

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
1325 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005**

ORDER

July 24, 2017

**FORMAL CASE NO. 1142, IN THE MATTER OF THE MERGER OF ALTAGAS LTD.,
AND WGL HOLDINGS, INC., Order No. 18843**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. By this Order, the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (“Commission”) establishes the Public Interest Factors to be considered in this merger proceeding. The Public Interest Factors are included in Appendix A. The Commission also establishes the procedural schedule, which is attached as Appendix B. To take into account the adopted procedural schedule, the Commission waives certain deadlines in the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (“Commission’s Rules”) for this proceeding. For this proceeding only, the Commission delegates to the General Counsel the authority to issue orders on uncontested procedural matters. Finally, the Commission provides further guidance relating to filing requirements and the evidentiary hearing.

II. BACKGROUND

2. On April 25, 2017, the Commission opened this proceeding to review the merger Application filed by AltaGas, WGL Holdings, Inc. (“WGL Holdings”), and Washington Gas Light Company (“WGL”) (collectively, “Joint Applicants”) pursuant to D.C. Code §§ 34-504 and 34-1001.¹ The Joint Applicants propose to merge WGL Holdings, the parent of WGL, and Wrangler Inc. (“Merger Sub”), a wholly-owned indirect subsidiary of AltaGas (the “Merger”).² The Joint Applicants represent that WGL will continue to operate as a District of Columbia utility subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the Commission and without any reduction in the Commission’s existing oversight or authority.³ The Merger is proposed as an all-cash transaction for approximately \$4.5 billion.

3. In addition to the Office of the People’s Counsel for the District of Columbia (“OPC”), a party to this proceeding by statutory right, several other interested persons joined this proceeding as parties: the Apartment and Building Owners Association of Metropolitan Washington (“AOBA”); the District of Columbia Government (“DCG”); the Department of

¹ *Formal Case No. 1142, In the Matter of the Merger of AltaGas Ltd., and WGL Holdings, Inc.* (“Joint Application”), filed April 24, 2017.

² Joint Application at 1.

³ Joint Application at 7.

Defense/Other Federal Executive Agencies (“DoD/FEA”); the National Consumer Law Center/National Housing Trust/National Housing Trust-Enterprise Preservation Corporation (“NCLC”); International Brotherhood of Teamster’s Local No. 96 (“Teamsters Local 96”); the Baltimore Washington Laborers and Public Employees District Council (“LiUNA”), the Office and Professional Employees International Union Local 2, AFL-CIO (“OPEIU Local 2”); and Potomac Electric Power Company (“Pepco”).

4. On May 25, 2017, the Commission released a Public Notice establishing a prehearing conference date of July 6, 2017.⁴ The Public Notice also directed the parties to file joint statements on areas of agreement and separate filings on areas of disagreement by June 19, 2017. NCLC filed its Comments on June 16, 2017.⁵ The Joint Applicants, OPC, AOBA, and DCG filed comments on June 19, 2017.⁶ The Joint Applicants also filed a Stipulation on behalf of all of the parties regarding the procedural schedule and limited consensus on discovery.⁷ On June 28, 2017, the Joint Applicants filed reply comments.⁸

5. On July 6, 2017, the Commission held a prehearing conference. All parties except for OPEIU Local 2 participated in the prehearing conference.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Public Interest Factors

1. Positions of the Parties

6. In past merger proceedings, to determine whether a transaction is in the public interest, the Commission has: (1) traditionally balanced the interests of shareholders and investors with ratepayers and the community; (2) determined that benefits to the shareholders must not come

⁴ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Public Notice, rel. May 25, 2017.

⁵ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Comments on the Consideration of Additional Factors and Issues by the National Consumer Law Center/National Housing Trust/National Housing Trust-Enterprise Preservation Corporation (“NCLC Comments”), filed June 16, 2017.

⁶ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Applicants’ Response to May 25, 2017, Public Notice Regarding Factors and Discovery Procedure (“Joint Applicants’ Comments”), filed June 19, 2017; Additional Comments of the Office of the People’s Counsel on Factors and Issues for Determining Whether the Proposed Merger is in the Public Interest and Procedural Schedule (“OPC Comments”), filed June 19, 2017; Comments of the Apartment and Office Building Association of Metropolitan Washington in Response to the Commission’s May 25, 2017 Public Notice (“AOBA Comments”), filed June 19, 2017; District of Columbia Government’s Suggested Factors and Issues to be Included in this Proceeding (“DCG Comments”), filed June 19, 2017.

