

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-250537

ORDER 05

DENYING OBJECTION TO ORDER 03

BACKGROUND

- 1 On July 8, 2025, Puget Sound Energy (PSE or Company) filed with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) proposed revisions to its currently effective electric tariff, WN U-60, Schedule 95 Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism (PCAM).
- 2 On August 7, 2025, this matter came before the Commission at its regularly scheduled open meeting. The Commission heard comments from Commission staff (Staff), PSE, Public Counsel, the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers (AWEC), and NW Energy Coalition (NVEC). Following this discussion, the Commission issued Order 01, Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions (Order 01), and set this matter for adjudication.
- 3 On September 12, 2025, the Commission held a prehearing conference in this matter before Administrative Law Judge Ann Paisner.
- 4 On September 23, 2025, the Commission issued Order 02 Protective Order.
- 5 On September 24, 2025, the Commission issued Order 03, Prehearing Conference Order, which among other things, set deadlines for dispositive motions in the docket and set the hearing in this matter for April 8, 2026.
- 6 On October 3, 2025, PSE filed an Objection to Order 03 (Objection). In its Objection PSE “objects to the language in paragraph 3 of Order 03 stating that a ‘schedule for

power cost only rate cases (PCORC) and power cost adjustment mechanism (PCAM) updates was set in the Commission’s January 15, 2025, Final Order 09/07 (“Order 09/07”) in PSE’s 2024 general rate case (“2024 GRC”).”¹

7 PSE argues that the language quoted is not contained in Order 09/07 in Docket UE-240004 and that such language is unnecessary in a prehearing conference order. PSE argues the above quoted language mischaracterizes the Commission’s ruling in Order 09/07, which PSE argues “simply allowed the status quo of annual power cost updates from the prior MYRP to continue in the current MYRP and addressed in what proceedings prudence determinations could occur.”² PSE argues that the language should be stricken from Order 03.

8 On October 13, 2025, Staff filed a Response to PSE’s Objection. Staff argues first that PSE’s characterization of Order 09/07 is incorrect. Specifically, Staff argues Order 09/07 does set a schedule for filing power cost adjustments and power cost only rate cases “when holistically examining paragraphs 369-381.”³

9 Staff further argues that the Commission should reject PSE’s Objection as it is irrelevant and does not meet the threshold for review under Washington Administrative Code WAC 480-07-810(2).⁴ Specifically, Staff argues that the language PSE objects to is in a procedural, background section of the order, is not a finding of fact, and creates no prejudice.⁵ Staff argues that nit picking such language serves no purpose and only creates further litigation burden on non-company parties.⁶

DISCUSSION

10 The Commission construes pleadings and motions liberally “with a view to effect justice among the parties.”⁷ Further, WAC 480-07-430(3)(a) allows parties to object to a written prehearing conference order with ten days after the order is served, and that such objections will be considered pursuant to WAC 480-07-810. WAC 480-07-810(2)

¹ PSE’s Objection at ¶ 2.

² PSE’s Objection at ¶ 5.

³ Staff’s Response at ¶ 3.

⁴ Staff’s Response at ¶ 4.

⁵ Staff’s Response at ¶ 4.

⁶ Staff’s Response at ¶ 4.

⁷ WAC 480-07-395(4).

provides the Commission may accept review of interim or interlocutory orders when the order terminates a party's participation in a docket, to prevent substantial prejudice to a party, or to save the Commission and parties substantial effort or expense.

11 PSE's Objection is vague in that it cites no legal authority or reasoning in support of its objection falling within one of the three categories described in WAC 480-07-810(2).

12 Consequently, we agree with Staff. The Objection should be overruled or denied, and the language should not be stricken from Order 03. The Commission notes that pursuant to WAC 480-07-810(2), the language PSE objects to clearly does not terminate any party's position in the matter. Further, even if one were to argue that the language may prejudice a party or could save the parties substantial time and expense, neither is true here. In suspending this matter for adjudication, the Commission contemplated a deadline for dispositive motions addressing in part whether PSE should be permitted to file for this change at this time under the Multiyear Rate Planning statute. Therefore, any prejudice from the language contained in Order 03 is not substantial, nor could it be categorized as a statement that could not be corrected in the Commission's final order.

13 Consequently, the Commission rejects PSE's objection.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

14 (1) The Commission is an agency of the state of Washington vested by statute with the authority to regulate the rates, regulations, practices, accounts, and affiliated interests of public service companies, including electrical companies.

15 (2) Puget Sound Energy is engaged in the business of providing electric services within the state of Washington and is a public service company subject to Commission jurisdiction.

16 (3) After review and giving due consideration, PSE's Objection to Order 03 should be denied as it fails to meet the standards of WAC 480-07-810(2)(b).

ORDER

THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

17 (1) Puget Sound Energy's Objection to Order 03 should be overruled or otherwise denied as review is not available pursuant to WAC 480-07-810(2).

- 18 (2) The Commission retains jurisdiction over the subject matter and Puget Sound Energy to effectuate the provisions of this Order.

DATED at Lacey, Washington, and effective February 5, 2026.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



BRIAN J. RYBARIK, Chair



ANN E. RENDAHL, Commissioner



MILTON H. DOUMIT, Commissioner