```
1
                      STATE OF ALASKA
 2
             REGULATORY COMMISSION OF ALASKA
 3
 4
 5
      Before Commissioners: Stephen McAlpine, Chairman
                             Rebecca Pauli
                             Robert M. Pickett
 6
                             Norman Rokeberg
                             Janis W. Wilson
 7
 8
      In the Matter of the Tariff
      Revision Designated as TA150-117 )
 9
      Filed by ACS of Fairbanks, LLC,
10
      d/b/a Alaska Communication
                                         ) U-17-080
      Systems, Alaska Communications,
                                         )
      ACS Local Service, and ASC for
11
                                         )
      Carrier of Last Resort Support
12
                                         )
     and
                                         )
13
     In the Matter of the Tariff
      Revision Designated as TA192-359 )
14
      Filed by ACS of the Northland.
15
      LLC, d/b/a Alaska Communication
                                         ) U-17-081
      Systems, Alaska Communications,
                                         )
      ACS Local Service, and ASC for
16
                                         )
      Carrier of Last Resort Support
     in the Glacier State Study Area
17
18
19
             REGULATORY COMMISSION OF ALASKA
            701 West Eighth Avenue, Suite 300
20
                 Anchorage, Alaska 99501
21
                   PREHEARING CONFERENCE
                     September 25, 2017
22
                         2:00 p.m.
23
                   BEFORE JOHN P. WOOD
                Administrative Law Judge
24
25
```

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
       For Alaska Communications:
             Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot
 3
             1156 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1020
             Washington, DC 20005
4
             BY:
                  ELISABETH ROSS
 5
         For the Attorney General:
6
              ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
 7
              1031 West 4th Avenue, Suite 200
              Anchorage, Alaska 99501
8
              BY:
                    JEFFREY WALLER
9
         Also Present:
10
              Lisa Phillips
              Lew Craig
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	ALJ WOOD: Good afternoon. It's
3	approximately 2:00, September 25th, 2017 in the
4	Commission's hearing room in Anchorage, Alaska.
5	This is the time and place set for the joint
6	prehearing conference In the Matter of the Tariff
7	Revision Designated as TA150-117. It's filed by
8	ACS of Fairbanks, LLC, d/b/a Alaska Communication
9	Systems, Alaska Communications, ACS Local Service,
10	and ASC for Carrier of Last Resort Support.
11	That's given Docket No. U-17-080.
12	Also, In the Matter of the Tariff Revision
13	Designated as TA192-359 Filed by ACS of the
14	Northland, LLC, d/b/a Alaska Communication
15	Systems, Alaska Communications, ACS Local Service,
16	and ACS for Carrier of Last Resort Support in the
17	Glacier State Study Area. That docket is given
18	No. U-17-081.
19	This is John P. Wood, administrative law
20	judge for the Commission presiding. This
21	prehearing conference was scheduled by Order No. 3
22	issued in Docket U-17-080 on September 11th, 2017
23	and by Order No. 3 issued in Docket U-17-081 on
24	September 11th, 2017.
25	I'll take appearances on behalf of the