⁷ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Stipulation Regarding Procedural Schedule and Discovery Procedure (“Stipulation”), filed June 19, 2017.

⁸ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Applicants’ Response to OPC and Intervenors’ Comments on Discovery Procedure, Factors, and Issues (“Joint Applicants’ Reply Comments”), filed June 28, 2017.

at the expense of the ratepayers; and (3) found that, to be approved, the transaction must produce a direct and tangible benefit to ratepayers.⁹

7. To determine whether these three public interest requirements are met, the Commission has in past merger cases identified several factors it considers in reviewing the nature of each transaction. These Public Interest Factors include the effects of the transaction on: (1) ratepayers, shareholders, the financial health of the utilities standing alone and as merged, and the economy of the District; (2) utility management and administrative operations; (3) public safety and the safety and reliability of services; (4) risks associated with all of the Joint Applicants' affiliated non-jurisdictional business operations, including nuclear operations; (5) the Commission's ability to regulate the new utility effectively; (6) competition in the local retail, and wholesale markets that impacts the District and District ratepayers; and (7) conservation of natural resources and preservation of environmental quality.¹⁰

8. The parties agree that these seven public interest factors are appropriate for use in this proceeding (with the deletion of the reference to nuclear operations in Public Interest Factor 4).¹¹ Two of the parties propose additional factors. AOBA seeks the addition of a factor that considers "the effect of the transaction on intraclass rate equity in the District of Columbia." AOBA argues that this proposed factor is within the public interest requirement that must be investigated pursuant to D.C. Code § 34-504.¹² NCLC seeks the addition of a factor to address the impact of the proposed transaction on low income consumers and communities in the District of Columbia.¹³ OPC believes that AOBA's Public Interest Factor 8 could be subsumed under Public Interest Factor 1.¹⁴ The Joint Applicants oppose AOBA's proposed additional factor, arguing that it is subsumed under Public Interest Factor 1 and that the Commission rejected a similar request in the last merger case, *Formal Case No. 1119*.¹⁵ No party commented on NCLC's proposal.

⁹ *Formal Case No. 1002, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Pepco and the New RC, Inc. for Authorization and Approval of Merger Transaction*, Order No. 12395, ¶ 17, rel. May 1, 2002. Citing *Formal Case No. 951, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Potomac Electric Power Company and Constellation Energy Corporation for Authorization and Approval of Merger and for a Certificate Authorizing the Issuance of Securities*, Order No. 11075, pp. 17-18, rel. October 20, 1997.

¹⁰ *Formal Case No. 1119, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Exelon Corporation, Pepco Holdings, Inc., Potomac Electric Power Company, Exelon Energy Delivery Company, LLC and New Special Purpose Entity, LLC for Authorization and Approval of Proposed Merger Transaction ("Formal Case No. 1119")*, Order No. 17597, rel. August 22, 2014.

¹¹ OPC Comments at 5; DCG at 1.

¹² AOBA Comments at 4.

¹³ NCLC Comments at 1.

¹⁴ OPC Comments at 7.

¹⁵ Joint Applicants' Reply Comments at 2-3.

2. Decision

9. The Commission declines to add any factors to its Public Interest Factors List because the proposed factors by NCLC and AOBA can be subsumed under Public Interest Factor 1. As the Commission previously determined in *Formal Case No. 1119*, the term “ratepayer” includes low income ratepayers, so a separate public interest factor focusing solely on low income ratepayers is unnecessary.¹⁶ The Commission also sees no reason to deviate from its decision in Order No. 17597, stating that intraclass equity issues could be handled under Public Interest Factor 1.¹⁷

B. Issues List

1. Positions of the Parties

10. OPC, AOBA, and DCG include issues lists in their Comments in addition to their Public Interest Factors lists.¹⁸ OPC also asserts that the Commission should not limit the identification of issues in dispute.¹⁹ Instead, OPC urges the Commission to permit issues identified by the parties to the extent that they are raised in the Joint Application or are addressed in the Public Interest Factors. OPC contends that it is imperative to enumerate issues to be scrutinized and addressed in this proceeding. OPC believes that enumeration of issues will mitigate discovery disputes.²⁰ DCG requests that the Commission find that its issues are subsumed in the Public Interest Factors. DCG also reserves the right to propose additional issues.²¹ The Joint Applicants oppose the formalization of issues in addition to public interest factors, noting that the Commission did not formalize any issues in addition to the public interest factors in the last merger case, *Formal Case No. 1119*.²²

2. Decision

11. In *Formal Case No. 1119*, the Commission declined to identify issues in addition to the Public Interest Factors.²³ The parties seeking the identification of issues have not presented any persuasive argument to convince the Commission to treat this case differently than *Formal*

¹⁶ See, *Formal Case No. 1119*, Order No. 17530, para 26.

