## STATE OF VERMONT PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

INFORMATION SESSION RE: COMMISSION'S PROCESSING OF CERTAIN NET-METERING CASES

October 1, 2021 9:30 a.m.

Via Videoconference

Information Session held before the Vermont Public Utility Commission, via GoToMeeting, on October 1, 2021, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

## PRESENT

STAFF: Stephanie Hoffman, Staff Attorney
Kyle H. Landis-Marinello, General
Counsel
Ann C. Bishop, Operations Director

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
P.O. BOX 329
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05402-0329
(802) 863-6067
EMAIL: info@capitolcourtreporters.com

## PRESENT

2	Kimberly Hayden, Esq.
3	Alex Wing, Esq. Kevin Anderson, ANR
	Victoria Westgate, Esq
4	Eric Guzman, Esq.
	Tom Petraska
5	Laurie Stanley
	Ryan Jarvis
6	Ben Civiletti
	Amanda Simard
7	Grace Grundhauser
	Carol Robertson
8	Bill Powell
	Carolyn Anderson
9	Sara Hildebrand
	Karly Carrara
10	Mike Gadway
	Kevin McCollister
11	Aaron Lavallee
	Mike Lazorchak
12	John Guerin
	Taylor Newton
13	Eric Phanuef
	Gillian Bergeron
14	_

MS. HOFFMAN: Welcome everyone, and good morning. My name is Steph Hoffman, and I'm a staff attorney at the Public Utility Commission. With me today from the commission is Kyle Landis-Marinello, General Counsel, and Ann Bishop, our Operations Director.

This is a virtual information session regarding the commission's processing of certain net-metering cases. The purpose of today's information session is to provide an outline of the procedure and answer questions about it from members of the public.

Before we begin the substantive information session, I just want to remind everyone that the commission staff will not mute anyone's microphone today. That means that you should keep yourself on mute unless you are speaking. That way we can minimize background noise.

If you're not going to be actively speaking during the information session, it is also helpful if you could turn your video off so that when people begin speaking we can see their picture better on the screen.

The commission has implemented a procedure for processing certain net-metering petitions in which after the 30-day comment period

there are no outstanding substantive issues and no parties that have any concerns with the project that warrant further investigation or a hearing. This procedure only applies to net-metering petitions. So systems greater than 50 KW that are not roof-mounted

photovoltaic systems or hydroelectric facilities.

After an internal review at the commission, the hearing officer in such a case, may issue a memorandum to the applicant. A generic version of that memo was distributed publicly with the announcement of this information session. The memo requests that the applicant file one, a commission uncontested net-metering petition waiver form signed by all parties. That is available on our website. And two, a document containing all the final agreed upon proposed conditions introduced during the comment period or during any other further litigation of the case.

The memo further explains that the commission may still have questions or concerns about the proposed project, and thus, the memo does not signal a final determination on the merits of the application.

The parties in such a case may then elect to sign and file a waiver form that is

available on the commission's website, as I mentioned. You can get there either by going to puc.vermont.gov, under the drop-down menu at the top of bar there is a form section. And then there is a drop down under that for CPG applicants. And the form is on that web page. Or you can go to puc.vermont.gov/document/net-metering-petition-waiver-form.

If the commission receives the two documents described in the memo and that I articulated above, then it will consider whether this procedure applies and the case may result in a non-precedential shorter final order than is typical of net-metering petitions.

Again, submission by the applicant and other parties of these materials does not guarantee that the case will be processed in this way.

So that's the information that we have to provide today. We will now turn to questions. I ask that you would raise your hand or turn on your camera to signal that you have a question. I will call on each person individually. Please try not to speak over one another. And whenever you begin talking, please identify yourself by name for the court reporter and provide your affiliation, if any,

with the group or entity if you desire.

I'll also remind parties that we can not discuss specific cases that are pending with the commission or that may be filed with the commission in the future. So I will now open it up to questions from members of the public.

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes, Ms. Hayden.

MS. HAYDEN: Sorry. I couldn't find the icon for raising my hand. Just a quick question. The non-precedential final order, why would it be a non-precedential order if it's a final order?

