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages)	 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL	 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public
2 3	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS	 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for the Energy Project.
2 3 4 5	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages)	 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for the Energy Project. MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon
2 3 4 5 6	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS	 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for the Energy Project. MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.
2 3 4 5	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages)	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip20you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip20you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for21bringing that up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip20you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for21bringing that up.22MR. COLEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip20you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for21bringing that up.22MR. COLEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.23JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So on the issue 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	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1 JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel. 2 MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken, 3 Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public 4 counsel. 5 JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for 6 the Energy Project. 7 MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon 8 Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project. 9 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 10 So on the issue of the evidence and testimony 11 submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to 12 the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony 13 up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits? 14 MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may. 15 Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on 16 behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was 17 a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion, 18 so. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip 10 you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for 21 bringing that up. 22 MR. COLEM
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBITS COMMISSION REGULATORY STAFF JL-1T Testimony of Jing Liu (27 pages) PUBLIC COUNSEL SKC-1T Testimony of Stephanie K. Chase (5 pages) ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS LDK-1T Testimony of Lance D. Kaufman (5 pages) LDK-2 Curriculum Vitae THE ENERGY PROJECT	1JUDGE HOWARD: And public counsel.2MS. GAFKEN: Good afternoon. This is Lisa Gafken,3Assistant Attorney General appearing on behalf of public4counsel.5JUDGE HOWARD: And could we have an appearance for6the Energy Project.7MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Simon8Ffitch appearing on behalf of the Energy Project.9JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.10So on the issue of the evidence and testimony11submitted so far, are the parties willing to stipulate to12the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits and testimony13up to and including the settlement testimony and exhibits?14MR. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I apologize, if I may.15Brent Coleman here, I would like to make an appearance on16behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I was17a little late joining in on the pre-meeting discussion,18so.19JUDGE HOWARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Coleman. Did I skip20you in my run down there? I apologize. Thank you for21bringing that up.22MR. COLEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.23JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So on the issue of the

3 (Pages 59 to 62)

	Page 63		Page 65
1	including the settlement and testimony and exhibits? I	1	The commission has said that it favors settlements if
2	would turn first to the company.	2	they are lawful and consistent with the public interest.
3	MS. CARSON: PSE has no objection and would like to	3	That is the case here and I'm going to point to a few
4	see those exhibits and testimony stipulated into the	4	aspects of the settlement that demonstrate that.
5	record.	5	First, this settlement, like all power cost-only rate
6	JUDGE HOWARD: And staff.	6	cases, allows for the power cost baseline rate to be reset
7	MR. DALLAS: Staff has no objection.	7	to more accurately reflect the power cost and load that
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Public council.	8	will be in affect during the rate year. This is important
9	MS. GAFKEN: Public counsel has no objection and	9	because it mitigates the risk of surcharges in the future.
10	would also stipulate to the admission of all the testimony	10	Second and relatedly, this PCORC, like all other
11	and exhibits.	11	PCORCs, allows new resources, PPAs, transmission
12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And AWEC.	12	contracts, to go into rates and be determined to be
13	MR. COLEMAN: AWEC has no objection and would	13	prudent. No party objects to the prudence of the
14	stipulate. Thank you, Your Honor.	14	resources that PSE has presented in the case and PSE has
15	JUDGE HOWARD: And could we get The Energy Project's	15	provided substantial testimony and evidence supporting the
16	position.	16	prudence. We respectfully ask that the commission approve
17	MR. FFITCH: Energy Project has no objection and	17	the prudence of these resources.
18	agrees to stipulation of the exhibits.	18	These power purchase agreements and transmission
19	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, all. Then all the	19	contracts are important because they address the capacity
20	pre-filed exhibits and testimony are admitted and I'll	20	shortfall that's resulted from the closure of cold strip
21	provide a copy of the exhibit list to the court reporter	21	units 1 and 2 and they also bring in new renewable energy
22	so it can be made part of the record.	22	into PSE's portfolio consistent with statutory mandates.
23	(All pre-filed exhibits and testimony are admitted.)	23	Third, the settlement is in the public interest
24	JUDGE HOWARD: Next we will turn to opening	24	because it increases the low-income assistance. It
25	statements and we will be allowing the parties an	25	increases it to double the base rate of the residential
	Page 64		Раде бб
1			
1 2	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the	1	customer increase in this case.
2	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy.	2	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that
	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner,	2 3	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one
2 3	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas.	2	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement
2 3 4	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this	2 3 4	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy
2 3 4 5	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case.	2 3 4 5	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also
2 3 4 5 6	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this	2 3 4 5 6	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy
2 3 4 5 6 7	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It	2 3 4 5 6 7	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work papers. The parties engaged in discovery and in March,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the commission approve the settlement as filed, without conditions. Again, it's carefully negotiated, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work papers. The parties engaged in discovery and in March, the parties participated in a settlement conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the commission approve the settlement as filed, without conditions. Again, it's carefully negotiated, it represents the interests of PSE, its residential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work papers. The parties engaged in discovery and in March, the parties participated in a settlement conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the commission approve the settlement as filed, without conditions. Again, it's carefully negotiated, it represents the interests of PSE, its residential customers, its low-income customers, its commercial and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work papers. The parties engaged in discovery and in March, the parties participated in a settlement conference. Shortly before responsive testimony was due, the settling parties reached a settlement in principal. That's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the conditions. Again, it's carefully negotiated, it represents the interests of PSE, its residential customers, its low-income customers, its commercial and industrial customers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opportunity to make an opening statement in support of the settlement. I would turn first to Puget Sound Energy. MS. CARSON: Thank you, Judge Howard, Chair Danner, Commissioner Randall, and Commissioner Balasbas. Thank you for the opportunity to present this settlement agreement for PSE's power cost only-rate case. This settlement is a full multi-party settlement. It is not opposed by any party, although public counsel has not joined in the settlement and the settlement is a carefully negotiated package. It reflects give and take from all parties and we ask that the commission approve the settlement without conditions. PSE filed this power cost-only rate case back in December in a manner consistent with past PCORCs. In recognition of the fact that PCORCs are to be expedited rate proceedings with the decision issued in six months, PSE held a technical conference in January. The technical conference parties had the opportunity to ask questions and PSE walked through its testimony, exhibits, and work papers. The parties engaged in discovery and in March, the parties participated in a settlement conference.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	customer increase in this case. Fourth, this settlement addresses some issues that the parties have grappled with for quite a while and one of these is the green direct program. The settlement provides for a compromise in this case on the energy credit for green direct customers. But parties also recognize that there's more work to do on this and so it allows for a collaborative process to set up a durable consistent method for calculating the green direct credit in the future; and all stakeholders will be able to participate in this. And finally, it's important to recognize that this settlement represents a significant compromise for PSE on the revenue request that it made in its filing. The settlement is approximately \$23 million less than the revenue that PSE filed for and projected that would be needed to serve customers with the power in the rate year. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the commission approve the settlement as filed, without conditions. Again, it's carefully negotiated, it represents the interests of PSE, its residential customers, its low-income customers, its commercial and

4 (Pages 63 to 66)

1the commission's questioning; Susan Free, Jon Piliaris, and William Einstein. Thank you.1paying their proportional share of PSE's fixed cost.3JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms, Carson. I would now turn to staff for their opening statement.3Second, the energy credit is adjusted from 75 percent5MR. DALLAS: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has stated any opposition to the settlement, although public ecoursel did not join the settlement.1Second, the energy credit is adjusted from 75 percent of the total power cost rate to a 100 percent of the variable cost rate. Staff believe that this adjustment closely reflects the actual avoided cost of green direct customers having their own dedicated PPAs. However, this settlement that are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made.1paying their proportional share of PSE's fixed cost.10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement.1be a collaborative where all interested parties are invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with this rate-making principal.11I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the settlement thar are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made.112First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has incurred increased variable fuel cost.113I well briefly discuss conting the form of new and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.114PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the	Page 67	Page 69
2 and William Einstein. Thank you. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Carson. I would now 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Carson. I would now 4 4 turn to staff for their opening statement. 5 5 MR. DALLAS: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you 6 6 Know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this 7 7 docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has 7 8 stated any opposition to the settlement, although public 8 9 counsel did not join the settlement is 6 10 480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is 7 11 consistent with law and the public interest and therefore 9 invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be 13 I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the 10 changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with 14 settlement that are important to staff, but try not to 14 transmission rate, and also establishes another 15 reiterate the points PSE just made. 12 Lastly, this settlement 16 First, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's 16 transmission rate, and also establishes another 16<	the commission's questioning: Susan Free, Jon Piliaris,	1 paying their proportional share of PSE's fixed cost.
3 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Carson. I would now 3 of the total power cost rate to a 100 percent of the 4 turn to staff for their opening statement. 4 variable cost rate. Staff believe that this adjustment 5 MR. DALLAS: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you 5 closely reflects the actual avoided cost of green direct 6 know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this 6 customers having their own dedicated PPAs. However, this 7 docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has 7 settlement provides that after this proceeding, there will 8 stated any opposition to the settlement. Pursuant to WAC 9 invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be 10 480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement. 10 charged again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with 11 consistent with law and the public interest and therefore 11 this rate-making principal. 12 requests that the commission approve the settlement. 12 Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable 14 settlement that are important to staff, but try not to 14 transmission rate, and also establishes another 15 reiterate the points PSE just made. 17 In conclusion, staff believe that		
4 turn to staff for their opening statement. 4 variable cost rate. Staff believe that this adjustment 5 MR. DALLAS: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you 5 closely reflects the actual avoided cost of green direct 6 know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this 5 customers having their own dedicated PPAs. However, this 7 docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has 7 settlement provides that after this proceeding, there will 8 stated any opposition to the settlement. Pursuant to WAC 9 invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be 10 480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is 10 changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with 11 consistent with law and the public interest and therefore 11 this rate-making principal. 13 I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the 13 outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA 14 settlement that are important to staff, but try not to 14 transmission cast, increased 15 reiterate the points PSE just made. 15 collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas 16 First, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's 16 Iransconons. 19<	-	
6know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this67docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has68stated any opposition to the settlement, although public89counsel did not join the settlement.Puester this settlement is10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is1011consistent with law and the public interest and therefore1112requests that the commission approve the settlement.1213I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the1314settlement that are important to staff, but try not to1415reiterate the points PSE just made.16First, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new18and renewed PPAs, increased variable fuel cost.19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's21requests tha tate increase will be mitigated to22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase	-	4 variable cost rate. Staff believe that this adjustment
7docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has stated any opposition to the settlement, although public 97settlement provides that after this proceeding, there will 88stated any opposition to the settlement. 10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is consistent with law and the public interest and therefore 1210480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is consistent with law and the public interest and therefore 121010changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with this rate-making principal. 12131 will briefly discuss some of the terms within the settlement that are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made. 1611Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA transmission rate, and also establishes another collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas transactions.16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost. 1911In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-740 the because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased 2021requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to 2223Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to 2323Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to 2423Nevertheless the percentage increase as the increase23Nevertheless this rate increase as the help program will 25242524PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the he	5 MR. DALLAS: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you	5 closely reflects the actual avoided cost of green direct
8stated any opposition to the settlement, although public89counsel did not join the settlement.Pursuant to WAC10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is1011consistent with law and the public interest and therefore1112requests that the commission approve the settlement.1213I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the1314settlement that are important to staff, but try not to1415reiterate the points PSE just made.1516First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has1617incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new1718and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased1819gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.1920\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.2123Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to2324PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will2425be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase23	know, a full multi-party settlement was filed for this	6 customers having their own dedicated PPAs. However, this
9counsel did not join the settlement.9invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is10changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with11consistent with law and the public interest and therefore10this rate-making principal.12requests that the commission approve the settlement.12Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable13I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the13Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable14settlement that are important to staff, but try not to14transmission rate, and also establishes another15reiterate the points PSE just made.15collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has16In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.10In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission approve the settlement. And today we do have24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefo	7 docket on April 2nd. No party to this proceeding has	7 settlement provides that after this proceeding, there will
10480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is consistent with law and the public interest and therefore requests that the commission approve the settlement.10changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with this rate-making principal.13I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the settlement that are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made.10Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA transmission rate, and also establishes another collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas transactions.16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.11In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-740 because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased trequested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to \$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.12In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-740 because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to 2423that the commission will have to address in future proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	3 stated any opposition to the settlement, although public	8 be a collaborative where all interested parties are
11consistent with law and the public interest and therefore11this rate-making principal.12requests that the commission approve the settlement.12Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable13I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the13outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA14settlement that are important to staff, but try not to14transmission rate, and also establishes another15reiterate the points PSE just made.15collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has16transactions.17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new17In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased18meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74019gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the sett	counsel did not join the settlement. Pursuant to WAC	9 invited to determine if this adjustment needs to be
12requests that the commission approve the settlement.12Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable13I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the13outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA14settlement that are important to staff, but try not to14transmission rate, and also establishes another15reiterate the points PSE just made.15collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has16transmission cost, increased17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new17In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	480-07-740, staff believes that this settlement is	10 changed again to reduce all cost shifting to comply with
13I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the settlement that are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made.13outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA14settlement that are important to staff, but try not to reiterate the points PSE just made.13outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.16In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74019gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues21Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will 2523Therefore, staff recommends that the 2525be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase24Proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the 25	consistent with law and the public interest and therefore	11 this rate-making principal.
14settlement that are important to staff, but try not to15reiterate the points PSE just made.16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase	² requests that the commission approve the settlement.	12 Lastly, this settlement also provides for reasonable
15reiterate the points PSE just made.15collaborative directed at PSE's intracompany gas16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has16transactions.17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new17In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased18meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74019gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	3 I will briefly discuss some of the terms within the	13 outcomes on the colstrip O&M expenses, increase to BPA
16First, this settlement recognizes that PSE has incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.16transactions.19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.17In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74020However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to \$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.1021S65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.2123Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will 252325be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase2426proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	settlement that are important to staff, but try not to	14 transmission rate, and also establishes another
17incurred increases to its power cost in the form of new17In conclusion, staff believe that this settlement18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased18meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74019gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.22collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	· · · · ·	
18and renewed PPAs, increased transmission cost, increased gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.18meets the applicable legal standards within WAC 480-07-74019gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.22collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	•	
19gas pipeline cost, and increased variable fuel cost.19because it results in fair rates given PSE's increased20However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's20cost, effectuates the commission's guidance on green21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.2223Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to2324PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will2425be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase2526commission approve the settlement. And today we do have		-
 However, this settlement significantly reduces PSE's requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to \$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update. Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase 		
21requested revenue deficiency from \$87 million to21direct within PSE's last GRC, and sets up three separate22\$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update.22collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have		
 \$65.3 million, subject to a power cost update. Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase Collaboratives to tackle complicated and important issues that the commission will have to address in future proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the commission approve the settlement. And today we do have 		
23Nevertheless this rate increase will be mitigated to23that the commission will have to address in future24PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will24proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the25be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase25commission approve the settlement. And today we do have		
 PSE's most vulnerable rate payers as the help program will be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase 24 proceedings. Therefore, staff recommends that the 25 commission approve the settlement. And today we do have 		
25 be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase 25 commission approve the settlement. And today we do have	•	
Dago 68	be receiving twice the percentage increase as the increase	25 commission approve the settlement. And today we do have
rage 00 rage 70	Page 68	Page 70
1 to residential customers base rates. Staff believes the 1 Jing Liu available as a witness for any questions from the	to residential customers base rates. Staff believes the	1 Jing Liu available as a witness for any questions from the
2 proposed revenue deficiency in this settlement will result 2 bench. Thank you.	2 proposed revenue deficiency in this settlement will result	2 bench. Thank you.
3 in just, fair, reasonable, and sufficient rates given 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I will now turn to	3 in just, fair, reasonable, and sufficient rates given	3 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I will now turn to
4 PSE's increased power cost since its last GRC. 4 Ms. Gafken if public counsel would like to provide an	PSE's increased power cost since its last GRC.	4 Ms. Gafken if public counsel would like to provide an
5 Second, this settlement provides that for the first 5 opening statement.	5 Second, this settlement provides that for the first	1 5
6 time, PSE rate payers will receive the direct net benefit 6 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, thank you, Judge Howard, Chair	5 time, PSE rate payers will receive the direct net benefit	
8 longer receive these benefits indirectly from the PCA 8 Public counsel is not a settling party in this case.	-	
9 mechanism and which these benefits must run through the 9 We are neutral on the settlement under consideration	_	
10 dead and sharing bands. This results in a direct 10 today. We will not be providing a recommendation to the	5	
11 \$4.4 million benefit to PSE's rate payers. This 11 commission regarding whether to accept or reject the		
12 settlement further provides for a collaborative where 12 settlement. This means that public counsel is not		
13 interested parties may come up with an agreed to 14 actively supporting the settlement. However, in this		
14 methodology to quantify the net benefits of EIM for future 14 case, we are also expressly not opposing the settlement.		
 proceedings and this is important so PSE rate payers can continue to receive these direct benefits in the future. f The adjustments made in the settlement, from my perspective, correct the filing and fairly reflect Puget 		
17 Third, this settlement also eliminates any cost it's 17 Sound Energy's power costs. The increased power cost 18 shifting, while helps eliminate any cost shifting between 18 though will have a significant impact on customer bills.		
19 green direct customers and PSE's rate payers pursuant to 19 As we heard this week heard earlier this week at the		
the requirements of RCW 19.29.090 and Order 8 and Docket 20 public comment hearing, customers are sensitive to rate		
21 UE-190530. This is accomplished by doing two things: 21 increases, especially during the pandemic. There are	•	
22 First, for the purpose of rate calculation, this 22 settlement terms that we view as particularly reasonable,		
	3 settlement includes areen direct load, but not the cost of	
across load, this ensures that green direct customers are 25 green direct terms, inclusion of the energy and balance	G <i>i</i>	24 In her testimony. Very brieny, those terms include the
	the green direct PPAs. Because fixed costs are spread	

5 (Pages 67 to 70)

	Daga 71	Decc. 72
	Page 71	Page 73
1	market benefits, exclusion of the smart berm costs, and	1 PCORC moving forward.
2	increasing low income assistance funding in the event that	2 JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry, Mr. Coleman, the court reporter
3	this case results in higher rates.	3 is indicating there is an issue.
4	Additionally, the settlement calls for two work	4 MR. COLEMAN: I'll do my best to maybe start a new
5	groups, one on hedging and one on the EIM cost and	5 sentence.
6	benefits. If those work groups take place, public counsel	6 We appreciate the efforts of all the parties, and the
7	will participate because the issues contemplated by each	7 company in particular, to address and evaluate the need of
8	of those groups are very important.	8 the PCORC on a going forward basis in the future
9	I want to take a moment to express my gratitude. I	9 proceeding. Accordingly, we do recommend to the
10	want to commend the parties in the discussions and	10 commission that the settlement agreement be adopted
11	engagement in this case. Collectively, we worked really	11 without further modification. I apologize, if you can
12	hard during the negotiation process. I want to also	12 bear with me for just one moment. I missed one point on
13	extend any compliments, specifically to Mr. Dallas, for	13 my thoughts.
14	commission staff who took an active role in effectively	14 As mentioned in the settlement agreement, AWEC takes
15	managing the process.	15 no position with respect to the prudence of the PPAs and
16	To wrap up my comments here, Ms. Chase is here this	16 other investments that are discussed that were
17	afternoon as public counsel's witness addressing the	17 discussed by counsel for the company. Thank you.
18	settlement and will be available for any of your	18 JUDGE HOWARD: MR. FFITCH, would you like to provide
19	questions. Thank you.	19 an opening statement for the Energy Project?
20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. With that, I would turn to	20 MR. FFITCH: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Good
21	Mr. Coleman for any opening statement from AWEC.	21 morning Chairman Danner, Commissioners Randall and
22	MR. COLEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor, and good	22 Balasbas. I'm Simon Ffitch appearing on behalf of the
23	afternoon, Mr. Chairman and commissioners.	23 Energy Project. The Energy Project appreciates the
24	On behalf of the AWEC, I won't reiterate the legal	24 commission's accommodation in excusing Energy Project
25	and regulatory standards addressed by PSE and staff, but	25 Director, Shawn Collins, from the hearing today.
	Page 72	Page 74
1		Page 74 1 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,
1 2	Page 72 AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in	
	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in	1 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,
2	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The
2 3	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of
2 3 4	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low
2 3 4 5	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the
2 3 4 5 6	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to
2 3 4 5 6 7	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration.	For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low income customers. The Energy Project particularly appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low income customers. The Energy Project particularly appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion in their initial filing of a proposal for increased funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help program. In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low income customers. The Energy Project particularly appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion in their initial filing of a proposal for increased funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help program. In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an agreed formula for the increase consistent with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM.	 For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony, Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The settlement specifically addresses the significant level of need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low income customers. This level of need is based on both the economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low income customers. The Energy Project particularly appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion in their initial filing of a proposal for increased funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help program. In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an agreed formula for the increase consistent with the formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and finally, as mentioned in AWEC's settlement testimony and referenced in the settlement agreement, AWEC submits that there is an ongoing question regarding the continued	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers19electricity customers and that would take affect for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and finally, as mentioned in AWEC's settlement testimony and referenced in the settlement agreement, AWEC submits that	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers19electricity customers and that would take affect for the20heating season that begins this coming October.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and finally, as mentioned in AWEC's settlement testimony and referenced in the settlement agreement, AWEC submits that there is an ongoing question regarding the continued	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers19electricity customers and that would take affect for the10heating season that begins this coming October.21The Energy Project also supports the fact that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and finally, as mentioned in AWEC's settlement testimony and referenced in the settlement agreement, AWEC submits that there is an ongoing question regarding the continued necessity of the PCORC framework and its application by	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers19electricity customers and that would take affect for the10heating season that begins this coming October.21The Energy Project also supports the fact that the22settlement has been able to reduce the overall revenue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	AWEC agrees that this settlement is in the public interest. There were four main areas of focus for AWEC in its participation in this matter and we believe that the terms of the settlement agreement address and resolve those concerns in the manner that is that supports public interest. Specifically, we feel like there is a the settlement has arrived at a fair balance of the cost associated with the transmission services provided by Bonneville Power Administration. We also believe that given the maturity of the energy imbalance market, the costs and benefits are more appropriately addressed and we appreciate the efforts that were gone over were put forward by the parties to reflect the benefits and the cost associated with the participation in the EIM. We also agree, as mentioned by Ms. Gafken, with respect to the treatment of the smart berm costs in its consistency with the commission's prior decisions; and finally, as mentioned in AWEC's settlement testimony and referenced in the settlement agreement, AWEC submits that there is an ongoing question regarding the continued necessity of the PCORC framework and its application by Puget Energy and we appreciate the efforts and support the	1For the reasons stated in Mr. Collins' testimony,2Energy Project supports the settlement stipulation. The3settlement specifically addresses the significant level of4need for bill assistance among Puget Sound Energy's low5income customers. This level of need is based on both the6economic consequences of COVID-19 and the ongoing need to7broaden the reach of assistance to more of PSE's low8income customers. The Energy Project particularly9appreciates Puget's recognition of this by their inclusion10in their initial filing of a proposal for increased11funding for their home energy lifeline program, the help12program.13In negotiation, the parties were able to develop an14agreed formula for the increase consistent with the15formula that was used in the last Puget Sound Energy16general rate case; and this results in a settlement17specifically providing for an increase of approximately18\$1.2 million in help funding for electrical customers19electricity customers and that would take affect for the10heating season that begins this coming October.21The Energy Project also supports the fact that the22settlement has been able to reduce the overall revenue23impact of the initial filing and that it allows for future

6 (Pages 71 to 74)

	Page 75		Page 77
1	interest and recommends approval by the commission.	1	and if we would take a position if we were to make a
2	Thank you. That concludes my statement.	2	prudency determination in the order in this case. Maybe
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, all. Do we have any	3	start with Mr. Dallas.
4	questions from the bench for the attorneys before we bring	4	MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner. This is
5	the witnesses up for questioning?	5	a topic that Ms. Carson and I have talked about quite a
6	CHAIR DANNER: Hi, this is Dave Danner. I have a	6	bit. Staff's position on this is staff is not contesting
7	question. Ms. Carson, in your comments, it appears that	7	the prudence of any resources within PSE's filing;
8	you are saying that this settlement actually would result	8	therefore, our position is because no one is contesting
9	in a prudence determination; is that what I heard you say?	9	prudence, the commission doesn't need to make an explicit
10	MS. CARSON: Yes, Chair Danner, that is correct. We	10	prudence determination. Typically, the commission will
11	are asking PSE is asking for a prudence determination	11	make an exclusive prudence determination when someone is
12	in this case. The PCA settlement that goes back to 2002	12	contesting the prudence of that resource; and there is an
13	and as it was revised in 2015 and approved by the	13	argument that, you know, the commission, including a
14	commission, allows for and provides the commission will	14	resource and rates; therefore, making an implicit prudence
15	make a prudence determination on the new resources and the	15	determination. So Ms. Carson is correct, that no party is
16	commission has done that in every PCORC prior to this, so	16	contesting prudence, but staff's position is that the
17	we think that's important. It takes away any uncertainty	17	commission does not need to make an explicit prudence
18	going forward. So, yes, we are asking for a prudence	18	determination when deciding if the commission decides
19	determination. The other parties take no position and do	19	to approve the settlement.
20	not contest the prudence of these resources.	20	CHAIR DANNER: All right, thank you very much.
21	CHAIR DANNER: All right. So because others	21	Ms. Gafken, is that your position as well?
22	parties have said that, I mean, specifically, I mean, I	22	MS. GAFKEN: I don't know that is exactly my
23	can turn to Jing Liu's testimony for staff. She said,	23	position, you know, in looking at the settlement terms.
24	"There's no inquiries and other than PSE take no position	24	Of course, we're neutral on it, but no party is
25	and therefore do not contest or support affirmatively	25	contesting Puget has to have for the prudence
	Page 76		Page 78
1	support the prudence of PSE's proposed and renewed	1	determination. So they've provided evidence and whatnot
2	resources presented in PSE's filing." So I guess my	2	supporting their position, but no party is affirmatively
3	question then is: Is it your view that the settlement	3	saying that they agree, you know, they're not taking that
4	actually does state that the settlement itself makes a	4	specific step forward saying that they also agree that
5	prudency determination or are you asking us to make that	5	they're prudent, but there is no opposition. I don't I
6	in addition to what the settlement says and, in fact, if	6	do not believe that making a determination explicitly in
7	that is the case, would we, you know, are we amending the	7	the order will change the settlement term. I I have to
8	settlement?	8	admit, I have not given a lot of thought about whether the
9	MS. CARSON: I don't believe that you're amending the	9	commission has to make that determination, so I don't know
10	settlement. No party contests the prudence of the	10	if I agree specifically with Mr. Dallas's position as he
11	settlement. Other parties can speak for themselves, but I	11	just stated; but I think the company does have to ask for
12	know some parties feel that very fact that resources are	12	it and they've provided evidence supporting their
13	in rates means that they're prudent. We're not	13	position.
14	necessarily comfortable with that. We think sometimes the	14	CHAIR DANNER: Well, yeah. So I don't know where we
15	commission has said something different from that so we	15	have, you know, tacitly given made a prudency
16	think it's important to have the prudence determination as	16	determination or not expressly done so. I certainly don't
17	has been made in every other power cost-only rate case and	17	know what benefit there would be in, you know, making a
18	which the PCORC documents provide will happen.	18	prudency determination in a later GRC or something. It
19	I don't think anybody's saying there shouldn't be a	19	seems to me that we have to make some kind of
1)		20	determination here, but it sounds like you're not
20	prudence determination. I think parties just didn't	1 2 0	
		21	objecting to the expenditures that are at issue in this
20	didn't agree that it would be, but they also did not	1	objecting to the expenditures that are at issue in this case; is that correct?
20 21	didn't agree that it would be, but they also did not contest it. They just took no position on it.	21	
20 21 22	didn't agree that it would be, but they also did not contest it. They just took no position on it. CHAIR DANNER: Right. But it's not in the	21 22	case; is that correct? MS. GAFKEN: That's correct. I guess I can take it
20 21 22 23	didn't agree that it would be, but they also did not contest it. They just took no position on it.	21 22 23	case; is that correct?

