```
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
1
2
                          COMMISSION
    THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND )
3
    TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,
                               )
 4
                                  )
                   Complainant, )
5
                                  )
                                      DOCKET NO. UW-011576
              vs.
                                  )
б
                                      Volume I
                                 )
    MEADOWS WATER SYSTEM, LLC, )
                                     Pages 1 - 20
7
                                  )
                  Respondent.
                                 )
8
     -----
9
10
              A prehearing conference in the above matter
11
    was held on March 21, 2002, at 9:35 a.m., at 1300 South
12
    Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington,
13
    before Administrative Law Judge THEO MACE.
14
15
              The parties were present as follows:
16
              THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
    COMMISSION, by MARY M. TENNYSON, Senior Assistant
    Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive
17
    Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington
18
    98504; phone, (360) 664 -1220.
19
              MEADOWS WATER SYSTEM, LLC, by STEPHEN L.
    HARRINGTON, Comanager, 3242 Capitol Boulevard, Suite B,
20
    Post Office Box 676, Olympia, Washington 98540; phone,
    (360) 357-3277.
21
              MEADOWS WATER SYSTEM, LLC., by NICHOLAS
22
    ADAMS, Comanager, 7852 Delphi Road Southwest, Olympia,
    Washington 98512; phone, (360) 791-3265.
23
24
    Kathryn T. Wilson, CCR
25
    Court Reporter
```

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 JUDGE MACE: We are here today for the first 3 4 prehearing conference in Docket No. UW-011576. This is 5 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission against Meadows Water System, LLC. This is an inquiry б into whether or not tariff provisions proposed by 7 Meadows Water System resulting in an increase in 8 9 revenue of approximately \$58,000, or 23 percent 10 annually, are just and reasonable.

My name is Theo Mace, and I'm the 11 12 administrative law judge who has been assigned to hold 13 this hearing. Today is March 21st, 2002, and we are 14 convened in a hearing room at the commission's offices 15 in Olympia, Washington. Just to give you a rundown of 16 what we are going to do today, I will take appearances 17 and give you some instruction about how to give your appearance. I will deal with petitions to intervene, 18 19 if there are any; any procedural motions or matters 20 that need to be brought to my attention; the need for 21 protective order; for invoking the discovery rule; 22 discussion of any issues or stipulations that the 23 parties have entered into or will expect to enter into, 24 and to deal with the schedule of proceedings, one of the most important things we will deal with today. 25

As far as appearances are concerned, this is 1 what I would like to have you do. I would like to take 2 appearances from all the parties. I will begin with 3 4 Meadows, and I want you to state your full name, 5 spelling your last name, state who you represent, your б street address and mailing address, your telephone 7 number, your fax number, and if you have one, an e-mail 8 address. Please designate one representative for each 9 party for purposes of service and communications. I hope that's clear, and if you have any 10 11 questions along the way, please feel free to call my 12 attention to them, and I need to have you speak clearly 13 and into the microphone so the court reporter can 14 record what you are saying for the record. Would the 15 company please begin giving their appearances? 16 MR. ADAMS: My name is Nicholas Adams. Last 17 name spelled A-d-a-m-s. My mailing address is 7852 Delphi Road Southwest, Olympia, Washington, 98512; 18 19 phone number, (360) 791-3265; fax number, 20 (360) 943-5685; e-mail, delphi7852@aol.com. I'm the 21 comanager of the Meadows Water System, and my fellow 22 comanager, Steve Harrington, will be the person that we 23 will designate to receive the notice. 24 MR. HARRINGTON: My name is Stephen 25 Harrington, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, H-a-r-r-i-n-q-t-o-n. I'm