1	parties. For ACS Fairbanks?
2	MS. ROSS: My name is Elisabeth
3	Ross from Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot
4	representing Alaska Communications, both ACS of
5	Fairbanks and also ACS of the Northland Glacier
6	State. And I have with me today Ms. Lisa
7	Phillips, who is the manager senior manager of
8	regulatory affairs and risk management for Alaska
9	Communications.
10	ALJ WOOD: Thank you, Ms. Ross.
11	And on behalf of the attorney general?
12	MR. WALLER: Good morning, Your
13	Honor. Jeff Waller and Lew Craig.
14	ALJ WOOD: Thank you, Mr. Waller.
15	All right. So we're here to set a procedural
16	schedule. The parties filed one filed two, one
17	for each docket, leading up to a joint hearing.
18	Do the parties have anything they wish to add?
19	Address? Discuss?
20	MS. ROSS: If I may?
21	ALJ WOOD: Please.
22	MS. ROSS: We went through a lot of
23	effort to develop this procedural schedule. There
24	was a real tension, I would say, between wanting
25	to make sure we had a very clear record for the

```
1
       Commission in each case because the service areas
 2
       of the two companies are so incredibly different.
 3
           You have Fairbanks on the one hand, and then
 4
       you have on the other Northland, which has four
       distinct and separate pieces, service areas, that
       are -- one is an island, Kodiak. They're at
 6
 7
       different parts of the state, everything from
8
       Nenana and Fairbanks down to Kenai.
                                            So we wanted
       to make sure that the record was clear for both
9
10
       companies. But at the same time, we really strove
11
       to try to figure out something that was efficient
12
       for us and the Commission to keep costs down.
           So we did go back and forth. We didn't want
13
       to bring witnesses up twice, but we decided that
14
15
       it would be good to have some level of procedural
       consolidation in the schedule while also trying to
16
17
       preserve the intrinsic different nature of the two
18
       service areas. So that was the balance we were
19
       trying to achieve in the way we proposed the
20
       schedule.
21
                     ALJ WOOD: Yes.
                                      Thank you,
22
       Ms. Ross.
           And, Mr. Waller?
23
24
                     MR. WALLER:
                                  Yes.
                                         I just wanted to
25
       comment on what Ms. Ross said.
                                       And, Your Honor,
```

1	so you understand where we're coming from, we did
2	not want to have to fly our expert up twice
3	because it's expensive. But we also understand
4	that there could be possibilities where you might
5	have a witness presenting policy arguments or
6	testimony, and we didn't want to have that person
7	do that twice in some kind of artificial thing.
8	So the idea was kind of like Your Honor did
9	with this kind of joint prehearing conference for
10	these two. Maybe not necessarily up to the level
11	of consolidation even though RAPA doesn't
12	oppose consolidation. We sort of leave that up to
13	ACS on how they feel but the idea of having
14	procedurally a joint hearing so that we cover some
15	information that only needs to be covered once,
16	once and then we get into discussing each
17	different study area and make sure we keep that so
18	there's no bleed over.
19	And the reason, Your Honor, that RAPA was a
20	little worried about it, I will draw your
21	attention to Docket U-13-203 and 204 where there
22	was two different things going on involving the
23	same utility. And one was a final order and one
24	wasn't. And now we have this odd appeal that is
25	kind of perplexing in some ways. So we didn't

```
1
       want to get into that kind of problem either.
 2
           But we did want to leave the flexibility so
       that we wouldn't have to have the Commission sit
 3
 4
       and listen to ACS's witness one time and say, Here
 5
       is all the policy arguments; and then two days
       later say, Here are all the exact same policy
6
 7
       arguments again.
8
           Does that make sense. Your Honor?
9
                     ALJ WOOD:
                                It does.
                                           And I have no
10
       idea what you're talking about on those other
11
       dockets.
                 But, yes, when I received your
12
       procedural schedule and trying to work through a
13
       good way to approach the hearing, at least as of
14
       right now I agree it should be some sort of a
15
       joint hearing. But I don't know that
       consolidation of the two dockets is necessarily a
16
17
       good idea.
18
           So I'm sure that you guys might have some
19
       better ideas. But right now I'm envisioning maybe
20
       opening -- call it concurrent opening statement,
21
       whatever you want to call it, that address --
22
       well, let's start with the pre-filed testimony.
23
       Sorry.
           The pre-filed testimony, I imagine, would
24
25
       come in in both dockets with the totality of the
```

```
1
       testimony. So that's going to be your policy
 2
       stuff as well as the study area and exchange area,
 3
       specific factual information. So you're probably
 4
       going to have a lot of overlap, I would imagine,
       on the policy things in the pre-filed testimony.
 5
       But let's get that all in, separate in each
 6
       docket.
 7
 8
           Then when we get to hearing, maybe like a
 9
       consolidated joint opening statement, especially
10
       when you're addressing, you know, the policy
11
       issues. You know, clearly segregate your factual
12
       discussions into separate portions.
                                             So even
13
       though you're running in one long stretch, you
14
       know, it's easy to point to in the record where,
15
       All right, we're talking about Northland here,
16
       Fairbanks here.
17
           When we get to putting the witnesses up on
18
       the stand, maybe a similar approach where the
       witness will start off with the policy issues that
19
       cover both dockets and then have -- it doesn't
20
21
       seem very efficient to put the witnesses up, you
22
       know, for one docket, take them down, put them up
23
       for a second docket.
24
           So maybe policy stuff, Here you go. We've
25
       got Northland here, then we've got Fairbanks here
```

```
1
      with a very clean factual break in between the
2
            And then the same approach for the attorney
3
       general's witness or witnesses.
4
           So that's kind of what I envisioned.
                                                  I know
 5
       that's what we're here to figure out today.
      don't know if you had different ideas, similar
       ideas.
7
8
                     MR. WALLER:
                                  Actually, what you
9
       described is one of the things Lisa and I talked
       about, which I think is the right approach, which
10
11
       is when it's covering both, make sure it's clear
12
      you're talking about both. But when you want to
13
       talk about specific, have a little road sign in
14
       the, you know, oral testimony that says, Now I'm
       talking about this, Now I'm talking about that.
15
      We can do the same thing in our opening and
16
17
       closina.
18
           And then presumably the Commission would
19
       issue two separate orders so we don't -- if we get
20
       results that differ between the study areas, we're
21
       not having to face maybe an appeal of two things
22
       that get stuck together when they could be
23
       separated out. So I think that makes sense to
24
       proceed that way. And we've got the stairstep or
25
       phased testimony here that also kind of works for
```

```
1
       us.
           But when we can take things together, it
 2
 3
       makes sense to kind of do them together and then
 4
       just do the hearing as one thing. And I agree
       not -- you know, I don't want to have to make
 5
 6
       Mr. Lew get up, talk about one thing, sit down,
       and then right back up a day later. Just cover
 7
 8
       everything we can with each witness but just make
9
       sure we're clear enough in our questioning and
10
       testimony to separate them out.
11
                     ALJ WOOD: Ms. Ross, do you have
12
       anything to add?
13
                                I concur with what
                     MS. ROSS:
14
       Mr. Waller has said. We tried to come up with
15
       some very specific recommendations for you to make
       it easier. But what you're talking about is along
16
17
       the lines of the concept that we discussed.
18
           But we also said, you know, neither of us has
       really started into our pre-filed testimony
19
20
       drafting part yet. So it's hard to know whether,
21
       for example, our policy witness is going to feel
22
       the same about policy for both companies. So I
23
       think that as we get further into the case, we'll
24
       have a better sense of any other recommendations
```