7 (Pages 75 to 78)

	Page 79		Page 81
1		1	
1 2	in that review, you know, I can't represent that we looked	1 2	prudence determination because doing so will imply that
	at it with a fine tooth comb top to bottom, but we also	3	the commission has complete information, to say with
3	didn't find anything objectionable. There were things		certainty that something is prudent or isn't prudent. So
4	that raised questions. We asked questions and at THE end	4	I think by including the resource into rates, it
5	of the day, we were satisfied that there wasn't, you know,		implicitly states that it's prudent and there is no need
6	anything that was amiss with the resources being provided.	6 7	to make such an explicit finding.
7	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Mr. Ffitch and	8	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So, I guess I would like to
8	then Mr. Coleman, your thoughts as well.	9	pose the same question to the other attorneys of the
9	MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. On behalf of The	10	settling party, as well as to Ms. Gafken to respond to
10	Energy Project, I don't really have anything to add to		that question. You know, what is the advantage of not
11	elaborate the statement we agreed to in the settlement	11 12	doing that here or waiting on prudence?
12	which is that we don't take a position on prudence and we		MS. GAFKEN: I understand what Mr. Dallas was
13	don't contest the prudence of these particular resources;	13	expressing is that the commission wouldn't necessarily
14	so I don't feel that I have anything to add to those two	14	need to explicitly make a prudence determination, but that
15	statements that we've agreed to.	15 16	it wouldn't also be held over until later. I guess I
16	CHAIR DANNER: All right, thank you. And		would note that in past settlements, in other cases
17	Mr. Coleman.	17 18	parties have expressly held that prudence determination
18	MR. COLEMAN: I apologize for the delay. A little		until a later time. I was just sitting here trying to
19	struggle getting things to click.	19	think of a specific example that I could offer and I'm
20	You know, I think that AWEC's position will be	20	coming up short, but I've been, you know, party to a case
21	similar to that of Mr. Ffitch. This was something that we	21	several times before the commission where we have held
22	did think through significantly with respect to some of	22	that prudency determination for a later case. That's not
23	this language and do not take a position with respect to	23	what this settlement has expressed. You know, in this
24	the prudence or and that I agree.	24	settlement, the settling parties are not opposing the
25	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So I guess I'm not hearing any	25	prudency determination, they are also not asking for that
	Page 80		Page 82
1			
	party recommend that we postpone a prudence decision to	1	prudency determination to be postponed. Puget, on the
2	party recommend that we postpone a prudence decision to some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not	1 2	prudency determination to be postponed. Puget, on the other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency
2 3	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not		other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency
	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the	2	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again,
3	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually	2 3	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a
3 4	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination.	2 3 4	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement
3 4 5	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there	2 3 4 5	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a
3 4 5 6	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it	2 3 4 5 6	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be
3 4 5 6 7	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank	2 3 4 5 6 7	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think
3 4 5 6 7 8	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an explicit prudence determination if no one is contesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object to that ruling.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an explicit prudence determination if no one is contesting it. The commission allows resources in all the time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object to that ruling. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Mr. Coleman or Mr. Ffitch,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an explicit prudence determination if no one is contesting it. The commission allows resources in all the time without making an explicit prudence determination. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object to that ruling. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Mr. Coleman or Mr. Ffitch, anything to add?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an explicit prudence determination if no one is contesting it. The commission allows resources in all the time without making an explicit prudence determination. I think by including the resources in rates, the commission	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object to that ruling. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Mr. Coleman or Mr. Ffitch, anything to add? MR. FFITCH: Thank you for the question,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some other proceeding later. It's just that they're not taking position on prudency and then leaving open the question of whether we can move ahead without actually making an explicit prudency determination. So, all right. I will leave it at that and if there is any other questions on prudency, I would just leave it to the other commissioners to clarify my question. Thank you, Judge. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So just to follow-up on Chair Danner's question about prudence, I'd like to maybe pose this question first to Mr. Dallas. So why or what is the advantage of not making a prudence determination here? Why would we wait if there is no one who opposes the prudence of any of the resources that Puget is asking for here? MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Danner (sic). I think there is no law requiring the commission to make an explicit prudence determination if no one is contesting it. The commission allows resources in all the time without making an explicit prudence determination. I think by including the resources in rates, the commission is making an implicit prudence determination and the time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other hand, needs to ask for that specific prudency determination and they want that. You know, and again, I'll just reiterate that I don't believe that making a prudency determination would alter the settlement agreement because there isn't opposition. So then I think it's a question of whether the commission wants to be silent on the issue and just approve the rates as they're set out in the settlement or if the commission feels that it has enough to make that prudency determination. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Chair Danner. CHAIR DANNER: I just want to clarify. So if we were to make that prudency determination right now, I'm not hearing that you would object or that staff would object or that Mr. Ffitch or Mr. Coleman would object. So with regard to yourself MS. GAFKEN: That's where I was going to go. So speaking just for public counsel; no, we would not object to that ruling. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Mr. Coleman or Mr. Ffitch, anything to add? MR. FFITCH: Thank you for the question, Commissioner Balasbas. We, being the Energy Project, did

8 (Pages 79 to 82)

	Page 83		Page 85
1	that did give us comfort with the particular language in	1	prudence in this case, are there risks in the future?
2	the settlement agreement. You know, stating that we take	2	MS. CARSON: Thank you, Commissioner Randall. We
3	no position and that we don't contest prudence. With	3	think there are potentially risks in the future if you
4	regard to the specific question here about, you know,	4	don't have the certainty of a prudence determination and
5	where does that leave the commission, I would agree with	5	that's why the PCA settlement provides for that and I
6	Ms. Gafken's statement that the commission could then do	6	think that's why the commission has provided for that each
7	what it feels is appropriate with regard to the prudence	7	time in a PCORC. But I mean, you know, if the commission
8	issue and the Energy Project would not object if the	8	believes that there's an implicit prudence finding when
9	commission chose or felt it was important to make a	9	these resources go into rates, PSE is not opposed to that
10	specific, explicit prudence determination here. I hope	10	position either, but I think it, you know, there's a
11	that is helpful.	11	this is, as you said, the potential for uncertainty with
12	MR. COLEMAN: From AWEC's position, we would also	12	without a prudence determination.
13	support and agree with the discussion from Ms. Gafken and	13	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you.
14	would not, to the extent the commission feels that the	14	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I'd just like to go back to
15	information and the record is sufficient to make the	15	Mr. Dallas for another I just want to put this question
16	decision, we would not we would not contest such a	16	very directly to you. You've stated in responses to
17	decision in line with the agreed upon language hereof	17	questions from all three of us here that you both don't
18	taking no position.	18	you don't you seem to not find the resources prudent,
19	CHAIR DANNER: Mr. Dallas, you too?	19	but you're also not contesting it. You seem to be saying
20	MR. DALLAS: Yes. Staff wouldn't object to the	20	two different things here. So which one is it? Are you
21	commission making such a determination. I think staff's	21	saying that the resources are not prudent or are in
22	point is that such determination isn't necessary. You	22	prudence or are you saying they're prudent? And, again,
23	know, in this proceeding, the commission is approving this	23	I'd like a direct answer to the question. Would staff
24	settlement and in this settlement, we didn't agree to an	24	object if the commission did make a prudence determination
25	explicit finding of prudence and the commission doesn't	25	as part of its order in this case?
	Page 84		Page 86
1	need to make this additional finding. You know, they	1	MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Commissioner Balasbas. So
2	certainly can, they have the discretion to do it, but the	2	our position is that we take no position, but we also do
3	commission can simply include these resources and rates	3	not contest. And that's slightly different than saying,
4	and there's an understanding that we're not going to	4	you know, staff affirmatively supports the prudence of
5	contest these resources in the future. So staff certainly	5	each item. You know, we've looked at it and we don't
6	wouldn't object to the commission doing this. Our point	6	believe that the resources are imprudent, but that is
7	is that it's just not necessary.	7	different than saying that we affirmatively support that
8	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. So Mr. Dallas, you just	8	they are prudent.
9	said that you can't agree to the prudence in this case,	9	And as to your second question, staff would not
10	you just don't contest it. But so you would would	10	object if the commission did want to make an affirmative
11	you I think Chair Danner asked you earlier, this	11	prudence finding. The only point staff is trying to make
12	wouldn't create a condition on the settlement if the	12	here is that if the commission doesn't want to make such
13	commission were to determine prudence, would it?	13	affirmative prudence finding, it doesn't have to
14	MR. DALLAS: I don't believe so. I think, you know,	14	incidentally include these resources in the rates.
15	what we're trying to do here is just let the commission	15	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. Thank you.
16 17	know that the settlement doesn't call for an explicit	16 17	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. That was my question as
17 18	prudence finding by the commission. And to clarify that, staff doesn't believe we're not taking the position	18	well, so I'm glad we have clarity on that. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Did we have any further questions for
10	that anything is prudent, but the wording of the language	19	the attorneys before we call the witnesses?
20	in the settlement is that no party the parties take no	20	Hearing none, we will continue on and call the
21	position and do not contest.	21	witnesses. Because this is a virtual hearing, let's first
22	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. I think as you can tell	22	have the witnesses identify themselves and the party that
23	from our questions, we're just trying to clarify where all	23	they are appearing for beginning with the settlement
24	of the parties are in terms of this prudence question.	24	witnesses for Puget Sound Energy, which would include
25	And Ms. Carson, if the commission were to not determine	25	William Einstein. Then I'll swear in the witnesses at

9 (Pages 83 to 86)

	Page 87	Page 89
1	same time and we will hear testimony from the witnesses	1 and I'm sure you all are aware we heard public comment
2	together as a panel. So could we first have the witnesses	2 about from green direct customers, have received two
3	from the company identify themselves.	3 letters from green direct customers in the last day or so.
4	MS. FREE: Good afternoon, Chairman Danner,	4 What notice did PSE provide directly or indirectly to
5	Commissioners Randall and Balasbas. This is Susan Free.	5 green direct customers to inform them of the proposed
6	I'm the director of revenue requirements and regulatory	6 tariff change?
7	compliance for Puget Sound Energy.	7 MR. EINSTEIN: Well, I don't have do you want to
8	MR. EINSTEIN: Good afternoon, commissioners. Will	8 go, Jon?
9	Einstein, I'm the director of product development for PSE.	9 MR. PILIARIS: Yes. I can take that one. I was just
10	MR. PILIARIS: Good afternoon, Chair Danner,	10 pulling it up. We filed, apparently, on December 17th
11	Commissioners Balasbas and Randall. My name is Jon	11 no, that is a notice of appearance. Apologize. That
12	Piliaris. I'm director of regulatory affairs for Puget	12 is that is the wrong notice. That is under public
13	Sound Energy.	13 notice. I don't have that the date of the actual
14	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you all. Could we have staff's	14 notice, but my understanding was a notice was provided
15	witness identify herself. Jing Liu, can you hear me?	15 broadly. Not to my knowledge, there was no specific
16	MS. LIU: Sorry, I forgot to unmute. My apologies.	16 announcement or communication that was made directly,
17	Good afternoon, Judge Howard and good afternoon Chairman	17 unless this was handled through Mr. Einstein's group, but
18	Danner and commissioners. My name is Jing Liu, the deputy	18 there was not a direct communication to green direct
19	assistant director for energy section of regulatory	19 customers specifically. It was a more broad announcement
20	services.	20 that went to all customers electric customers.
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And could we have public	21 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Is that your understanding,
22	counsel's witness identify themselves.	22 Mr. Einstein?
23	MS. CHASE: Good afternoon, Judge Howard and	23 MR. EINSTEIN: It is and I guess if that is different
24	commissioners. My name is Stephanie Chase and I'm a	24 from the question you're asking I'm trying to
25	regulatory analyst with public housing.	25 understand what you are asking about a particular notice
	Page 88	Page 90
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And could we have AWEC's	1 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking
1 2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And could we have AWEC's witness identify themselves.	
	•	1 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking
2	witness identify themselves.	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers
2 3	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual
2 3 4	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on.
2 3 4 5	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff
2 3 4 5 6	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers.	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on.
2 3 4 5 6 7	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular
2 3 4 5 6 7	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands.	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only rate case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and the program costs; and these initial questions are for PSE, either Mr. Einstein or Mr. Piliaris, I assume. So in the tariff that PSE filed in December 2020 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only rate case. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Correct. Okay. So for that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and the program costs; and these initial questions are for PSE, either Mr. Einstein or Mr. Piliaris, I assume. 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only rate case. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Correct. Okay. So for that filing, that put into affect the changes to the green
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and the program costs; and these initial questions are for PSE, either Mr. Einstein or Mr. Piliaris, I assume. So in the tariff that PSE filed in December 2020 	1related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking2relating to a notice we would have provided to customers3relative to tariff changes associated with the actual4tariff that the customers are on.5COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff6changes, to the tariff that the customers are on.7MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular8situation, while I don't have that particular notice of9provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding10would be that that would be just in relation to the last11set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe12implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the13customers receive as part of their participation in the14green direct program. You may recall we made several15adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources16were coming online, and that was not would not be the17same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only18rate case.19COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Correct. Okay. So for that20filing, that put into affect the changes to the green21direct program, I believe that the tariff also provided as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and the program costs; and these initial questions are for PSE, either Mr. Einstein or Mr. Piliaris, I assume. So in the tariff that PSE filed in December 2020 accompanying its green direct tariff filing, PSE stated 	1related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking2relating to a notice we would have provided to customers3relative to tariff changes associated with the actual4tariff that the customers are on.5COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff6changes, to the tariff that the customers are on.7MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular8situation, while I don't have that particular notice of9provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding10would be that that would be just in relation to the last11set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe12implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the13customers receive as part of their participation in the14green direct program. You may recall we made several15adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources16were coming online, and that was not would not be the17same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only18rate case.19COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Correct. Okay. So for that20filing, that put into affect the changes to the green21direct program, I believe that the tariff also provided as22Item 8, that the energy charge credit will be updated with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 witness identify themselves. MR. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and commissioners, my name is Lance Kaufman. I'm an economist with Aegis Insight and I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Western Energy Consumers. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And as we've noted, The Energy Project's witness is excused from the hearing. So I will swear in each of you here at the same time. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? THE WITNESSES: I do. I do. I do. I do. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. At this point, we'll open it up to questions from the commissioners. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: This is Commissioner Randall and I'll begin with some questions about green direct and the program costs; and these initial questions are for PSE, either Mr. Einstein or Mr. Piliaris, I assume. So in the tariff that PSE filed in December 2020 accompanying its green direct tariff filing, PSE stated that notice to individual customers under provisions of 	 related to this power cost-only rate case or you're asking relating to a notice we would have provided to customers relative to tariff changes associated with the actual tariff that the customers are on. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: It would be about the tariff changes, to the tariff that the customers are on. MR. EINSTEIN: Right. So in that particular situation, while I don't have that particular notice of provision in front of me at the moment, my understanding would be that that would be just in relation to the last set of adjustments we made to the tariffs, which I believe implemented pricing adjustments for the charge the customers receive as part of their participation in the green direct program. You may recall we made several adjustments over the course of the fall as the resources were coming online, and that was not would not be the same as notice for issues related to the power cost-only rate case. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Correct. Okay. So for that filing, that put into affect the changes to the green direct program, I believe that the tariff also provided as Item 8, that the energy charge credit will be updated with each general rate case, power cost-only rate case, or

10 (Pages 87 to 90)

	Page 91		Page 93
1	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. So the company in its	1	MS. LIU: So I don't believe we did any
2	testimony your testimony, Mr. Einstein, the	2	communication.
3	Exhibit 9-HC, referenced several interactions with	3	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Does any other party
4	potential green direct customers, both historic and	4	have a response to that question?
5	perspective in its slide presentation to the management	5	MS. GAFKEN: Public counsel did not reach out to any
6	committee. And so as the company prepared this filing,	6	green direct customers.
7	and now we're talking about this file in particular, what	7	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. So in the settlement,
8	communications did the company have with its green direct	8	the settling parties have reserved the right to reevaluate
9	customers?	9	the method of determining the green direct customer's
10	MR. EINSTEIN: So the company is in regular	10	costs and have agreed to work toward a path forward on a
11	communication, particularly given the complexity of this	11	durable method for calculating the energy credit for green
12	particular program and Schedule 139, is in regular	12	direct customers. Is this now there are two other
13	communication with the customers on the program about	13	collaboratives in this settlement, but is this a
14	various changes and elements in it. We did not	14	collaborative or just what exactly is this working
15	specifically provide any notice to we didn't provide	15	forward, working on a path forward?
16	any specific outreach at the beginning of the power	16	MR. PILIARIS: I this is Jon Piliaris. I guess
17	cost-only rate case to these customers because at that	17	I'll start. I don't honestly profess to know if there is
18	point, we did not anticipate any changes to the energy	18	a defined term around collaborative if that's outlined
19	credit that these customers received at the time of the	19	anywhere specifically. But the intent anyway was to
20	filing.	20	again we recognize in the settlement discussions that
20	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. So after the filing	21	there was a wide array of opinions and that we will not
22	though, did the company communicate to green direct	22	have enough time to really fully flush those out in the
23	customers about the potential changes to the rates?	23	time allowed for the settlement itself. And so we tried
23	MR. EINSTEIN: We have started communications with	23	to land on a reasonable middle ground for purposes of
24	these customers about the changes to the rates associated	24	settlement and then park the rest of the discussion for
20	these customers about the changes to the fates associated	25	settlement and then park the rest of the discussion for
	Page 92		Page 94
1		1	
1 2	Page 92 with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation.	1	Page 94 later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have
	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation.		later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have
2	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I	2	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail,
2 3	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my	2 3	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of
2 3 4	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I	2 3 4	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an
2 3 4 5	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic.	2 3 4 5	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology
2 3 4 5 6	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company	2 3 4 5 6	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we
2 3 4 5 6 7	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company	2 3 4 5 6 7	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Did you say a pass through?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Chair Danner, you had your hand up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Did you say a pass through? MS. LIU: It would be it is tied to the power cost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Chair Danner, you had your hand up. CHAIR DANNER: I just wanted to clarify. The term
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Did you say a pass through? MS. LIU: It would be it is tied to the power cost rate that we determined in this proceeding, so without the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Chair Danner, you had your hand up. CHAIR DANNER: I just wanted to clarify. The term "collaborative" is used with regard to the hedging and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Did you say a pass through? MS. LIU: It would be it is tied to the power cost rate that we determined in this proceeding, so without the conclusion of this proceeding, it will be hard to pin down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Chair Danner, you had your hand up. CHAIR DANNER: I just wanted to clarify. The term "collaborative" is used with regard to the hedging and with the EIM, but this one just says a path forward, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with the settlement, but not prior to the settlement conversation. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. All right. Well, I have some questions for other parties, but I'll see if my colleagues have any additional questions just for the company on this topic. Okay. So for the other parties, when the company filed this PCORC or when you were aware that the company would file a PCORC, did you contact green direct customers or after the filing contact green direct customers about the possibility that there would be issues related to them in this matter? And that is for any of the witnesses, non-company witnesses. I guess I'll start with Ms. Liu. MS. LIU: I don't believe commission staff reached out to specific individual green direct customers to inform them of any changes, because in our perception, the energy credit would be would be a fall-through from this power cost rate that we are determining in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Did you say a pass through? MS. LIU: It would be it is tied to the power cost rate that we determined in this proceeding, so without the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	later consideration in what we're calling the collaborative. The intent of the collaborative is to have a more fully drawn-out discussion with far more detail, far more analysis, far more sharing, far more sharing of data to see if we can, under the best of cases, come to an agreement as to what a durable and consistent methodology could be for calculating this credit going forward, if we can reach consensus. If not, then at least we have clarity around what's the primary points of contention or differences are and those could be brought forward in a future rate case before the commission for adjudication and the commission's determination to the extent necessary. That will be go ahead. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Would this collaborative include those green direct customers? MR. PILIARIS: The company's intention would be that yes, they would definitely be encouraged to attend and to participate. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Chair Danner, you had your hand up. CHAIR DANNER: I just wanted to clarify. The term "collaborative" is used with regard to the hedging and

11 (Pages 91 to 94)