the comanager of the Meadows Water System, LLC. My 1 street address is 3242 Capitol Boulevard, Suite B, 2 Tumwater, Washington, 98501. Mailing address, same 3 4 company name, P.O. Box 676, East Olympia, 98540. 5 Telephone number is (360) 357-3277. Fax is (360) 357-3758. E-mail address is steveh@thewaterco.net. 6 7 MS. TENNYSON: My name is Mary M. Tennyson, I'm a senior assistant attorney general. I'm 8 9 representing commission staff in this proceeding. My street address is 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive 10 11 Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington, 12 98504-0128. My telephone number is (360) 664-1220. 13 Fax number is (360) 586-5522. My e-mail address is 14 mtennyso@wutc.wa.gov. 15 JUDGE MACE: Is there anyone on the 16 conference bridge who wants to enter an appearance? 17 Hearing nothing, let's proceed to petitions to intervene. I have received no petitions to intervene 18 19 in this proceeding. Is anyone aware of any potential 20 intervenors? 21 MS. TENNYSON: No. 22 JUDGE MACE: Let's turn next to the question of the discovery rule. Will the parties be engaging in 23 24 discovery in this proceeding? MS. TENNYSON: I believe we will. I would 25

like to on behalf of staff invoke the discovery rule. 1 2 JUDGE MACE: The discovery rule has been 3 invoked. The discovery process is outlined in WAC 4 480-09-480. If there are any problems with discovery 5 in this proceeding, please contact me, and we can б consider those on an expedited basis. You may contact 7 me by telephone if necessary. MR. HARRINGTON: What is you telephone 8 9 number? JUDGE MACE: (360) 664-1285. The next matter 10 11 has to do with the protective order, and I need to ask 12 the parties whether or not there would be a need for a 13 protective order in this proceeding? Protective order usually has to do with the protection of commercial 14 15 information. 16 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, procedurally if we were to invoke that, what would be our showing? Would 17 we have a burden of proof of some kind? 18 19 JUDGE MACE: Primarily what we do right now 20 is if the parties feel there may be commercial

21 information that they want to have protected, we would 22 go ahead and issue a protective order, and the 23 protective order outlines the procedures that the 24 parties would file if there were information that 25 needed protection.

MR. HARRINGTON: We would like to invoke 1 2 that. JUDGE MACE: I'll see to it that a protective 3 4 order is issued. Is there any sense from the parties 5 of what are the issues that divide them? What are the issues that will be dealt with in the hearing if there б 7 is a hearing? MS. TENNYSON: This is Mary Tennyson for 8 9 staff. From the staff's perspective, the matter of the 10 amount of salary paid by the company is an issue, and I 11 believe from the company's perspective, the staff's 12 treatment of the five companies, of which 13 Mr. Harrington is one of the owners, the treatment of 14 the five companies as combined is, for purposes of the 15 salary and rate setting, an issue. 16 MR. HARRINGTON: I'm not sure I clearly 17 understand that issue. Could you elaborate on that, 18 please? 19 MS. TENNYSON: I'm explaining what I 20 understand to be your issue. 21 JUDGE MACE: This is not an effort to be a 22 negotiating session. I want to get an idea of what 23 issues will be addressed during the proceeding just in 24 an outline form. MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I didn't know staff 25

1 would be stating the issues that we have, but one issue 2 we have with the statement that was made is the 3 treatment of five companies as combined. That is 4 something we've never felt was relevant to this 5 particular filing, in the sense of these others companies are different, independent companies with б different ownerships, and staff has been the one 7 bringing those into this filing, not us. 8

9 JUDGE MACE: And I understand that, and the 10 purpose of this exercise is it's supposed to be a brief 11 attempt to just get an idea of what the issues are that 12 the parties have, and that may be an issue for staff. 13 It may be something that you think is irrelevant, and 14 we'll just have to deal with that. You'll deal with 15 that in your negotiations with staff or on the record, 16 but if staff feels it's an issue, it's an issue for the 17 case, and I'm just asking basically since staff is primarily involved in investigating this particular 18 19 rate request, then whatever issues they have may be 20 something that will be addressed, and we just want to 21 get an idea of issues. It's not intended to be 22 argument at this point.