we can make to make it even more efficient than

25

what you're talking about. 1 2 ALJ WOOD: Okay. Thank you, 3 Ms. Ross. All that being said, the schedule looks good 4 I can honestly say I'm really not excited 5 about a hearing in the middle of July, but that's what works for the schedule. The one date that's 7 8 on there that doesn't quite work is the statutory 9 deadline that looks like you've got two months rather than three months from the end of the 10 11 hearing. Unless my math is off. MR. WALLER: You're correct, Your 12 13 That was my mistake. I gave that to Ms. Ross. You're correct. It should be 14 15 October 17th. MS. ROSS: We have no objection to 16 17 that. 18 MR. WALLER: And to make sure the 19 record is clear, the AG also consents to extending 20 the statutory deadline to October 17th. We better 21 make sure that's not a weekend, though. 22 ALJ WOOD: Yeah. I'm looking at it 23 Why don't we just make it right now. 24 October 19th, which is a Friday? MR. WALLER: That's fine with the 25

```
1
       attorney general.
 2
                     MS. ROSS:
                                No objection.
                     ALJ WOOD: All right. So we'll go
 3
 4
       with the October 19th, 2018 statutory deadline.
       will adopt the procedural schedule as proposed by
 5
       the parties. We will go with a working plan to
 6
       hold the joint hearing along the lines of what
 7
 8
       we've discussed at the prehearing conference
       today. If we need to reassess or readdress as the
9
       dockets proceed, we will do so.
10
11
           Do the parties need a confidential discovery
12
       order issued?
13
                     MS. ROSS: Yes, please.
14
                                  Just to be careful.
                     MR. WALLER:
15
       think you and I had talked about -- Ms. Ross, you
       and I had talked about using the last one that
16
17
       went through from one of the utility cases.
18
           Did you get a chance to look at that?
19
                                I didn't. I'd be happy
                     MS. ROSS:
20
       to do that, though. Do you know which one it was
21
       you wanted to use?
                     MR. WALLER: I believe -- didn't
22
23
       Your Honor just recently issue what we consider
24
       the latest -- the latest version? Was that in --
```