	Page 95	Page	97
1	those are interchangeable, whether it's a path forward or	1 answer this question from the company, but I will put that	
2	a collaborative, this is going to be an inclusive process	2 to any of the company witnesses who would like to answer	
3	for the green direct customers and will be encouraged to	3 this. I'd just like to get a sense of scale of the	
4	attend and participate; is that right?	4 roughly \$3.7 million change in the energy credit amount.	
5	MR. PILIARIS: That's correct.	5 I'd just like to kind of get a sense of scale as to how	
6	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.	6 large is that in relation to the total energy credit.	
7	MR. PILIARIS: Thank you, commissioner.	7 MR. PILIARIS: I was with you until the last part of	
8	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: And do any of the other	8 your question. I'm not sure what you mean by total energy	
9	settling parties have any additional comments they want to	9 credit of the 3-7.	
10	make on this question?	10 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So the settlement desc	ribes,
11	I'm not seeing anything. That is all I had at this	11 I believe it's a reduction of the energy credit,	
12	point, Chair Danner.	12 \$3.7 million to the green direct customers. I guess for,	
13	Commissioner Balasbas, if you have any questions,	13 you know, maybe say, for example, a large green direct	
14	please go ahead.	14 customer or any like a typical, if there's such a	
15	COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I do have an additional	15 thing, as a typical green direct customer, kind of what	
16	question. I believe this is probably best answered by	16 how big of a change is that to them?	
17	Ms. Free; and in your Exhibit SEF-9, this and the	17 MR. PILIARIS: Yeah, I don't have that number handy.	
18	settlement discusses tracking the generation surplus and	18 It would be an easy number to calculate. Giving you	
19	the deficiency of the green direct generation with respect	19 general a general indication of proportionality, if you	
20	to the green direct load and so I have two questions here:	20 look at the current credit level, which is around \$47 a	
21	The first is in tracking the differences. Is the	21 megawatt hour, it is reduced to something just below 40.	
22	settlement creating a deferral that would then be later	Just looking at that proportionality, it looks like a	
23	amortized into the future rates of green direct tariff	23 reduction a little less than 20 percent reduction in	
24	customers?	their credit if that is helpful.	
25	MS. FREE: No. That is not the intention of the	25 We can follow-up in a bench request for a precise	
	Page 96	Page	98
			20
1	tracking that I lay out in my Exhibit SEF-9. The purpose	1 number if you would like that.	
1 2	tracking that I lay out in my Exhibit SEF-9. The purpose of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the	 number if you would like that. CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request or 	
		-	
2	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the	2 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of	ut
2 3	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? 	ut
2 3 4	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go 	ut
2 3 4 5	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off 	ut
2 3 4 5 6	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism.	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting.	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the order of about six percent. In other words, just putting 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the order of about six percent. In other words, just putting aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over	2CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of3there asking for that specific information, don't we?4COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go5look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off6hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is7not, then yes, I would like to add that.8JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission9Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that10and it should go out later today asking for the bill11impacts essentially of this change.12CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.13MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the14issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers,15the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the16order of about six percent. In other words, just putting17aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC18filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation?	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the order of about six percent. In other words, just putting aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a roughly six percent increase to these particular 	ut ing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the order of about six percent. In other words, just putting aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a roughly six percent increase to these particular customers' rates. 	ut ing to ner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for recovery. The theory is that the green direct product	 CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of there asking for that specific information, don't we? COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is not, then yes, I would like to add that. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that and it should go out later today asking for the bill impacts essentially of this change. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers, the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the order of about six percent. In other words, just putting aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a roughly six percent increase to these particular customers' rates. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Chair Danner, did 	ut ing to ner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for recovery. The theory is that the green direct product itself is priced at appropriate levels so there will not	2CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of3there asking for that specific information, don't we?4COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go5look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off6hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is7not, then yes, I would like to add that.8JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission9Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that10and it should go out later today asking for the bill11impacts essentially of this change.12CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.13MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the14issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers,15the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the16order of about six percent. In other words, just putting17aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC18filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a19roughly six percent increase to these particular20customers' rates.21COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Chair Danner, did22have a question?	ut ing to ner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for recovery. The theory is that the green direct product itself is priced at appropriate levels so there will not be, over the long-term, significant over or under	2CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of3there asking for that specific information, don't we?4COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go5look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off6hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is7not, then yes, I would like to add that.8JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission9Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that10and it should go out later today asking for the bill11impacts essentially of this change.12CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.13MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the14issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers,15the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the16order of about six percent. In other words, just putting17aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC18filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a19roughly six percent increase to these particular20customers' rates.21COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Chair Danner, did22have a question?23CHAIR DANNER: I don't have any more questions on	ut ing to ner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for recovery. The theory is that the green direct product itself is priced at appropriate levels so there will not be, over the long-term, significant over or under	2CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of3there asking for that specific information, don't we?4COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go5look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off6hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is7not, then yes, I would like to add that.8JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission9Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that10and it should go out later today asking for the bill11impacts essentially of this change.12CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.13MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the14issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers,15the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the16order of about six percent. In other words, just putting17aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC18filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a19roughly six percent increase to these particular20customers' rates.21COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Chair Danner, did23CHAIR DANNER: I don't have any more questions on24green direct.	ut ing to ner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of SEF-9 is to address the commission's order from the 2019 GRC, I think it is Paragraph 296 in Order 8, to ensure that there is no profitization associated with the over or under generation of the green direct PPA. And so it really is just presenting that we've developed a methodology with commission staff that allows us to essentially strip those costs out of our PCA mechanism. And the reporting of that is included in SEF-9 to ensure that there are no impacts of the over or under generation of the PPAs within our PPA mechanism. But there is no established deferral that's going to be dealt with at any time, it's just strictly reporting. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So what would, I guess then as a follow-up, what is this really just informational and nothing further happens with it or would the company propose something to be done with, you know, especially if there's maybe a significant amount of under or over generation? MS. FREE: The intention is not to track it for recovery. The theory is that the green direct product itself is priced at appropriate levels so there will not be, over the long-term, significant over or under	2CHAIR DANNER: I believe we have a bench request of3there asking for that specific information, don't we?4COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, I was actually go5look to Judge Howard to see. I don't remember right off6hand if that was in our list of bench requests and if is7not, then yes, I would like to add that.8JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Chair Danner and Commission9Balasbas, I think we will be issuing one shortly on that10and it should go out later today asking for the bill11impacts essentially of this change.12CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.13MR. PILIARIS: And I did can speak to that. To the14issue of the bill impacts for these particular customers,15the bill impact of the change in the credit is on the16order of about six percent. In other words, just putting17aside the overall increase associated with the PCORC18filing itself, the change in the credit will result in a19roughly six percent increase to these particular20customers' rates.21COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Okay. Chair Danner, did22have a question?23CHAIR DANNER: I don't have any more questions on	ut ing to ner

12 (Pages 95 to 98)

	Page 99	Page 1	01
1			
1 2	CHAIR DANNER: So I just have some general questions	1 CHAIR DANNER: As you recall a few years ago, the 2 commission did a proceeding on gas hedging. That report	
3	just to get a little more specificity on the hedging collaborative. You know, the settlement commits to	3 resulted in a white paper and that was a lengthy	
4	settling parties to a collaborative to examine the hedging	4 proceeding. Are you envisioning something like that in	
5		5 the future or at that point this is just information	
6	practices and I was just wondering, what are the specific		
7	issues that the parties have identified for examination	 gathering for your own purpose? MS. LIU: I will say at this point it is exploratory. 	
8	and what's the goal? I wonder, if any, if you can speak		
° 9	to that. MR. PILIARIS: I can start. I believe this was an	8 It's more informational, educational. We don't envision a 9 regulatory requirement from that.	
10	issue that was raised by staff. In their discovery, they	10 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you so much.	
			om
11 12	were having some challenges making the translation between	11 JUDGE HOWARD: Did we have any further questions fro	om
	the gas hedging program, which they appeared to be more		that
13	familiar with, and the electric hedging program, which		Inal
14	they were less familiar with; and they were trying to	14 I would ask unless my colleagues have questions that they	
15 16	stack up to the programs on either side, so they wanted	15 wish to ask. I'm seeing shaking heads.	
16	more detail around that. That was one element of it.	16 So this question is for Ms. Free and relates to the	
17	Another element of the collaborative is around the	17 production tax credits. Does the company have information	
18	inner book transfers of gas between the two the two	18 this might be more appropriate for a bench request	
19	books of business, the electric book that uses gas for	19 submitted information about the amount of the remaining	
20	generation and the gas book that uses gas for LDC load and	20 non-monetized PTCs that could be applied to offset cold	
21	how that how that occurs. So they wanted my	21 strip remediation costs? Because some of the PTCs have	
22	understanding was that staff wanted more essentially	been monetized and now used to address matters in this	
23	education around those issues. But I would defer to Jing	23 settlement, so it's about the remaining non-monetized	
24	for maybe staff's perspective for the perspective on that.	24 PTCs.	
25	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Ms. Liu, do	25 MS. FREE: So Jon Piliaris does math really well but	
	Page 100	Page 1	02
1	Page 100 you have anything to add?	Page 1 1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request.	02
1 2	_		02
	you have anything to add?	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request.	02
2	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you,	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 	
2 3	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 	
2 3 4	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 	
2 3 4 5	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 	
2 3 4 5 6	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 	
2 3 4 5 6 7	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative.	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful.	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. 	ĸe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. Do my colleagues have other questions? 	ĸe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. 2 I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 3 cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 4 the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 5 somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 6 appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 7 correct. 8 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 9 Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 10 our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 11 that complete information. So thank you very much for 12 trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 13 don't have any other questions. 14 Do my colleagues have other questions? 15 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have	ke
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. Do my colleagues have other questions? CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have 	ke
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative?	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. Do my colleagues have other questions? CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have any further questions. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And I do not have any further 	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. 2 I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 3 cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 4 the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 5 somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 6 appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 7 correct. 8 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 9 Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 10 our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 11 that complete information. So thank you very much for 12 trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 13 don't have any other questions. 14 Do my colleagues have other questions? 15 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have 16 any further questions. 17 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And I do not have any furt 18 questions either.	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of the collaborative would be exploratory. We have not	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. 2 I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 3 cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 4 the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 5 somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 6 appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 7 correct. 8 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 9 Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 10 our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 11 that complete information. So thank you very much for 12 trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 13 don't have any other questions. 14 Do my colleagues have other questions? 15 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have 16 any further questions. 17 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And I do not have any furt 18 questions either. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you indicated that PSE w	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of the collaborative would be exploratory. We have not identified any specific areas of concern. We just like to	1I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request.2I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset3cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off4the top of my head how many we had. This might have been5somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly6appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are7correct.8COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make9Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to10our list of bench requests that we will send just to get11that complete information. So thank you very much for12trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I13don't have any other questions.14Do my colleagues have other questions?15CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have16any further questions.17COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And I do not have any furt18questions either.19JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you indicated that PSE w20reserving the right to redirect. Did you intend to do any	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of the collaborative would be exploratory. We have not identified any specific areas of concern. We just like to know how the company do it and understand it better and	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. 2 I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 3 cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 4 the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 5 somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 6 appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 7 correct. 8 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 9 Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 10 our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 11 that complete information. So thank you very much for 12 trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 13 don't have any other questions. 14 Do my colleagues have other questions? 15 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have 16 any further questions. 17 Questions either. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you indicated that PSE w 20 reserving the right to redirect. Did you intend to do any 21 redirect of the company's witnesses?	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of the collaborative would be exploratory. We have not identified any specific areas of concern. We just like to know how the company do it and understand it better and addressed in how is our understanding about intercompany 	1 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. 2 I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset 3 cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off 4 the top of my head how many we had. This might have been 5 somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly 6 appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are 7 correct. 8 COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make 9 Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to 10 our list of bench requests that we will send just to get 11 that complete information. So thank you very much for 12 trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I 13 don't have any other questions. 14 Do my colleagues have other questions? 15 CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have 16 any further questions. 17 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And I do not have any furt 18 questions either. 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you indicated that PSE w 20 reserving the right to redirect. Did you intend to do any 21 redirect of the company's w	ke e
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 you have anything to add? MS. LIU: I don't specifically. Thank you, Mr. Piliaris. I think you summarized it very well. The company provides a gas hedging plan file as is with the commission, so commission staff is relatively familiar with gas hedging. However, when it comes to the gas for electric hedging and the electric hedging programs, staff is not as familiar. And during the data discovery process, we realized we really need a lot more time and resources in order to get to the bottom of this, so we requested this collaborative. CHAIR DANNER: Great. Thank you, that's very helpful. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: So is this collaborative more of an informational gathering session? Educational for staff and all the parties or are there specific concerns that you hope to address through the collaborative? MS. LIU: This is Jing, again. I think the nature of the collaborative would be exploratory. We have not identified any specific areas of concern. We just like to know how the company do it and understand it better and addressed in how is our understanding about intercompany transactions, as well as how the company balance the risk 	 I don't. I think that we prefer to get a bench request. I can tell you I think we use about 126 million to offset cold strips 1 and 2 regulatory assets. I don't recall off the top of my head how many we had. This might have been somewhere around 250 million, but I would certainly appreciate the chance to make sure those numbers are correct. COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, and I won't make Mr. Piliaris do math in his head. So we will add that to our list of bench requests that we will send just to get that complete information. So thank you very much for trying to do the math in your head. I appreciate it. I don't have any other questions. Do my colleagues have other questions? CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, commissioner. I don't have any further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Carson, you indicated that PSE w reserving the right to redirect. Did you intend to do any redirect of the company's witnesses? MS. CARSON: Yes, I would like to do brief redirect. And my first question actually relates to kind of a 	ke e

13 (Pages 99 to 102)

	Page 103		Page 105
1	everyone except public counsel and no one has any	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Were there any additional
2	objection to this, but, Ms. Free, could you address the	2	questions from the bench?
3	housekeeping correction to the settlement that you would	3	COMMISSIONER DANNER: No questions. Thank you.
4 5	like to that you've identified and would like to discuss?	4	COMMISSIONER RANDALL: None from me. Thank you.
6	MS. FREE: Yes. Thank you. On Page 2 I'm sorry,	6	MR. DALLAS: Judge Howard, can I have few redirect questions, please?
7	on Page 4 of the settlement agreement, it is in Section 3,	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Certainly. Please,
8	Item A-1(a), there is a rate reference that would be used	8	briefly, yes. Certainly.
9	for the tracking of our PCA mechanisms. That rate of	9	MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	\$40.706 per mega watt hour is incorrect. That rate is a	10	Ms. Liu, does staff have a list of green direct
11	grossed up rate for revenue sensitive items. It should be	11	customers?
12	a rate that is net of revenue sensitive items. So that	12	MS. LIU: Thank you for asking this, we actually do
13	rate should be changed to \$38.716 per mega watt hour and	13	not. In all the work papers that we receive from the
14	that rate can be found on page in attachment A to the	14	company, each one of the customers are only identified by
15	settlement agreement, Page 7, Column Roman Numeral I, Row	15	a code, so the list of customers are confidential; so even
16	37.	16	if we would like to notify them, we will have no means of
17	MS. CARSON: Thank you, Ms. Free. And then I just	17	doing that; and I also would like to say we believe the
18	have a question, I believe for Mr. Einstein. You were	18	commission has the authority to change the green direct
19	asked about when notice was given, actually both you and	19	credit level. Schedule 139 clearly states that the energy
20	Mr. Piliaris were asked when notice was given, about the	20	charge credit will be updated with each general rate case,
21	potential change to the green direct credit. So just to	21	power cost-only rate case, or other power related filings,
22	clarify, did PSE propose any changes to the green direct	22	so we feel this is within the commission's authority.
23	energy credit in its initial filing?	23	MR. DALLAS: Thank you, Ms. Liu.
24	MR. EINSTEIN: No, we did not.	24	MS. LIU: Thank you.
25	MS. CARSON: So no notice was given at that time of a	25	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Dallas, was that all of your
	Page 104		Page 106
1	change?	1	questions?
2	MR. EINSTEIN: That's correct.	2	MR. DALLAS: Yes, Your Honor.
3	MS. CARSON: And when was this change to the green	3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Well, with that I would
4	direct energy credit? When did this first come about?	4	like to thank our panel of witnesses for their testimony
5	MR. EINSTEIN: I'll defer to Mr. Piliaris.	5	today and their patience as we waited for the open meeting
6	MR. PILIARIS: I would like to actually clarify the	6	to conclude.
7	response given by Mr. Einstein on the last question	7	Is there anything else that we should address before
8	because the energy credit will change. It would have	8	we adjourn?
9	changed in this case regardless by virtue of the fact that	9	MS. GAFKEN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Lisa Gafken
10	the power costs were changing, so there was a change that	10	with public counsel and I do have one additional item to
11	was proposed, but there was not a change in the	11	address or to get direction from. So there are public
12	methodology that was proposed. So there was a very slight	12	comments that have been submitted both to the UTC and to
13	change in the credit that was proposed and they would	13	public counsel directly and we would put those comments
14	have the green direct customers should have taken	14	into a public comment exhibit. So I have two questions:
15	notice of that, so I want to make sure that is clear. And	15	One, the date on which we should file that, and I have a
16 17	now that I've clarified that, can you repeat the question?	16 17	proposal about that. And then two, what the exhibit
	MS. CARSON: Yeah, the question was: When did this	18	number would be.
18 19	change to the methodology for calculating the green direct credit become a real issue in this case?	19	So with respect to the filing date, I typically ask for about a week to prepare them. My impression is that
20	MR. PILIARIS: It became an issue, I think,	20	there are quite a few comments that have come in. I know,
20	officially in the settlement discussions among the	21	you know, in Puget cases, my office typically gets around
22	participants in the case and these were obviously	22	20 or so comments directly and with other companies, quite
23	confidential conversations among the parties.	23	a bit less. In this case, I know we've gotten upwards of
24	MS. CARSON: Okay. Thank you. That's all the	24	40 some and I suspect that the amount that we'll get from
25	questions I have.	25	the commission will also be fairly large, so I would
	-		

14 (Pages 103 to 106)

	Page 107	
1	propose that we file on April 30th, which is just over a	
2	week from today.	
3	JUDGE HOWARD: That would be acceptable for our	
4	purposes. I would even give you until May 4th. And if	
5	you wouldn't mind labeling the exhibit Bench Exhibit	
б	No. 5.	
7	MS. GAFKEN: Okay. No. 5 and May 4th will be lovely.	
8	Thank you.	
9	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Were there any other	
10	concerns or questions before we adjourn?	
11	Hearing nothing, that concludes our settlement	
12	hearing today and we are off the record. Thank you all.	
13 14		
14 15		
15 16	(CONCLUDED AT 1:18 P.M.)	
10 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Page 108	
1		
2	STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss.	
3 4	COUNTY OF BENTON)	
5	This is to certify that I, ChaRae Kent, the undersigned Washington Certified Court Reporter, residing	
6	at West Richland, reported the within and foregoing	
7	videoconference hearing on the date herein set forth; that said proceeding was taken by me in shorthand and	
8	thereafter transcribed, and that same is a true and correct record of the testimony of said witness, including	
	all questions, answers and objections, if any, of counsel.	
9	I further certify that I am not a relative or	
10	employee or attorney or counsel of any the parties, nor am I financially interested in the outcome of the cause.	
11	This transcript and invoice have been prepared and	
12	submitted for final production and delivery in accordance	
13	with all Washington State laws, rules and regulations, including WAC-308-14-130, WAC 308-14-135, RCW 18-145, and	
14	applicable court rules regulating formatting and equal terms requirements. Alterations, changes, fees or charges	
	that violate any of these provisions are not authorized by	
15 16	me. This certification does not apply to reproduction of	
17	this transcript by any means unless under my direct supervision and control.	
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Washington State CCR number this 10th day	
19	of May, 2021.	
20 21		
22	CHARAE KENT, RPR, CCR	
	Certified Court Reporter in The State of Washington	
23	License CCR No. 2408	
24		
25		

15 (Pages 107 to 108)