MS. HOFFMAN: Well so this will be explained further, should an order be received, within the context of the order. But that decision is available to us for a variety of reasons. We are kind of designating these orders as non precedential because they would not contain the same analysis as a typical NMP order would contain.

MS. HAYDEN: But there would be a Proposal for Decision including findings of fact, and then an order affirming the final decision. So it would be a decision on the merits.

MS. HOFFMAN: These are certainly decisions on the merits, and we would have to have the evidence supporting all the typical findings

required by statute for such an order. Yes.

MS. HAYDEN: But that would be in the application materials, all of the evidence, and then the findings of fact would cite the evidence supporting each of the statutory criteria. So I'm not understanding why it would not have any precedential value.

MS. HOFFMAN: We are just providing that information in advance because it's a designation that would be in such -- one of these shorter, abbreviated orders. Much like certain orders that come out of the appellate court and other courts are non precedential based on the sort of posture of that case.

MS. HAYDEN: I guess I'm not -- I would have to look at the civil rules. But I think if you've got a stipulation by all of the parties, and which essentially is what the waiver would be, and you've got evidentiary findings that support all of the criteria, that it really would be a final order that should have precedential value.

But I don't want to belabor the point.

I'll look into it. I guess I didn't see that nuance
in the procedural order that was issued the other
day. So I don't want to take up everybody's time.

question.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you for your Mr. Anderson?

MR. K. ANDERSON: Good morning. I'm

Kevin Anderson with the Agency of Natural Resources.

I had a similar question. You know, the email

introducing this alternative process says the case

may then result in a non-precedential order, and I

guess I'm curious how we can be assured that would be

the case before signing the waiver.

I mean and kind of related is there an opportunity at this point to suggest revisions to the waiver form that clarify those waivers are made on the condition that it would be a non-precedential order?

MS. HOFFMAN: So I'll just clarify that the "may" in that sentence applies to may result in such an order. Not whether that order would contain the non-precedential designation. So if the case -- if it's deemed by the commission that this procedure applies, then the order that is issued is an abbreviated order that covers the statutory criteria required in such an order. But then it would be designated within that order as non precedential.

If, in fact, there are remaining issues after the commission's review of the case, then a

typical -- more typical NMP order would issue in that case.

Does that answer your question?

MR. K. ANDERSON: Kind of. So we would know that the commission intends to make it a non-precedential order before we are asked to sign the waiver?

MS. HOFFMAN: The waiver -- the waiver process is one of the components required to get this review. However, the commission still has the authority to determine the case doesn't get sort of an abbreviated order and needs a more typical order. So if the waiver is signed, that's not a guarantee that you get processed this way. There is still commission authority to review these issues and make a final determination of whether the process applies.

If, in fact, this process applies and is going to be utilized, the order that comes out of it is a shorter, non-precedential, abbreviated order.

MR. K. ANDERSON: I understand. I think we may be, at ANR, more reluctant to sign that waiver if we don't know whether that order -- that final order will be non precedential.

And then just a follow-up question.

You know, what happens if a party chooses not to sign

the waiver form? I mean the sample memo to the applicant says commission requests that you file this waiver form. You know, I mean I can imagine what might happen. But, you know, from the commission's perspective what would happen in that case? The party doesn't sign a waiver.

MS. HOFFMAN: All parties to a case would have to sign the waiver for this process to be -- to move forward. Otherwise, it would just be handled as has been typically the case.

MR. K. ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks.

MS. HOFFMAN: Mr. Wing?

MR. WING: Alex Wing, Vermont

Department of Public Service. My colleague at ANR,

Kevin Anderson, I guess asked one of my questions

which was, I guess, whether this was volitional for

all the parties. And then I just wanted to confirm

that the intended scope of applicability -- I think

you said was 50 kilowatts?

MS. HOFFMAN: These apply to netmetering petitions. So the 5107 category of projects.

MR. WING: Gotcha. All right. Thank you.

MS. HOFFMAN: Are there any other

questions? Yes. Ms. Westgate.