¹⁷ See, Order No. 17597, ¶ 122.

¹⁸ OPC Comments at 5, Attachment A; AOBA Comments at 4, 7, 8, Attachment A at 7-14.

¹⁹ OPC Comments at 5, Attachment A.

²⁰ OPC Comments at 6.

²¹ DGC Comments at 1.

²² Joint Applicants’ Comments at 1-3; Joint Applicants’ Reply Comments at 3-6.

²³ See, Order No. 17597, ¶ 115-125.

Case No. 1119. The Commission agrees with the Joint Applicants that formalizing issues could create confusion regarding how the Commission will evaluate the merger. Thus, the Commission clarifies that the seven Public Interest Factors will be used to evaluate whether the three-prong public interest test is satisfied. Issues that are relevant to these seven Public Interest Factors may be investigated by the parties but will not be formalized.

C. Designation of this Proceeding as a Rate Case or Other Investigation

1. Positions of the Parties

12. In response to the Commission's Public Notice opening this proceeding, AOBA claims that this proceeding is a rate case pursuant to D.C. Code § 34-912 due to the possibility of rate increases after the conclusion of this proceeding if the merger is approved.²⁴ However, at the prehearing conference, AOBA withdrew this argument.²⁵ The Joint Applicants argue that this case is not a rate case, following the reasoning of Order No. 17597.²⁶

2. Decision

13. In Order No. 17597, the Commission determined that the Exelon/Pepco merger proceeding was not a rate case because no rates will be set in this proceeding.²⁷ The Commission finds the same reasoning is applicable in this proceeding and, therefore, concludes that *Formal Case No. 1142* is an "other proceeding" for the purposes of D.C. Code § 34-912. The Commission notes that no party now objects to this designation.

D. Procedural Schedule

14. The parties have submitted a joint procedural schedule, which includes the following dates:

Event	Date
Filing of Application	April 24, 2017
Comments due regarding pre-hearing conference	June 19, 2017
Reply to pre-hearing conference comments	June 28, 2017
Prehearing Conference	July 6, 2017
Commission Order on Prehearing Conference	July 24, 2017
Applicants' Supplemental Direct (if required)	August 21, 2017
Settlement Conference	Week of August 28, 2017

²⁴ AOBA Comments, Attachment A at 3.

²⁵ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Transcript of Prehearing Conference ("Tr.") at 49, July 6, 2017.

²⁶ Joint Applicants' Comments at 3; Joint Applicants' Reply Comments at 6-8.

²⁷ *Formal Case No. 1119*, Order No. 17597, ¶ 84, 86, rel. August 22, 2014.

Direct Testimony and Workpapers of OPC and Intervenors	September 29, 2017
Settlement Conference	October 19, 2017
Applicants' Rebuttal Testimony	October 27, 2017
Settlement Conference	November 16, 2017
Evidentiary Hearings Begin	December 5, 2017
Evidentiary Hearings End	December 15, 2017
Initial Post Hearing Briefs	January 16, 2018
Reply Briefs	January 30, 2018
PROJECTED Decision Date	April 30, 2018

15. The Commission finds this procedural schedule to be reasonable and adopts it, with four modifications. The first modification is to require the Joint Applicants to file supplemental testimony. The second modification is to permit the filing of rebuttal testimony by any party that wishes to do so, not just the Joint Applicants. The third modification adds Community Hearings in November, at dates and locations to be determined by the Commission. The fourth modification relates to discovery and is discussed below.