23 MR. ADAMS: Procedurally at what point would 24 we raise the issues as to whether or not it's legally 25 relevant?

1	JUDGE MACE: You would have an opportunity to
2	cross-examine any evidence that staff provided about
3	that, and you would also have an opportunity in briefs
4	to address that issue. You would have plenty of
5	opportunities.
6	MR. HARRINGTON: I may have misheard what
7	Ms. Tennyson said, but I thought she said she was
8	stating what she thought the company's issues are; is
9	that correct? That's what I thought I heard her say.
10	JUDGE MACE: That's what I thought I heard
11	you say.
12	MS. TENNYSON: The issue of the salary is an
13	issue for staff, and in setting that salary, staff has
14	viewed the companies as combined for that purpose, and
15	that is an issue the company contests.
16	JUDGE MACE: These are salaries of executives
17	or the salaries generally of staff?
18	MS. TENNYSON: The salaries of the
19	executives, the owners. The "management" would be a
20	better term.
21	JUDGE MACE: Let me just turn next to the
22	question that sort of derives out of this exercise,
23	which is that I would encourage the parties to discuss
24	whatever issues divide them and where possible to enter
25	into stipulations of fact so that we don't have a whole

1 panoply of contested issues before us and also to 2 discuss possible settlement of the case, and I wonder 3 if you have had any opportunity to discuss settlement. 4 MS. TENNYSON: There have been ongoing 5 discussions.

б JUDGE MACE: When you discuss scheduling, if 7 you seek to do so, you could include settlement conference or other appropriate dates that would relate 8 9 to discussion of the issues so that we could arrive 10 either at a settlement or at the clearest statement of 11 the contested issues in the case, and I will allow you 12 to give yourselves opportunity to do that when we go 13 off the record to discuss scheduling. Did you have a 14 question?

15 MR. ADAMS: I had a question that the 16 statement was the amount of salary paid by the company, 17 and this morning about eight o'clock, we finally received staff's response to some information we 18 provided last week, and this is an issue we've been 19 20 discussing with staff off and on for two years, 21 actually, but they came back and reduced --22 MS. TENNYSON: If I might interject at this point, I'm concerned about -- we have been engaged in 23 24 various discussions, and because you are the judge

sitting on the case, I think it's inappropriate to get

0009

into any discussions of settlement matters. 2 MR. ADAMS: Please let me continue with the 3 question, because I'm trying to find out what the issue 4 is that last Thursday, we had agreed to an SMA 5 allocation of about 97,000. This morning it was reduced to 84,000. Did that have anything to do with б 7 salaries or other issues? MS. TENNYSON: I'm not going to get into the 8 9 discussion of detailed numbers. The issue, and perhaps I stated it as overbroadly, but we are talking about 10 11 the amount of salary to be included in rates, and 12 that's as far as I want to state in terms of any issues 13 at this point. JUDGE MACE: Right now, and I'm not trying to 14 15 foreclose you from discussing this issue, but for 16 purposes of this proceeding this morning, we are 17 basically here to outline issues that may divide the parties and then to discuss scheduling of the 18 19 proceeding. You will have ample opportunity, 20 Mr. Adams, to discuss with staff and clarify whatever 21 adjustments that staff made and to contest those 22 adjustments if you disagree with them, and the schedule 23 will give you an opportunity to do that. I would 24 prefer not to do that on the record at this point because the issues are not refined to the point where 25

1 it's appropriate to bring it up on the record. MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I need clarification 2 at this point. Staff has discussed salaries in two 3 4 formats, one having to do with the amount paid by the 5 company. That I understand. That has been an issue between us. The other issue staff brought up was the 6 7 treatment of the five companies as combined. That I 8 understand.

9 Another issue of salary that we've discussed 10 in the past, and I don't know if it's resolved or if it 11 is at issue, is salaries allocated in the SMA, and the 12 reason I brought up the numbers is that last Thursday, 13 we had a set number. This morning we get a different 14 number. I don't know if the reason for that change is 15 because of staff's concern about the salaries in the 16 SMA or some other item that we don't even know is at 17 issue yet.

JUDGE MACE: What I would ask you to do is after we go off the record today, discuss that with staff, because it's not something that we can resolve on the record today.

MR. ADAMS: Will we be precluded from raising
issues later on though?
JUDGE MACE: No, you will not be precluded.