MS. WESTGATE: Sorry. Victoria

Westgate from Dunkiel Saunders. I was just wondering

if you could speak a little bit to the expected time

lines. I assume that this kind of order would result

in a quicker decision from the commission. So I

didn't know if you had any, like, expectations about

that you could share.

MS. HOFFMAN: I can just share that the procedure is now available to hearing officers in cases where this might apply as of the end of this information session. And so we aren't absolutely certain about how this process will go in the beginning, but certainly there is an intention here to create sort of efficiency in the process in some ways. But only after that complete and comprehensive review would take place that is typical in an NMP case.

MS. WESTGATE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HOFFMAN: Any other questions? Mr.

Anderson?

MR. K. ANDERSON: Yes. Just one. I kind of asked it earlier, but is there, you know, is this kind of set? And this is the process moving forward? But is the commission or is the commission

open to, you know, making changes, for example, to
the waiver form at this point? Are you open to that
feedback if that's something that would, you know, be
more likely to result in parties executing the waiver
form?

MS. HOFFMAN: So I think that the best way to answer that is we would accept comments, public comments, in our miscellaneous administration case which is Case No. 21A-0013 should anyone have comments on the procedure itself.

MR. K. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you.
MS. HOFFMAN: Ms. Hayden.

MS. HAYDEN: Yes. So in terms of Mr. Anderson's questions, a thought. If the parties were to provide both the waiver form and the conditions document as well as a stipulation that included the standard language of no precedential effect, would the commission consider receiving that and conditioning its order on that? Or do you -- maybe you don't know the answer to that.

In other words, the parties would stipulate or they could expand the waiver to include language with a stipulation that it's being offered on the condition that the if -- if it's kind of fast tracked through this process, that the order would

1

2

not have any precedential effect. It would just -kind of a standard condition that's in most of the ANR stipulations that we enter into.

MS. HOFFMAN: I think that the parties are free to kind of provide a context or additional information with the filings that are required, and we would certainly consider that information in processing the application.

> MS. HAYDEN: Okay. Thank you. MS. HOFFMAN: Any other questions? (No response).

MS. HOFFMAN: All right. Seeing none, we will conclude this information session. And thank you all for attending this morning on a Friday in peak foliage season. So thank you all. Have a wonderful day.

> (Whereupon, the proceeding was adjourned at 9:53 a.m.)

24

25

## <u>CERTIFICATE</u>

I, Kim U. Sears, do hereby certify that I recorded by stenographic means the information session re:

Commission's processing of certain net-metering cases, via

GoToMeeting, on October 1, 2021, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

I further certify that the foregoing testimony was taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting and the foregoing 13 pages are a transcript of the stenograph notes taken by me of the evidence and the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties thereto or their counsel, and I am in no way interested in the outcome of said cause.

Dated at Williston, Vermont, this 2nd day of October, 2021.