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					1 490 100
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		90:11.12.15	62:16 88:5	appreciate 72:12	53:8 61:24 62:3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
Article administrative allowing 63:25 appreciates 73:23 86:19 74:13,22 accept 70:11 administion 62:12,25 allows 65:6,11 66:8 appropriate 83:7 74:9 Aurora 57:19,20 acceptable 107:3 admit 78:8 alter 82:5 appropriate 83:7 96:22 101:18 Aurora's 58:7 accompanying adopted 73:10 Alternations 108:14 appropriate 83:7 authority 105:18 88:22 adopted 73:10 Alternate 59:11 approvel 56:6 75:11 approvel 56:6 75:1 authorized 108:14 88:22 accomplished altraits 87:12 amortized 95:23 approving 83:23 avoide 69:5 Accet 58:9 affect 65:8 74:19 anloyis 54:22 57:16 66:15 74:17 71:21,24 72:1,2 active 71:14 affirmative 86:10 analysis 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 71:22 472:1,2 addition 76:6 after moon 62:2,7 97:2 answers 85:23 97:1 array 93:21 array 93:21 aske 47:13 75:12 additional 84:1 67:5 71:17,23 answers 108:28 answers 108:28 aske 47:13 75:12 Biori 23:14:12,223 85:13					
					•
Accept 70:11 accept 70:11 active 71:12 active 71:12 actin actine 71:12 active 71:12 active 71:12 active 71:12 ac			0		
acceptable 107:3 accommodation 73:2463:10 admit 78:8 adopted 73:1096:7 alter 82:5 alter 82:5 approvinately approvinately approvinately approved 56:17 approved 75:13 approvinately 66:16 66:19 67:12 approved 75:13 atfixer 87:12 actively 70:13 affirmatively 75:25 attime 86:10 affirmatively 75:25 addition 76:6 add 79:10.14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 addition 11:0 affired 108:18 affirmatively 75:25 addition 76:6 addition 71:10 addition 11:11 address 65:19 addition 71:11 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 66:2 address 66:2 address 66:2 address 65:19 address 66:2 address 66:18 address 61:18 address 61:18 address 61:14 address 61:14 addr	,		,		
accommodition 73:24 admit 78:8 admitted 63:20,23 admitted 63:20,23 admitted 63:20,23 adopted 73:10 alter 82:5 Alterations 108:14 approval 56:6 75:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:1 approval 56:6 71:1 approval 56:1 appro	-	-			· ·
accomplant admitted 63:20,23 Alterations 108:14 72:12 105:22 accomplanying 88:22 adopting 54:12 Alternate 59:11 approval 56:675:11 available 66:25 accomplished 68:21 advantage 80:13 amended 55:22.224 approve 64:11 available 66:25 Accounting 54:19 Acgis 88:5 amount 96:18 97:4 approving 83:23 avoided 69:5 accurately 65:7 affect 65:8 74:19 101:19 106:24 approving 83:23 aware 89:1 92:8 Actively 70:13 affirmative 86:10 analysis 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 71:21,24 72:1,2 90:3 attiminotation 76:6 analysis 54:22 57:6 61:1,8 67:7 107:1 aware 89:1 92:8 add 79:10,14 82:21 78:2 86:4,7 89:16,19 argument 77:13 argument 77:13 90:3 affirmatively 75:25 answered 95:16 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 addition 76:6 affirenton 62:2,7 97:2 argument 77:13 B 54:5 address 65:19 agre 07:17,73 answered 95:16 asked 79:4 84:11 Balbridge 52:22 address 65:19 agree 72:16 76:21 <td< td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	-				
Alternate 59:11 approval 56:6 75:1 authorized 108:14 88:22 adopted 73:10 Alternate 59:11 approval 56:6 75:1 authorized 108:14 88:22 accomplished advantage 80:13 amending 76:7.9 65:16 66:19 67:12 available 66:25 Accounting 54:19 Aegis 88:5 amount 96:18 97:4 approval 75:13 avoided 69:5 Accurs 57:13 affirs 87:12 amount 96:18 97:4 approvin 83:23 aware 89:1 92:8 accurately 65:7 affired 65:8 74:19 101:19 106:24 approvainately approvim 82:33 acture 71:14 affirmative 86:10 analysis 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 71:21,24 72:1,2 active 71:14 affirmatively 75:25 analouse 87:23 97:1 argue 80:25 72:20 83:12 88:1 90:3 affired 108:18 answered 95:16 asked 79:4 84:11 73:12,920 addition 76:6 afternoon 62:2,7 97:2 aside 98:17 asked 79:4 84:11 90:51 106:10 87:23 88:3 anticipate 91:18 103:19,20 asked 79:4 84:11 100:12 100:2 agreeenet 55:8,23 anybody's 76:19 ask					č
Adopting 54:12 accomplished 68:21 Adopting 54:12 advantage 80:13 81:10 Amended 55:22,24 amending 76:7,9 81:10 approve 64:11 65:16 66:19 67:12 69:25 77:19 82:3 approved 75:13 approved 75:13 available 66:25 70:1 71:18 Accounting 54:19 Accounting 54:19 Aegis 88:5 affairs 87:12 accurately 65:7 affairs 87:12 amount 96:18 97:4 approving 83:23 accurately 65:7 approving 83:23 approved 75:13 approved 75:13 available 66:25 70:1 71:18 Acquire 57:13 active 71:14 active 71:14 attive 17:14 attive 70:13 attia 69:5 89:13 90:3 affirm 88:11 86:13 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:10 affirmative 85:23 97:1 atdition 76:6 affired 108:18 answers 108:8 addites 65:19 agree 72:16 76:11 atdites 106:10 87:23 88:3 anticipate 91:18 address 65:19 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 65:14 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 65:14 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 71:17 addresse 66:2 72:2 agree 66:13 74:14 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 71:17 addresse 66:2 72:2 agree 66:13 74:14 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 75:7 agree 66:2 72:2 agree 66:12 72:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:2 73:2 46:6 72:4,20 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:2 73:2 46:6 72:4,20 agree 75:7 agree 66:2 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 75:7 agree 66:12 agree 65:18 agree 75:7 agree 65:18 agree 75:7 agree 65:18 agree 75:7 agree 65:18 agree 65:18 agr					
accomplished 68:21 advantage 80:13 81:10 amending 76:7.9 amiss 79:6 65:16 66:19 67:12 69:25 77:19 82:8 70:1 71:18 Avenue 53:8 Accossing Accounting 54:19 Aegis 88:5 affairs 87:12 active 77:13 amont jee 65:8 74:19 90:20 amount 96:18 97:4 analysis 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 approving 83:23 aware 89:1 92:8 avoide 69:5 aware 89:1 92:8 Accurately 65:7 active 71:14 actively 70:13 affirmative 86:10 affirmative 86:10 analysis 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 Avec 53:8 avoide 69:5 90:20 actual 69:5 89:13 86:13 affirmatively 75:25 ann onuoncement announcement 98:7 100:1 102:9 array 93:21 affirenon 62:2,7 97:2 array 93:21 array 93:21 asked 79:4 84:11 asked 79:4 84:11 B 54:5 back 64:13 75:12 addition 76:6 69:23 77:42,55 arrive 72:7 agere 72:16 76:21 agree 72:16 76:21 73:7 96:2 100:17 arrive 72:7 83:5,13,24 84:9 asker 95:16 apparently 89:11 apparently 89:10 apparently 89:10 apparently 89:10 apparently 89:10 apparente 55:24 56:6,20 72:12 100:22 arrive 72:2 arrive 72:25 90:1 83:51,15 64:4 70:7 73:22 86:23 asset 102:3 assistant 62:24 asset 102:3 83:1,15 96:14,22 addresses 66:2 72:12 100:22 37:10 agree 66:10 72:4,20 appearing 62:3,8 107:10 adjustent 55:12 agree 66:18 72:12 agree		-			
and the second field of the second		1 0	· · · · · ·	**	
Accounting 54:19 Accounting 54:19 Accounting 54:19 Accounting 54:19 Accounting 54:19 Acquire 57:13 active 71:14 active 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:13 attive 71:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:11 attive 70:13 attive 70:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:14 attive 70:13 attive 70:10 attive 70:13 attive 70:12 attive 70:12 attiv		U	8		
Acct 58:9 accurately 65:7affairs 87:12 affect 65:8 74:19amount 96:18 97:4 101:19 106:24 analysis 54:22 57:6approximately 66:15 74:17 April 51:18 54:3 61:1,8 67:7 107:1 argue 80:25aware 89:1 92:8 AWEC 63:12,13actively 70:13 actively 70:13 actively 70:13 adt 99:0,14 82:21affirmatively 75:25 afficed 108:18 affirmatively 75:25amouncement answer 85:23 97:11 answer 85:23 97:11 answer 85:23 97:12 array 93:21array 93:21 array 93:21 aside 98:17 aside 98:17aware 89:1 92:8 AWEC 63:12,1390:3 90:3 90:3affirmatively 75:25 afficed 108:18 affired 108:18 affired 108:18 age 0101:1 age 0101:1 agree 72:16 76:21 argue 68:13 74:14mouncement answer 80:8 anticipate 91:18 anyway 93:19array 93:21 asked 79:4 84:11 Binbridge 52:22 Balasbas 53:13Additionally 71:4 addresse 65:19 73:7 96:2 100:27 r3:7 96:2 100:22 addresse 66:2green 68:13 74:14 73:10,15 83:17 agreent 55:8,23 agreement 55:8,23 addresse 66:2array 93:19 agreent 55:8,23 agreement 55:8,23 agreement 55:8,23 agreement 55:12 agreement 55:12 agrees 63:18 72:11 adjustment 55:12 adjustment 55:12 adjustment 55:12affir 82:18 80:4 agrees 63:18 72:1 alplicable 69:18 agrees 63:18 72:1 appears 75:7 applicable 69:12 applicable 69:12 applicable 69:12 agreement 55:12 agrees 63:18 72:1amount 96:18 97:4 applicable 69:12 applicable 6					
Accuratoly 65:7 affect 65:8 74:19 101:19 106:24 approximately AWEC 63:12,13 Acquire 57:13 affect 65:8 74:19 101:19 106:24 approximately AWEC 63:12,13 actively 70:13 affirmative 86:10 analysts 54:22 57:6 66:15 74:17 71:21,24 72:1,2 actual 69:5 89:13 affirmatively 75:25 analysts 75:25 Ann 53:12 61:14 areas 72:2 100:20 areas 72:2 100:20 addition 76:6 affer 006:22,7 97:2 aswer 85:23 97:1 array 93:21 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 additional 84:1 67:5 71:17,23 answer 095:16 aswer 095:16 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 Binbridge 52:22 back 64:13 75:12 address 65:19 67:5 71:17,23 anyway 93:19 76:5 80:15 81:25 Balabas 53:13 Balance 70:25 72:7 addresse 65:19 79:10 17 83:5,13,24 84:9 apologize 62:14.20 98:3,10 105:12 73:22 80:10 81:7 addresses 66:2 57:24 56:6,20 37:10 71:18 89:11 apperame 61:22 assistant 52:8 66:10 84:4 70:7 addresses 66:2 73:10,14 82:6 appearance 52:1 assistant 52:8 102:17 Bace 74:5 Bace 74:5 Bace 52:5 68:1	6	0			
Interfuely 07:13 active 71:14 active 71:14 active 71:14 active 71:14 atfirmative 86:10 atual 69:5 89:13 90:3 atfirmative 86:10 add 79:10,14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 addition 76:6 add 79:10,14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 additional 84:1 92:5 95:9,15 add 79:10,14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 additional 84:1 92:5 95:9,15 add 79:10,14 82:21 92:5 95:9,15 additional 84:1 92:5 95:9,15 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:19 address 65:12 73:7 96:2 100:17 address 65:12 address 66:2 74:3 address 66:2 74:3 address 65:2 address 66:2 74:3 address 65:2 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 74:3 address 65:2 75:24 56:6,20 75:24 56:6,2					
Active 71:14 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:13 active 71:14 active 71:14 affirmatively 75:25 add 79:10,14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 addition 16:6 additional 84:1 92:5 95:9,15 additionally 71:4 additionally 71:4 additionally 71:4 age 101:1 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 68:13 74:14 79:11,15 83:17 addresse 65:19 addresse 66:2 72:12 100:22 addresse 66:2 55:24 56:6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 adjourn 106:8 107:10 adjudication 94:11 adjusted 69:2 adjusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:2 adjusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:2 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:2 algusted 69:4 algusted 69:2 algusted 69:2 algusted 69:2 alg	U U				,
actively 70:13 actively 70:14 actively 70:14 actively 70:13 actively 70:14 actively 70:16 actively 70:17 actively 70:17 activ					
Ann 53:12 61:14 90:3areas 72:2 100:20 argue 80:2579:20 83:12 88:190:3 90:3affirmatively 75:25 add 79:10.14 82:21 98:7 100:1 102:9 addition 76:6 attend 94:11 92:5 95:9,15 105:1 106:10Ann 53:12 61:14 answer 85:23 97:1 97:2areas 72:2 100:20 argue 80:25 argument 77:13 aring 93:21 arived 72:7 askied 79:484:11 103:19,2079:20 83:12 88:1 B4ditionally 71:4 address 65:19 73:7 96:2 100:17 101:22 103:2affirmatively 75:23 affired 108:18 attend 91:11 agree 72:16 76:21 agree d 68:13 74:14 93:10answer 80:82 anticipate 91:18 apologize 62:14,20 appearance 61:22 93:10areas 72:2 100:20 asking 75:11,11,18 asked 79:4 84:11 103:19,20Bainbridge 52:22 balance 70:25 72:7 asking 75:11,11,18 Balasbas 53:1369:23 72:4,25 73:7 96:2 100:17 101:22 103:279:11,15 83:17 93:10apologize 62:14,20 appearance 61:22 agreement 55:8,23 62:5,15 89:11 appearance 61:22 agreement 55:8,23assets 102:3 assistance 65:24 98:11 assistance 65:24 99:13,15 96:14,22 97:10 98:4,986:1,15 87:5,11 92:13,15 96:14,22 92:3 10:16:16 61:24 62:3 87:19 assistant 52:8base 65:25 68:1 based 64:10addressing 71:17 adjusted 69:2 adjusted 69:2 adjusted 69:2 adjustem t 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9agreement 65:18 agreement 65:18 agreeme				-	
add 109, 139, 139 affirmatively 75:25 announcement argue 80:25 argument 77:13 argue 80:25 add 79:10,14 82:21 78:2 86:4,7 89:16,19 arrived 72:13 argue 80:25 addition 76:6 affirmatively 75:25 answer 85:23 97:1 arrived 72:7 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 addition 18 4:1 67:5 71:17,23 answers 108:8 asked 79:4 84:11 103:19,20 Additionally 71:4 ago 101:1 anyway 93:19 76:5 80:15 81:25 Balasbas 53:13 69:23 72:4,25 78:3,4,10 79:24 apologise 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 assets 102:3 Balasbas 53:13 69:21 00:17 83:5,13,24 84:9 apologise 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 32:28 0:10 81:7 106:7,11 79:11,15 83:17 appearance 61:22 assistant 52:8 102:17 addresse 66:2 55:24 56:6,20 appearances 52:1 assistant 52:8 102:17 addresses 66:2 73:10,14 82:6 appearance 52:1 assistant 52:8 102:17 addresse 66:2 73:10,14 82:6 appeared 99:12 assicant 52:8 102:17 addresse 66:2 73:10,14 82:6 appeared 99:12 assicant 52:8 <td< td=""><td>e</td><td></td><td>•</td><td>-</td><td></td></td<>	e		•	-	
Add 79:10,14 82:2178:2 86:4,789:16,19argument 77:13B98:7 100:1 102:9affixed 108:18answer 85:23 97:1array 93:21atray 93:21B 54:5additional 84:167:5 71:17,23answered 95:16aside 98:17aside 98:17aside 98:1792:5 95:9,1587:4,8,10,17,17answers 108:8asked 79:4 84:11Bainbridge 52:224ditionally 71:4agree 72:16 76:21anyway 93:1976:5 80:15 81:25Balasbas 53:1369:23 72:4,2578:3,4,10 79:24apologies 87:1689:24,25 90:161:15 64:4 70:773:7 96:2 100:1783:5,13,24 84:9apologies 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1273:22 80:10 81:7101:22 103:2agree d 68:13 74:1473:11 79:18 89:11asset 102:382:11,20,23 85:1addresse 67:12593:10appearance 61:22assistance 65:2495:13,15 96:14,2272:12 100:22agreement 55:8,2362:5,15 89:1171:2 74:4,797:10 98:4,9addresse 66:255:24 56:6,2053:1 61:1661:24 62:3 87:19bads 68:10addressing 71:1764:6 72:4,20appearance 52:1assistant 52:8102:17adjourn 106:873:10,14 82:6appeard 99:12associated 72:8,14base 65:25 68:1adjustment 55:12agrees 63:18 72:1108:1398:17assuming 94:25adjustment 55:12agrees 63:18 72:1application 72:22attachment 103:14BJJ-3 55:12adjustment 55:12s2:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14BJJ-3 55:12adjustment 55:1582:1	actual 69:5 89:13				79:20 83:12 88:1
add 79:10,14.82:21 73.2.30:4,7 367:10:19 affixed 108:18 array 93:21 array 93:21 addition 76:6 affixed 108:18 answer 85:23 97:1 array 93:21 aside 98:17 site 72:7 addition 184:1 67:5 71:17,23 answere 05:16 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 site 72:7 site 64:13 75:12 105:1 106:10 87:23 88:3 anticipate 91:18 103:19,20 back 64:13 75:12 back 64:13 75:12 Additionally 71:4 ago 101:1 anybody's 76:19 asking 75:11,11,18 Bainbridge 52:22 balance 70:25 72:7 Additionally 71:4 ago 101:1 anybody's 76:19 asking 75:11,11,118 100:23 Balasbas 53:13 anyway 93:19 76:5 80:15 81:25 61:15 64:4 70:7 73:7 96:2 100:17 83:5,13,24 84:9 apologize 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 73:22 80:10 81:7 106:7,11 79:11,15 83:17 appearenty 89:10 assets 102:3 86:1,15 87:5,11 addressed 71:25 93:10 appearance 61:22 assistance 65:24 95:13,15 96:14,2: 74:3 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 53:1 61:16 61:24 62:3 87:19 bands 68:10 addressig 71:17 64:6 72:4,20<	90:3	•		0	
98:7 100:1 102:9 anter noon 62:2,7 anter noon 62:2,7 answere 108:2 97:1 arrived 72:7 back 64:13 75:12 additional 84:1 97:2 arrived 72:7 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 105:1 106:10 87:23 88:3 anticipate 91:18 anticipate 91:18 asked 79:4 84:11 103:19,20 Additionally 71:4 ago 101:1 anyway 93:19 76:5 80:15 81:25 Balasbas 53:13 69:23 72:4,25 78:3,4,10 79:24 apologize 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 73:22 80:10 81:7 101:22 103:2 agreed 68:13 74:14 79:11,15 83:17 applogize 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 73:22 80:10 81:7 addressed 71:25 93:10 appearance 61:22 assistance 65:24 95:13,15 96:14,2: addresses 66:2 75:6 59:5,6,10,12 53:1 61:16 61:24 62:3 87:19 associated 72:8,14 adjourn 106:8 73:10,14 82:6 appeard 99:12 associated 72:8,14 base 65:25 68:1 adjudication 94:11 103:15 appearance 52:7 assum 88:20 assum 94:25 s8:6,24 69:4,9 ahead 58:21 80:4 application 72:22 assuming 94:25 basis 73:8 adjustment 5	add 79:10,14 82:21	,	<i>'</i>	0	
addition 76:5 addition 26:1, 7 answered 95:16 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 additional 84:1 92:5 95:9,15 87:4,8,10,17,17 answered 95:16 aside 98:17 aside 98:17 Additionally 71:4 ago 101:1 apologies 87:16 apyeay 93:19 asking 75:11,11,18 100:23 69:23 72:4,25 78:3,4,10 79:24 apologies 87:16 apologies 87:16 aspects 65:4 aside 98:17 73:7 96:2 100:17 83:5,13,24 84:9 apologies 62:14,20 98:3,10 105:12 32:11,20,23 85:14 106:7,11 79:11,15 83:17 appearance 61:22 assistance 65:24 82:11,20,23 85:14 addressed 71:25 72:12 100:22 agreement 55:8,23 62:5,15 89:11 assistant 52:8 86:1,15 87:5,11 74:3 57:6 59:5,6,10,12 53:1 61:16 61:24 62:3 87:19 associated 72:8,14 93:10 adjusted 69:2 agreement 65:18 agreement 65:18 appearance 52:1 assuming 94:25 based 74:5 adjusted 69:2 agreement 65:18 agrees 63:18 72:1 application 72:22 assuming 94:25 basis 73:8 adjustment 55:12 58:21 90:4 application 72:22 application 72:22 attachment 10	98:7 100:1 102:9			v	
additional 84:1bits in 11,25answer(a) 95:18asked 79:4Bainbridge 52:2292:5 95:9,1587:4,8,10,17,17answers 108:8asked 79:484:11103:19,20Additionally 71:4ago 101:1anybody's 76:19asking 75:11,11,118100:23address 65:19agree 72:16 76:21anyway 93:1976:5 80:15 81:25Balasbas 53:1369:23 72:4,2578:3,4,10 79:24apologize 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1273:22 80:10 81:773:7 96:2 100:1783:5,13,24 84:9apologize 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1273:22 80:10 81:7101:22 103:2agreed 68:13 74:1473:11 79:18 89:11aspects 65:482:11,20,23 85:14106:7,1179:11,15 83:17appearance 61:22assistance 65:2492:13,15 96:14,2272:12 100:22agreement 55:8,2362:5,15 89:1171:2 74:4,797:10 98:4,9addresseg 71:1764:6 72:4,20appearance 52:1assistant 52:8102:17adjourn 106:873:10,14 82:6appearing 62:3,898:17bands 68:10adjusted 69:2agreements 65:18appears 75:7assum 88:2055:4,6,15 65:6adjusted 69:2agrees 63:18 72:1108:13assuming 94:25baseline 54:16,1758:6,24 69:4,9abed 58:21 80:4application 72:22attachment 103:14attachment 103:14adjustment 55:1282:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14attachment 103:14adjustment 55:1282:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14attachment 103:14adjustment 55:12 </td <td>addition 76:6</td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	addition 76:6	,			
92.5 95.9,13Str.23 88:3 anticipate 91:18 address 65:19Str.23 88:3 ago 101:1 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 68:13 74:14anticipate 91:18 anybody's 76:19 apologize 62:14,20Instr.10.1011 asking 75:11,11,18 76:5 80:15 81:25balance 70:25 72:7 100:2369:23 72:4,25 73:7 96:2 100:17 101:22 103:278:3,4,10 79:24 83:5,13,24 84:9 agreed 68:13 74:14apologize 62:14,20 73:11 79:11 889:11 apparently 89:10 appearance 61:22 93:1098:3,10 105:12 98:3,10 105:12Balasbas 53:13 61:15 64:4 70:7 73:22 80:10 81:7addressed 71:25 72:12 100:22 addresses 66:2 74:3 addressing 71:17 adjucication 94:11 aljusted 69:2 agreement 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9greenent 55:18 83:2 94:6 103:7 103:15 agrees 63:18 72:1 aljustment 55:12 88:2,24 69:4,9agrees 63:18 72:1 appication 72:22 appication 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 applied 101:20balance 70:25 72:7 assistant 52:8 balasbas 53:13 61:15 64:4 70:7 73:22 80:10 81:7balance 70:25 72:7 addresses 66:255:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20 73:10,14 82:6 appearing 62:3,8 applicable 69:18 aljusten 55:12 s8:6,24 69:4,9applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 applicable 101:20attend 94:17 95:4 attend 94:17 95:4balance 70:25 72:7 applicable 101:20attend 94:17 95:4 attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ-3 55:12	additional 84:1	,			
Additionally 71:4 address 65:19ago 101:1 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 72:16 76:21 agree 68:13 74:14anybody's 76:19 anyway 93:19 apologize 87:16 apologize 62:14,20asking 75:11,11,18 89:24,25 90:1 89:24,25 90:1100:23 61:15 64:4 70:7 73:22 80:10 81:7 73:22 80:10 81:7101:22 103:2 101:22 103:2agreed 68:13 74:14 93:1073:11 79:18 89:11 appearance 61:22 93:10assets 102:3 assistance 65:24 95:13,15 96:14,22 assistance 65:24 95:13,15 96:14,2286:1,15 87:5,11 86:1,15 87:5,11 95:13,15 96:14,22 93:10addresses 66:2 74:355:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20 74:3appearance 61:22 55:24 56:6,20 74:3assistant 52:8 61:26 62:3 87:19 addresses 66:2assistant 52:8 102:17addressing 71:17 adjucication 94:11 103:15 adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustment 55:12agreements 65:18 agrees 63:18 72:1 altead 58:21 80:4 82:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22 application 72:	92:5 95:9,15				U
Additionally 71:4ag to 1011algo 1011algo 10111algo 10111algo 10111address 65:19agree 72:16 76:21anyway 93:19asking 1511111069:23 72:4,2578:3,4,10 79:24apologies 87:1689:24,25 90:176:5 80:15 81:2573:7 96:2 100:1783:5,13,24 84:9apologie 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1282:11,20,23 85:12101:22 103:2agreed 68:13 74:1473:11 79:18 89:11aspects 65:482:11,20,23 85:12106:7,1179:11,15 83:17apparently 89:10assets 102:382:11,20,23 85:14addressed 71:2593:10appearance 61:22assistance 65:2495:13,15 96:14,2272:12 100:22agreement 55:8,2362:5,15 89:1171:2 74:4,797:10 98:4,9addressing 71:1764:6 72:4,20appearances 52:1associated 72:8,14base 65:25 68:1adjuctation 94:11103:15appears 75:7assum 88:20base 65:25 68:1adjusteed 69:2agreements 65:18applicable 69:18assuming 94:25basis 73:8adjustment 55:1282:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-2 55:1158:6,24 69:4,982:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12adjustments 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12	105:1 106:10		-	-	
address 65:19agree 72:16 76:21anyway 93:1976:5 80:15 81:25Balasbas 53:1369:23 72:4,2578:3,4,10 79:24apologies 87:1689:24,25 90:161:15 64:4 70:773:7 96:2 100:1783:5,13,24 84:9apologie 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1273:22 80:10 81:7101:22 103:2agreed 68:13 74:1473:11 79:18 89:11aspects 65:482:11,20,23 85:1-106:7,1179:11,15 83:17apparently 89:10assets 102:386:1,15 87:5,11addressed 71:2593:10appearance 61:22assistance 65:2495:13,15 96:14,2:74:355:24 56:6,2055:24 56:6,2053:1 61:1661:24 62:3 87:1996:3 91:25 96:4adjourn 106:853:2 94:6 103:773:22 86:2398:1790:3 91:25 96:498:17adjudication 94:11103:15appears 75:7assume 88:20assuming 94:25basis 73:8adjustment 55:12agrees 63:18 72:1108:13application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-2 55:1158:6,24 69:4,982:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BJJ-3 55:12adjustments 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BJJ-3 55:12	Additionally 71:4	0		0	
69:25 72:4,2510:3,1,10 19:11apologize 62:14,2098:3,10 105:1273:22 80:10 81:773:7 96:2 100:17agreed 68:13 74:1479:11,15 83:17agreed 68:13 74:1473:11 79:18 89:11aspects 65:4assets 102:3106:7,1179:11,15 83:1793:10apparently 89:10assets 102:386:1,15 87:5,11addressed 71:2593:10agreement 55:8,2362:5,15 89:11assistance 65:2495:13,15 96:14,2274:357:6 59:5,6,10,1264:6 72:4,20appearances 52:1assistant 52:8102:17adjourn 106:873:10,14 82:6appearing 62:3,890:3 91:25 96:4base 65:25 68:1107:10103:15agreements 65:18appears 75:7assume 88:20sseim 74:5adjusted 69:2agrees 63:18 72:1applicable 69:18108:13applicable 69:18assuming 94:25adjustment 55:1282:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-2 55:11adjustment 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-3 55:12	•	0			
73:7 96:2 100:17 101:22 103:2 106:7,1183:5,13,24 84:9 agreed 68:13 74:14 79:11,15 83:17 93:10apologize 62:14,20 73:11 79:18 89:11 apparently 89:10 appearance 61:22 62:5,15 89:1198:3,10 105:12 aspects 65:4 assets 102:3 assistance 65:24 71:2 74:4,7 95:13,15 96:14,22 95:13,15 96:14,22 9102:1773:22 80:10 81:7 82:11,20,23 85:14 86:1,15 87:5,11 95:13,15 96:14,22 9102:17addressing 71:17 adjustaction 94:11 103:15 adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:1598:17 appears 75:7 applicable 69:18 108:13 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 application 72:22 attachment 103:14 BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ-3 55:1273:22 80:20 BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ-3 55:12	69:23 72:4,25		1 0	,	
101:22 103:2 106:7,11agreed 68:13 74:14 79:11,15 83:17 93:1073:11 79:18 89:11 apparently 89:10 appearance 61:22aspects 65:4 assets 102:3 assistance 65:24 71:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:882:11,20,23 85:14 86:1,15 87:5,11addressed 71:25 72:12 100:22 addresses 66:2 74:393:10 appearent 55:8,23 55:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20 55:24 56:6,20appearance 61:22 appearances 52:1 53:1 61:16 appearances 52:1assistance 65:24 71:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:8 61:24 62:3 87:1990:3 91:25 96:14,22 97:10 98:4,9 102:17addressing 71:17 adjourn 106:8 107:1064:6 72:4,20 73:10,14 82:6 83:2 94:6 103:7appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:23 appears 75:7 appears 75:7 appears 75:7 assume 88:20 assuming 94:25base 65:25 68:1 baseline 54:16,17 55:4,6,15 65:6 basis 73:8adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15agrees 63:18 72:1 82:11 94:13 95:14108:13 application 72:22 applied 101:20attachment 103:14 attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ-3 55:12		83:5,13,24 84:9	apologize 62:14,20	98:3,10 105:12	
106:7,1179:11,15 83:17apparently 89:10assets 102:386:1,15 87:5,11addressed 71:2593:10appearance 61:22assistance 65:2495:13,15 96:14,23addresses 66:255:24 56:6,2055:24 56:6,2055:24 56:6,20appearances 52:1assistant 52:874:357:6 59:5,6,10,1253:1 61:1661:24 62:3 87:19102:17adjourn 106:864:6 72:4,20appearing 62:3,890:3 91:25 96:4base 65:25 68:1107:1083:2 94:6 103:773:22 86:2398:17baseline 54:16,17adjustment 55:12agreements 65:18agrees 63:18 72:1appears 75:7assume 88:2055:4,6,15 65:6adjustment 55:1258:6,24 69:4,982:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-1T 55:10adjustment 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12		agreed 68:13 74:14	73:11 79:18 89:11	aspects 65:4	
addressed 71:25 72:12 100:22 addresses 66:2 74:393:10 agreement 55:8,23 55:24 56:6,20 57:6 59:5,6,10,12appearance 61:22 62:5,15 89:11 appearances 52:1 53:1 61:16 appeared 99:12 adjourn 106:8 107:10assistance 65:24 71:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:8 61:24 62:3 87:19 associated 72:8,14 90:3 91:25 96:4 98:1795:13,15 96:14,22 97:10 98:4,9 102:17addressing 71:17 adjourn 106:8 107:1064:6 72:4,20 73:10,14 82:6 83:2 94:6 103:7 103:15 adjusted 69:2 s8:6,24 69:4,9 adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9appearance 61:22 62:5,15 89:11 appearances 52:1 53:1 61:16 appeared 99:12 appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:23 applicable 69:18 applicable 69:18 application 72:22 applied 101:20assistance 65:24 71:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:8 base 65:25 68:1 base 65:25 68:1 base 74:5 baseline 54:16,17 55:4,6,15 65:6 basis 73:8adjustment 55:12 s8:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:1593:11 94:13 95:14 82:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22 applied 101:20assistance 61:22 71:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:8 98:1795:13,15 96:14,22 97:10 98:4,9 102:17adjustment 55:12 baseline 54:16application 72:22 applied 101:20assuming 94:25 attachment 103:14 atten 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ-3 55:12	106:7.11	79:11,15 83:17	apparently 89:10	assets 102:3	
72:12 100:22 addresses 66:2 74:3agreement 55:8,23 55:24 56:6,20 57:6 59:5,6,10,1262:5,15 89:11 appearances 52:1 53:1 61:1671:2 74:4,7 assistant 52:897:10 98:4,9 102:17addressing 71:17 adjourn 106:8 107:1064:6 72:4,20 73:10,14 82:6 83:2 94:6 103:753:1 61:16 appeared 99:12 appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:2355:24 56:6,20 assistant 52:897:10 98:4,9 102:17adjudication 94:11 adjusted 69:2 s8:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:1573:22 86:23 appeared 99:12 appears 75:7 appears 75:7 applicable 69:18 application 72:2290:3 91:25 96:4 98:17base 65:25 68:1 basel 74:5adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15agreements 65:18 application 72:22 abead 58:21 80:4 82:11 94:13 95:14application 72:22 applied 101:20assume 88:20 assuming 94:25 Attaching 54:12 attachment 103:14 BDJ-2 55:11 BDJ-3 55:12	<i>,</i>	93:10	appearance 61:22	assistance 65:24	
addresses 66:2 74:355:24 56:6,20 57:6 59:5,6,10,12appearances 52:1 53:1 61:16assistant 52:8 61:24 62:3 87:19102:17 bands 68:10addressing 71:17 adjourn 106:8 107:1064:6 72:4,20 73:10,14 82:653:1 61:16 appeared 99:12associated 72:8,14 90:3 91:25 96:4base 65:25 68:1 based 74:5adjudication 94:11 adjusted 69:2 s8:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15103:15 agrees 63:18 72:1 82:11 94:13 95:14appearances 52:1 103:15associated 72:8,14 99:3 91:25 96:4base 65:25 68:1 based 74:5adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15agrees 63:18 72:1 82:11 94:13 95:14applicable 69:18 108:13 applied 101:20assuming 94:25 Attaching 54:12 attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-1T 55:10 BDJ-3 55:12		agreement 55:8,23	62:5,15 89:11	71:2 74:4,7	,
74:357:6 59:5,6,10,1253:1 61:1661:24 62:3 87:19bands 68:10addressing 71:1764:6 72:4,20appeared 99:12associated 72:8,14base 65:25 68:1adjourn 106:873:10,14 82:6appearing 62:3,890:3 91:25 96:4base 74:5107:1083:2 94:6 103:773:22 86:2398:17baseline 54:16,17adjudication 94:11103:15appears 75:7assume 88:20sseline 54:16,17adjusted 69:2agreements 65:18agrees 63:18 72:1applicable 69:18assuming 94:2558:6,24 69:4,9alead 58:21 80:4application 72:22attachment 103:14BDJ-2 55:11adjustments 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4BDJ-3 55:12		55:24 56:6,20	appearances 52:1		
addressing 71:17 adjourn 106:8 107:1064:6 72:4,20 73:10,14 82:6 83:2 94:6 103:7 103:15appeared 99:12 appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:23associated 72:8,14 90:3 91:25 96:4 98:17base 65:25 68:1 based 74:5adjudication 94:11 adjusted 69:2 stee 69:2 adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15103:15 agreements 65:18 agrees 63:18 72:1 ahead 58:21 80:4 82:11 94:13 95:14appeared 99:12 appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:23 applicable 69:18 108:13associated 72:8,14 90:3 91:25 96:4 98:17base 65:25 68:1 based 74:5adjustment 55:12 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15aspeared 99:12 appearing 62:3,8 103:15appearing 62:3,8 73:22 86:23 applicable 69:18 108:13assume 88:20 assuming 94:25 Attaching 54:12 attachment 103:14 BDJ-2 55:11base 65:25 68:1 baseline 54:16,17 55:4,6,15 65:6baseline 54:16,17 55:4,6,15 65:6basis 73:8 BDJ-1T 55:10BDJ-1T 55:10 BDJ-3 55:12BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ 455:12		57:6 59:5,6,10,12	53:1 61:16	61:24 62:3 87:19	
adjourn 106:8 73:10,14 82:6 appearing 62:3,8 90:3 91:25 96:4 based 74:5 107:10 83:2 94:6 103:7 103:15 appearing 62:3,8 98:17 ssume 88:20 adjusted 69:2 agreements 65:18 agrees 63:18 72:1 applicable 69:18 ssuming 94:25 based 74:5 58:6,24 69:4,9 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 application 72:22 attachment 103:14 BDJ-2 55:11 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20 attend 94:17 95:4 BDJ-3 55:12		64:6 72:4,20	appeared 99:12	associated 72:8,14	
107:1083:2 94:6 103:773:22 86:2398:17adjudication 94:11103:15appears 75:7assume 88:20adjusted 69:2agreements 65:18applicable 69:18ssuming 94:25adjustment 55:12ahead 58:21 80:4application 72:22attachment 103:1458:6,24 69:4,982:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4adjustments 54:1582:11 94:13 95:14applied 101:20attend 94:17 95:4		73:10,14 82:6	appearing 62:3,8	90:3 91:25 96:4	
adjudication 94:11 103:15 appears 75:7 assume 88:20 55:4,6,15 65:6 adjusted 69:2 agreements 65:18 applicable 69:18 assuming 94:25 basis 73:8 adjustment 55:12 agrees 63:18 72:1 ahead 58:21 80:4 application 72:22 attachment 103:14 BDJ-1T 55:10 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20 attend 94:17 95:4 BDJ-355:12	0	83:2 94:6 103:7	73:22 86:23	98:17	
adjusted 69:2 agreements 65:18 applicable 69:18 assuming 94:25 basis 73:8 adjustment 55:12 agrees 63:18 72:1 108:13 application 72:22 attaching 54:12 basis 73:8 58:6,24 69:4,9 agrees 63:18 72:1 application 72:22 attaching 54:12 basis 73:8 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20 attend 94:17 95:4 BDJ-3 55:12		103:15	appears 75:7	assume 88:20	, ,
adjusted 09.12 agrees 63:18 72:1 108:13 adjustment 55:12 agrees 63:18 72:1 108:13 58:6,24 69:4,9 ahead 58:21 80:4 application 72:22 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20	•	agreements 65:18	applicable 69:18	assuming 94:25	
adjustment 55:12 ahead 58:21 80:4 application 72:22 attachment 103:14 BDJ-2 55:11 adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20 attachment 103:14 BDJ-3 55:12	0	-		0	
adjustments 54:15 82:11 94:13 95:14 applied 101:20 attend 94:17 95:4 BDJ-3 55:12 BDJ 455:13 100.10 100.10 100.10 100.10 100.10	0	0	application 72:22	0	
aujustinents 54.15 Auto 52.2.60.5 Auto 100.16 Auto 52.0.21 BDI 455.12				attend 94:17 95:4	BDJ-3 55:12
	0				BDJ-4 55:13
	55.5 57.15 10.15			v /	