25 Let us turn then next to the question of scheduling for

the proceeding --

2 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, we have other issues. JUDGE MACE: Yes, go ahead. 3 4 MR. ADAMS: Again, Your Honor, we are 5 operating somewhat at a disadvantage here because we б were anticipating this information earlier this week, 7 and as of last evening at 7:30 when we were meeting, we had not received it. We received staff's e-mail with 8 9 their proposed pro forma this morning a little bit after eight o'clock and --10

11 JUDGE MACE: Mr. Adams, I would like to 12 interrupt you for just a minute. Again, I don't want 13 to cut you off, but this is just a hearing that's 14 preliminary. It's only to set a schedule for the most 15 part. It's not a hearing on the merits, and you will 16 have ample time to get further information from staff. 17 You will have ample time to discuss that information with staff. You will have ample time to raise any 18 19 issues that you want to raise about staff's position, 20 but this is not the forum to do that.

If you need further information from staff along the lines of discovery, you will have time to get that information, but I would prefer if these are the kinds of issues you need to raise that you discuss them with staff first after this preliminary scheduling

0012

hearing takes place. I'm not foreclosing you from
 raising these issues, but this is not the place to
 raise them.

4 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, as you indicated in 5 the beginning, one of the reasons for this meeting was 6 to discuss the issues so that we could perhaps settle 7 them, and we also have to look at our scheduling. If 8 we are unaware of some substantial issues or staff is, 9 perhaps that would affect our scheduling.

I guess if we are not precluded, we can raise issues at a later time, but there was a major change that staff made, and we feel that it's an issue, and one is in terms of rate base and how it's structured, or our rate schedule and how it's structured. That was substantially changed from our last meeting, and we would feel that is an issue.

17 JUDGE MACE: Right.

18 MR. ADAMS: And I don't believe that raising 19 issues is a matter of discussing the questions on the 20 merits. I guess if we want to go ahead with 21 scheduling, we will go ahead and do that.

JUDGE MACE: I would like to go ahead and do that. I recognize you have issues where you disagree with staff, but again, other than just getting an outline of the issues, I would prefer not to go into

questions of needing more information or further
 discussing the issues with staff before we get to the
 merits.

4 MR. HARRINGTON: To keep it simple, what you 5 are saying to me is that the counsel for the staff 6 outlines what the issues are? We can't add to that 7 list of issues?

JUDGE MACE: I didn't intend that. I didn't 8 9 want to get into the question of needing more information from staff and needing to discuss issues 10 11 with staff and the merits of the issues here. If rate 12 base and how it's structured is an issue, then I've 13 noted it, but just in a general sense, you are certainly not precluded from raising the issues about 14 15 what adjustments staff makes.

MS. TENNYSON: Your Honor, if I might ask a clarifying question of Mr. Adams. When you refer to rate schedule and how it's structured, is this a matter of a rate base or rate design?

20

MR. ADAMS: Rate design.

JUDGE MACE: What I would like to do now is give the parties an opportunity to discuss scheduling. I would like you to also incorporate or indicate for the record at the end of the scheduling discussion what the actual suspension date is, how long we have for the

case so that we have an idea of how long we have. 1 2 MS. TENNYSON: I believe I could do that at this point. The effective date of the suspension was 3 4 January 1st, 2002, and that would mean that we would 5 need a final order by November 1st, 2002, and the б company does have the option of extending that date if 7 we need more time. JUDGE MACE: Hopefully, that won't be the 8 9 case. I'll give you 20 minutes to discuss the schedule for proceedings. I think that will be enough, half an 10 hour, 15 minutes. 11 12 MS. TENNYSON: 15 minutes, but it depends. 13 We could even start with 10. MR. ADAMS: We have to consult with our 14 15 counsel. 16 JUDGE MACE: Why don't we start with 15 17 minutes. If you need longer than that, I will be happy to give it to you. Let's go off the record now while 18 19 the parties discuss scheduling. 20 (Discussion off the record.) 21 JUDGE MACE: The parties have discussed 22 scheduling, and I forgot whether we put this on the 23 record, but a final order needs to be entered on 24 November 1st, 2002, based on the proposed effective date or suspension date of the tariffs. The company 25

