1 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION -----) 2 In the Matter of the Application of:) 3 PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT ) DOCKET NO. UE-950195 COMPANY 4 VOLUME 1 ) PAGES 1 - 12 ) For Approval of (1) Conservation 5 ) Asset Transaction under the ) Washington Conservation Financing 6 ) Statute and (2) Proposed Tariff ) 7 Revisions and Rate Mechanism. ) ) 8 9 A hearing in the above matter was held on 10 March 23, 1995 at 9:30 a.m. at 1300 South Evergreen 11 Park Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington before 12 Administrative Law Judge ELMER CANFIELD. 13 The parties were present as follows: 14 PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, by JAMES M. VAN NOSTRAND, Attorney at Law, 411 - 108th Avenue Northeast, Bellevue, Washington 98004. 15 16 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STAFF, by ROBERT CEDARBAUM, Assistant Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive 17 Southwest, Olympia, Washington 98504. 18 FOR THE PUBLIC, DONALD TROTTER, Assistant 19 Attorney General, 900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000, Seattle, Washington 98504. 20 21 22 23 24 Cheryl Macdonald, CSR 25 Court Reporter

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 JUDGE CANFIELD: This pre-hearing 3 conference will please come to order. This is docket No. UE-950195 in the matter of the application of 4 5 Puget Sound Power and Light Company for approval of б conservation asset transaction under the Washington conservation financing statute and proposed tariff 7 8 revisions and rate mechanism. The proceeding today is 9 being conducted by Administrative Law Judge Elmer Canfield of the Office of Administrative Hearings on 10 11 Thursday, March 23, 1995 in Olympia, pursuant to 12 notice to all interested parties. The commissioners 13 will be sitting on the case when evidentiary hearings 14 are held.

At today's session we're going to be taking appearances, and as further indicated on the notice of hearing, take interventions, mark and distribute applicant's direct testimony and exhibits. We'll also deal with discovery matters, the schedule and other preliminary matters. We would like to start by taking appearances beginning with the applicant, please.

MR. VAN NOSTRAND: On behalf of Puget Sound
Power and Light Company, James M. Van Nostrand,
411 - 108th Avenue Northeast, Bellevue 98004.
JUDGE CANFIELD: Thank you. Over here,

25

1 please.

2 MR. CEDARBAUM: Representing Commission staff, my name is Robert Cedarbaum, assistant attorney 3 general. My address is the Heritage Plaza Building, 4 5 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest in Olympia. б The zip code is 98504. 7 JUDGE CANFIELD: Thank you. 8 MR. TROTTER: Donald T. Trotter, assistant attorney general for the public counsel section of the 9 attorney general's office. My address is 900 Fourth 10 11 Avenue, Suite 2000, Seattle, Washington 98164. 12 JUDGE CANFIELD: Thank you. Any other 13 appearances? 14 Let the record reflect there are none. Are 15 there any preliminary matters that anyone has to 16 address at the outset before we get started this 17 morning? 18 Hearing nothing right off the bat, I will Usually at the initial juncture we would 19 go ahead. 20 deal with interventions, and I did check downstairs at 21 the records center and there had been no petitions to 22 intervene filed, and I guess I can just ask if there 23 are any interventions being requested at this time. 24 Let the record reflect there are none, and

we have a number of matters to cover at the session

1 this morning. I don't have any preference in the 2 particular order that we take them in. Maybe I can leave that open to the parties to address. We've got 3 to deal with the exhibits. I haven't seen the 4 5 proposed exhibits yet. We will be marking those for б identification, and I don't know whether a protective order is going to be requested or not in the matter. 7 Maybe I can have the applicant address that initially 8 9 whether the applicant is requesting the issuance of 10 protective order in the matter. 11 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Yes, Your Honor, we will

12 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Yes, Your Honor, we will 12 be.

JUDGE CANFIELD: I don't know if that's been discussed among the parties or not, but any comment on that request one way or the other?

16 MR. CEDARBAUM: The Commission staff was 17 advised by the company earlier this week that some of 18 the materials we've requested through data requests is 19 confidential, and so in order to treat that we don't 20 have any objection to a protective order being issued 21 by the Commission in this proceeding. I think until 22 that order is actually issued, I think we've agreed to kind of go on an honor system and so that we can get 23 this information today, but the protective order being 24 25 issued is something we don't object to.

JUDGE CANFIELD: Okay. Any comment, Mr.
 Trotter?

3

MR. TROTTER: No.

JUDGE CANFIELD: With that, I will grant 4 5 the request for a protective order, and will request б that the Commission issue one as soon as possible, and it will be patterned after the protective order in the 7 Electric Lightwave matter, UT-901029. That's the 8 9 form used by the Commission for a number of years, and 10 I will request that that be issued as soon as possible 11 so that those matters can be taken care of. I did 12 check downstairs to see if there's any possibility of reducing the number of prefiled evidence in the 13 14 matter, and was advised that that was not the case, 15 that they had not prepared a full distribution list, 16 so we'll leave it as it is at the original plus 19 17 copies.

18 I will note that in the notice of hearing the Commission did invoke the discovery provisions of 19 20 WAC 480-09-480, and the Commission also shortened the 21 response time for data requests to five business days. 22 As I understand, Mr. Cedarbaum, there have already been some data requests made in the matter? 23 24 MR. CEDARBAUM: That's right, Your Honor. I think we issued some formal data requests, about 13 25

or 14. We've copied Mr. Trotter on the requests
 themselves and we've received responses, and so the
 five-day turnaround time has worked so far. It's been
 fine.

