```
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
                         COMMISSION
 2
    WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
 3
    TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,
 4
                  Complainant,
 5
                                ) DOCKET NO. TG-080913
              vs.
                                ) Volume III
    POINTS RECYCLING AND REFUSE, ) Pages 26 - 35
    LLC,
 7
                 Respondent.
 8
    WHATCOM COUNTY,
 9
                  Complainant,
10
                                ) DOCKET NO. TG-081089
              vs.
                                ) Volume III
11
    POINTS RECYCLING AND REFUSE, ) Pages 26 - 35
12
   LLC,
13
                 Respondent.
                               )
    RENEE COE, SHELLEY DAMEWOOD, )
14
    and SHANNON TOMSEN,
15
                  Complainants, )
16
                                ) DOCKET NO. TG-082129
              vs.
                                ) Volume III
17
    POINTS RECYCLING AND REFUSE, ) Pages 26 - 35
18
    LLC,
19
                 Respondent. )
    _____
             A prehearing conference in the above matter
20
21
    was held on April 6, 2009, at 1:00 p.m., at 1300
22
    South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Olympia,
23
    Washington, before Administrative Law Judge MARGUERITE
24
    E. FRIEDLANDER.
25
    Kathryn T. Wilson, CCR, Court Reporter
```

1	The parties were present as follows:
2	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, by JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI, Assistant
3	Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington
4	
5	POINTS RECYCLING AND REFUSE, LLC, by JAMES K. SELLS, Attorney at Law; Ryan, Sells, Uptegraft, 9657
6 7	Levin Road Northwest, Suite 240, Silverdale, Washing 98383; telephone, (360) 307-8860.
8	WHATCOM COUNTY, by DAN GIBSON (via bridge line), Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, 311 Grand Avenue, Suite 201, Bellingham, Washington 98225; telephone, (360) 676-6784.
9	
10	RENEE COE, SHELLEY DAMEWOOD, and SHANNON TOMSEN, by SHANNON TOMSEN (via bridge line), pro se, 2125 Whalen Drive, Point Roberts, Washington 98281; telephone, (360) 945-0206.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

24

25

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Let's be on the record.
3	I'm Marguerite Friedlander, the administrative law
4	judge presiding over this proceeding. I'll start out
5	by cautioning all the parties, as I did off the record,
6	not to discuss anything that has come up in the
7	mediation session from February 25th, or the subsequent
8	news article in the all-points bulletin because that is
9	not why we are here today.
10	We are here today before the Washington
11	Utilities and Transportation Commission on Monday
12	afternoon, April 6th, 2009, for a prehearing conference
13	in Docket TG-080913, tariff revisions proposed by
14	Points Recycling and Refuse, LLC, which would remove
15	curbside recycling collection from its tariff; Docket
16	TG-081089, a complaint filed by Whatcom County against
17	Points, and Docket TG-082129, a complaint filed by
18	Renee Coe, Shelley Damewood, and Shannon Tomsen,
19	against Points. The Commission has convened this
20	prehearing conference because of the request filed by
21	Commission staff on March 18th, 2009, to suspend the
22	procedural schedule until late July at which time the
23	parties would set a new procedural schedule and a

hearing in order to allow for additional discovery.

Before we get into that matter, let's go

- 1 ahead and take short appearances. We've all gotten
- 2 together before, so just go ahead and state your full
- 3 name and the party that you represent. Let's go ahead
- 4 and begin with Points.
- 5 MR. SELLS: If Your Honor please, Jim Sells,
- 6 attorney, appearing on behalf of Points Recycling and
- 7 Refuse, in all three consolidated causes.
- JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: For Whatcom County?
- 9 MR. GIBSON: Dan Gibson, deputy prosecuting
- 10 attorney with the civil division representing Whatcom
- 11 County.
- 12 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Commission staff?
- MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Jennifer
- 14 Cameron-Rulkowski, assistant attorney general on behalf
- 15 of Commission staff.
- 16 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Thank you, and on behalf
- of Complainants?
- MS. COE: Renee Coe on behalf of
- 19 Complainants.
- JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: We also have appearing, I
- 21 believe, Shelley Damewood and Shannon Tomsen; correct?
- MS. COE: Yes.
- JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: There is no one else in
- 24 the hearing room. Is there anyone else on the
- 25 conference bridge who would like to state an

- 1 appearance? Hearing nothing, let's go back to the
- 2 substance of why we are here, because when I received
- 3 Staff's request, I was a little bit concerned because
- 4 of the fact that this matter has been going on for over
- 5 a year now, and I guess my concern is that we have
- 6 canceled a hearing date and we have no hearing day in
- 7 sight, and we may be pushing this off for another three
- 8 months. So I would like to have a little bit more, I
- 9 guess, certainty with regard to the schedule at this
- 10 point.
- 11 My other concern with regard to the
- 12 procedural schedule is the application in Freedom 2000,
- 13 LLC. Because this docket must progress before that
- 14 docket is possibly even necessary, Freedom 2000 LLC's
- 15 application is being put in limbo until this proceeding
- 16 has been through the process completely, and I would
- 17 like to know a little bit more about where we are with
- 18 the schedule and if there is a possibility that we
- 19 don't have to wait until July in order to set these
- 20 dates. Since it was Staff's request, why don't I go
- 21 ahead and start with Staff.
- 22 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, Staff has
- 23 issued a series of data requests to Points, and we do
- 24 not yet have a deadline for Points to respond. The
- 25 ten-day deadline has passed, but we have not been able