		Ĩ		
BDJ-5 55:14	book 99:18,19,20	70:8,14 71:3,11	changes 90:3,6,20	Coleman 53:3
BDJ-6 55:16	books 99:19	74:16 75:12 76:7	91:14,18,23,25	62:14,15,19,22
BDJ-7 55:17	bottom 79:2 100:10	76:17 77:2 78:22	92:16 103:22	63:13 71:21,22
BDJ-8 55:18	Box 52:8,17	78:24 81:20,22	108:14	73:2,4 79:8,17,18
bear 73:12	BPA 56:19 57:9,10	84:9 85:1,25 90:1	changing 104:10	82:15,20 83:12
beginning 57:16	57:11,13,14,16	90:18,23,23 91:17	ChaRae 51:24 61:3	collaborative 66:8
61:16 86:23 91:16	69:13	94:11 104:9,19,22	108:5,22	68:12 69:8,15
begins 74:20	Brent 53:3 62:15	105:20,21 106:23	charge 90:12,22	93:14,18 94:2,2
behalf 61:24 62:3,8	brief 102:22	cases 65:6 81:16	105:20	94:14,22,24 95:2
62:16 71:24 73:22	briefly 67:13 70:24	94:5 106:21	Chargeable 58:9	99:3,4,17 100:11
79:9 88:5	105:8	cause 108:10	charges 108:14	100:14,17,19
believe 69:4,17	bring 65:21 75:4	CCR 51:24 108:18	Chase 53:16 60:4	collaboratives
72:3,10 76:9 78:6	bringing 62:21	108:22,23	70:23 71:16 87:23	69:22 93:13
82:4 84:14,18	broad 89:19	Centralia 57:11	87:24	colleagues 92:5
86:6 90:11,21	broaden 74:7	certainly 78:16	chose 83:9	101:14 102:14
92:14 93:1 95:16	broadly 89:15	84:2,5 102:5	Cindy 56:8,9	Collectively 71:11
97:11 98:2 99:9	brought 94:10	105:7,7,8	clarified 104:16	Collins 60:8 73:25
103:18 105:17	business 99:19	certainty 81:3 85:4	clarify 76:25 80:8	Collins' 74:1
believes 67:10 68:1		certification	82:12 84:17,23	colstrip 58:8 59:5
74:25 85:8	<u> </u>	108:16	94:21 103:22	69:13
Bellevue 52:13,17	C 57:10 61:7 108:1	Certified 61:3	104:6	Columbia 58:19
bench 70:2 75:4	108:1	108:5,22	clarity 86:17 94:9	Column 103:15
97:25 98:2,6	CAISO 54:20	certify 108:5,9	clear 104:15	comb 79:2
101:18 102:1,10	calculate 97:18	Chair 61:13 64:3	clearly 105:19	come 68:13 94:5
105:2 107:5	calculating 59:15	70:6 75:6,10,21	click 79:19	104:4 106:20
benefit 68:6,11	66:9 93:11 94:7	76:23 77:20 78:14	closely 69:5	comes 100:6
78:17	104:18	79:7,16,25 80:11	closure 65:20	comfort 83:1
benefits 68:8,9,14	calculation 54:14	82:11,12 83:19	CLS-10C 56:19	comfortable 76:14
68:16 71:1,6	55:16 58:2 68:22	84:11 86:16 87:10	CLS-11 56:20	coming 74:20
72:11,14 100:24	call 84:16 86:19,20	88:3 94:19,21	CLS-12C 56:21	81:20 90:16
BENTON 108:3	calling 94:1	95:6,12 98:2,8,12	CLS-13C 56:22	commend 71:10
berm 71:1 72:17	calls 71:4	98:21,23 99:1,25	CLS-14C 56:23	comment 70:20
best 73:4 94:5	capacity 56:19,23	100:12 101:1,10	CLS-1HCT 56:8	89:1 106:14
95:16 96:25	65:19	102:15	CLS-2 56:9	comments 71:16
better 100:21	captioned 61:10	Chairman 53:12	CLS-3 56:10	75:7 95:9 106:12
big 97:16	carefully 64:10	71:23 73:21 87:4	CLS-4 56:11	106:13,20,22
bill 74:4 98:10,14	66:20	87:17	CLS-5HC 56:12	commercial 66:22
98:15	Carson 52:11	challenges 99:11	CLS-6HC 56:13	commission 51:2,6
bills 70:18	61:18,19 63:3	chance 102:6	CLS-7HC 56:15	51:20 52:3,6 54:1
Biomass 56:18	64:3 67:3 75:7,10	change 78:7 89:6	CLS-8 56:17	60:2 61:11,13,24
Birud 55:11	76:9 77:5,15	97:4,16 98:11,15	CLS-9C 56:18	64:11,25 65:1,16
bit 77:6 106:23	84:25 85:2 102:19	98:18 103:21	Coal 59:6,8,10	66:19 67:12 69:23
Blc@dvclaw.com	102:22 103:17,25	104:1,3,8,10,11	code 105:15	69:25 70:11 71:14
53:5	104:3,17,24	104:13,18 105:18	Coie 52:12 61:19	73:10 75:1,14,14
Board 56:15	case 55:6 64:6,13	changed 69:10	cold 65:20 101:20	75:16 76:15 77:9
Bonneville 72:9	65:3,14 66:1,5	103:13 104:9	102:3	77:10,13,17,18
	l		l	l