Kim U Seas

					15
	10:15, 11:21,	11:18, 12:9,	7:20, 8:21	4:25, 10:2	
0	11:22, 12:11	12:9	curious - 8:8	filed - 6:4	I
	Anderson's -	cases [5] 1:4,		<b>filings -</b> 13:6	
05402-0329 -	12:14	3:9, 6:3, 11:11,	D	final [9] 4:16,	icon - 6:9
1:20	Ann [2] 1:13, 3:5	14:5		4:22, 5:13, 6:10,	identify - 5:24
	announcement - 4:11	category - 10:21 cause - 14:14	Dated - 14:15	6:11, 6:21, 7:20, 9:16, 9:23	imagine - 10:3
1	ANR [4] 2:3,	certain [6] 1:4,	<b>decision [5]</b> 6:14, 6:20, 6:21, 6:22,	findings [4] 6:20,	implemented - 3:23
<b>1 [3]</b> 1:6, 1:9,	9:21, 10:14,	3:8, 3:24, 7:11,	11:6	6:25, 7:4, 7:19	include - 12:22
14:6	13:3	11:13, 14:5	decisions - 6:24	foliage - 13:15	included - 12:16
<b>13 -</b> 14:9	anyone's - 3:14 appellate - 7:12	certainly [3] 6:23, 11:14, 13:7	<b>deemed -</b> 8:19	follow-up - 9:24 foregoing [2]	including - 6:20
	applicability -	certify [3] 14:3,	Department -	14:7, 14:9	individually - 5:22
2	10:18	14:7, 14:12	10:14 <b>described -</b> 5:10	forward [2] 10:9,	info@capitolcour - 1:21
	applicant [4] 4:9,	changes - 12:1	designated - 8:23	11:25	information [14]
<b>2021 [4]</b> 1:6, 1:9,	4:12, 5:15, 10:2	chooses - 9:25	designating - 6:16	free - 13:5	1:3, 1:8, 3:7,
14:6, 14:16 <b>21A-0013 -</b> 12:9	applicants - 5:5 application [3]	<b>cite -</b> 7:4   <b>civil -</b> 7:16	designation [2]	<b>Friday -</b> 13:14   <b>future -</b> 6:5	3:9, 3:13, 3:19,
2nd - 14:15	4:23, 7:3, 13:8	Civiletti - 2:6	7:10, 8:18 <b>desire -</b> 6:1	latare 6.5	4:11, 5:18, 7:9,
	applies [6] 4:4,	clarify [2] 8:12,	determination [2]	G	11:12, 13:6, 13:7, 13:13,
3	5:12, 8:16, 8:20,	8:15	4:22, 9:16		14:4
	9:16, 9:17	colleague - 10:14	determine - 9:11	Gadway - 2:10	intended - 10:18
<b>30-day -</b> 3:25	<b>apply [2]</b> 10:20, 11:11	comes - 9:18	<b>Director [2]</b> 1:13,	General [2] 1:12,	intends - 9:5
<b>329 -</b> 1:19	aren't - 11:12	3:25, 4:17	3:6 <b>discuss -</b> 6:3	3:5	intention - 11:14 interested - 14:14
5	articulated - 5:11	comments [3]	distributed - 4:10	generic - 4:9 Gillian - 2:13	internal - 4:7
<u>5</u>	assume - 11:5	12:7, 12:8,	document [2]	Gotcha - 10:23	introduced - 4:16
<b>50 [2]</b> 4:5, 10:19	assured - 8:8 attending - 13:14	12:10 commission [21]	4:15, 12:16	GoToMeeting [2]	introducing - 8:6
<b>5107 -</b> 10:21	attorney [2] 1:11,	1:1, 1:9, 3:3,	documents - 5:10	1:9, 14:6	investigation - 4:3
	3:3	3:4, 3:14, 3:23,	drop - 5:5 drop-down - 5:3	<b>Grace -</b> 2:7   <b>greater -</b> 4:5	issue [2] 4:9, 9:1 issued [2] 7:24,
8	authority [2]	4:8, 4:13, 4:20,	<b>Dunkiel -</b> 11:3	group - 6:1	8:20
<b>802 -</b> 1:20	9:11, 9:15	5:9, 6:4, 6:4,		Grundhauser - 2:7	issues [3] 4:1,
<b>863-6067 -</b> 1:20	<b>available [4]</b> 4:14, 5:1, 6:15, 11:10	8:19, 9:5, 9:10, 9:15, 10:2, 11:6,	E	guarantee [2]	8:24, 9:15
	3.1, 0.13, 11.10	11:25, 11:25,		5:16, 9:13 <b>Guerin -</b> 2:12	itself - 12:10
9	В	12:18	earlier - 11:23	guess [5] 7:15,	
