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ORDER

By this Order, the commission approves, with
one modification, the Stipulated Procedural Order filed by the
parties in this docket on February 5, 2008, attached hereto as
Exhibit A ("Stipulated Procedural Order"). In addition, the
commission determines the level of involvement of KIUC in this
proceeding, and approves KIUC's request to not hold a public
hearing for this docket on the island of Kauai, as preliminarily
scheduled.

¹The parties to this docket are: HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. ("HECO"), HAWAII ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY, INC. ("HELCO"), MAUI ELECTRIC COMPANY, LIMITED ("MECO"), KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE ("KIUC"), the DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS, DIVISION OF CONSUMER ADVOCACY, LIFE OF THE LAND, and HAWAII RENEWABLE ENERGY ALLIANCE (collectively, "Parties"). HECO, HELCO, and MECO are collectively referred to herein as the "HECO Companies."
I.

Background

By Order No. 23913, filed on December 20, 2007, the commission initiated this proceeding to examine the HECO Companies' proposal, in Docket No. 2007-0008, for a Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program ("REI Program"). The REI Program includes, among other proposals: (1) a Renewable Energy Infrastructure Surcharge that would allow electric utilities in Hawaii to recover the costs of renewable infrastructure facilities through a surcharge to ratepayers; and (2) a consolidation incentive mechanism that would allow the HECO Companies to recover costs for renewable projects built on the islands of Hawaii and Maui from Oahu ratepayers. Although the HECO Companies proposed the REI Program in Docket No. 2007-0008, the Commission initiated this docket to separately examine whether the proposed REI Program is just and reasonable.

II.

Discussion

A.

Stipulated Procedural Order

In Order No. 23913, the commission directed the Parties to file, within forty-five days of the date of the Order, a

---

stipulated prehearing (or procedural) order to govern the matters of this proceeding for the commission's review and approval. On February 5, 2008, the Parties timely filed their Stipulated Procedural Order.

Upon review by the commission, the Stipulated Procedural Order, including the Stipulated Regulatory Schedule attached as Exhibit A thereto, appears reasonable. The commission therefore adopts the Stipulated Procedural Order, attached hereto as Exhibit A. The commission, however, makes one modification to Section III.E.1, on page 8, of the Stipulated Procedural Order by requiring the Parties to file an original plus nine copies (rather than eight) of any document filed with the commission.

B. KIUC’s Involvement

Regarding KIUC’s involvement in this proceeding, the Parties note in the Stipulated Procedural Order:

Because the HECO Companies’ proposed [REI Program], which is the sole subject of this investigatory proceeding, does not appear to directly impact KIUC and the island of Kauai, KIUC’s initial participation as a party in this proceeding will be reduced to: (1) monitoring the proceeding to ensure, among other things, that its interests and/or rights are adequately protected, and (2) at KIUC’s own discretion, participating in each of the procedural steps set forth in Stipulated Regulatory Schedule (Exhibit “A”),

---

3No other party moved to intervene or participate in this proceeding.
to the extent necessary. Notwithstanding the foregoing, KIUC reserves its right to fully participate as a party at any time during this proceeding to the extent allowed by this Stipulated Procedural Order.\textsuperscript{4}

 Likewise, by letter dated and filed on February 1, 2008, KIUC requested that the commission not hold a public hearing on the island of Kauai in this docket, asserting:

 (1) \textsuperscript{5}The proposed REI Program is not being proposed by KIUC . . . does not otherwise involve nor impact the island of Kauai, and will not in any way impact the services provided, projects implemented, or the rates or charges that any of the residents and/or customers on the island of Kauai pay for electric service.