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					i age i i i
	78.9 80.18 20 22	61.17 63.2 73.7	67.11 74.14 94.6	90.1 17 23 91.17	66.22 22 23 68.1
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
88:21,23,25 92:67,8 92:67,8 96:16 60:5 57:24,41,8,19,20 74:19 88:35,19,20,20 85:67,24 97:12,1004,21 contact 92:9,10 57:24 58:35,19,20,20 90:2,4,613 91:13,17,19,23,25 96:7 100:53 company's 94:16 contest 75:20,25 58:22,24,24 68:24 91:13,17,19,23,25 96:7 105:18 102:21 76:22 79:13 80:24 70:17 71:17 93:12 94:15 95:3 106:25 Comparison 54:17 84:21 86:3 rointroin 94:9 104:10 95:12 99:13,17,19,23,25 94:12 96:21 105:15 contesting 77:6,8 104:10 105:15 eusomers' 98:20 commissioner completa 81:2 85:19 continue 68:16 67:9 70:4,8,12,23 D D 105:15 eusomers' 98:20 05:12 59:13,11 102:11 continue 68:16 67:9 70:4,8,12,23 D D D 105:15 Eusomers' 98:20 05:11,21,02,03 sempliace 87:7	, ,				,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
85:67,24 100:23 101:17 contemplated 71:7 58:7,8,9,11,12,13 90:24,6,13 91:4,9 86:12 92:14 94:11 105:14 contention 94:9 58:14,18,19,20,21 91:13,17,19,23,25 101:2 105:55 company's 94:16 context 75:20,25 58:22,242,468:24 91:13,17,19,23,25 106:25 Comparved 55:2 83:3,16 84:5,10 70:17 71:1 72:11 93:12 94:15 95:3 06:20 72:18 73:24 55:6 57:4 59:17 contesting 77:6,8 104:10 105:15 06:12,13 61:14,14 102:11 contests 76:10 council 63:8 foi:15 foi:16:7		, ,			
86:12 92:14 94:11 105:14 contention 94:9 58:14,18,19,20,21 91:13,17,19,23,25 96:7 100:21 70:27 71:17 71:17 72:11 93:12 94:15 95:24 97:11 72:11 93:12 94:15 95:31 95:24 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:27 97:12 98:11 104:14 105:15 customers' 98:20 commissioner 55:15 56:15 81:10 62:1,46:39 64:8 D <td></td> <td>, , ,</td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td>		, , ,	,		
$\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 $,	, ,	, ,
commission's 67:1 69:20 72:18 73:24 94:12 96:2 105:22 commissioner Comparison 54:17 55: 6 57:4 59:17 55:12,13 61:14,14 64:4,4 70:7,7 77:4 64:4,4 70:7,7 77:4 64:4,4 70:7,7 77:4 80:10,17 81:7 82:11,20,23 84:8 66:1,15 88:17,17 89:21 90:5,19 91:1,21 92:3,20 91:1,21 92:3,20 91:1,21 92:3,20 91:1,21 92:3,20 91:1,21 92:3,20 97:10 98:4,8,21 100:16 107:10 67:5 71:23 73:21 80:22 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:23 73:21 80:24 73:73:21 80:23 73:21 80:24 73:73:24 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12,17 81:12 80:12 73:21 80:12 73:21 81:12 83:19 91:22 73:21 81:12 83:19 91:22 73:21 81:12 80:19 81:11 80:16 87:4 81:11 80:16 87:4 81:12 80:11 91:21 73:21 81:11 80:16 87:4 81:11 80:16 87:4 81:12 80:11 91:22 73:10:21 91:22 73:10:21 9					
69:20 72:18 73:24 55:6 57:4 59:17 contesting 77:6.8 104:10 105:15 94:12 96:21 05:22 59:18,19 77:12,16,25 80:19 council 63:8 council 63:8 councel 53:6 60:3 councel 53:6 60:3 63:10,17 81:7 complexity 91:11 complexity 91:11 contests 76:10 62:1,4 63:9 64:8 67:9 70:4,8,12,23 D5:15 5:11 60:5 61:7 80:10,17 81:7 compliance 87:7 86:20 71:6 73:17 76:25 D3 52:21 D3 52:21 84:22 85:2,13,14 compliance 66:5 Contract 57:9,11 108:10 61:24 63:7 67:5 71:13 77:3,4 91:1,21 92:3,20 66:13 72:24 55:1,15 6:1 58:1 106:10,13 108:8 60:12,17 81:12 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 80:12,17 81:12 95:13,15 96:14,25 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 courted 13:36:21 90:29,21,23,21 90:29,21,23,22 91:8,21 98:25 100:14,25 conclude 75:2 104:23 create 84:12 73:21 75:6,6,10 98:25 100:14,25 107:15 conclude 75:2 104:23 77:15 78:22,23 92:24 93:11 94:7 7		-			
94:12 96:2 105:22 59:18,19 77:12,16,25 80:19 council 63:8 customers' 98:20 53:12,13 61:14,14 102:11 complete 81:2 67:9 70:4,81,22.3 62:1,4 63:9 64:8 D D 54:1 55:11 60:5 64:4,4 70:7,777;7 complexity 91:11 complexity 92:10 62:1,4 63:9 64:8 D D 54:1 55:11 60:5 84:22 85:21,31,4 complicated 69:22 continue 63:16 82:18 93:5 103:11 D 55:1 56:1 58:1 106:10,13 108:8 Dallas 52:7 61:23 86:1,15 88:17,17 compromise 66:5 concern 100:20 contract 57:9,11 courset's 71:17 71:13 77:3,4 92:12 90:5,19 concerns 72:5 concerns 72:5 contract 57:9,11 courset's 71:17 87:22 80:12,17 81:12 94:14,19 95:7,8 conclude 106:6 control 108:17 courset's 73:21 85:19 86:1 105:5 105:9,23,25 106:1 99:10 conclude 75:2 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 courset's 71:17 73:21 175:6,6,10 99:10 conclude 75:2 100:12 control 108:17 courset's 71:17 73:21 75:6,6,10 101:13 102:8,15		-			,
commissioner complete 81:2 85:19 counsel 53:6 60:3 dext 53:12,13 61:14,14 102:11 contexts 76:10 62:1,4 63:9 64:8 67:9 70:4,8,12,23 D 54:1 55:11 60:5 64:4,4 70:7,7 77:4 compliance 87:7 compliance 87:7 86:20 71:6 73:17 76:25 61:7 82:11,20,23 84:8 compliance 87:7 compliance 71:13 55:1 56:1 58:1 106:10,13 108:8 Dallas 52:7 61:23 86:1,15 88:17,17 comply 69:10 59:1 72:21 108:10 61:24 63:7 67:5 89:21 90:5,19 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 91:1,21 92:3,20 66:13 72:24 57:11,13,15,16 87:22 83:19,20 84:8,14 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 95:13,15 96:14,25 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 courtest 57:21 105:15 86:1 105:5 97:10 98:48,21 conclude 106:6 contract 57:9:11 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dallas's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 CONCLUDED conversation 92:2 COVTL 19 74:6 Dallas's 78:10 101:			8		
53:12,13 61:14,14 102:11 contests 76:10 62:1,4 63:9 64:8 D 64:4,4 70:7,7 77:4 compliance 87:7 s6:20 71:6 73:17 76:25 61:7 82:11,20,23 84:8 compliance 87:7 s6:20 71:6 73:17 76:25 61:7 82:11,20,23 84:8 compliance 87:7 continue 63:16 52:18 93:5 103:1 106:10,13 108:8 84:22 85:2,13,14 compliments 71:13 55:1 56:1 58:1 106:10,13 108:8 61:24 63:7 67:5 89:21 90:5,19 comcern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:12,21 83:19,20 84:8,14 91:1,21 92:3,20 66:13 72:24 57:11,13,15,16 87:22 83:19,20 84:8,14 92:25 93:3,7 concerns 72:5 contracts 58:19 courser 71:24 90:15 85:15 86:1 105:5 95:13,15 96:14,25 107:16 control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dalas's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 107:11 conclusion 69:17 correct 70:16 75:10 90:22 91:19 92:17 77:20 78:14 79:7 98:8 75: 81:11,8 92:23 77:15 78:22,23 92:24 93:11 94:7 79:16,25 80:17 90:19 99:55 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>customers 90.20</td>					customers 90.20
53:12,130:11,130:14,147 102:11 102:11 102:11 102:11,100:16,100:16 102:14,100:17,100:16,100:16 64:4,470:17,777:4 compliance 87:7 continue 68:16 67:970:4,81,2,23 105:11 fo:5 105:11 fo:5 82:12,12,023 84:8 complicated 69:22 continue 65:16 82:18 93:5 103:1 103:10 103:10 103:10 103:10 103:10 103:12 103:12 103:10 103:12 103:10 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 101:13 (03:8) 105:15 (000:16 (107:10) 65:12,19 course 77:24 90:15 course 77:24 90:15 105:9,23,25 (106:12) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 105:9,23,25 (106:2) 103:3 (114:6:4:3 70:7) 73:21 78:6,6,10 103:3 (114:6:4:3 70:7) 73:21 78:6,6,10 103:13 104:19 (107:10) 107:11 conclusion 69:17		–			D
80:10,17.81:7 compliance 87:7 comcliance 67:7:17 sold 87:22 counsel's 71:17 sold 87:22 counsel's 71:17 sold 87:22 counsel's 71:17 sold 87:22 counsel's 71:17 sold 87:21 coi:13 co	, , ,	- •			
82:11,20,23 84:8 complicated 69:22 continued 53:1 82:18 93:5 103:1 D3 52:21 84:22 85:2,13,14 comple 69:10 59:1 72:21 106:10,13 108:8 61:24 63:7 67:5 89:21 90:5,19 compromise 66:5 Contract 57:9,11 106:10,13 108:8 61:24 63:7 67:5 91:1,21 92:3,20 66:13 72:24 57:11,31,51,61 87:22 80:12,17 81:12 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 94:14,19 95:7,8 conclude 106:6 control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dallas' 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 control 108:17 conclude 106:6 control 108:17 control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dallas's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 107:15 concludes 75:2 104:23 cortert 70:16 75:10 09:22 91:19 92:17 77:20 78:14 79:7 90:23 73:24 107:11 condition 84:12 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 82:11,12 83:19 101:12 conditions 64:12 104:2 108:8 98:15,18 103:21 84:11 86:16 87:4 commissioners confidential 104:23 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 CROSS=EXAML 99:1,25 100:12					
84:22 85:2,13,14 compliance of 12 components 71:13 compliance of 12 components 71:13 compliance of 12 compliance of 12 components 71:13 compliance of 12 compliance of 12 components 71:13 compliance of 12 co	,				
86:1.15 88:17,17 comply 69:10 59:172:21 108:10 61:24 63:7 67:5 89:21 90:5,19 compromise 66:5 Contract 57:9,11 108:10 61:24 63:7 67:5 91:1,21 92:23,20 66:13 72:24 57:11,13,15,16 87:22 80:12,17 81:19,20 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 94:14,19 95:7,8 concerns 72:5 contract 58:19 course 77:24 90:15 85:15 86:1 105:5 95:13 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 course 77:24 90:15 65:12,19 course 77:24 90:15 85:15 86:1 105:5 98:25 100:14,25 CONCLUDED control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dallas's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 concludes 75:2 104:23 creating 95:22 75:17:23 73:21 75:16 66:96:92 75:21 76:23 77:4 101:12 condition 69:17 oprite 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 82:11,12 83:19 101:12 conditions 64:12 104:2 108:8 98:15,18 103:21 84:11 86:16 87:4 comminise 99:3 66:20 correction 102:24 103:23 104:4,8		-			
89:21 90:5,19 91:1,21 92:3,20 compromise 66:5 66:13 72:24 Contract 57:9,11 57:11,13,15,16 counsel's 71:17 87:22 71:13 77:3,4 80:12,17 81:12 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 87:22 83:19,20 84:8,14 94:14,19 95:7,8 concerns 72:5 contracts 58:19 court 61:3 63:21 85:15 86:1 105:5 95:13,15 96:14,25 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 court 61:3 63:21 105:9,23,25 106:2 98:25 100:14,25 107:15 concludes 75:2 104:23 conversation 92:2 coverset 70:16 75:10 90:22 91:19 92:17 73:21 76:6,610 102:17 105:3,4 concludes 75:2 104:23 correct 70:16 75:10 90:22 91:19 92:17 77:20 78:14 79:7 87:24 88:4,16 condition 84:12 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 82:11,12 83:19 101:12 conference 64:17 103:3 cost 54:16,17 55:4 credits 101:17 88:11,82:10 91:22 105:15 65:7 67:17,18,19 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 101:1,10 102:15 91:22 confidential 104:23 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 COSS-EXAMI 99:1,25 100:12 91:22<		-		,	
91:1/21 92:3/20 66:13 72:24 57:11,13,15,16 87:22 80:12,17 81:12 92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 94:14,19 95:7,8 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 course 77:24 90:15 80:12,17 81:12 97:10 98:4,8,21 conclude 106:6 control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dallas's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 107:15 conclude 75:2 104:23 creats 84:12 61:14 64:3 70:7 101:13 102:8,15 107:11 copy 63:21 creating 95:22 73:21 75:6,6,10 75:21 76:23 77:4 67:5 71:23 73:21 concludes 75:2 104:23 creating 95:22 73:21 75:6,6,10 75:21 76:23 77:4 80:8 87:5,8,11,18 92:23 77:15 78:22,23 92:24 93:11 94:7 79:16,25 80:17 87:24 88:4,16 condition 84:12 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 84:11 86:16 87:4 communicate confidential 104:23 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 CROSS-EXAMI 99:1,25 100:12 91:22 105:15 65:7 67:17,18,19 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 101:1,10 102:15 consequences 74:6 68:18,23 69:1,3,4 curent 97:20 99:1,25 100:12 <td>, , , ,</td> <td>1.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>71:13 77:3,4</td>	, , , ,	1.			71:13 77:3,4
92:25 93:3,7 concern 100:20 58:3,4 59:8 COUNTY 108:3 83:19,20 84:8,14 94:14,19 95:7,8 concerns 72:5 100:16 107:10 65:12,19 course 77:24 90:15 85:15 86:1 105:5 97:10 98:4,8,21 conclude 106:6 control 108:17 73:2 108:5,13,22 Dalae's 78:10 98:25 100:14,25 107:15 concludes 75:2 104:23 corversation 92:2 COVID-19 74:6 61:14 64:3 70:7 107:11 copy 63:21 correct 70:16 75:10 90:22 91:19 92:17 73:21 75:6,6.10 75:21 76:23 77:4 67:5 71:23 73:21 condition 84:12 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 82:11,12 83:19 101:12 conditions 64:12 104:23 correction 102:24 103:3 104:19 105:19,20 79:8,10 91:6 64:18,21 cost 54:16,17 55:4 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 CROSS-EXAMI 87:10,18 88:3 91:22 105:15 consensus 94:8 68:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:19,20 70:17 70:12 59:2 60:1 101:1,10 102:15 93:2 consideration 70:9 94:1 71:5 72:7,14 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 Current 97:20 Danner's 80:11 91:8,24 consideration 70:9 94:1 71:5	,	–	,		-
94:14,19 95:7,8 95:13,15 96:14,25concerns 72:5 100:16 107:10contracts 58:19 65:12,19course 77:24 90:15 court 61:3 63:21 73:21 08:5,13,2285:15 86:1 105:5 105:9,23,25 106:297:10 98:4,8,21 98:25 100:14,25conclude 106:6 CONCLUDEDcontrol 108:17 conversation 92:2 conversations73:2 108:5,13,22 COVID-19 74:6Dallas's 78:10 Danner 53:12101:13 102:8,15 102:17 105:3,4107:15 concludes 75:2conversation 92:2 conversationscoversation 92:2 conversationscovers 44:12 coversations61:14 64:3 70:7 73:21 75:6,6,10201:17 105:3,4 67:5 71:23 73:21 80:8 87:5,8,11,18 87:24 88:4,16 101:12condition 69:17 condition 84:12 conditions 64:12correct 70:16 75:10 90:19 95:5 102:7 91:9 92:1790:22 91:19 92:17 91:24 93:11 94:777:16,25 80:17 79:16,25 80:1730:18 99:3 66:20 91:22conference 64:17 confidential 104:23 105:15correction 102:24 cost 54:16,17 55:4 cost 54:16,17 55:4103:3 correct 70:16 75:10 99:1,25 100:1284:11 86:16 87:4 87:10,18 88:399:1,22 101:1,10 102:15 93:2consensus 94:8 conselva 94:8 consideration 70:9cost 54:16,17 55:4 65:7 67:17,18,19 69:5,10,20 70:17credits 101:17 current 97:2098:2,8,12,21,23 01:1,10 102:15 105:391:8,24 companies 106:22onsistency 72:18 consistent 64:1468:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17current 97:20 curreuly 60:6 customer 66:1 customer 66:1 customer 59:39Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 dated 59:6					· ·
95:13,15 96:14,25100:16 107:1065:12,19court 61:3 63:21105:9,23,25 106:297:10 98:4,8,21conclude 106:6control 108:1773:2 108:5,13,22Dallas's 78:1098:25 100:14,25107:15conversation 92:2conversation 92:2conversation 92:2COVID-19 74:6Callas's 78:10102:17 105:3,4concludes 75:2104:23create 84:1261:14 64:3 70:761:14 64:3 70:7102:17 105:3,4conclusion 69:17correct 70:16 75:1090:22 91:19 92:1777:20 78:14 79:780:8 87:5,8,11,1892:2377:15 78:22,2390:19 95:5 102:792:24 93:11 94:779:16,25 80:1787:24 88:4,16condition 84:1290:19 95:5 102:797:4,69,11,20,2482:11,12 83:19101:12conditions 64:12104:2 108:898:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4commits 99:366:20correction 102:24103:23 104:4,8,1387:10,18 88:3commite 56:14confidential 104:2355:6,17 64:6 65:6CROSS-EXAMI99:1,25 100:1291:22105:1565:7 67:7,18,1954:9 55:9,19 56:7101:1,10 102:1593:2consideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:1770:18 97:14,15105:393:2consideration 72:969:5,10,20 70:1770:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:691:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:6date 45:26consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6			,		
97:10 98:4,8,21 98:25 100:14,25 101:13 102:8,15 102:17 105:3,4conclude 106:6 CONCLUDED 107:15control 108:17 conversation 92:2 conversations73:2 108:5,13,22 COVID-19 74:6 create 84:12 creating 95:22 creating 95:22 creating 95:22 r73:21 75:6,6,10Dallas's 78:10 Danner 53:12 61:14 64:3 70:7 73:21 75:6,6,10 73:21 75:6,6,10commissioners 67:5 71:23 73:21 80:8 87:5,8,11,18 92:23107:11 conclusion 69:17 92:23correct 70:16 75:10 77:15 78:22,23 90:19 95:5 102:7 104:21 104:2 108:8 99:19 95:5 102:790:22 91:19 92:17 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 98:15,18 103:21 98:15,18 103:2177:16,25 80:17 82:11,12 83:19 82:11,12 83:19101:12 conditions 64:12 101:12conditions 64:12 conditions 64:1290:19 95:5 102:7 104:2 108:8 correction 102:2497:4,6,9,11,20,24 98:15,18 103:21 98:15,18 103:21 98:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4 84:11 86:16 87:4commite 99:3 communicate 91:22 consideration 70:9 33:2correction 102:24 65:7 67:17,18,19 65:7 67:17,18,1998:15,18 103:21 99:1,22 60:1 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 57:1 59:2 60:1 101:1,10 102:15 54:9 55:9,19 56:799:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15 105:391:8,24 communications 91:8,24 comsistency 72:18 p1:8,24onsistency 72:18 p2:18,21 p2:18,2192:18,21 70:18 97:14,15 70:18 97:14,15Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 dated 59:6					105:9,23,25 106:2
98:25 100:14,25CONCLUDEDconversation 92:2COVID-19 74:6Danner 53:12101:13 102:8,15107:15conversationscreate 84:1261:14 64:3 70:7102:17 105:3,4concludes 75:2104:23creating 95:2273:21 75:6,6,10commissioners107:11copy 63:21credit 66:6,9 69:275:21 76:23 77:467:5 71:23 73:21conclusion 69:17correct 70:16 75:1090:22 91:19 92:1777:20 78:14 79:780:8 87:5,8,11,1892:2377:15 78:22,2392:24 93:11 94:779:16,25 80:1787:24 88:4,16condition 84:1290:19 95:5 102:797:4,6,9,11,20,2482:11,12 83:19101:12conditions 64:12104:2 108:898:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4commits 99:366:20correction 102:24103:23 104:4,8,1387:10,18 88:3commitee 56:14conference 64:17103:3104:19 105:19,2094:19,21 95:6,1259:8,10 91:664:18,21cost 54:16,17 55:4credits 101:1798:2,8,12,21,2391:22105:1565:7 67:17,18,1954:9 55:9,19 56:7101:1,10 102:1593:2consideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:17Current 97:20Danner's 80:1193:2consideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:17Curriculum 60:6date 88:25 89:1391:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:6companies 106:22consistency 72:18cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6			,		
101:13 102:8,15 102:17 105:3,4107:15 concludes 75:2conversations 104:23create 84:12 creating 95:2261:14 64:3 70:7 73:21 75:6,6,10commissioners 67:5 71:23 73:21 80:8 87:5,8,11,18 92:23107:11 condition 69:17copy 63:21 correct 70:16 75:10 90:22 91:19 92:17creating 95:22 reating 95:2273:21 75:6,6,10 75:21 76:23 77:480:8 87:5,8,11,18 87:24 88:4,16 101:1292:23 condition 84:12 conditions 64:1277:15 78:22,23 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,2490:22 91:19 92:17 97:4,6,9,11,20,24 82:11,12 83:1977:20 78:14 79:7 79:16,25 80:1787:24 88:4,16 101:12conditions 64:12 conditions 64:1290:19 95:5 102:7 104:2 108:8 104:2 108:898:15,18 103:21 104:19 105:19,2084:11 86:16 87:4 87:10,18 88:3commitee 56:14 59:8,10 91:6conference 64:17 64:18,21 constenue 64:18cost 54:16,17 55:4 correction 102:24credits 101:17 98:2,8,12,21,2399:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:1591:22 communication 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:17 71:5 72:7,14Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1 70:18 97:14,15Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 date 88:25 89:13 106:15,18 108:691:8,24 companies 106:22consistency 72:18 consistent 64:14p2:18,21 customer 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6					Danner 53:12
102:17 105:3,4 commissionersconcludes 75:2104:23 copy 63:21creating 95:2273:21 75:6,6,1067:5 71:23 73:21 80:8 87:5,8,11,18 101:12107:11 condition 84:12copy 63:21 correct 70:16 75:10credit 66:6,9 69:275:21 76:23 77:487:24 88:4,16 101:1292:23 conditions 64:1277:15 78:22,23 90:19 95:5 102:790:22 91:19 92:17 97:4,6,9,11,20,2479:16,25 80:17 82:11,12 83:1987:24 88:4,16 101:12conditions 64:12 conditions 64:1290:19 95:5 102:7 104:2 108:897:4,6,9,11,20,24 98:15,18 103:2182:11,12 83:19 84:11 86:16 87:4commits 99:3 commitee 56:14 59:8,10 91:666:20 correct 64:17 103:3correction 102:24 103:3103:23 104:4,8,13 104:19 105:19,2087:10,18 88:3 94:19,21 95:6,1291:22 communication 93:2consensus 94:8 consideration 70:9cost 54:16,17 55:4 65:7 67:17,18,19credits 101:17 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 57:1 59:2 60:1 current 97:2098:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:1291:8,24 communications 91:8,2494:171:5 72:7,14 92:18,21 consistency 72:18 consistent 64:1492:18,21 71:5 72:7,1470:18 97:14,15 70:18 97:14,15 customer 66:1 70:18 97:14,15Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 dated 59:6					61:14 64:3 70:7
commissioners107:11copy 63:21credit 66:6,9 69:275:21 76:23 77:467:5 71:23 73:21conclusion 69:1792:2377:15 78:22,2390:22 91:19 92:1777:20 78:14 79:780:8 87:5,8,11,1892:2377:15 78:22,2390:22 91:19 92:1779:16,25 80:1787:24 88:4,16condition 84:1290:19 95:5 102:797:4,6,9,11,20,2484:11 86:16 87:4101:12conditions 64:12104:2 108:898:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4commits 99:366:20correction 102:24103:23 104:4,8,1387:10,18 88:3communicateconfidential 104:2355:6,17 64:6 65:6credits 101:1798:2,8,12,21,2391:22105:1565:7 67:17,18,1954:9 55:9,19 56:799:1,25 100:1293:2consequences 74:668:18,23 69:1,3,4current 97:20Damer's 80:1191:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15Damer's 80:1391:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:6date 59:6customer 66:170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:691:8,24consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6					73:21 75:6,6,10
67:5 71:23 73:21 80:8 87:5,8,11,18conclusion 69:17 92:23correct 70:16 75:10 77:15 78:22,2390:22 91:19 92:17 92:24 93:11 94:777:20 78:14 79:7 79:16,25 80:1787:24 88:4,16 101:12condition 84:12 conditions 64:1290:19 95:5 102:7 104:2 108:897:4,6,9,11,20,24 98:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4 82:11,12 83:19commits 99:3 committee 56:14 59:8,10 91:666:20 correction 102:24103:23 104:4,8,13 104:19 105:19,2087:10,18 88:3 94:19,21 95:6,12communicate 91:22confidential 104:23 105:1555:6,17 64:6 65:6 65:7 67:17,18,19credits 101:17 54:9 55:9,19 56:798:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:1293:2 communications 93:2consideration 70:9 94:169:5,10,20 70:17 71:5 72:7,1457:1 59:2 60:1 current 97:20101:1,10 102:15 105:391:8,24 companies 106:22consistency 72:18 consistent 64:1492:18,21 cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9Danner's 80:11 date 59:6	,			6	75:21 76:23 77:4
80:8 87:5,8,11,18 87:24 88:4,16 101:1292:23 condition 84:12 omitions 64:1277:15 78:22,23 90:19 95:5 102:7 90:19 95:5 102:7 97:4,6,9,11,20,2492:16,25 80:17 82:11,12 83:19 84:11 86:16 87:4101:12 commits 99:3 commits 99:3 commits 99:3 59:8,10 91:666:20 66:20104:2 108:8 correction 102:24 103:3 cost 54:16,17 55:4 55:6,17 64:6 65:698:15,18 103:21 103:23 104:4,8,13 104:19 105:19,20 94:19,21 95:6,1284:11 86:16 87:4 87:10,18 88:3 94:19,21 95:6,1259:8,10 91:6 91:2264:18,21 confidential 104:23 105:15cost 54:16,17 55:4 65:7 67:17,18,19credits 101:17 54:9 55:9,19 56:798:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:1291:22 93:2 communication 93:2 03:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:9 94:168:18,23 69:1,3,4 95:5,10,20 70:17current 97:20 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1 70:18 97:14,15 customer 66:1Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 date 88:25 89:1391:8,24 companies 106:22consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6			1.0	-	77:20 78:14 79:7
87:24 88:4,16 101:12condition 84:12 conditions 64:1290:19 95:5 102:7 104:2 108:897:4,6,9,11,20,24 98:15,18 103:2182:11,12 83:19 84:11 86:16 87:4101:12 commits 99:366:20 correction 102:24104:2 108:8 103:398:15,18 103:21 103:23 104:4,8,1384:11 86:16 87:4 87:10,18 88:3commitee 56:14 59:8,10 91:6conference 64:17 64:18,21 confidential 104:23103:3 55:6,17 64:6 65:6103:23 104:4,8,13 104:19 105:19,2094:19,21 95:6,12 94:19,21 95:6,12g1:22 communication 89:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consensus 94:8 consequences 74:6 94:167:19,22 68:4,17 69:5,10,20 70:1757:1 59:2 60:1 57:1 59:2 60:1101:1,10 102:15 105:3g1:8,24 companies 106:2294:1 consistent 64:1492:18,21 cost-only 55:6Curriculum 60:6 customer's 93:9Danner's 80:11 date 459:6					79:16,25 80:17
101:12conditions 64:12104:2 108:898:15,18 103:2184:11 86:16 87:4commits 99:366:20correction 102:24103:23 104:4,8,1387:10,18 88:3committee 56:14conference 64:17103:3104:19 105:19,2094:19,21 95:6,1259:8,10 91:664:18,21cost 54:16,17 55:4credits 101:1798:2,8,12,21,23communicateconfidential 104:2355:6,17 64:6 65:6CROSS-EXAMI99:1,25 100:1291:22105:1565:7 67:17,18,1954:9 55:9,19 56:7101:1,10 102:15communicationconsequences 74:668:18,23 69:1,3,4current 97:20Danner's 80:1193:2consideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:17Curriculum 60:6date 88:25 89:1391:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:6companies 106:22consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6					82:11,12 83:19
commits 99:3 committee 56:14 59:8,10 91:666:20 conference 64:17 64:18,21correction 102:24 103:3103:23 104:4,8,13 104:19 105:19,20 credits 101:1787:10,18 88:3 94:19,21 95:6,12communicate 91:22confidential 104:23 105:15cost 54:16,17 55:4 65:7 67:17,18,19credits 101:17 54:9 55:9,19 56:798:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12sy:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:966:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17CROSS-EXAMI 54:9 55:9,19 56:799:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15sy:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:968:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17current 97:20 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8g1:8,24 companies 106:22consistency 72:18 consistent 64:1492:18,21 cust-only 55:670:18 97:14,15 customer's 93:9106:15,18 108:6 dated 59:6					84:11 86:16 87:4
committee 56:14 59:8,10 91:6 communicate 91:22conference 64:17 64:18,21 confidential 104:23 105:15103:3 cost 54:16,17 55:4 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 65:7 67:17,18,19 67:19,22 68:4,17 68:18,23 69:1,3,4 93:2104:19 105:19,20 credits 101:17 CROSS-EXAMI 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 57:1 59:2 60:1 101:1,10 102:15 105:394:19,21 95:6,12 98:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15 105:3communication 89:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:9 94:166:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17 71:5 72:7,14 92:18,21104:19 105:19,20 credits 101:17 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 57:1 59:2 60:1 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1 70:18 97:14,15 customer's 93:994:19,21 95:6,12 98:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15 105:3communications 91:8,24 companies 106:2294:1 consistency 72:18 consistent 64:14103:3 cost-only 55:6104:19 105:19,20 credits 101:17 CROSS-EXAMI 54:9 55:9,19 56:7 57:1 59:2 60:1 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1 70:18 97:14,15 customer's 93:994:19,21 95:6,12 98:2,8,12,21,23 101:1,10 102:15 105:3				,	87:10,18 88:3
59:8,10 91:6 communicate 91:2264:18,21 confidential 104:23 105:15cost 54:16,17 55:4 55:6,17 64:6 65:6 65:7 67:17,18,19 67:19,22 68:4,17credits 101:17 CROSS-EXAMI 54:9 55:9,19 56:798:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15communication 89:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:968:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17 71:5 72:7,14credits 101:17 CROSS-EXAMI 57:1 59:2 60:1 current 97:2098:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15communications 91:8,24 companies 106:2294:1 consistency 72:18 consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6credits 101:17 CROSS-EXAMI 57:1 59:2 60:1 current 97:2098:2,8,12,21,23 99:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15 105:3Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 date 88:25 89:13 106:15,18 108:6date 88:25 89:13 106:15,18 108:6					94:19,21 95:6,12
communicate 91:22confidential 104:23 105:1555:6,17 64:6 65:6 65:7 67:17,18,19 67:19,22 68:4,17CROSS-EXAMI 54:9 55:9,19 56:799:1,25 100:12 101:1,10 102:15communication 89:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:968:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:17current 97:20 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:194:1 71:5 72:7,1494:1 92:18,21current 97:20 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8 date 88:25 89:1391:8,24 companies 106:22consistency 72:18 consistent 64:1492:18,21 cost-only 55:670:18 97:14,15 customer's 93:9106:15,18 108:6 dated 59:6	59:8,10 91:6	64:18,21	cost 54:16,17 55:4	,	
91:22105:1565:7 67:17,18,1954:9 55:9,19 56:7101:1,10 102:15communicationconsensus 94:867:19,22 68:4,1757:1 59:2 60:1105:389:16,18 91:11,13consequences 74:668:18,23 69:1,3,4current 97:20Danner's 80:1193:2consideration 70:994:171:5 72:7,14Curriculum 60:6date 94:5 100:891:8,24consistency 72:1892:18,2170:18 97:14,15106:15,18 108:6companies 106:22consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9date 459:6	-	confidential 104:23	,	CROSS-EXAMI	-
communication 89:16,18 91:11,13 93:2consequences 74:6 consideration 70:967:19,22 68:4,17 68:18,23 69:1,3,4 69:5,10,20 70:1757:1 59:2 60:1 current 97:20105:3onsequences 74:6 onsideration 70:969:5,10,20 70:17 71:5 72:7,14current 97:20 Curriculum 60:6 customer 66:1Danner's 80:11 data 94:5 100:8onsistency 72:18 companies 106:2200:5,10,20 70:17 consistent 64:1470:18 97:14,15 customer's 93:9106:15,18 108:6 dated 59:6			,		, ,
93:2 consideration 70:9 69:5,10,20 70:17 Curriculum 60:6 data 94:5 100:8 93:2 94:1 71:5 72:7,14 customer 66:1 106:15,18 108:6 91:8,24 consistency 72:18 92:18,21 70:18 97:14,15 106:15,18 108:6 companies 106:22 consistent 64:14 cost-only 55:6 customer's 93:9 data 94:5 100:8	communication	consensus 94:8	67:19,22 68:4,17	57:1 59:2 60:1	
communications 94:1 71:5 72:7,14 customer 66:1 date 88:25 89:13 91:8,24 consistency 72:18 92:18,21 70:18 97:14,15 106:15,18 108:6 companies 106:22 consistent 64:14 cost-only 55:6 customer's 93:9 date 38:25 89:13	89:16,18 91:11,13	consequences 74:6	68:18,23 69:1,3,4	current 97:20	
91:8,24 consistency 72:18 92:18,21 70:18 97:14,15 106:15,18 108:6 companies 106:22 consistent 64:14 cost-only 55:6 customer's 93:9 dated 59:6	93:2	consideration 70:9	69:5,10,20 70:17	Curriculum 60:6	
companies 106:22consistent 64:14cost-only 55:6customer's 93:9dated 59:6	communications	94:1	71:5 72:7,14	customer 66:1	
		consistency 72:18	92:18,21	70:18 97:14,15	,
company 52:10 65:2,22 66:9 64:13 65:5 76:17 customers 66:6,17 Dave 53:12 61:13	_	consistent 64:14	v	customer's 93:9	
	company 52:10	65:2,22 66:9	64:13 65:5 76:17	customers 66:6,17	Dave 53:12 61:13

