```
00001
              BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
 1
                    TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 3
     WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
                                  ) Docket No. TG-010611
                                  ) Volume I
     TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,
 4
                                   ) Pages 1 to 10
                   Complainant,
 5
               vs.
 6
     BREM-AIR DISPOSAL, INC.,
 7
                    Respondent.
 8
 9
                A prehearing conference in the above matter
10
11
     was held on September 21, 2001, at 10:00 a.m., at 1300
     South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 206, Olympia,
12
13
     Washington, before Administrative Law Judge ROBERT
14
     WALLIS.
15
                The parties were present as follows:
                THE COMMISSION, by DONALD T. TROTTER, Senior
16
     Assistant Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park
17
     Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington 98504-0128.
                BREM-AIR DISPOSAL, INC., by POLLY L. MCNEILL,
18
     Attorney at Law, Summit Law Group, 1505 Westlake Avenue
19
     North, Suite 300, Seattle, Washington 98109.
20
21
22
23
24
     Joan E. Kinn, CCR, RPR
25
```

Court Reporter

0000	02						
1							
2	INDEX OF EXHIBITS						
3							
4							
5	EXHIBIT:	MARKED:	ADMITTED:				
6	1	4	4				
7	2	4	4				
8	3	4	4				
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

```
00003
                     PROCEEDINGS
1
               JUDGE WALLIS: The conference will please
3
    come to order.
               This is a prehearing conference in the matter
5
    of Commission Docket Number TG-010611. And it's being
6
    held in Olympia, Washington on September 21 of the year
7
    2001. My name is Robert Wallis. I am the presiding
8
    Administrative Law Judge. I am substituting for Judge
9
    Berg, who is otherwise occupied this morning with a
10
    commitment that takes precedence over this proceeding.
11
    And either he or I will be assisting the commissioners
12
    in further stages of this proceeding.
13
               I would like to begin by asking for
14
    appearances and begin with the Complainant.
15
               MR. TROTTER: For the Commission, my name is
16
    Donald T. Trotter, Assistant Attorney General. My
17
    address is 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest,
18
    P.O. Box 40218, Olympia, Washington.
19
               JUDGE WALLIS: And for the Respondent.
20
               MS. MCNEILL: Thank you. Polly L. McNeill
21
    for Brem-Air Disposal, Inc. My address is 1505 Westlake
    Avenue North, Suite 300, Seattle, 98109.
22
               JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much.
23
2.4
               The parties have presented to us this morning
```

a settlement agreement, a Tariff Number 16, and a draft

25

```
1
    order accepting the settlement agreement which the
    parties propose that the Commission receive and act
    upon. I would like at this time to mark the settlement
 4
    agreement as Exhibit Number 1 for identification, the
 5
    Tariff as Exhibit Number 2 for identification, and the
 6
    draft order as Exhibit Number 3 for identification.
 7
                Is there any objection to receiving those
8
    documents?
9
               MS. MCNEILL: No, Your Honor.
10
               MR. TROTTER: No.
11
                JUDGE WALLIS: Because this is a settlement,
12
     it is customary that the parties have the opportunity to
13
    demonstrate to the Commission why acceptance of the
14
     settlement is consistent with the responsibilities of
15
     the Commission and with the public interest. Are the
16
    parties prepared to proceed with such statements?
17
               MR. TROTTER: Yes.
18
               MS. MCNEILL: Yes.
19
               JUDGE WALLIS: Who would like to go first?
20
               MR. TROTTER: I would be happy to.
21
               JUDGE WALLIS: Mr. Trotter.
22
               MR. TROTTER: But before I do that, just a
    formality if you could, I don't remember whether you
23
24
     called for interventions or not. Perhaps you could go
25
    through that formality so that it's on the record that
```

00005 interventions were called. I don't think there are any, but at least we'll have it on the record. JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you, Mr. Trotter. 4 Let me ask at this time if there are any 5 persons present either in the hearing room or on the 6 bridge line who wish to state an appearance this 7 morning? 8 Let the record show that there is no response, and consequently there being no persons here 9 10 to state an appearance, there are no potential 11 interveners present. 12 Thank you. 13 MR. TROTTER: Thank you. 14 JUDGE WALLIS: Please proceed. MR. TROTTER: Thank you. 15 16 As the second page of the --17 JUDGE WALLIS: Would you pull the microphone

18 a little bit closer, please.

MR. TROTTER: As the second page of the 19 20 Exhibit 1 agreement indicates, when this case first came 21 before the Commission, the Commission Staff had not yet completed its investigation of the filing. Accordingly, 22 23 the filing was suspended I believe on June 13th of this 2.4 year. And subsequent to that time, the Commission 25 Staff, primarily Nicki Johnson, completed its

2.4

investigation. What is attached to the settlement agreement is the financial analysis.

