

## Brenda Martinez

---

**From:** Phil Olbrechts <olbrechtslaw@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 08, 2011 8:04 AM  
**To:** Steve Pilcher  
**Cc:** Brenda Martinez  
**Subject:** RE: Procedural inquiry

Please post and add as an exhibit:

Response documents can comment on any information in any written documents submitted through August 4, 2011 as well as any verbal testimony provided on the last two days of verbal testimony (7/21/11 and 7/16/11, as outlined in Section I of Pre-Hearing II). The response documents can respond to any of the documents identified by Mr. Edelman below from Yarrow Bay. The reply documents can respond to any information in the response documents.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Steve Pilcher [mailto:SPilcher@ci.blackdiamond.wa.us]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 06, 2011 9:21 PM  
**To:** [olbrechtslaw@gmail.com](mailto:olbrechtslaw@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** FW: Procedural inquiry

FYI

---

**From:** Bob Edelman [BobEdelman@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 06, 2011 12:15 PM  
**To:** Steve Pilcher  
**Subject:** Procedural inquiry

Please forward this procedural inquiry to Mr. Olbrechts.

Mr. Examiner:

Exhibit 139 was submitted by Yarrow Bay as testimony but is an extensive rebuttal to verbal testimony and to statements made in written pre-hearing briefs.

Is Exhibit 139 to be considered testimony with responses due on August 12 or responses with replies due within two days following the posting of all responses?

Thank you for your consideration of my question.

Bob Edelman

EXHIBIT

181