E. Discovery Process

16. The parties have reached some consensus on the discovery process but are also in disagreement about establishing deadlines for discovery. The parties agree that a party has 10 business days to respond to a data request unless the parties mutually agree to a later date. They also agree that any objections to data requests be served on the proponent of the request within five business days of service. Upon receipt of the objection, the proponent of the data request has three business days to reply to the objection and to confer with the objecting party by teleconference before filing a motion to compel.²⁸ If the parties cannot resolve the issues, then the proponent of the data request must file a motion to compel within three business days of the last teleconference. Any response to a motion to compel must be filed within two business days of the filing of the motion to compel. The deadline for filing a motion to compel can be extended by mutual agreement if the parties believe that they can resolve the dispute. The parties also agree to limit the motion to compel and response to three single-spaced pages in letter format with 12 point or larger font. The parties also agree to work in good faith to promptly resolve all disputes before seeking relief from the Commission.²⁹

17. The Commission appreciates the efforts of the parties to resolve discovery disputes before bringing them to the Commission. The Commission adopts the discovery dispute resolution process proposed by the parties with two additions: the parties should try to resolve the dispute before objecting to data requests; and in the letter, the party seeking discovery must include the dates and times of all teleconferences and other consultations for the purpose of resolving the

²⁸ Stipulation at 2.

²⁹ Stipulation at 3.

dispute. Because this process has different deadlines than are included in the Commission's discovery rule, Section 123, the Commission waives the deadlines established in that rule for this proceeding.³⁰

F. Discovery Deadlines

1. Positions of the Parties

18. The parties disagree on the establishment of discovery deadlines. OPC and AOBA support the use of a rolling discovery process, in which data requests are served on a rolling basis, instead of by a specific date. Responses to data requests are due within a specific period of days after the filing of testimony. OPC proposes that responses to data requests be due within 10 business days of the request. OPC also supports ending all discovery requests five business days before hearings commence.³¹

19. OPC argues that rolling discovery would be appropriate in this proceeding due to the voluminous Application. OPC asserts that rolling discovery would allow the parties to review the materials and propound discovery requests in an efficient manner, instead of losing the ability to serve data requests unless they are served by a certain date. OPC argues that rolling discovery spaces out the discovery requests, so that a party is not inundated with data requests at a deadline. Further, OPC maintains, the merger is being reviewed by two other state commissions, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC"), and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States ("CFIUS"). OPC emphasizes that this transaction involves the purchase of WGL Holdings by a foreign entity.³² OPC argues that information from these other proceedings may become relevant in this proceeding, and that prescribed discovery deadlines could prevent data requests on this new information.³³

20. AOBA argues that establishing deadlines for discovery increases the potential for unfocused cross-examination and the establishment of an incomplete record. AOBA claims that the nature of this proceeding lends itself to needing additional discovery outside of specified dates. AOBA's reasons for rolling discovery include the fact that AltaGas is a new entity to the District of Columbia; the proposed post-merger corporate structure has many layers; the existing financial structures and operations of AltaGas and WGL are very different than prior mergers; and elements of the merger have broader implications than traditional gas utility or ratemaking. AOBA believes that rolling discovery is necessary to examine these issues.³⁴ AOBA does believe that an end date

³⁰ 15 DCMR § 123 (1992). Section 123.1 provides five business days for an objection to the data request to be served on the requesting party, while Section 123.2 establishes five business day deadlines for filing motions to compel and responses to motions to compel.

³¹ OPC Comments at 7.

³² Tr. at 10.

³³ OPC Comments at 8.

³⁴ AOBA Comments at 6.

before hearings should be established, with the caveat that exhibits or testimony that is modified immediately after the end date of discovery should be subject to additional discovery. AOBA argues that the Maryland Public Service Commission (“MD PSC”) has adopted rolling discovery for its merger proceeding.³⁵

21. The Joint Applicants note that discovery on their Application is already occurring, and indicate that they are responding to these data requests on a rolling basis. As a general rule, they propose to continue to respond to discovery requests on a rolling basis, with the deadline of ten business days following the request. The Joint Applicants recommend the establishment of a procedural schedule for discovery on the additional pleadings, with the following deadlines:

Application and Direct Testimony

August 2 - Deadline for data requests on initial application and direct testimony
August 16 – Deadline for responses to August 2 data requests

Supplemental Testimony

August 28 – Deadline for initial data requests on Joint Applicants’ supplemental testimony;
September 11 – Deadline for responses to August 28 data requests

OPC/Intervenor Testimony

October 5 – Deadline for initial data requests on OPC/Intervenor testimony;
October 17 – Deadline for responses to October 5 data requests³⁶