 (2) Although KIUC reserves the right to implement its own REI Program at some point in the future, it currently has no plans to implement such a program or to seek recovery outside of a rate case proceeding for any of its renewable efforts. As a result, KIUC does not believe it would be appropriate or necessary to hold a public hearing on this issue at this time, especially when KIUC currently does not plan on seeking such recovery, and thus there is no specific REI Program proposal before the Commission for Kauai residents to review and provide comments on as it may affect them.\textsuperscript{6}

 (3) Despite any efforts that may be taken by the Commission and/or KIUC to attempt to clarify the purpose of the public hearing, KIUC believes that a public hearing on the island of Kauai to receive comments on a proposal that

\textsuperscript{4}Stipulated Procedural Order at 4 n.2.

\textsuperscript{5}Letter dated and filed on February 1, 2008, from KIUC to the commission, at 2.

\textsuperscript{6}Id. at 3-4 (footnote omitted).
involves entities (i.e., HECO Companies) that do not provide any electric service on the island of Kauai, is not being proposed by KIUC, and that has no rate or other impacts on Kauai's residents, would create undue confusion to KIUC's customers.

Upon review, the commission finds reasonable, and approves, KIUC's proposed level of involvement in this proceeding, as described in the Stipulated Procedural Order. Specifically, KIUC may continue to be a party in this proceeding, but take a limited role, in its discretion, in participating in the procedural steps set forth in the Stipulated Regulatory Schedule.

Moreover, based on the representations in KIUC's letter and in the Stipulated Procedural Order that the HECO Companies' proposed REI Program will not impact the island of Kauai, and that KIUC currently has no plans to implement its own REI Program, the commission approves KIUC's request to not hold a public hearing for this docket on the island of Kauai; provided, however, that KIUC may not later opt-in to any REI Program that the commission may approve in this docket. Rather, if KIUC intends to later implement its own REI Program, it must file a separate application with the commission to do so, and at that time, the commission, in its discretion, may hold a public hearing on Kauai to gather public comments on KIUC's proposal.

Given the commission's determination herein to not hold a public hearing on the island of Kauai, as preliminarily scheduled, the commission hereby notifies the Parties that it  

7Id. at 4.
will conduct public hearings in this docket according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, May 5, 2008</td>
<td>Oahu⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 7, 2008</td>
<td>Hilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 8, 2008</td>
<td>Kona¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, May 12, 2008</td>
<td>Molokai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 14, 2008</td>
<td>Maui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 15, 2008</td>
<td>Lanai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Orders

THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

1. The commission adopts the Stipulated Procedural Order, attached hereto as Exhibit A, to govern the course of this proceeding. However, the commission modifies Section III.E.1 of the Stipulated Procedural Order by requiring the Parties to file an original plus nine copies (rather than eight) of any document filed in this docket with the commission.

⁹The commission will notify the Parties of the exact times and locations of the public hearings when they are determined.

¹⁰The commission originally planned to hold a public hearing on Kauai on Monday, May 5, 2008, and hold a public hearing on Oahu on Friday, May 9, 2008. Given the commission's determination to not hold a public hearing on Kauai, the commission will move up the hearing date for Oahu to Monday, May 5, 2008, and not hold any hearings on Friday, May 9, 2008.

¹⁰The commission notes that the above hearing dates for Hilo and Kona are different from those proposed in the commission's preliminary hearing schedule.
2. KIUC is permitted to continue to be a party in this proceeding, but take a limited role, in its discretion, as described in the Stipulated Procedural Order, in participating in the procedural steps set forth in the Stipulated Regulatory Schedule.

3. KIUC's request that the commission not hold a public hearing in this docket on the island of Kauai, is approved; provided, however, that KIUC may not later opt-in to any REI Program that the commission may approve in this docket. Rather, if KIUC intends to later implement its own REI Program, KIUC shall file a separate application with the commission to do so, and at that time, the commission, in its discretion, may hold a public hearing on Kauai to gather public comments on KIUC's proposal.