will file its direct testimony on April 29th. The 1 staff will file on June 3rd of this year, 2002. 2 Rebuttal will be filed on July 3rd. A hearing will be 3 4 held on July 30th. We did not discuss how much time 5 will be needed for the hearing. I'm referring now to б the company, Mr. Harrington or Mr. Adams, how many 7 witnesses do you think you will be bringing to the 8 hearing? 9 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, we are not sure of 10 all the issues yet so we are not sure. JUDGE MACE: Do you have any estimate? 11 12 MR. HARRINGTON: I can't imagine more than 13 two. JUDGE MACE: For staff, do you think one day 14 15 of hearing will be enough, or should we block out more 16 than one day? 17 MS. TENNYSON: I think we should probably block out more than one day. I think we may need one 18 19 and a half, but let's schedule it. 20 JUDGE MACE: I'll block out two days then, so 21 that would be July 30th and July 31st for hearing. 22 MR. HARRINGTON: Right. 23 JUDGE MACE: Simultaneous briefs will be due 24 on August 28th. Is there anything else related to the schedule or of a preliminary nature before I conclude 25

1 with some information about how to make filings and on 2 some other housekeeping matters? Anything else? MR. ADAMS: No. 3 4 JUDGE MACE: Let me indicate that as far as 5 filings are concerned, we need to have an original plus б 11 copies for this proceeding for internal distribution 7 at the commission. All filings must be made through the commission secretary either by mail to the 8 9 secretary at WUTC, P.O. Box 47250, 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington, 98504-7250 10 11 or by other means of delivery to the commission's 12 offices at the street address that I just recited. 13 We require that filings of substance -- that 14 is, testimony, briefs, motions or answers -- include an 15 electronic copy on a 3.5 inch IBM formatted 16 high-density disk in PDF Adobe Acrobat format 17 reflecting the pagination of your original. Also send us the text in your choice of Word 97 or later or Word 18 19 Perfect 6.0 or later. 20 Service on all parties must be simultaneous 21 with filing. Ordinarily, the commission does not 22 accept filings by fax, so please don't rely on that 23 unless you have my permission to do so. The commission

25 protective order. The prehearing order will include

will enter a prehearing conference order and a

0017

requirements for witness lists, and that will be the
 time you will have to determine who your witnesses will
 be, and exhibit lists to be submitted shortly before
 the evidentiary hearings.

5 The order will also remind the parties that б the commission encourages stipulations both as to facts 7 and to issues that can be resolved prior to settlement process or other means of alternative dispute 8 9 resolution. The commission should be advised of any progress that you make, and again, I encourage you 10 11 if -- we don't have a date for a settlement conference 12 in here or for ADR, but those options are available. 13 You can certainly talk amongst yourselves at any time 14 about the issues and try to resolve them. If you would 15 like to do so, we have the availability of mediation 16 through use of a settlement judge, a judge other than 17 myself that would be able to assist the parties to negotiate the issues. 18

19 MR. HARRINGTON: Does that happen 20 simultaneously?

JUDGE MACE: Simultaneously. Probably what would happen is if you started to do mediation or got into settlement discussions that would preclude you from meeting dates in the schedule, we would probably suspend the schedule and allow you to go ahead with

1 those discussions. We need to keep in mind that there 2 is that 10-month statutory period that we need to 3 observe, but we could address that if it got to the 4 point where you were involved in discussions and needed 5 the additional time.

6 MS. TENNYSON: I did have one point on the 7 electronic copies. If we have exhibits that are in the 8 form of spreadsheets in Excel format, then I think we 9 should be looking at filing those in Excel format. You 10 can't convert those to Word, and I don't know if one 11 can convert those to PDF, but if we can say for 12 electronic spreadsheets in Excel format.

13 JUDGE MACE: As far as I'm concerned, I 14 think that's appropriate. I encourage the parties to 15 discuss what is the best way that information can be 16 exchanged and provided and also provided to the 17 commission in the best way the commission can understand it, so that's fine. Anything else? 18 19 MR. HARRINGTON: You said an original and 11 20 copies plus electronic. Can you do one original and 21 everything else electronic?

JUDGE MACE: No. The actual filing requirements require 19 copies. What I've tried to do is consult with the commission to cut down that number to just meet the internal distribution list. I think

1	eventually we may go to all electronic copies, but we
2	aren't there yet. We are working on that.
3	MR. HARRINGTON: You got my vote.
4	JUDGE MACE: Anything else? Then we are
5	adjourned. Thank you very much.
6	
7	(Prehearing conference adjourned at 10:51 a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	