Rebuttal Testimony

November 3 – Deadline for initial data requests on Rebuttal testimony;
November 14 – Deadline for responses to November 3 data requests³⁷

22. The Joint Applicants recommend that for follow-up data requests, the parties should follow 15 DCMR § 122.6, which requires service of the follow-up requests within five business days of the receipt of a response, and five business days to respond to a follow-up data request. Additionally, the Joint Applicants seek to follow 15 DCMR § 122.6’s limitation of one follow-up data request per original request.³⁸

23. In Reply Comments, the Joint Applicants argue that since the Commission has well-established discovery rules (unlike Maryland, which does not have such rules) the Commission

³⁵ AOBA Comments at 7.

³⁶ Joint Applicants’ Comments at 4.

³⁷ Joint Applicants’ Comments at 5.

³⁸ Joint Applicants’ Comments at 5.

should follow its rules and establish discovery timeframes. The Joint Applicants also question OPC's contention that rolling discovery is necessary in this proceeding due to the complexity of this case by arguing that the Pepco/Exelon merger was far more complex.³⁹ The Joint Applicants also question AOBA's assertion that establishing discovery deadlines undermines the discovery process and inhibits the creation of a complete record by noting that the parties in *Formal Case No. 1119* were able to propound many rounds of discovery in *Formal Case No. 1119*. The Joint Applicants argue that permitting rolling discovery could lead to abuse of the discovery process. The Joint Applicants contend that OPC and the Intervenors have not shown any compelling reason for rolling discovery.⁴⁰

2. Decision

24. Section 122 of the Commission's rules set forth deadlines for issuing and responding to discovery requests. This section establishes deadlines for serving discovery requests after the filing of different rounds of testimony, typically ten days. While AOBA and OPC seek to waive these rules for this proceeding to permit discovery on any filing to continue until just before the hearing to permit parties to obtain all of the information that they need, the Commission finds these arguments unpersuasive. The Commission believes that the deadlines in its rules serve to focus the parties on the material included in the particular filing and permit more focused information requests to obtain clarification or material the parties believe is missing from the filing. Allowing discovery on all filings to continue until just before the evidentiary hearing could distract the parties from hearing preparation. Setting deadlines for discovery also permits the Commission sufficient time to resolve any discovery disputes that arise. The Commission adopts the discovery deadlines proposed by the Joint Applicants and adds these dates to the procedural schedule. The Commission also adds a deadline of two business days to object to a follow-up discovery request. To the extent that the deadlines in the Joint Applicants' proposal differ from those established in Section 122, the Commission waives the time periods in that rule. However, the Commission does not waive the time periods in Section 122.6, which deal with follow-up data requests. While the Commission expects the parties to attempt to resolve any disputes before they bring disputes to the Commission, the Commission also expects the parties, particularly the Joint Applicants, to alert the Commission should the discovery process become onerous or duplicative.

G. Delegation of Authority

25. To ensure that procedural issues do not impede parties' hearing preparations, the Commission delegates to its General Counsel, for the purpose of this case only, decisions regarding all uncontested procedural motions, such as motions for extension of time, motions to intervene, and motions for special appearance.

³⁹ Joint Applicants' Comments at 9.

⁴⁰ Joint Applicants' Reply Comments at 10-11.

H. Updates on Related Proceedings

26. The Commission notes that the Joint Applicants must obtain regulatory approval for the merger from three state commissions, FERC and CFIUS. The Joint Applicants have already filed with the Commission a notice regarding FERC action on the merger⁴¹ and an update on proceedings before CFIUS and review pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act.⁴² The Commission directs the Joint Applicants to notify the Commission and the parties when CFIUS, other federal agencies, or the other state commissions take action on any related filings.

I. Filing Requirements

27. To facilitate the organization of testimony, the Commission directs that testimony shall include tables specifically identifying for each public interest factor all testimony and exhibits relied upon. All parties filing testimony in this proceeding on more than two public interest factors shall file and serve with the testimony a Public Interest Factors Index to the parties direct, supplemental, and rebuttal testimony. The index shall identify, by Public Interest Factor, all testimony and exhibits relied upon with respect to that Factor.