no, you were not on GVEA. I don't remember which

25

```
1
       one it was.
 2
                     ALJ WOOD: I believe I've heard
       rumors that the order that was issued in the
 3
 4
       ENSTAR U-16-066 docket was represented in a
 5
       subsequent docket to another ALJ as the latest.
       In quotes, latest.
6
 7
                     MR. WALLER: It is.
                                          And I agree
8
       that's one of the ones that we have done.
9
       would have no problem with an order substantially
10
       like that.
11
           Lisa, if you want to look it over.
                                Yeah. I'd like to have
12
                     ALJ WOOD:
13
       Ms. Ross have the opportunity to go ahead and
14
       review the order.
15
                     MS. ROSS: Thank you.
16
                     ALJ WOOD: And then you can just
17
       file a short pleading requesting issuance of a
18
       confidentiality order identical to Order U-16...
19
                     MR. WALLER: I don't remember which
20
       number it is.
21
                     ALJ WOOD: I don't have it off the
22
       top of my head.
23
                     MS. ROSS: The discovery procedure?
                     MR. WALLER: Yeah.
                                          It's the one
24
25
       governing confidential discovery materials.
```

1	MS. ROSS: Okay. So it's all
2	consolidated?
3	MR. WALLER: Yeah.
4	ALJ WOOD: Oh, and we don't have
5	discovery orders anymore, Ms. Ross, if that's what
6	you're asking.
7	MS. ROSS: I just wanted to make
8	sure it's all one package. I'll take a look at
9	that and submit a short pleading.
10	ALJ WOOD: Okay. Thank you,
11	Ms. Ross.
12	That covers it for my notes today. Do the
13	parties have anything that they wish to address?
14	MS. ROSS: We have nothing further.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. WALLER: Nothing, Your Honor.
17	ALJ WOOD: And, actually, just to
18	make it completely clear on the record since it
19	might be a short amount of time before I'm able to
20	turn a scheduling order around so I can get this
21	on the calendar, we've got a statutory deadline of
22	October 19th, 2018. And a joint hearing in the
23	two dockets will be held July 9th, 2018 through
24	July 18th, 2018, with a prehearing conference
25	being held on the first day of the hearing, so

```
July 9th.
 1
 2
           You know what? Ms. Ross, when are you
 3
       planning on being in state before the hearing? I
       know it's a ways out, but do you come in the week
 4
 5
       before or the weekend before?
 6
                     MS. ROSS: I'll be in probably --
       if the hearing starts on a Monday, I'll probably
 7
       come in the previous Thursday, I would think.
 8
 9
                     ALJ WOOD: Okay. Let's look at a
10
       prehearing conference on July 6th, so the Friday.
11
       That way we can deal -- in case the mechanics of
12
       the joint hearing are such that I need to make
13
       adjustments over the weekend.
14
                     MR. WALLER: That's fine with us,
15
       Your Honor.
                                So we'll hold the
16
                     ALJ WOOD:
17
       prehearing conference on July 6th, 2018. And then
       the hearing itself will begin July 9th, 2018.
18
19
           Anything further?
20
                     MS. ROSS: No, thank you.
21
                     ALJ WOOD: Hearing nothing, we're
22
       adjourned.
                   Thank you.
23
                     (Adjourned 2:18 a.m.)
24
25
```

1	TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2	I, Adrianell Poteet Sorrels, hereby
3	certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1
4	through 15 are a true, accurate, and complete
5	transcript of the Prehearing Conference in Docket
6	Nos. U-17-080 and U-17-081 held at the Regulatory
7	Commission of Alaska on September 25, 2017,
8	transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic
9	sound recording to the best of my knowledge and
10	ability.
11	
12	Date Adrianell Poteet Sorrels, Transcriber
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
I	