4. The commission will conduct public hearings in this docket according to the schedule set forth above.
DONE at Honolulu, Hawaii FEB 26 2008

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

By Carlito P. Caliboso, Chairman

By John E. Cole, Commissioner

By Leslie H. Kondo, Commissioner

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Kaiulani Kidani Shinsato
Commission Counsel
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EXHIBIT A
BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Docket No. 2007-0416

Instituting a Proceeding to Examine
Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc., Hawaii
Electric Light Company, Inc., and Maui
Electric Company, Limited’s Proposal for a
Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program

STIPULATED PROCEDURAL ORDER

On December 20, 2007, the Commission issued Order No. 23913 to initiate a proceeding
to examine Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (“HECO”), Hawaii Electric Light Company, Inc.
(“HELCO”) and Maui Electric Company, Limited’s (“MECO”) (collectively the “HECO
Companies”) proposal in Docket No. 2007-0008 (Renewable Portfolio Standards or “RPS”
proceeding) for a Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program (“REIP”).

In Docket No. 2007-0008, the HECO Companies proposed an REIP, consisting of (1)
renewable energy infrastructure projects to encourage development of third party renewable
energy resources, maintain current renewable energy resources, and/or enhance energy choices
for customers while maintaining acceptable levels of reliability, and (2) the creation and
implementation of a “Renewable Energy Infrastructure Surcharge” (“REI Surcharge”) that may
facilitate raising capital by providing investors assurance of a mechanism to recover the utilities’
investment in renewable infrastructure in a timely fashion.
The HECO Companies also proposed that the Commission adopt a consolidation incentive mechanism ("Consolidation Incentive") that generally would operate to credit customers of electric utility affiliates within a consolidated electric utility whose service territories exceed their RPS percentage on a stand-alone basis, to be paid for through a compensation payment or surcharge on customers of the affiliated electric utilities, if any, whose service territories fall short of their RPS percentage on a stand-alone basis.

On October 12, 2007, the HECO Companies, the Division of Consumer Advocacy of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs ("Consumer Advocate"), the Kauai Island Utility Cooperative ("KIUC") and the Hawaii Renewable Energy Alliance ("HREA") (collectively the "Stipulating Parties") filed a Stipulation and Joint RPS Framework which proposed a Framework for Renewable Portfolio Standards which included an RPS Penalty Framework and an REIP, modified according to agreements reached between the Stipulating Parties. The REIP in the stipulated framework proposed a Temporary REI Surcharge which would be available to all electric utilities (including KIUC), and limited in application to projects that need to be implemented or initiated in the near-term and were approved by the Commission for recovery through this temporary surcharge. The Stipulating Parties agreed that the Consolidation Incentive requested by the HECO Companies, which would involve the recovery of certain Maui and island of Hawaii costs through an Oahu surcharge, would not be implemented until further review by the Commission (which could occur in a follow up proceeding involving public hearings and comment).

---

1 The remaining party in Docket No. 2007-0008, Life of the Land, did not sign the Stipulation and Joint RPS Framework.
The Stipulating Parties also requested that the Commission initiate a follow up proceeding to expeditiously consider whether the HECO Companies' proposed REIP with a permanent REI Surcharge should be included in the RPS Framework.

In Decision and Order No. 23912, filed on December 20, 2007, in Docket No. 2007-0008, the Commission approved a Framework for Renewable Portfolio Standards that included an RPS Penalty Framework but denied the proposal for a Temporary REI Surcharge and instead opened Docket No. 2007-0416 to examine the HECO Companies' proposed REIP, including the Consolidation Incentive.

Order No. 23913 designated the HECO Companies, KIUC, the Consumer Advocate, HREA and Life of the Land as parties in this proceeding. No other party filed a motion to intervene or participate in this proceeding.

The parties and participants agree that the following provisions of this Stipulated Procedural Order are mutually acceptable to each.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the following Statement of Issues, Schedule of Proceedings, and procedures shall be utilized in this docket.