5 JUDGE CANFIELD: Okay. We haven't б discussed scheduling yet. I don't know whether there's going to be any particular need for a 7 discovery schedule. I guess we can address that in 8 9 due course as well, but has the schedule been 10 discussed among the parties, Mr. Cedarbaum? 11 MR. CEDARBAUM: A discovery schedule? 12 JUDGE CANFIELD: Well, schedule in general as well as any possible discovery schedule. 13 14 MR. CEDARBAUM: No on both counts. Other than the data requests that we've issued and the 15 16 responses that have come in so far. We haven't 17 discussed the need for deposition. At this time I 18 don't see that need. It may come up in the future, so 19 I'd just as soon leave that open for now. If we see 20 the need for deposition we can, I think, agree to that 21 informally and advise you on the schedule. If we have 22 a problem with it we'll get in touch.

JUDGE CANFIELD: So it would be your proposal to leave that open and allow the parties to deal informally to the extent possible.

1 MR. CEDARBAUM: That's right. 2 JUDGE CANFIELD: Any comments from the 3 others on that? 4 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: That's fine, Your Honor. 5 JUDGE CANFIELD: Let's leave that as 6 discussed then. Is the applicant prepared to 7 distribute the testimony and exhibits at today's 8 session? 9 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Yes, Your Honor. Do 10 that now? 11 JUDGE CANFIELD: Okay. Why don't we go off the record for a moment to distribute those around 12 then, so I will take a short recess. 13 14 (Recess.) 15 JUDGE CANFIELD: We're back on the record 16 now after a short recess during which time the 17 prefiled evidence was distributed, and I did go ahead 18 and assign numbers to them off the record, which I 19 will recap on the record. The prefiled testimony of D. E. Gaines, G A I N E S, was identified as DEG-1. 20 I will mark that for identification as Exhibit T-1. 21 22 There was one accompanying exhibit of Mr. Gaines 23 identified as DEG-2. I will mark that as Exhibit 2 24 for identification.

25

(Marked Exhibits T-1 and 2.)

25

1 JUDGE CANFIELD: And Mr. Van Nostrand indicated that that was the extent of the prefiled 2 testimony and exhibits, and he did note that the 3 application is on file at the Commission as well. 4 Do 5 you know when that was filed? б MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Yes, Your Honor. 7 February 16. 8 JUDGE CANFIELD: February 16, 1995. 9 We will be dealing with scheduling at today's session as well. I believe earlier Mr. Cedarbaum indicated 10 11 that that had not been discussed among the parties. 12 Maybe it would be appropriate to take a short recess 13 to discuss the scheduling-type matters and come back 14 on the record. 15 MR. CEDARBAUM: It's my understanding that 16 the Commission has a proposed schedule. I don't know 17 if the company knows about it or not. I don't care if we do that off the record or or on the record. 18 19 JUDGE CANFIELD: Why don't we take a short break to discuss the scheduling matter and come back 20 21 on and announce the schedule. So take another short 22 recess. 23 (Recess.) 24 JUDGE CANFIELD: We're back on the record

after a brief recess during which time the proposed

1 schedule was outlined and discussed, and I believe the parties indicated that they could live with the 2 schedule. Let me just go ahead and announce it on the 3 record. The prefiling date for staff and public 4 5 counsel set at April 24. The prefiling date for б company rebuttal set at May 28, and the cross of all parties set at May 23 to be continued to May 25 if 7 necessary, and oral argument set for May 25, and that 8 9 would follow the evidentiary hearings on the matter. 10 And with that let me just briefly go around the room. 11 Mr. Van Nostrand, I believe you indicated that the applicant could live with and accept that 12 13 schedule. 14 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Yes, Your Honor. That 15 the acceptable. 16 JUDGE CANFIELD: And Mr. Cedarbaum. MR. CEDARBAUM: It's acceptable to staff. JUDGE CANFIELD: Mr. Trotter. MR. TROTTER: Yes. 20 JUDGE CANFIELD: That schedule 21 will be adopted. I will be getting out a pre-hearing 22 conference order summarizing these matters that we've discussed at the conference today, but I'm also 23 understanding, Mr. Cedarbaum, that the Commission will 24 be issuing a notice of hearing on that. Is that 25

17

18

19

1 correct?

2	MR. CEDARBAUM: Yes. I would assume that
3	the notice of hearing will go out for the only
4	evidentiary phase that will remain in this case for
5	the end of May, but that the prefiling dates, the 24th
б	and the 28th, are being set today.
7	JUDGE CANFIELD: Yeah, that's my
8	understanding as well, and if that wasn't understood,
9	let it be so understood that these dates are being
10	adopted and are so set at today's pre-hearing
11	conference.
12	MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Your Honor, did you
13	indicate that the oral argument on the 25th, was that
14	at 9:30 in the morning?
15	JUDGE CANFIELD: That's my understanding
16	that it would be noticed out for 9:30 on May 25, but
17	if the evidentiary hearing had not yet been concluded
18	that it would be bumped to later on in the day
19	following the conclusion of the testimony. I will ask
20	if there are any other matters that the parties have
21	to address at the session today. I've covered the
22	matters that have occurred to me. Maybe I can ask Mr.
23	Van Nostrand if there's anything further that he has
24	to address today.
25	MD VAN NOCTRAND: No Vour Honor

25 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: No, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE CANFIELD: And Mr. Cedarbaum.
2	MR. CEDARBAUM: No.
3	JUDGE CANFIELD: Mr. Trotter.
4	MR. TROTTER: No.
5	JUDGE CANFIELD: With that then I will
б	thank you all for coming in and participating and, as
7	indicated, I will try to get a pre-hearing conference
8	order out as soon as possible, and I will also request
9	the Commission to issue a protective order as soon as
10	possible in the matter. So with that, thank you all.
11	This session is adjourned.
12	(Hearing adjourned at 9:55 a.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	