- 1 to come up with a deadline. So at this point, we do
- 2 not know when we will get those responses, and when we
- 3 do, Staff will need up to several months in order to go
- 4 through those responses and analyze them.
- 5 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Mr. Sells, as far as
- 6 speaking on behalf of Points Recycling, is there a
- 7 reason?
- 8 MR. SELLS: Several. If Your Honor, please,
- 9 that is correct. We've received some data requests,
- 10 but in fact what the data requests are is an audit,
- 11 which is fine. We don't have any problem undergoing an
- 12 audit. Generally, an audit is a 45-day period, and I
- 13 could be wrong about that, but something like that, and
- 14 generally, there is an auditor involved from the
- 15 Commission that goes up to the company and tells the
- 16 company what they want and don't want and so forth. We
- 17 understand the traveling restrictions and we understand
- 18 there is not going to be an auditor sent up there.
- 19 What we've done, just as of Friday, is
- 20 submitted a list, basically, of questions from Points
- 21 trying to get some sort of input from an auditor here
- 22 as to if we are going in the right direction. Is this
- 23 what you want. Is this not what you want. What kind
- 24 of allocations do you want and that sort of thing. If
- 25 we could get some sort of response, some sort of input

- 1 from that, I don't think it's going to take very long
- 2 to put it together. This is not a large company. How
- 3 long, I don't know. We could have filed something by
- 4 now, but it would probably be totally useless to Staff
- 5 and to the Commission because there wasn't an auditor
- 6 involved, and Mr. Wilkowski is not an auditor and
- 7 neither am I.
- 8 I guess I look to Staff to see if those
- 9 things I sent down on Friday are helpful or useless or
- 10 somewhere in between.
- MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, may I
- 12 respond?
- JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Sure.
- MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Quickly to say that
- 15 Mr. Gene Eckhardt is sitting next to me, and he told me
- 16 that he expects that it will take considerably shorter
- 17 than the three months that I just stated to go through
- 18 those responses. He estimates about one month, but we
- 19 know that there is always some back and forth when an
- 20 auditor does go through the information that a company
- 21 provides.
- 22 As to the document that Mr. Sells provided me
- 23 with last week, this is very similar to a document that
- 24 Staff has already received, and it may be helpful to go
- 25 off the record at this point and discuss that in more

0033

- 1 detail.
- 2 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: Okay. Why don't we go
- 3 ahead and do that. When we come back on the record, I
- 4 have a few questions about the request that Staff has
- 5 made of Points regarding is this an audit for one
- 6 year's worth of figures, or are we talking about a much
- 7 more expanded audit? That will kind of give me a
- 8 better gauge of how long it's going to take for Staff
- 9 to process it if it's more than one year's worth of
- 10 numbers.
- 11 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, it's for
- 12 a test year. Basically, the data request encompasses
- 13 most of what a company would normally file for a
- 14 general rate increase, and I believe we will need to
- 15 set a deadline to get these responses in before we can
- 16 proceed to set a procedural schedule.
- JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: So then that goes into my
- 18 second question which was do you anticipate going back
- 19 to prefiling testimony, et cetera, or of the deadlines
- 20 that have been previously suspended, picking up where
- 21 we left off, or are you anticipating that this might
- 22 become a much shorter proceeding once you have all your
- 23 figures?
- MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Your Honor, the
- 25 reason that I originally suggested suspension, and this

- 1 is speaking from my perspective, is that once this
- 2 information was in, it could be that it would help the
- 3 parties resolve the case, and if not the parties,
- 4 perhaps the ultimate decision maker, but we just don't
- 5 know at this time.
- 6 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: That's understandable.
- 7 If no one has anything else to add, we will go off the
- 8 record, and I will leave the room and let the parties
- 9 discuss what needs to be discussed as far as Mr. Sells'
- 10 filing from Friday. We are off the record.
- 11 (Discussion off the record.)
- 12 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: While we were off the
- 13 record, the parties discussed possible discovery
- 14 scheduling revisions, and I believe that April 24th has
- 15 been decided as the date for responses to the second
- 16 set of data requests?
- 17 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: That's correct, Your
- 18 Honor.
- 19 JUDGE FRIEDLANDER: We have agreed that
- 20 Staff needs approximately six weeks to go over those
- 21 before the parties will be in a better position to know
- 22 whether discovery needs to continue or we can set
- 23 another schedule, so we will have a telephonic status
- 24 conference on Friday, June 5th, at 1:30 p.m. Is there
- 25 anything else that the parties needed to discuss with

```
0035
    me procedurally? Hearing nothing, this hearing is
1
     adjourned. Thank you.
 2
 3
              (Prehearing adjourned at 1:45 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```