I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The issue in this docket is:

Whether the HECO Companies' Proposed Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program (included as Exhibit B to the Stipulation and Joint RPS Framework, filed on October 12, 2007 in Docket No. 2007-0008), including a permanent REI surcharge and the Consolidation Incentive, is just and reasonable and should be approved and included in the RPS Framework.
II. SCHEDULE OF PROCEEDINGS

The parties shall adhere to the schedule of proceedings set forth in the Stipulated Regulatory Schedule hereto attached as Exhibit "A". Notwithstanding the above, the parties shall have the right to amend the Stipulated Regulatory Schedule as may be agreed in writing and approved by the Commission from time to time. However, the intent of the parties in agreeing to a schedule at this time is to promote the efficient and cost-effective allocation of resources. Therefore, any changes to the schedule should be proposed only when there is an urgency or substantial competing need that cannot be reasonably accommodated without a change.

III. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS TO FACILITATE AND EXPEDITE THE ORDERLY CONDUCT OF THESE PROCEEDINGS

A. Requests for Information

A party to this proceeding may submit information requests to another party within the time schedule specified in this Stipulated Procedural Order. If a party is unable to provide the information requested within the prescribed time period, it should so indicate to the inquiring party as soon as possible. The parties shall then endeavor to agree upon a later date for submission of the requested information. If the parties are unable to agree, the responding party, as applicable, may seek approval for the late submission from the Commission upon a showing of good cause. It is then within the Commission’s discretion to approve or disapprove such late

---

2 Because the HECO Companies’ Proposed REIP, which is the sole subject of this investigatory proceeding, does not appear to directly impact KIUC and the island of Kauai, KIUC’s initial participation as a party in this proceeding will be reduced to: (1) monitoring the proceeding to ensure, among other things, that its interests and/or rights are adequately protected, and (2) at KIUC’s own discretion, participating in each of the procedural steps set forth in Stipulated Regulatory Schedule (Exhibit “A”), to the extent it deems necessary. Notwithstanding the foregoing, KIUC reserves its right to fully participate as a party at any time during this proceeding to the extent allowed by this Stipulated Procedural Order.
filings and take any additional action that may be appropriate, such as extending the date for the party to respond.

In lieu of responses to information requests that would require the reproduction of voluminous documents or materials (e.g., documents over 50 pages), the documents or materials may be made available for reasonable inspection and copying at a mutually agreeable designated location and time. In the event such information is available on computer diskette or other readily usable electronic medium, the party responding to the information request shall make the diskette or such electronic medium available to the other parties and the Commission. Subject to objections that may be raised and to the extent practicable, the electronic files for spreadsheets will contain all cell references and formulae intact, and will not be converted to values prior to submission. A party shall not be required, in a response to an information request, to provide data that is/are already on file with the Commission or otherwise part of the public record, or that may be stipulated to pursuant to Part D, infra. The responding party shall, in lieu of production of a document in the public record, include in its response to the information request an identification of the document with reasonable specificity sufficient to enable the requesting party to locate and copy the document. In addition, a party shall not be required, in a response to an information request, to make computations, compute ratios, reclassify, trend, calculate, or otherwise rework data contained in its files or records.

For each response to an information request, the responding party should identify the person who is responsible for preparing the response as well as the witnesses who will be responsible for sponsoring the response at the evidentiary hearing.

A party may object to responding to an information request that it deems to be irrelevant, immaterial, unduly burdensome, onerous or repetitious, or where the response contains
information claimed to be privileged or subject to protection (confidential information). If a party claims that information requested is confidential, and withholds production of all or a portion of such confidential information, the party shall: (1) provide information reasonably sufficient to identify the confidential information withheld from the response, without disclosing privileged or protected information; (2) state the basis for withholding the confidential information (including, but not limited to, the specific privilege applicable or protection claimed for the confidential information and the specific harm that would befall the party if the information were disclosed); and (3) state whether the party is willing to provide the confidential information to some or all representatives of the party pursuant to a protective order.

A party seeking production of documents notwithstanding a party’s claim of confidentiality, may file a motion to compel production with the Commission.

The responses of each party to information requests shall adhere to a uniform system of numbering agreed upon by the parties. For example, the first information request submitted by the Consumer Advocate in this docket shall be referred to and designated as “CA-IR-1” and a response to this information request shall be referred to and designated as “Response to CA-IR-1.”

