

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)	DOCKET UW-110054
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION)	
)	
Complainant,)	ORDER 04
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER GRANTING JOINT
RAINIER VIEW WATER)	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
COMPANY, INC.,)	TIME TO FILE RESPONSES TO
)	BENCH REQUESTS
Respondent.)	
)	
.....)	

MEMORANDUM

- 1 **NATURE OF PROCEEDING.** On January 4, 2011, Rainier View Water Company, Inc. (Rainier View or Company) filed with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) a revision to its currently effective Tariff WN U-2, designated as Original Sheet No. 56. The Company initially proposed charges of \$8,640 per equivalent residential unit (ERU) for all future customers of the Southwood/Sound water system¹ and \$1,702 per ERU for all future customers of all other water systems. On January 24, 2011, the Company filed revised tariff sheets reflecting rates at the same level as recent contract facilities charges. Rainier View proposed facilities charges of \$6,480 per ERU for all future customers of the Southwood/Sound water system and \$1,210 per ERU for all future customers of all other water systems.

- 2 On June 10, 2011, the Company filed a Motion to Amend Procedural Schedule, requesting the extension of the initial and response testimony deadlines until June 23,

¹ The Company asserts that this amount is premised on the estimated cost to build a water main to connect directly to the Lakewood Water District, which is the water source for any expected customer growth in the Southwood/Sound water system.

2011, and July 28, 2011, respectively.² On June 20, 2011, the parties filed a request to hold the procedural schedule in abeyance. They asserted that settlement negotiations were progressing and asked to file a status report within one month. The Commission approved this request on June 21, 2011. On July 21, 2011, the parties filed an update on settlement negotiations, indicating that they continue to make progress toward a full settlement of the case. The parties suggested that the schedule continued to be held in abeyance and pledged to file an additional status report by September 1, 2011. On July 26, 2011, Rainier View filed a three-month waiver of the statutory suspension period.

3 On September 1, 2011, the Company filed a letter further extending the statutory suspension period of its tariffs by two months. The parties also filed a status report on September 1, 2011, again requesting that the Commission continue to hold the procedural schedule in abeyance and indicating that settlement negotiations were progressing. The status report also stated that another update would be provided by November 1, 2011.

4 The parties filed their final status report on November 1, 2011, stating that a settlement agreement was circulating between the parties and asking that the procedural schedule continue to be held in abeyance.

5 On April 3, 2012, the Commission issued a Notice directing the parties to file a status report on the settlement negotiations. The parties filed the status report, a Settlement Agreement and Supporting Narrative (Settlement Agreement) on April 6, 2012.³ Tariff sheets reflecting the pricing in the Settlement Agreement were filed on April 27, 2012, but later withdrawn and replaced on May 9, 2012.

6 On May 30, 2012, the Commission issued Notice of Bench Request Nos. 1-11 (Notice). In that Notice, the Commission sought more detailed information about the settlement process and support showing how the Settlement Agreement serves the public interest. Responses to the Bench Requests were due by June 13, 2012.

² The Motion stated that the parties were pursuing settlement negotiations. The Commission's regulatory staff (Staff) did not oppose the Motion.

³ Rainier View waived the suspension period entirely for this docket in its April 6, 2012, filing.

7 **MOTION.** On June 1, 2012, Staff filed a request for an extension of the June 13, 2012, deadline (Motion). Staff asserts that out-of-office unavailability of those responsible for preparing the responses necessitates an extension until June 25, 2012. Staff states that Rainier View supports this request.

8 ***Discussion and Determination.*** Pursuant to WAC 480-07-385(2), the Commission will grant a timely request for extension to which all parties agree unless it is inconsistent with the public interest or the Commission's administrative needs. Staff's request, at this time, is not inconsistent with the public interest and the Commission's administrative needs. Staff's request should be granted.

9 However, given the parties' proclivity for delay, we do not expect to see, nor will we be so accommodating of, future extension requests.

ORDER

10 THE COMMISSION ORDERS that Staff's request for an extension of the deadline for responses to Bench Request Nos. 1-11 is granted.

Dated at Olympia, Washington, and effective June 4, 2012.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

MARGUERITE E. FRIEDLANDER
Administrative Law Judge