The first attachment is the results of her investigation showing that the company has a net revenue deficiency less than what it originally claimed. The Staff reviewed the rate design proposals and found them acceptable. Particularly in the drop box area, there was some redesign of the rates. But fundamentally this is the, had this filing not needed to be suspended at that time, this is what the Staff would have brought to the Commission for approval. So it is the result of that investigation and with, of course, with the cooperation of the company that this result is before you.

But the Staff did its work, and this is what it determined based on its audit was an acceptable result based on the records of the company and the investigation that the Staff made, so it is on that basis that the Staff believes that these rates are fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient. As you do note on the financial results page, it shows an operating ratio at the pro forma level that's within the range that the Commission has found acceptable. So I just want to emphasize this is what the Commission Staff would have recommended to the Commission at an open public meeting,

25

1 and that's what we're recommending here. JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you. 3 Ms. McNeill. 4 MS. MCNEILL: Thank you. 5 As the record shows, Brem-Air Disposal 6 originally made a filing seeking a revenue requirement 7 of \$656,506. It was a good faith filing based on our 8 initial belief of what our needed revenues were. We 9 looked forward to and anticipated working with Staff on 10 that filing, as is typically done, and were able and 11 successful in working through with Staff in their 12 investigation in identifying areas where the revenue 13 requirement could be reduced and adjusted and reallocated based on certain different factors. As 14 15 Mr. Trotter said, were it not for the time frames 16 requiring a suspension, this probably would not have had 17 a suspension on it had there been a greater amount of 18 time to work with the Staff and the company in resolving 19 these areas. 20 So we are satisfied that the adjusted revenue 21 requirement that was worked out with Staff and from both the company and the Commission is just, fair, and 22 23 sufficient for the company's needs and that the final 2.4 rates which are reflected on the attachment of the last

page to the settlement agreement are rates that are

25

just, fair, and reasonable to the customers, and we support this. And again, to echo Mr. Trotter's comments, had this come before the Commission, we would have stood up and supported this filing. 5 JUDGE WALLIS: Thank you very much. Have the 6 parties calculated the percentage increases that result? 7 I know that's easily calculable from the table that is 8 appended, but I'm wondering if that calculation has been 9 made and if it could be stated for the record to save me 10 going to my calculator and risking hitting the wrong 11 button. 12 MR. TROTTER: Your Honor, as the agreement 13 indicates, the increase to most rates was 4.9%. I 14 believe that that's reflected if you compare current 15 rates to substitute tariff page rates on the table, it's 16 right in that range. The exception is the drop box 17 rates, which some go up substantially, some go down 18 substantially, and I believe there's also some 19 statistics in the agreement showing those percentages. If you would like, we could, probably should have, put a 20 21 percentage, the exact percentage, in an additional column on the table, but I believe it's right in the 22 23 range of 4.9%. 2.4 JUDGE WALLIS: Very well. Does any party

have anything further to state at this time?

5

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2.4

25

1 MR. TROTTER: The only other thing I would state, Your Honor, is that this is an agreed result subject to Commission approval. The company has requested the rates be effective October 1st of this year, which is several days from now, but not a long 6 time from now. The Staff for its part would be willing 7 to waive a proposed order. I assume the company will, and they can speak for themselves. If there's anything else that would be required of us to accomplish that, we 10 would be happy to try to accommodate. 11 JUDGE WALLIS: Ms. McNeill. 12 MS. MCNEILL: Yes, I was going to add that, 13

you know, the revenue requirement is premised on an effective date of October 1st, and if we're not able to achieve that, then we will have to come back and recalculate, so we're all hopeful that we will be able to achieve that. Mindful that it's not a lot of time between now and October 1st, we are definitely willing to waive a proposed order, and mindful that this is subject to the Commission's approval, and certainly would make ourselves available should there be any need for any questions to be answered or information provided to facilitate that approval process.

JUDGE WALLIS: Very well, and we will do our best to expedite the processing of this matter and to

```
00010
1 see that an order is entered within the time frame
    recommended. If there are any further questions, may we
   make those via electronic mail to counsel with copy to
   other counsel?
5
               MR. TROTTER: Certainly.
6
               MS. MCNEILL: Absolutely.
7
               JUDGE WALLIS: Very well, is there anything
8
   further?
9
               MS. MCNEILL: No, sir.
10
               MR. TROTTER: No.
11
               JUDGE WALLIS: Okay, thank you very much.
               (Hearing adjourned at 10:10 a.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```