		commission's [6]	<b>effect [2]</b> 12:17, 13:1	7:23, 8:8, 10:15,	<b>J</b>
<b>9:30 [3]</b> 1:6, 1:9,	background - 3:17	1:3, 3:8, 5:1,	efficiency - 11:15	10:16	<b>Jarvis -</b> 2:5
14:6   <b>9:53 -</b> 13:18	bar - 5:4	8:25, 10:4, 14:5 complete - 11:16	<b>either -</b> 5:2	Guzman - 2:4	John - 2:12
9.33 - 13.10	begin [3] 3:12, 3:21, 5:23	components - 9:9	elect - 4:25		
A	beginning [3] 1:9,	comprehensive -	<b>email [2]</b> 1:21, 8:5	H	K
	11:14, 14:6	11:16	enter - 13:3	handled - 10:10	<b>Karly -</b> 2:9
<b>a.m [4]</b> 1:6, 1:9,	belabor - 7:22	concerns [2] 4:2, 4:20	entity - 6:1	happen [2] 10:4,	<b>Kevin [4]</b> 2:3,
13:18, 14:6	Ben - 2:6 Bergeron - 2:13	conclude - 13:13	Eric [2] 2:4, 2:13	10:5	2:10, 8:4, 10:15
Aaron - 2:11 abbreviated [4]	best [2] 12:6,	condition [3]	Esq [4] 2:2, 2:2,	happens - 9:25	kilowatts - 10:19
7:11, 8:21, 9:12,	14:11	8:13, 12:24,	2:3, 2:4 essentially - 7:18	<b>Hayden [9]</b> 2:2, 6:7, 6:8, 6:19,	Kim - 14:3
9:19	<b>better -</b> 3:21	13:2 conditioning -	everybody's -	7:2, 7:15, 12:12,	Kimberly - 2:2 KW - 4:5
ability - 14:11	Bill - 2:8	12:19	7:25	12:13, 13:9	<b>Kyle [2]</b> 1:12, 3:4
absolutely - 11:12 accept - 12:7	<b>Bishop [2]</b> 1:13, 3:5	conditions [2]	everyone [2] 3:1,	hearing [3] 4:3,	
actively - 3:18	<b>bit -</b> 11:4	4:16, 12:15	3:13 <b>evidence [4]</b> 6:25,	4:8, 11:10   <b>held -</b> 1:8	L
additional - 13:5	<b>BOX -</b> 1:19	confirm - 10:17	7:3, 7:4, 14:11	helpful - 3:20	
adjourned - 13:18	BURLINGTON -	consider [3] 5:11,   12:18, 13:7	evidentiary - 7:19	hereby - 14:3	Landis-marinello
administration -	1:20	contain [3] 6:17,	example - 12:1	Hildebrand - 2:9	[ <b>2]</b> 1:12, 3:5   language [ <b>2</b> ]
12:8 advance - 7:9	C	6:18, 8:17	executing - 12:4 expand - 12:22	Hoffman [21] 1:11, 3:1, 3:2,	12:17, 12:23
affiliation - 5:25		containing - 4:15	expectations -	6:7, 6:12, 6:23,	<b>Laurie -</b> 2:5
affirming - 6:21	camera - 5:21	context [2] 6:14, 13:5	11:7	7:8, 8:1, 8:15,	Lavallee - 2:11
Agency - 8:4	<b>CAPITOL</b> - 1:19	couldn't - 6:8	expected - 11:4	9:8, 10:7, 10:12,	Lazorchak - 2:11 likely - 12:4
agreed - 4:16 Alex [2] 2:2,	Carol - 2:7	counsel [3] 1:12,	explained - 6:13	10:20, 10:25,	lines - 11:5
10:13	<b>Carolyn -</b> 2:8 <b>Carrara -</b> 2:9	3:5, 14:13	explains - 4:19	11:9, 11:20, 12:6, 12:12,	litigation - 4:18
alternative - 8:6	case [18] 4:8,	court [3] 1:19,	F	13:4, 13:10,	
<b>Amanda -</b> 2:6	4:18, 4:24, 5:12,	5:25, 7:12 courts - 7:13	<b>E</b>	13:12	M
analysis - 6:17	5:17, 7:14, 8:6,	covers - 8:21	facilities - 4:6	However - 9:10	making 12:1
Anderson [12] 2:3, 2:8, 8:2,	8:9, 8:18, 8:25, 9:2, 9:11, 10:5,	<b>CPG -</b> 5:5	fast - 12:24	hydroelectric - 4:6	making - 12:1 materials [2]
8:3, 8:4, 9:4,	10:7, 10:10,	create - 11:15	feedback - 12:3		5:16, 7:3
9:20, 10:11,	,,	<b>criteria [3]</b> 7:5,	file [3] 4:12,		<b>maybe -</b> 12:19