28. All filings made with the Commission must be electronically filed (e-filed) using the Portable Document Format (PDF). Documents created in Microsoft Word, Excel, and other software programs must be converted to PDF before submission to the Commission. Parties must ensure that the paper copies are identical to the e-filed document. To ensure that the electronic and paper filings are the same, parties are strongly encouraged to make their paper copies from the PDF version of the filing. Parties not yet registered as users with the Commission's eDocket system may do so by accessing the Commission's website: www.dcpssc.org/edocket/newuser.asp?fmode=N, reviewing and completing the application for Account – Letter of Assurance, and submitting an electronic and a paper copy of the application to the Commission. Public filings shall be served on all parties and Commission staff.

J. Evidentiary Hearing Procedure

29. The parties will present their case and cross-examine other parties' witnesses in the following order: Joint Applicants, OPC, and Intervenors in alphabetical order. Evidence shall be presented in the following order:

Joint Applicants	Direct Case
OPC	Entire Case

⁴¹ *Formal Case No. 1142*, Letter to Brinda Westbrook-Sedgwick, Commission Secretary, from Moxila A. Upadhyaya, Counsel for AltaGas, filed July 10, 2017.

⁴² *Formal Case No. 1142*, Letter to Brinda Westbrook-Sedgwick, Commission Secretary, from Moxila A. Upadhyaya, Counsel for AltaGas, filed July 14, 2017.

Intervenors in alphabetical order	Entire Case
Joint Applicants	Rebuttal Case

30. The Commission directs parties to file any appropriate motions to limit or strike testimony and exhibits prior to the hearings so that we can issue a ruling either before the hearings commence or on the first day of the hearing. Also, to the extent possible, the parties shall file stipulations regarding exhibits to be introduced at the evidentiary hearing, to minimize the time spent at the hearing marking and introducing exhibits.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

31. The seven factors that the Commission will use to evaluate if this merger is in the public interest are **ADOPTED** and included in Attachment A;

32. This case shall be classified as an “other investigation” for purposes of D.C. Code § 34-912; and

33. The procedural schedule in Attachment B is **ADOPTED**.

A TRUE COPY:

BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:



CHIEF CLERK:

**BRINDA WESTBROOK-SEDGWICK
COMMISSION SECRETARY**

Public Interest Factors in *Formal Case No. 1142*

- (1) The effects of the transaction on ratepayers, shareholders, the financial health of the utilities standing alone and as merged, and the economy of the District;
- (2) The effects of the transaction on utility management and administrative operations;
- (3) The effects of the transaction on public safety and the safety and reliability of services;
- (4) The effects of the transaction on risks associated with all of the Joint Applicants' affiliated non-jurisdictional business operations;
- (5) The effects of the transaction on the Commission's ability to regulate the new utility effectively;
- (6) The effects of the transaction on competition in the local retail, and wholesale markets that impacts the District and District ratepayers; and
- (7) The effects of the transaction on conservation of natural resources and preservation of

Procedural Schedule in *Formal Case No. 1142*

Event	Date
Filing of Application	April 24, 2017
Comments due regarding pre-hearing conference	June 19, 2017
Reply to pre-hearing conference comments	June 28, 2017
Prehearing Conference	July 6, 2017
Commission Order on Prehearing Conference	July 24, 2017
Deadline for data requests on initial application and Direct Testimony	August 2, 2017
Deadline for responses to August 2 data requests	August 16
Joint Applicants' Supplemental Direct	August 21, 2017
Settlement Conference	Week of August 28, 2017
Deadline for initial data requests on Supplemental Direct Testimony	August 28, 2017
Deadline for responses to initial data requests on Supplemental Direct Testimony	September 11, 2017
Direct Testimony and Workpapers of OPC and Intervenors	September 29, 2017
Deadline for initial data requests on OPC and Intervenor Direct Testimony	October 5, 2017
Deadline for responses to initial data requests on OPC and Intervenor Direct Testimony	October 17, 2017
Settlement Conference	October 19, 2017
Rebuttal Testimony	October 27, 2017
Deadline for initial data requests on Rebuttal Testimony	November 3, 2017
Deadline for responses to initial data requests on Rebuttal Testimony	November 14, 2017
Community Hearings	November TBD
Settlement Conference	November 16, 2017
Evidentiary Hearings Begin	December 5, 2017
Evidentiary Hearings End	December 15, 2017
Initial Post Hearing Briefs	January 16, 2018
Reply Briefs	January 30, 2018
PROJECTED Decision Date	April 30, 2018