Each response shall be provided on a separate page and shall recite the entire question asked and set forth the response and/or reference the attached responsive document, indicating the name of the respondent for each response.

B. Witnesses

Witnesses shall submit written testimony and exhibits, and shall be available for cross-examination at the evidentiary hearing. Witnesses should file the workpapers used in preparing the evidence they sponsor at the time they submit their testimony and exhibits (statement of position) and have such workpapers available at the evidentiary hearing. Witnesses will not be
permitted to read prefiled written testimony at the evidentiary hearings.

At the evidentiary hearing, each witness may give a brief oral summary of the written testimony and exhibits and shall summarize the issues raised by such testimony or statement of position. Each witness shall be subject to cross-examination for both direct and rebuttal testimony and exhibits or statement of position.

The parties shall cooperate to accommodate the schedules of any mainland witnesses and will inform the Commission in advance of any scheduling difficulties with respect to such witnesses. If any party has an objection to a timely request to schedule a mainland witness in advance of other witnesses, the party shall make a timely objection to the Commission. The Parties will make their best effort to accommodate the schedules of mainland witnesses by coordinating their appearance at the evidentiary hearing.

C. Form of Prepared Testimony

All prepared testimony, including text and exhibits, shall be prepared in written form on 8-1/2” x 11” paper with line numbers and page numbers, and shall be served on the dates designated in the Schedule of Proceedings.

Each party shall be permitted to follow its own numbering system for written testimony and exhibits, provided that the numbering system utilized is consistent and is clearly understandable. Each document of more than one page shall be consecutively numbered. Each party shall prepare a list of its exhibits by exhibit numbers and titles.

The parties shall be permitted to make revisions to exhibits after the designated dates appearing in the Schedule of Proceedings. Revisions shall bear appropriate revision dates. However, revisions or additions that do more than correct typographical errors, update facts, or
give numerical comparisons of the positions taken by the parties, shall not be submitted except with the approval of the Commission.

Generally, exhibits should include appropriate footnotes, or narratives inserted in the related testimony, setting forth the sources of the information used and explaining the methods employed in making statistical compilations or estimates.

D. Matters of Public Record

To reduce unnecessary reproduction of documents and to facilitate these proceedings, identified matters of public record shall be admissible in this proceeding without the necessity of reproducing each document; provided that the document to be admitted is clearly identified by reference to the place of publication, file or docket number, and the identified document is available for inspection by the Commission, the parties; and further provided that any party has the right to explain, qualify or conduct examination with respect to the identified document. The Commission can rule on whether the identified document can be admitted into evidence when a party proffers such document for admission as evidence in this case.

From time to time, the parties may enter into stipulations that such documents, or any portion of such documents, may be introduced into evidence in this case.

E. Copies Filings and Information Requests

1. Copies of Filings and Information Requests:

| Public Utilities Commission | Original + 8 copies |
| Division of Consumer Advocacy | 3 copies |
| HECO/HELCO/MECO | 3 copies |
| KIUC | 2 copies |
| HREA, LOL | 1 copy each |
2. All pleadings, briefs and other documents required to be filed with the Commission shall comply with the formatting requirements prescribed pursuant to Chapter 61, Subchapter 2, Section 6-61-16 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and shall be filed at the office of the Commission in Honolulu within the time limit prescribed pursuant to Chapter 61, Subchapter 2, Section 6-61-15 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

3. Copies of all filings, information requests and information request responses should be sent to the parties by hand delivery or United States mail (first class, postage prepaid). In addition, if available, all parties shall provide copies of their filings, information requests and information request responses to the other parties via diskette or e-mail in a standard electronic format that is readily available by the parties. The parties agree to use Word 97, Word 2000 or Word 2003 as the standard programming format for filings in this case. The parties also agree to submit any spreadsheets (e.g., used as workpapers or exhibits or documentation submitted in response to information requests) in Microsoft Excel format. However, if workpapers, documentation, or exhibits attached to any filing are not readily available in an electronic format, a party shall not be required to convert such workpapers, documentation, or exhibits into an electronic format. Also, existing documents produced in response to requests need not be converted to Word 97/Word 2000/Word 2003 as long as the applicable format is identified. In the event a copy of a filing, information request or information request response is delivered to a party via diskette or e-mail, unless otherwise agreed to by such party, the same number of copies of such filing, information request or information request response must still be delivered to such party by hand delivery or United States mail (first class, postage prepaid) as provided in Part E.1 above.
F. **Order of Examination at the Evidentiary Hearing**