75:6	determine 69:9	83:13 93:25 94:3	elaborate 79:11	especially 70:21
day 58:21 79:5 89:3	84:13,25	discussions 71:10	electric 89:20	96:17
108:18	determined 65:12	93:20 104:21	99:13,19 100:7,7	essentially 96:8
Day-Ahead 58:2	92:22	Distallate 58:22	electrical 74:18	98:11 99:22
days 88:24	determining 92:18	Distillate 58:5	electricity 74:19	established 96:12
dead 68:10	93:9	docket 61:9 67:7	element 99:16,17	establishes 69:14
dealt 96:12	develop 74:13	68:20	elements 91:14	Eval 56:12
December 64:14	developed 96:6	Document 56:10	eliminate 68:18	evaluate 73:7
88:21 89:10	development 59:8	56:11,12	eliminates 68:17	event 71:2
decides 77:18	87:9	documents 76:18	EMC 56:5 57:7,9	evidence 62:10,24
deciding 77:18	differences 94:10	doing 68:21 81:1	57:14,16	65:15 78:1,12
decision 57:6,12	95:21	81:11 84:6 105:17	employee 108:10	exact 92:24
64:16 80:1 83:16	different 76:15	double 65:25	encouraged 94:17	exactly 77:22 93:14
83:17	78:25 85:20 86:3	drawn-out 94:3	95:3	examination 99:6
decisions 72:18	86:7 89:23	due 64:22	energy 51:9 52:15	examine 99:4
Decoupling 55:17	direct 54:7,10,25	durable 66:8 93:11	52:16,19 53:2,3	example 81:19
dedicated 69:6	55:10,14,20 56:5	94:6	54:2,6,19,20	97:13
Defendant 51:10	56:8 57:2 58:10		55:25 56:2,13	exclusion 71:1
defer 99:23 104:5	59:3 66:4,6,9 68:6	E	57:6,7,19 58:13	exclusive 77:11
deferral 95:22	68:10,16,19,23,24	E 54:1,5,10 61:7,7	58:15 59:7,9 60:5	excused 88:8
96:12	68:25 69:5,21	108:1,1	60:7 61:11,20	excusing 73:24
deficiency 54:14	70:25 85:23 88:18	earlier 70:19 84:11	62:6,8,16 63:15	exhibit 54:16 55:4
55:2 67:21 68:2	88:22 89:2,3,5,18	Earnings 54:22	63:17 64:2 65:21	63:21 91:3 95:17
95:19	89:18 90:14,21	easy 97:18	66:5 69:2 70:25	96:1 106:14,16
defined 93:18	91:4,8,22 92:9,10	economic 74:6	72:10,23 73:19,23	107:5,5
94:25	92:15 93:6,9,12	economist 88:4	73:23,24 74:2,8	exhibits 54:9 55:1,9
defining 94:24	94:15 95:3,19,20	education 99:23	74:11,15,21,24	55:19 56:1,7 57:1
definitely 94:17	95:23 96:5,21	educational 100:15	79:10 82:23 83:8	58:1 59:1,2 60:1
delay 79:18	97:12,13,15 98:24	101:8	86:24 87:7,13,19	62:12,13,25 63:1
delivery 108:12	103:21,22 104:4	effective 88:25	88:6,8 90:22	63:4,11,18,20,23
Demand 55:14	104:14,18 105:10	effectively 71:14	91:18 92:17,24	64:19
demonstrate 65:4	105:18 108:16	effectuates 69:20	93:11 97:4,6,8,11	Expected 54:23
deputy 87:18	directed 69:15	efforts 72:12,23	103:23 104:4,8	expedited 64:15
describes 97:10	direction 106:11	73:6	105:19	expenditures 78:21
detail 54:15 55:3	directly 85:16 89:4	EIM 68:7,14 71:5	Energy's 70:17	Expense 59:13,15
57:19 94:3 99:16	89:16 106:13,22	72:15 94:23	74:4	59:16,17,19
determination 75:9	director 73:25 87:6	Einstein 53:15	engaged 64:20	expenses 59:14
75:11,15,19 76:5	87:9,12,19	55:21 67:2 86:25	engagement 71:11	69:13
76:16,20 77:2,10	Directors 56:15	87:8,9 88:20 89:7	ensure 96:4,9	explicit 77:9,17
77:11,15,18 78:1	discovery 54:23	89:22,23 90:7,25	ensures 68:25	80:5,19,21 81:6
78:6,9,16,18,20	64:20 99:10 100:8	91:2,10,24 103:18	Enter 57:6	83:10,25 84:16
80:5,13,19,21,23	discretion 84:2	103:24 104:2,5,7	enters 80:24	explicitly 78:6
81:1,14,17,22,25	discuss 67:13 103:5	Einstein's 89:17	envision 101:8	81:14
82:1,3,5,10,13	discussed 73:16,17	either 85:10 88:20	envisioning 101:4	exploratory 100:19
83:10,21,22 85:4	discusses 95:18	98:25 99:15	EO12 52:16	101:7
85:12,24 94:12	discussion 62:17	102:18	equal 108:13	express 71:9
			l	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Γ				
expressed 81:23	105:21	full 64:7 67:6	103:25 104:7	H
expressing 81:13	final 57:5 108:12	fully 93:22 94:3	Giving 97:18	H 54:5
expressly 70:14	finally 66:12 72:19	funding 71:2 74:11	glad 86:17	hand 82:2 94:20
78:16 81:17	Financial 54:23	74:18	go 65:12 82:11,17	98:6 108:18
extend 71:13	financially 108:10	further 68:12	85:9,14 89:8	handled 89:17
extent 83:14 94:12	find 79:3 85:18	73:11 78:24 86:18	94:13 95:14 98:10	hands 88:10
	finding 81:6 83:25	96:16 101:11	goal 99:7	handy 97:17
F	84:1,17 85:8	102:16,17 108:9	goes 75:12	happen 76:18
F 108:1	86:11,13	future 65:9 66:10	going 65:3 73:8	happens 96:16
fact 64:15 74:21	fine 79:2	68:14,16 69:23	75:18 82:17 84:4	Harbor 53:4
76:6,12 104:9	first 63:2 64:2 65:5	73:8 74:23 84:5	94:7 95:2 96:12	hard 71:12 92:23
Factor 54:18 55:13	67:16 68:5,22	85:1,3 94:11	98:4	hard 112 92.23
fair 68:3 69:19 72:7	80:12 86:21 87:2	95:23 101:5	Golden 56:22,23	heads 101:15
fairly 70:16 106:25	95:21 102:23		good 61:18,23 62:2	hear 87:1,15
fall 90:15	104:4	G	62:7 67:5 71:22	heard 70:19,19
fall-through 92:17	fixed 55:17 57:24	G 61:7	73:20 87:4,8,10	75:9 89:1 102:25
familiar 99:13,14	58:8,20 68:24	Gafken 53:7 62:2,2	87:17,17,23 88:3	hearing 51:14 61:2
100:5,8	69:1	63:9 70:4,6 72:16	gotten 106:23	61:9 70:20 73:25
far 62:11 94:3,4,4,4	flush 93:22	77:21,22 78:23	grappled 66:3	79:25 82:14 86:20
favors 65:1	focus 72:2	81:9,12 82:17	gratitude 71:9	86:21 88:8 107:11
feel 72:6 76:12	follow-up 80:10	83:13 93:5 106:9	GRC 55:2,7 57:4	107:12 108:6
79:14 105:22	96:15 97:25	106:9 107:7	68:4 69:21 78:18	heating 74:20
feels 82:9 83:7,14	following 61:4	Gafken's 83:6	96:3	hedging 71:5 94:22
fees 108:14	foregoing 108:6	Garrison 57:11,13	Great 100:12	99:2,4,12,13
felt 83:9	forgot 87:16	57:15	green 55:14 56:5	100:4,6,7,7 101:2
FERC 58:9	form 67:17	gas 57:22,23 58:16	66:4,6,9 68:19,23	held 51:19 64:17
Ffitch 52:20,21	formalized 64:24	58:20 67:19 69:15	68:24,25 69:5,20	81:15,17,21
62:7,8 63:17	formatting 108:13	99:12,18,19,20,20	70:25 88:18,22	help 67:24 74:11,18
73:18,20,22 79:7	formula 74:14,15	100:4,6,6 101:2	89:2,3,5,18 90:14	helpful 83:11 97:24
79:9,21 82:15,20	forth 108:6	Gas-for-Power	90:20 91:4,8,22	100:13
82:22	forward 72:13 73:1	57:24	92:9,10,15 93:6,9	helps 68:18
Fifth 53:8	73:8 75:18 78:4	gathering 100:15	93:11 94:15 95:3	hereof 83:17
file 91:7 92:9 100:4	93:10,15,15 94:7	101:6	95:19,20,23 96:5	hereunto 108:18
106:15 107:1	94:10,23 95:1	general 52:8 53:8	96:21 97:12,13,15	Hi 75:6
filed 64:13 66:16	found 103:14	61:24 62:3 74:16	98:24 103:21,22	High 52:21
66:19 67:6 88:21	four 72:2	90:23 97:19,19	104:3,14,18	higher 71:3
89:10 92:8	Fourth 52:12 66:2	99:1 105:20	105:10,18	highlights 70:23
filing 55:7 58:11,12	framework 72:22	generation 95:18	grossed 103:11	Hill 55:24
58:14,15,17,20,23	Free 53:14 54:10	95:19 96:5,10,19	ground 93:24	Hills 56:22,23
58:24 66:14 70:16	67:1 87:4,5 95:17	99:20	group 89:17	historic 91:4
74:10,23 76:2	95:25 96:20	getting 79:19	groups 71:5,6,8	home 74:11
77:7 88:22 90:20	101:16,25 103:2,6	give 64:10 83:1	guess 76:2 78:23	homestly 93:17
91:6,20,21 92:10	103:17	88:11 107:4	79:25 81:7,15	Honor 61:18,23
98:18 103:23	front 90:9	given 68:3 69:19	88:25 89:23 92:13	62:7,14,22 63:14
106:18	fuel 58:5,8,22	72:10 78:8,15	93:16 96:14 97:12	71:22 73:20 79:9
filings 90:24	67:19	91:11 103:19,20	guidance 69:20	105:9 106:2,9
			-	100.7 100.2,7

Ρ	ag	е	1	1	4

				ų
hope 83:10 100:17	impression 106:19	initial 74:10,23	January 64:17	79:1,5,20 81:10
hour 97:21 103:10	imprudent 86:6	88:19 103:23	88:25	81:20,23 82:3
103:13	incidentally 86:14	inner 99:18	Jay 53:13 61:14	83:2,4,23 84:1,14
housekeeping	include 54:20	Input 57:21	Jhaveri 55:11	84:16 85:7,10
102:24 103:3	70:24 84:3 86:14	inquiries 75:24	Jing 53:14 60:2	86:4,5 93:17
housing 87:25	86:24 94:15	Insight 88:5	70:1 75:23 87:15	96:17 97:13 99:3
Howard 51:15 52:3	included 58:7,24	Integration 58:2,21	87:18 99:23	100:21 106:20,21
61:8,12,21 62:1,5	96:9	intend 102:20	100:18	106:23
62:9,19,23 63:6,8	includes 68:23	intent 93:19 94:2	JL-1T 60:2	knowledge 89:15
63:12,15,19,24	including 62:13	intention 94:16	Joe 52:7 61:23	KSJ-1T 54:7
64:3 67:3 70:3,6	63:1 77:13 80:22	95:25 96:20	Johnson 54:7,8	KSJ-2 54:8
71:20 73:2,18	81:4 108:8,13	interactions 91:3	join 67:9	
75:3 86:18 87:14	inclusion 70:25	interchangeable	joined 61:13 64:9	L
87:17,21,23 88:1	74:9	95:1	joining 62:17	L 56:8
88:7,15 98:5,8	inclusive 95:2	intercompany	Joint 55:8	labeling 107:5
101:11 102:19	income 71:2 74:5,8	100:22	Jon 52:16 53:16	Lacey 51:22 52:4
105:1,5,7,25	incorrect 103:10	interest 65:2,23	67:1 87:11 89:8	Lance 53:15 60:5
106:3 107:3,9	increase 66:1 67:23	67:11 72:2,6 75:1	93:16 101:25	88:4
Hydro 58:4	67:25,25 69:13	interested 68:13	Jon.Piliaris@pse	land 93:24
Hydroelectric	74:14,17 98:17,19	69:8 108:10	52:18	language 79:23
59:18	increased 67:18,18	interests 66:21	judge 51:15 52:2	83:1,17 84:19
	67:19 68:4 69:19	Interim 56:23	61:8,12,21 62:1,5	large 97:6,13
<u> </u>	70:17 74:10	INTERVENOR/	62:9,19,23 63:6,8	106:25
ID#18100 56:18	increases 65:24,25	52:19	63:12,15,19,24	Lastly 69:12
ID#18161 56:19	67:17 70:21	intracompany	64:3 67:3 70:3,6	late 62:17
ID#UP006 56:21	increasing 71:2	69:15	71:20 73:2,18	law 51:15 52:2,21
identified 99:6	Incremental 58:5	investments 73:16	75:3 80:9 86:18	61:12 67:11 80:18
100:20 103:4	58:22	invited 69:9	87:14,17,21,23	lawful 65:2
105:14	incurred 67:17	invoice 108:11	88:1,7,15 98:5,8	laws 108:12
identify 86:22 87:3	indicated 102:19	IRP 56:10,17	101:11 102:19	lay 96:1
87:15,22 88:2	indicating 73:3	Island 52:22	105:1,5,7,25	LDC 99:20
III 51:16 54:2	indication 97:19	issue 62:10,23 73:3	106:3 107:3,9	LDK-1T 60:5
imbalance 72:11	indirectly 68:8	78:21 82:8 83:8		LDK-260:6
impact 70:18 74:23	89:4	98:14 99:10	K	leave 80:6,7 83:5
98:15	individual 88:23	104:19,20	K 57:2 60:4	leaving 80:3
impacts 55:18	92:15	issued 64:16	Kaufman 53:15	legal 69:18 71:24
96:10 98:11,14	industrial 66:23	issues 66:2 69:22	60:5 88:3,4	lengthy 101:3
implemented 90:12	inform 89:5 92:16	71:7 90:17 92:11	Keepers 57:6,7	let's 61:16 86:21
implicit 77:14	Informal 54:23	99:6,23	Kenneth 54:7,8	letters 89:3
80:23 85:8	information 56:2	issuing 98:9	Kent 51:24 61:3	level 74:3,5 97:20
implicitly 81:5	81:2 83:15 98:3	item 86:5 90:22	108:5,22	105:19
imply 81:1	101:5,17,19	103:8 106:10	kind 78:19 97:5,15	levels 96:22
important 65:8,19	102:11	items 103:11,12	102:23	License 51:25
66:12 67:14 68:15	informational	т	know 67:6 76:7,12	108:23
69:22 71:8 75:17	96:15 100:15	$\frac{J}{J}$	77:13,22,23 78:3	lifeline 74:11
76:16 83:9	101:8	J 59:3	78:9,14,15,17,17	line 83:17
	l	l	I	I

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Lisa 53:7 62:2	59:7,9 91:5	middle 93:24	66:20	occurs 99:21
106:9	managing 71:15	million 66:15 67:21	negotiation 71:12	October 74:20
Lisa.Gafken@at	mandates 65:22	67:22 68:11 74:18	74:13	offer 57:8 81:19
53:10	manner 64:14 72:5	97:4,12 102:2,5	Negotiations 59:8	office 53:8 106:21
list 63:21 98:6	March 64:20	mind 107:5	net 68:6,14 103:12	officially 104:21
102:10 105:10,15	Mark 58:16	missed 73:12	neutral 70:9 77:24	offset 101:20 102:2
little 62:17 79:18	Mark-to-Model	mitigated 67:23	Nevertheless 67:23	Okay 79:25 84:8,22
97:23 99:2	57:22	mitigates 65:9	new 57:14,16 65:11	86:15 90:19 91:1
Liu 53:14 60:2 70:1	market 54:20	Model 58:16	65:21 67:17 73:4	91:21 92:3,7,25
87:15,16,18 92:13	57:23 58:15 71:1	modification 73:11	75:15	93:3,7 98:21
92:14,21 93:1	72:11	moment 71:9 73:12	non-company	104:24 107:7
99:25 100:2,18,25	Master 56:20	90:9	92:13	Olympia 52:9
101:7 105:10,12	math 101:25 102:9	monetized 101:22	Non-Fuel 58:24	ongoing 72:21 74:6
105:23,24	102:12	Monthly 57:19,23	non-monetized	online 90:16
Liu's 75:23	matter 51:4 72:3	months 64:16	101:20,23	only-rate 64:6
LLP 52:12	72:25 92:12	morning 61:18,23	None-Fuel 58:6	open 57:22 58:16
load 65:7 68:23,25	matters 101:22	73:21	noon 61:9	80:3 88:15 106:5
95:20 99:20	maturity 72:10	move 80:4	note 81:16	opening 63:24 64:1
Long 54:19	mean 75:22,22 85:7	moving 73:1	noted 88:7	67:4 70:5 71:21
long-term 96:23	97:8	MSCG 56:21	notice 88:23 89:4	73:19
longer 68:8	means 70:12 76:13	MT 57:11,13,15	89:11,12,13,14,14	Operations 59:5
look 97:20 98:5	105:16 108:16	59:12	89:25 90:2,8,17	opinions 93:21
looked 78:25 79:1	mechanism 54:21	multi-party 64:7	91:15 103:19,20	opportunity 64:1,5
86:5	55:17 68:9 74:24	67:6	103:25 104:15	64:18 66:24
looking 77:23	96:8,11	MW 57:9,10,11,13	notified 102:24	opposed 64:8 85:9
97:22	mechanisms 103:9	57:14,16	notify 105:16	opposes 80:14
looks 97:22	meeting 106:5	N	number 97:17,18	opposing 70:14
Loop 51:21 52:4	meets 69:18		98:1 106:17	81:24
lot 78:8 100:9	mega 103:10,13	N 54:1 61:7	108:18	opposition 67:8
lovely 107:7	megawatt 97:21	N.E 52:12	numbers 102:6	78:5 82:6
low 71:2 74:4,7	Memo 57:6,12	name 61:12 87:11	Numeral 103:15	order 54:12 57:5
low-income 65:24	Memoranda 56:6	87:18,24 88:4	0	68:20 77:2 78:7
66:22	mentioned 72:16	nature 100:18		85:25 96:2,3
Lower 57:16	72:19 73:14	NE 52:21	0 61:7	98:16 100:10
Lund 55:24	method 66:9 93:9	necessarily 76:14	O&M 59:13,14,15	Original 55:6
M	93:11	81:13 necessary 83:22	59:16,17,19 69:13	outcome 108:10
$\frac{\mathbf{M}}{\mathbf{M}60:8}$	methodology 68:14	84:7 94:13	object 82:14,14,15	outcomes 69:13
main 72:2	94:6 96:7 104:12		82:18 83:8,20 84:6 85:24 86:10	outlined 93:18
Maintenance 59:17	104:18	necessity 72:22 need 73:7 74:4,5,6	objecting 78:21	Outputs 58:13
Major 59:17	Metrics 54:23	77:9,17 81:5,14	objection 63:3,7,9	outreach 91:16
making 77:14 78:6	Michael 51:15 52:3	84:1 100:9	63:13,17 103:2	overall 74:22 98:17
78:17 80:5,13,21	61:12	needed 66:17	objectionable 79:3	Overview 54:18
80:23 82:4 83:21	Michael.Howard	needs 69:9 72:25	objections 108:8	Ownership 59:5
99:11	52:5	82:2	objects 65:13	P
management 56:13	Mid 58:19	negotiated 64:10	obviously 104:22	P 61:7
management 30.13	Mid-C 57:9 58:4	negonateu 04.10	00110u31y 104.22	L U1./
	I	I	I	1

p.m 61:2 107:15	84:20 86:22 93:3	PKW-13C 57:20	Portion 55:14	108:11
P.O 52:8	pass 92:20	PKW-14C 57:21	Portland 53:4	present 53:11 64:5
package 64:10	path 93:10,15	PKW-15C 57:22	pose 80:12 81:8	64:24 66:24
page 103:6,7,14,15	94:23 95:1	PKW-16C 57:23	position 63:16	presentation 59:7,9
pages 51:19 54:10	patience 106:5	PKW-17C 57:24	73:15 75:19,24	91:5
54:25 55:8,10,20	Paul 57:2,3	PKW-18C 58:2	76:22 77:1,6,8,16	Presentations 56:5
56:8 58:10 60:2,4	payers 67:24 68:6,7	PKW-19C 58:3	77:21,23 78:2,10	56:13,15
60:5,8	68:11,15,19	PKW-1CT 57:2	78:13 79:12,20,23	presented 65:14
pandemic 70:21	paying 69:1	PKW-2 57:3	80:3 83:3,12,18	72:24 76:2
panel 87:2 106:4	PCA 54:13,21,23	PKW-20C 58:4	84:18,21 85:10	presenting 57:7
paper 101:3	55:15 68:8 75:12	PKW-21C 58:5	86:2,2	96:6
papers 64:20	85:5 96:8 103:9	PKW-22C 58:6	positions 76:25	priced 96:22
105:13	PCORC 55:2,5	PKW-23C 58:8	possibility 92:11	Prices 57:23
Paragraph 96:3	65:10 72:22 73:1	PKW-24 58:9	postpone 80:1	pricing 90:12
park 93:25	73:8 74:24 75:16	PKW-25CT 58:10	postponed 82:1	primary 94:9
part 63:22 85:25	76:18 85:7 92:8,9	PKW-26C 58:11	potential 72:25	principal 64:23
90:13 97:7	98:17	PKW-27C 58:12	85:11 91:4,23	69:11
participants	PCORCs 64:14,15	PKW-28C 58:13	103:21	prior 72:18 75:16
104:22	65:11	PKW-29C 58:14	potentially 85:3	92:1
participate 66:11	Peak 56:19	PKW-30C 58:15	power 54:16,17	probably 95:16
71:7 94:18 95:4	Peaker 58:7,24	PKW-31C 58:16	55:4,6,6,15,17,23	proceeding 67:7
participated 64:21	percent 69:2,3	PKW-32C 58:18	55:24 56:6 57:4,4	69:7 73:9 80:2
participation 68:7	97:23 98:16,19	PKW-33C 58:19	57:6,18,23 58:9	83:23 92:19,22,23
72:3,15 90:13	percentage 67:25	PKW-34C 58:20	58:11,12,14,20	101:2,4 108:7
particular 73:7	perception 92:16	PKW-35C 58:21	64:6,13 65:5,6,7	proceedings 61:5
79:13 83:1 89:25	Perkins 52:12	PKW-36C 58:22	65:18 66:17 67:17	64:16 68:15 69:24
90:7,8 91:7,12	61:19	PKW-37C 58:24	67:22 68:4 69:3	Proces 58:15
98:14,19	perspective 70:16	PKW-3C 57:4	70:17,17 72:9	process 56:12 66:8
particularly 70:22	91:5 99:24,24	PKW-4C 57:6	76:17 90:1,17,23	71:12,15 95:2
74:8 91:11	PETITIONER/A	PKW-5C 57:7	91:16 92:18,21	100:9
parties 62:11,24	53:2	PKW-6 57:9	104:10 105:21,21	Produced 57:19
63:25 64:11,18,20	pgs 54:7 59:3	PKW-7C 57:10	power-related	product 56:19 87:9
64:21,23 66:3,6	Phase 56:14,16	PKW-8C 57:12	90:24	96:21
68:13 69:8 71:10	Piliaris 52:16 53:16	PKW-9C 57:14	PPA 56:18,21,22	production 54:18
72:13 73:6 74:13	67:1 87:10,12	place 61:5 71:6	56:23 96:5,11	55:13 59:13,14,15
75:19,22 76:11,12	88:20 89:9 93:16	Plaintiff 51:7	PPAs 65:11 67:18	59:16,18,19
76:20 81:17,24	93:16 94:16,24	plan 100:4	68:24 69:6 73:15	101:17 108:12
82:25 84:20,24	95:5,7 97:7,17	please 88:9 95:14	96:11	profess 93:17
92:4,7 93:8 95:9	98:13 99:9 100:3	105:6,7	practices 99:5	Professional 54:8
99:4,6 100:16	101:25 102:9	PO 52:17	pre-filed 62:12,25	54:11 55:11,21
102:25 104:23	103:20 104:5,6,20	point 65:3 73:12	63:20,23	56:9 57:3 59:4
108:10	pin 92:23	83:22 84:6 86:11	pre-meeting 62:17	61:4
party 64:8 65:13	pipeline 67:19	88:15 91:18 95:12	precise 97:25	profitization 96:4
67:7 70:8 76:10	PKW-10 57:16	101:5,7	prefer 102:1	program 66:4
77:15,24 78:2	PKW-11C 57:18	points 67:15 94:9	prepare 106:19	67:24 74:11,12
80:1 81:9,20	PKW-12C 57:19	portfolio 65:22	prepared 91:6	88:19 90:14,21
	I	l	I	Ι