McCollister - 2:10 9:1, 9:6, 9:12, 12:15, 13:5 session [10] 1:3, thereafter - 14:8 whenever - 5:23 means [2] 3:15, 9:12, 9:18, 9:19, providing - 7:8 1:8, 3:7, 3:10, thereto - 14:13 Whereupon -3:13, 3:19, 4:11, thus - 4:21 14:4 9:22, 9:23, 11:5, public [7] 1:1, 13:17 members [2] 12:19, 12:25 1:9, 3:3, 3:11, 11:12, 13:13, today [3] 3:4, whether [5] 5:11, 3:11, 6:6 orders [3] 6:16, 6:6, 10:14, 12:8 14:4 3:15, 5:19 8:17, 9:16, 9:22, memo [6] 4:10, publicly - 4:10 today's - 3:9 7:11, 7:12 share [2] 11:8, 10:16 4:12, 4:19, 4:21, Otherwise - 10:9 Tom - 2:4 Williston - 14:15 puc.vermont.gov -11:9 5:10, 10:1 outcome - 14:14 5:3 shorter [3] 5:13, **top -** 5:3 Wing [5] 2:2, memorandum **outline -** 3:10 puc.vermont.gov/ 7:11, 9:19 tracked - 12:25 10:12, 10:13, 4:9 outstanding - 4:1sign [6] 4:25, 9:6, transcript - 14:10 10:13, 10:23 **-** 5:7 mentioned - 5:2 purpose - 3:9 9:21, 9:25, 10:6, turn [3] 3:20, within [2] 6:14, menu - 5:3 10:8 5:19, 5:20 8:23 P signal [2] 4:22, typewriting - 14:9 merits [3] 4:22, wonderful - 13:16 Q 6:22, 6:24 5:21 typical [7] 5:13, wondering - 11:3 **P.O -** 1:19 metering [2] 3:9, signed [2] 4:14, 6:18, 6:25, 9:1, pages - 14:9 **quick -** 6:9 9:1, 9:12, 11:17 10:21 9:13 parties [13] 4:2, quicker - 11:6 Y microphone - 3:15 typically - 10:10 **signing -** 8:9 4:14, 4:24, 5:16, Mike [2] 2:10, Simard - 2:6 6:2, 7:17, 10:7, yourself [2] 3:16, R similar - 8:5 2:11 5:24 10:17, 12:4, U minimize - 3:17 Sorry [2] 6:8, 12:14, 12:21, raise - 5:20 miscellaneous -11:2 13:4, 14:13 uncontested raising - 6:9 12:8 sort [3] 7:13, party [2] 9:25, 4:13 re [2] 1:3, 14:4 morning [3] 3:2, 9:11, 11:15 understand - 9:20 10:6 **really -** 7:20 8:3, 13:14 speak [2] 5:23, peak - 13:15 understanding reasons - 6:15 move - 10:9 11:4 pending - 6:3 7:6 received - 6:13 moving - 11:24 **period** [2] 3:25, speaking [3] 3:16, unless - 3:16 receives - 5:9 mute [2] 3:14, 3:19, 3:21 4:17 upon - 4:16 receiving - 12:18 specific - 6:3 3:16 perspective - 10:5 Utility [3] 1:1, recorded - 14:4 staff [4] 1:11, **petition -** 4:13 1:9, 3:3 **reduced -** 14:9 1:11, 3:3, 3:14 N petitions [4] 3:25, utilized - 9:18 regarding - 3:8 standard [2] 4:4, 5:14, 10:21 related [2] 8:10, 12:17, 13:2 Natural - 8:4 Petraska - 2:4 14:12 V Stanley - 2:5 **Phanuef -** 2:13 **needs -** 9:12 reluctant - 9:21 **STATE - 1:1** net [2] 3:8, 10:20 photovoltaic - 4:6 remaining - 8:24 value [2] 7:7, statute - 7:1 net-metering [6] please [2] 5:22, remind [2] 3:13, 7:21 **statutory** [2] 7:5, 1:4, 3:24, 4:4, 5:24 6:2 variety - 6:15 8:21 4:13, 5:14, 14:5 point [3] 7:22, reporter - 5:25 Vermont [5] 1:1, stenograph -Newton - 2:12 8:11, 12:2 **REPORTERS -**1:9, 1:20, 10:13, 14:10 NMP [3] 6:18, **posture -** 7:14 1:19 14:15 stenographic -9:1, 11:17 **Powell - 2:8** version - 4:10 requests [2] 4:12, 14:4 noise - 3:17 precedential [10] via [3] 1:7, 1:9, 10:2 stenographically non [6] 5:12, 5:13, 6:16, 7:7 required [4] 7:1, 14:5 14:8 6:16, 7:13, 8:23, 7:13, 7:21, 8:23, 8:22, 9:9, 13:6 Victoria [2] 2:3, **Steph -** 3:2 9:5, 9:23 9:6, 9:23, 12:17, Resources - 8:4 11:2 Stephanie - 1:11 non-precedential 13:1 **video -** 3:20 response - 13:11 stipulate - 12:22 [6] 6:10, 6:11, procedural - 7:24 result [5] 5:12, Videoconference stipulation [3] 8:7, 8:13, 8:18, procedure [7] 8:7, 8:16, 11:5, 7:17, 12:16, 9:19 3:10, 3:24, 4:4, virtual - 3:7 12.4 12:23 none - 13:12 5:12, 8:19, review [5] 4:7, volitional - 10:16 stipulations - 13:3 notes - 14:10 11:10, 12:10 8:25, 9:10, 9:15, submission - 5:15 nuance - 7:23 proceeding -11:17 W substantive [2] 13:17 revisions - 8:11 3:12, 4:1 proceedings -Robertson - 2:7 0 suggest - 8:11 waiver [18] 4:13, 14:11 roof-mounted -4:25, 7:18, 8:9, **support -** 7:19 process [9] 8:6, October [4] 1:6, 4.5 8:12, 9:7, 9:8, supporting [2] 9:9, 9:16, 9:17, rules - 7:16 1:9, 14:6, 14:16 9:8, 9:13, 9:22, 6:25, 7: 10:8, 11:13, **Ryan -** 2:5 offered - 12:23 10:1, 10:3, 10:6, systems [2] 4:5, 11:15, 11:24, officer - 4:8 10:8, 12:2, 12:4, 4:6 12:25 officers - 11:10 12:15, 12:22 S processed [2] open [3] 6:5, waiver-form - 5:8 5:17, 9:14 12:1, 12:2 sample - 10:1 **waivers -** 8:12 processing [5] Operations [2] **Sara -** 2:9 wanted - 10:17 1:4, 3:8, 3:24, 13:8, 14:5 taken [2] 14:8, 1:13, 3:6 Saunders - 11:3 warrant - 4:3 14.10 opportunity - 8:11 says [2] 8:6, 10:2 ways - 11:16 project [2] 4:2, **Taylor -** 2:12 order [30] 5:13, scope - 10:18 web - 5:6 terms - 12:13 4:21 6:10, 6:11, 6:11, screen - 3:22 website [2] 4:15, projects - 10:22 testimony - 14:8 6:13, 6:14, 6:18, **Sears -** 14:3 Proposal - 6:20 thank [7] 8:1, 6:21, 7:1, 7:20, season - 13:15 Welcome - 3:1 10:23, 11:19, 12:11, 13:9, proposed [2] 7:24, 8:7, 8:14, section - 5:4 Westgate [5] 2:3, 4:16, 4:21 8:17, 8:17, 8:20, Seeing - 13:12 11:1, 11:2, 11:3,

13:13, 13:15

Thanks - 10:11

11:19

provide [5] 3:10,

5:19, 5:25,

**Service - 10:14** 

8:21, 8:22, 8:23,