The order of presentation of witnesses and whether the witness will present both written and rebuttal testimony at the same time shall be determined at the pre-hearing conference to be held at the discretion of the Commission.

Examination of any witness shall be limited to one attorney or representative for a party. The parties shall avoid duplicative or repetitious cross-examination. Friendly cross-examination will not be allowed. Cross-examination shall be limited to witnesses whose testimony is adverse to the party desiring to cross-examine. Recross-examination shall be limited to the extent of material covered in redirect examination unless otherwise permitted by the Commission.

G. **Communications**

Chapter 61, Subchapter 3, Section 6-61-29 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure concerning ex parte communications is applicable to any communications between a party and the Commission. However, the parties may communicate with Commission counsel on matters of practice and procedure through their own counsel or designated representative.

Communications between the parties should either be through counsel or through designated representatives. All pleadings, papers, and other documents filed in this proceeding shall be served on the opposing party. All motions, supporting memoranda, and the like shall also be served on opposing counsel.

H. **General**

These procedures are consistent with the orderly conduct of this docket. This Stipulated Procedural Order shall control the subsequent course of these proceedings, unless modified by the parties in writing and approved by the Commission, or upon the Commission’s own motion.
This Stipulated Procedural Order may be executed by the parties in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which taken together shall constitute one and the same instrument. The parties may execute this Stipulated Procedural Order by facsimile for initial submission to the Commission to be followed by the filing of originals of said facsimile pages.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, February 5, 2008

By

WILLIAM A. BONNET
Vice President
Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.
Maui Electric Company, Limited
Hawaii Electric Light Company, Inc.

By

KENT D. MORIHARA
KRIS N. NAKAGAWA
Attorneys for Kauai Island Utility Cooperative

By

HENRY Q CURTIS
Vice President of Consumer Affairs
Life of the Land

By

CATHERINE P. AWAKUNI
Executive Director
Division of Consumer Advocacy

By

WARREN S. BOLLMEIER II
President
Hawaii Renewable Energy Alliance
APPROVED AND SO ORDERED THIS ____________________________,
at Honolulu, Hawaii.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

By __________________________
Carlito P. Caliboso, Chairman

By __________________________
John E. Cole, Commissioner

By __________________________
Leslie H. Kondo, Commissioner

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Kaiulani Kidani Shinsato
Commission Counsel
EXHIBIT A
Stipulated Regulatory Schedule
Docket No. 2007-0416

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURAL STEPS</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Information Requests on HECO Companies' REIP</td>
<td>March 11, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HECO Companies' Responses to Information Requests</td>
<td>April 2, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Direct Testimonies (or Position Statements) of Other Parties (not including HECO Companies)</td>
<td>May 27, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HECO Companies' and Other Parties' Information Requests on Other Parties' Direct Testimonies or Position Statements</td>
<td>June 10, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other Parties' Responses to HECO Companies Information Requests</td>
<td>July 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. HECO Companies Responses to Information Requests from Other Parties</td>
<td>August 12, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prehearing Conference</td>
<td>To be set by the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evidentiary Hearing</td>
<td>To be set by the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Simultaneous Post-Hearing Opening Briefs</td>
<td>Four weeks after issuance of transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Simultaneous Post-Hearing Reply Briefs</td>
<td>Three weeks after Opening Briefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 See footnote 2 of Stipulated Procedural Order.

4 Exhibit B to the Stipulation and Joint RPS Framework, filed on October 12, 2007, in Docket No. 2007-0008.
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