				<u> </u>
91:12,13 99:12,13	80:23,24 81:1,11	74:15 77:25 80:15	106:14 107:10	94:8
programs 99:15	81:14,17 82:24	82:1 86:24 87:7	108:8	reached 64:23
100:7	83:3,7,10,25 84:9	87:12 106:21	quite 66:3 77:5	92:14
Progress 56:17	84:13,17,24 85:1	Puget's 74:9	106:20,22	real 104:19
project 52:19 56:18	85:4,8,12,22,24	pulling 89:10	·	realized 100:9
56:19,21 60:7	86:4,11,13	purchase 54:19	R	really 71:11 79:10
62:6,8 63:17	prudency 76:5,25	55:23,24 56:6	R 61:7 108:1	93:22 96:6,15
73:19,23,23,24	77:2 78:15,18	57:6 65:18	raise 88:10	100:9 101:25
74:2,8,21,24	80:3,5,7 81:22,25	purpose 68:22 96:1	raised 79:4 99:10	reasonable 68:3
79:10 82:23 83:8	82:1,2,5,10,13	101:6	Randall 53:12	69:12 70:22 93:24
Project's 63:15	prudent 65:13	purposes 93:24	61:14 64:4 70:7	reasons 66:18 74:1
88:8	76:13 78:5 81:3,3	107:4	73:21 84:8,22	recall 90:14 101:1
projected 66:16	81:5 84:19 85:18	pursuant 67:9	85:2,13 87:5,11	102:3
proportional 69:1	85:21,22 86:8	68:19	88:17,17 89:21	receive 68:6,8,16
proportionality	PSE 54:23 59:7,9	put 72:13 85:15	90:5,19 91:1,21	90:13 105:13
97:19,22	63:3 64:13,17,19	90:20 97:1 106:13	92:3,20,25 93:3,7	received 89:2 91:19
proposal 55:25	65:14,14 66:13,16	putting 98:16	94:14,19 95:8	receiving 67:25
57:7 74:10 106:16	66:21,25 67:15,16		98:21,25 100:14	recognition 64:15
propose 96:17	68:6,15 71:25	Q	100:25 101:13	74:9
103:22 107:1	75:11,24 85:9	Qualifications 54:8	102:8 105:4	recognize 66:7,12
proposed 57:4 68:2	87:9 88:20,21,22	54:11 55:11,21	rate 54:16,17 55:4	93:20
76:1 78:25 89:5	89:4 102:19	56:9 57:3 59:4	55:6,6,15,18	recognizes 67:16
104:11,12,13	103:22	quantify 68:14	57:20,21 58:11,12	recommend 73:9
provide 63:21 70:4	PSE's 54:21 56:13	question 72:21	58:18 59:14,15	80:1
73:18 76:18 89:4	56:15,17 57:4	75:7 76:3 80:4,8	64:13,16 65:5,6,8	recommendation
91:15,15	59:11 64:6 65:22	80:11,12 81:8,10	65:25 66:17 67:23	57:8 70:10
provided 65:15	67:20,24 68:4,7	82:7,22 83:4	67:24 68:6,7,11	recommends 69:24
72:8 78:1,12 79:6	68:11,19 69:1,15	84:24 85:15,23	68:15,19,22 69:3	75:1
85:6 88:24 89:14	69:19,21 74:7	86:9,16 88:25	69:4,14 70:20	record 63:5,22
90:2,21	76:1,2 77:7	89:24 93:4 95:10	74:16 76:17 90:1	83:15 102:24
provides 66:5 68:5	PSE-08N 52:17	95:16 97:1,8	90:18,23,23 91:17	107:12 108:8
68:12 69:7,12	PSE-1JT 55:8	98:22 101:13,16	92:18,22 94:11	recovery 96:21,24
75:14 85:5 100:4	PTCs 101:20,21,24	102:23 103:18	103:8,9,10,11,12	redirect 102:20,21
providing 70:10	public 53:6 60:3	104:7,16,17	103:13,14 105:20	102:22 105:5
74:17	62:1,3 63:8,9 64:8	questioning 67:1	105:21	reduce 69:10 74:22
provision 90:9	65:2,23 67:8,11	75:5	rate-making 69:11	reduced 97:21
provisions 88:23	70:4,8,12,20,23	questions 64:18	Rate-Year 57:18	reduces 67:20
108:14	71:6,17 72:1,6	70:1 71:19 75:4	rates 55:16,17	reduction 97:11,23
prudence 65:13,16	74:25 82:18 87:21	79:4,4 80:7 82:24 84:23 85:17 86:18	65:12 68:1,3 69:19 71:3 76:13	97:23
65:17 73:15 75:9	87:25 89:1,12	84:23 85:17 86:18		reevaluate 93:8
75:11,15,18,20	93:5 103:1 106:10	92:5 95:13,20	77:14 80:22,24 81:4 82:8 84:3	reference 103:8
76:1,10,16,20	106:11,13,14 P ===4,51+0,52+15	92:3 93:13,20 98:23 99:1 101:11	85:9 86:14 91:23	referenced 72:20
77:7,9,10,11,12	Puget 51:9 52:15	101:14 102:13,14	91:25 95:23 98:20	91:3
77:14,16,17,25	52:16 54:2,6	101:14 102:13,14 102:16,18 104:25	RCW 68:20 108:13	reflect 65:7 70:16
79:12,13,24 80:1	61:11,19 64:2	102.10,18 104.25	reach 74:7 93:5	72:13
80:11,13,15,19,21	70:16 72:23 74:4	105.2,5,0 100.1	1 cach / +. / 75.5	reflects 64:10 69:5
	I	l	I	I

Page	1	1	8
			-

regard 76:25 82:16 83:4,7 94:22representing 61:19 represents 66:13rest 93:25 Restated 55:22role 71:14SEF-5 54:15 SEF-6 54:16regarding 54:2366:21result 68:2 75:8roughly 97:4 98:19SEF-7 54:1759:10 70:11 72:21 regardless 104:9reproduction 108:1698:18roughly 97:4 98:19SEF-8 54:18Registered 61:4 regular 91:10,12request 55:25 56:2 66:14,18 97:25101:3Rte 58:296:1,2,9regular 91:10,1266:14,18 97:25results 56:3,4 68:10rules 108:12,13send 102:10	17
83:4,7 94:22 represents 66:13 Restated 55:22 Roman 103:15 SEF-6 54:16 regarding 54:23 66:21 result 68:2 75:8 roughly 97:4 98:19 SEF-7 54:17 59:10 70:11 72:21 reproduction 98:18 Row 103:15 SEF-8 54:18 regardless 104:9 108:16 resulted 65:20 RPR 51:24 108:22 SEF-9 54:19 95 Registered 61:4 request 55:25 56:2 101:3 Rte 58:2 96:1,2,9 regular 91:10,12 66:14,18 97:25 results 56:3,4 68:10 rules 108:12,13 send 102:10	17
regarding 54:2366:21result 68:2 75:8roughly 97:4 98:19SEF-7 54:1759:10 70:11 72:21reproduction98:18Row 103:15SEF-8 54:18regardless 104:9108:16resulted 65:20RPR 51:24 108:22SEF-9 54:19 95Registered 61:4request 55:25 56:2101:3Rte 58:296:1,2,9regular 91:10,1266:14,18 97:25results 56:3,4 68:10rules 108:12,13send 102:10	17
59:10 70:11 72:21 regardless 104:9reproduction 108:1698:18 resulted 65:20Row 103:15 RPR 51:24 108:22SEF-8 54:18 SEF-9 54:19 95Registered 61:4 regular 91:10,12request 55:25 56:2 66:14,18 97:25101:3 results 56:3,4 68:10Row 103:15 RPR 51:24 108:22SEF-9 54:19 95 96:1,2,9regular 91:10,1266:14,18 97:25results 56:3,4 68:10rules 108:12,13send 102:10	:17
Registered 61:4 regular 91:10,12request 55:25 56:2 66:14,18 97:25101:3 results 56:3,4 68:10Rte 58:2 rules 108:12,1396:1,2,9 send 102:10	:17
regular 91:10,12 66:14,18 97:25 results 56:3,4 68:10 rules 108:12,13 send 102:10	
0 / /	
regulating 108:13 98:2 101:18 102:1 69:19 71:3 74:16 ruling 82:19 sense 97:3,5	
regulations 108:12 requested 67:21 revenue 55:2,17,17 run 62:20 68:9 sensitive 70:20	
regulatory 60:2 100:11 66:14,16 67:21 103:11,12	
$71:25 \ 87:6, 12, 19$ requests 67:12 98:6 68:2 74:22 87:6 S sentence 73:5	
87:25 101:9 102:3 102:10 103:11,12 S 54:5,7,8 61:7 separate 69:21	
reiterate 67:15 requirement 101:9 review 74:24 79:1 S.E 52:4 serve 66:17	
71:24 82:4 requirements 82:24 satisfied 79:5 services 72:8 87	:20
reject 70:11 68:20 87:6 108:14 revised 56:17 75:13 saying 75:8 76:19 session 100:15	
related 90:1,17 requiring 80:18 RFI 56:3 78:3,4 85:19,21 set 66:8 82:9 90	:11
92:11 105:21 reserved 93:8 RFP 56:4,11,12,14 85:22 86:3,7 108:6,18	
relatedly 65:10 reserving 102:20 56:16 says 76:6 94:23 sets 69:21	
relates 101:16 reset 65:6 Richland 108:6 scale 97:3,5 settlement 51:1	
102:23 residential 65:25 right 62:23 63:12 SCarson@Perki 54:13 55:8 61	· ·
relating 90:2 66:21 68:1 71:20 75:21 76:23 52:14 62:13 63:1 64 62:13 63:1 64 62:13 63:1 64 62:13 63:1 64 62:13 63:1 64	· ·
relation 90:10 97:6 residing 108:5 77:20 79:7,16 Schedule 55:14,16 64:7,7,9,9,12,	
relative 90:3 108:9 resolution 72:24 80:6 82:13 88:10 55:17 91:12 64:23 65:4,5,2 relatively 100:5 resolve 72:4 90:7 92:3 93:8 105:19 66:2 4 13 15	
	·
	3
	1.7
	15
61:175:15,20 76:2,12 RJR-10 59:15see 63:4 92:4 94:572:1,4,7,19,20 Remove 58:677:7 78:25 79:6 RJR-11C 59:1798:573:10,14 74:2	
renewable 54:1979:13 80:15,20,22RJR-12 59:18seeing 95:1174:16,22,25 755:25 56:2 65:2182:25 84:3,5 85:9RJR-13C 59:19101:1575:12 76:3,4,6	
S5.25 S6.2 S5.21 S2.25 S4.3,5 S5.9 KJK-15C S9.19 Io1115 75.12 70.3,4,0 Renewal 57:9,10 85:18,21 86:6,14 RJR-1CT 59:3 SEF-10 54:20 76:10,11,24 <td>·</td>	·
Refewal 57.9,10 85.18,21 80.0,14 RJR-TC 1 59.5 SEF 10 5 1020 70.10,11,24 renewed 67:18 76:1 90:15 100:10 RJR-2 59:4 SEF-11 54:22 77:23 78:7 79	
repeat 104:16 respect 72:17 73:15 RJR-3 59:5 SEF-12C 54:23 81:23,24 82:5	
report 56:17 101:2 79:22,23 95:19 RJR-4C 59:6 SEF-13T 54:25 83:2,24,24 84	
reported 51:24 106:18 RJR-5C 59:7 SEF-14 55:2 84:16,20 85:5	14
108:6 respectfully 65:16 RJR-6C 59:9 SEF-15 55:3 86:23 92:1,19	3:7
reporter 61:3,4 66:18 RJR-7C 59:11 SEF-16 55:4 93:13,20,23,2	
63:21 73:2 108:5 respond 81:9 RJR-8 59:13 SEF-17 55:6 95:18,22 97:1	
108:22 response 54:23 RJR-9 59:14 SEF-1T 54:10 99:3 101:23 1	
reporting 54:19 93:4 104:7 Road 52:21 SEF-2 54:11 103:7,15 104:	
96:9,13 responses 85:16 Robert 59:3 SEF-3 54:12 107:11	
represent 79:1 responsive 64:22 Roberts 59:3 SEF-4 54:14 settlements 65:	

SHARE 37.10	13.411.372.13	Summarizing 57.0		incory 70.21
Snake 57:16	73:4 77:3 92:13	Summarizing 57:6	tariff 88:21,22 89:6	theory 96:21
SMC-1T 60:8	start 58:7,24 61:16	summarized 100:3	talking 91:7	105:24 106:4
singituy 80:3 smart 71:1 72:17	71:25	53:8	talked 77:5	105:1,3,4,9,12,23
slightly 86:3	standards 69:18	Suite 52:12,21 53:4	Talen 59:12	105:1,3,4,9,12,23
slight 104:12	stakeholders 66:10	83:15	takes 73:14 75:17	102:8,11,13 103:0
Slids 57:14,16	83:21 87:14 99:24	substantial 05.15 sufficient 68:3	108:7	102:8,11,15 103:6
Slides 57:7,9,10	staff's 77:6,16	substantial 65:15	taken 61:3 104:14	100:12,25 101:10
slide 91:5	100:5,7,16 105:10	56:16	86:2 89:9	98:12 99:25 100:2
55:22	96:7 99:10,22	Subsequent 56:14	79:23 83:2 84:20	88:15 95:6,7
Skookumchuck	86:9,11 92:14	101:19 100:12	77:1 78:23 79:12	87:14,21 88:1,7
skip 62:19	82:14 85:20 84:5 84:18 85:23 86:4	101:19 106:12	74:19 75:19,24	82:22 85:2,15 86:1,15,16,17
SKC-1T 60:4	82:14 83:20 84:5	submitted 62:11	take 64:10 71:6,9	82:22 85:2,13
situation 90:8 six 64:16 98:16,19	71:25 75:23 77:6	submits 72:20	tackle 69:22	79:7,9,16 80:8,17
situation 90:8	69:4,17,24 71:14	Submit 57:8	tacitly 78:15	75:2,3 77:4,20
sitting 81:18	67:4,10,14 68:1	Submission 56:3,4	T 54:5 108:1,1	71:19,22 73:17,20
simply 84:3	61:22,25 63:6,7	subject 67:22	Т	67:3 70:2,3,6
52:23	staff 52:6 60:2	struggle 79:19	System 56:21	64:3,5 66:24 67:2
Simon@ffitchla	stack 99:15	strips 102:3 Strom 52:11 61:19		62:20,22 63:14,19
Simon 52:20,21 62:7 73:22	Square 51:21 52:4 ss 108:2		swear 86:25 88:9 88:11	108:8 thank 61:21 62:9
similar 79:21	spread 68:24	strip 65:20 96:8 101:21		91:2,2 106:4
			suspect 106:24 SW 53:4	
silent 82:8	specificity 99:2 SPI 56:18	strictly 96:13	67:1 87:5	75:23 87:1 88:11
significantly 67:20 79:22		74:2 Street 52:12		64:19,22 65:15 70:24 72:19 74:1
96:23	89:19 91:15 93:19 100:2	stipulation 63:18 74:2	surplus 55:2 95:18 Susan 53:14 54:10	63:1,4,10,20,23
70:18 74:3 96:18	75:22 78:10 82:24	stipulated 63:4	97:8 102:6 104:15	62:10,12,13,25
significant 66:13	72:6 74:3,17	63:10,14 stipulated 63:4	sure 89:1 96:25	59:3 60:2,4,5,8
side 99:15	specifically 71:13	stipulate 62:11,24	surcharges 65:9	56:8 57:2 58:10
				54:25 55:8,10,20
shortly 64:22 98:9 sic 80:17	98:3 99:5 100:16 100:20	Stephanie 53:16 60:4 70:23 87:24	74:21 86:4	testimony 54:7,10
		▲ '	supports 72:5 74:2	Test 59:13,15
<pre>shortfall 65:20 shorthand 108:7</pre>	82:2,24 83:4,10 89:15 91:16 92:15	statutory 65:22 step 78:4,24	supporting 65:15 70:13 78:2,12	
	-	0		108:14
short 61:16 81:20	specific 78:4 81:19	stating 83:2	83:13 86:7	77:23 84:24 94:25
69:10	speaking 82:18	states 81:5 105:19	72:23 75:25 76:1	70:24,25 72:4
shifting 68:18,18	99:7	79:15	support 55:8 64:1	terms 67:13 70:22
Sheree 52:11 61:18	speak 76:11 98:13	statements 63:25	Supply 59:6,8,10	93:18 94:21
Shawn 60:8 73:25	Southeast 51:21	83:6	58:19,20,21,23,24	term 54:19 78:7
94:4	sounds 78:20	73:19 75:2 79:11	58:13,14,15,17,18	55:12
sharing 68:10 94:4	86:24 87:7,13	67:4 70:5 71:21	54:25 58:10,11,12	Temperature
share 69:1	70:17 74:4,15	statement 64:1	Supplemental	tell 84:22 102:2
Shaped 56:22	61:11,19 64:2	78:11 85:16 88:22	supervision 108:17	telephone 53:14
shaking 101:15	52:16 54:2,6	stated 67:8 74:1	59:15	technical 64:17,17
99:4	Sound 51:9 52:15	108:18,23	57:21 59:11,13,14	tax 101:17
settling 64:22 70:8 81:9,24 93:8 95:9	sorry 62:19 73:2 87:16 103:6	state 76:4 108:2,12	55:3 57:4,18,20	tariffs 90:11
	COMMY 62.10 72.2	started 91:24	Summary 54:15	95:23

	Page	120
--	------	-----

				8
thing 97:15	67:18 69:14 72:8	65:21	wanted 94:21 99:15	Woodland 51:21
things 68:21 79:3	Transport 57:22	unmute 87:16	99:21,22	52:4
79:19 85:20	58:16	update 67:22	wants 82:7	wording 84:19
think 75:17 76:14	Transportation	updated 55:2,3,4,6	Washington 51:1,5	words 98:16
76:16,19,20 78:11	51:2,6,20 52:3	90:22 105:20	51:20,22 54:1	work 64:19 66:7
79:20,22 80:18,22	54:1 57:24 58:20	upwards 106:23	61:10 108:2,5,12	71:4,6 93:10
81:4,19 82:6	61:11	use 54:18 102:2	108:18,23	105:13
83:21 84:11,14,22	treatment 72:17	uses 99:19,20	wasn't 79:5	worked 71:11
85:3,6,10 96:3	tried 93:23	UTC 106:12	watt 103:10,13	working 93:14,15
98:9 100:3,18	true 108:7	Utilities 51:2,5,20	Way 53:4	wouldn't 81:13,15
102:1,2,25 104:20	truth 88:12,12,13	52:3 54:1 61:10	we'll 88:15 106:24	83:20 84:6,12
Third 65:23 68:17	try 67:14		we're 61:9 76:13	107:5
thought 78:8	trying 81:18 84:15	V	77:24 84:4,15,18	wrap 71:16
thoughts 73:13	84:23 86:11 89:24	Value 57:22 58:16	84:23 91:7 94:1	wrong 89:12
79:8	99:14 102:12	variable 67:19 69:4	we've 79:15 86:5	WSPP 56:20
three 66:25 69:21	turn 63:2,24 64:2	various 91:14	88:7 96:6 106:23	WTE-10C 56:6
85:17	67:4 70:3 71:20	versus 61:11	week 70:19,19	WTE-1CT 55:20
Thursday 61:1,8	75:23	100:24	106:19 107:2	WTE-2 55:20
tied 92:21	twice 67:25	videoconference	went 89:20	WTE-3C 55:22
time 68:6 80:20,23	two 68:21 71:4	52:1 53:1 61:2	West 108:6	WTE-4C 55:24
81:18 85:7 87:1	79:14 85:20 89:2	108:6	Western 53:2,3	WTE-5 55:25
88:9 91:19 93:22	93:12 95:20 99:18	view 70:22 76:3	60:5 62:16 88:6	WTE-6 56:2
93:23 96:13 100:9	99:18 106:14,16	violate 108:14	Westmoreland	WTE-7HC 56:3
103:25	typical 97:14,15	virtual 86:21	59:12	WTE-8HC 56:4
times 81:21	typically 77:10	virtue 104:9	Wetherbee 57:2,3	WTE-9HC 56:5
today 61:8,9,13	106:18,21	Vitae 60:6	whatnot 78:1	
64:25 69:25 70:10		Volume 51:16 54:2	WHEREOF	X
73:25 88:12 98:10	U	Voluntary 54:19	108:18	X 54:1,5
106:5 107:2,12	UE-130617 54:12	vs 51:8 54:1 55:7	white 101:3	
tooth 79:2	UE-190530 68:21	vulnerable 67:24	wide 93:21	Y
top 79:2 102:4	UE-200980 51:6		William 53:15	yeah 78:14 97:17
topic 77:5 92:6	54:2 61:10	W	55:21 67:2 86:25	98:4 104:17
total 69:3 97:6,8	Unbalance 54:20	WA 52:4,9,13,17	willing 62:11,24	year 57:20,21 58:2
track 96:20	uncertainty 75:17	52:22 53:9	Wind 56:22 58:2	58:11,12,18 59:13
tracking 95:18,21	85:11	WAC 67:9 69:18	58:21 59:19	59:14,15,16 65:8
96:1 103:9	Under-Recoveries	88:24 108:13	wish 101:15	66:17
transactions 69:16	54:24	WAC-308-14-130	witness 70:1,23	years 101:1
100:23	undersigned 108:5	108:13	71:17 87:15,22	7
transcribed 108:7	understand 81:12	wait 80:14	88:2,8 108:8,18	$\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}}$
transcript 108:11	89:25 100:21	waited 106:5	witnesses 66:25	Zoom 61:2
108:16	understanding	waiting 81:11	75:5 86:19,21,22	0
transfers 99:18	84:4 89:14,21	walked 64:19	86:24,25 87:1,2	
translation 99:11	90:9,24 99:22	want 71:9,10,12	88:14 92:12,13	1
transmission 57:9	100:22	82:3,12 85:15	97:2 102:21 106:4	1 65:21 102:3
57:11,11,13,14,16	Unit 55:17	86:10,12 89:7	wonder 99:7	1.2 74:18
58:3,18 65:11,18	units 58:8 59:5	95:9 104:15	wondering 99:5	1:18 107:15

100 57:10 69:3	296 96:3	7 103:15
100 57:10 69:3 108 51:19	290 96:3 2nd 67:7	7/03:15 7/23/2019 59:8
108 5 52:12	2110 07:7	700 52:12
	3	
10th 108:18	3 59:5 103:7	75 57:16 69:2
11 54:12	3 59.5 105.7 3-7 97:9	8
12 61:8		
12/5/2019 59:6	3&4 58:8	8 54:25 68:20 90:22
12:00 61:2	3.7 97:4,12	96:3
126 102:2	30 88:24	8/29/2019 59:10
139 55:14 91:12	308-14-135 108:13	800 53:8
105:19	30th 107:1	81 56:8
14 55:10	321 52:21	87 67:21
142 55:17	360.664.1160 52:5	
15 54:7	360.664.1192 52:9	9
17 55:8,20	37 103:16	9 58:10
1750 53:4	38.716 103:13	9-HC 91:3
1750 55.4 17th 89:10	383 52:21	94 57:11
18-145 108:13		95 55:16
	4	97034 52:17
19.29.090 68:20	4 59:5 103:7	97201 53:4
1st 88:25	4.4 68:11	98004-5579 52:13
2	40 97:21 106:24	98009-9734 52:17
	40.706 103:10	98104-3188 53:9
2 56:14,16 65:21	425.456.2142 52:18	98110 52:22
102:3 103:6		
20 97:23 106:22	425.635.1400 52:13	98503 52:4
2000 53:8	43 54:10	98504 52:9
2002 75:12	450 53:4	
2015 54:13 56:2	47 97:20	
75:13	47250 52:8	
2017 55:25 56:10	480-07-740 67:10	
2018 56:11,12,14	69:18	
56:16	480-100-194 88:24	
2019 55:2,7 56:17	4th 107:4,7	
57:4 96:3		
2020 55:2,5,6 88:21	5	
2020 55:2,5,6 66:21 2021 51:18 54:3	5 60:4,5 107:6,7	
61:1 108:19	50 57:13,14	
2024 57:17	503.241.7242 53:5	
	51 51:19	
206.464.6595 53:9	557 58:9	
206.669.8197 52:22		
22 51:18 54:3 61:1	6	
22nd 61:8	6 60:8	
23 57:9 66:15	621 51:21 52:4	
2408 51:25 108:23	65.3 67:22	
250 102:5	0010 01.22	
27 59:3 60:2	7	
	•	