

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a
AVISTA UTILITIES,

Respondent.

In the Matter of the Petition of

AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a
AVISTA UTILITIES,

For an Accounting Order Regarding the
Appropriate Treatment of the Net Costs
Associated with the Repurchase of Debt

DOCKET NO. UE-070804

and

DOCKET NO. UG-070805
(consolidated)

DOCKET NO. UE-070311

PUBLIC COUNSEL REQUEST FOR
CLARIFICATION OF
PREHEARING CONFERENCE
ORDER

Pursuant to Paragraph 16 of Order No. 02 in the above-captioned docket, Public Counsel files this request for clarification of the prehearing conference order.

Paragraph 8 of the order states that the parties agreed on a procedural schedule during the conference and lists, *inter alia*, a public comment hearing on October 2 as one of the agreed dates. Paragraph 10 specifies that the October 2 hearing will be in Spokane. This inadvertently creates the impression that the parties agreed on a single hearing in Spokane.

At the prehearing conference on May 23, 2007, Public Counsel requested that two public comment hearings be held, one in Spokane, and a second in either Colville or in the Pullman/Colfax area. A range of dates was proposed. The recommendation was based on discussions with Commission Public Involvement Staff and the Company, and was not opposed. While Public Counsel is not requesting reconsideration of the decision as to the date or location, Public Counsel respectfully requests that the prehearing conference order be clarified to reflect that the parties did not stipulate on the issue of the single hearing location.

Dated this 6th day of June, 2007.

ROBERT M. MCKENNA
Attorney General

Simon J. ffitch
Assistant Attorney General
Public Counsel