```
00001
              BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
 1
                    TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 3
     WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
                                   ) Docket No. UW-010877
     TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,
                                   ) Volume I
 4
                                   ) Pages 1 to 19
                     Complainant,
 5
               vs.
 6
     RAINIER VIEW WATER COMPANY,
 7
     INC.,
 8
                     Respondent.
 9
10
11
                A prehearing conference in the above matter
     was held on September 20, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., at 1300
12
13
     South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 108, Olympia,
     Washington, before Administrative Law Judge MARJORIE R.
14
15
     SCHAER.
16
                The parties were present as follows:
                THE COMMISSION, by MARY M. TENNYSON, Senior
17
     Assistant Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park
     Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington 98504-0128.
18
19
                RAINIER VIEW WATER COMPANY, INC., by GWYN ANN
     TAYLOR, Attorney at Law, 2405 Evergreen Park Drive
20
     Southwest, Suite B-3, Olympia, Washington 98502.
21
22
23
24
     Joan E. Kinn, CCR, RPR
25
    Court Reporter
```

```
00002
                     PROCEEDINGS
1
               JUDGE SCHAER: Let's be on the record. We're
3
    here this morning for a hearing in Docket Number
4
    UW-010877. This is a filing by Rainier View Water
5
    Company requesting a general rate increase. We are in
6
    the Commission's Hearing Room 108 in the Commission
7
    headquarters building in Olympia, Washington. Today is
8
    September 20th, 2001. I'm Marjorie Schaer, and I'm the
9
    Administrative Law Judge assigned by the Commission to
10
    this proceeding.
11
               I would like to start by taking appearances
12
    from all the parties, and please state for the record
13
    your name, your client, your address, telephone, fax,
14
    and E-mail address if you use one, and we will start
15
    with you, Ms. Taylor.
16
               MS. TAYLOR: My name is Gwyn Ann Taylor. I'm
17
    appearing on behalf of Richard Finnegan, who is the
18
    attorney representing Rainier View Water. I don't have
19
    my -- I just started working with Mr. Finnegan, and my
20
    phone number information is in my car.
21
               MS. TENNYSON: (Indicates.)
22
               MS. TAYLOR: Okay, thank you.
               His phone number is 756-7001, fax number
23
```

753-6862, at 2405 Evergreen Park Drive Southwest,

Olympia, Washington 98502, and that is Suite B-1.

2.4

25

```
00003
               JUDGE SCHAER: Okay. And you had indicated
1
    that you're appearing for Mr. Finnegan.
3
               MS. TAYLOR: Yes.
4
               JUDGE SCHAER: Would you explain that; are
5
    you another attorney in the firm?
6
               MS. TAYLOR: Yes, I am.
7
               JUDGE SCHAER: And who is your client? I'm
8
    sure it's not Mr. Finnegan.
9
               MS. TAYLOR: No, it's Rainier View Water.
10
               JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you.
11
               Ms. Tennyson.
12
               MS. TENNYSON: Thank you. My name is Mary M.
13
    Tennyson, Senior Assistant Attorney General, appearing
14
    for Commission Staff. My address is 1400 South
15
    Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Post Office Box 40128,
16
    Olympia, Washington 98504-0128. My telephone number is
    (360) 664-1220, fax number is (360) 586-5522, E-mail is
17
18
    mtennyso@wutc.wa.gov.
19
               JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, thank you.
20
               And I had some indication in the file that
21
    Public Counsel might be involved. Do you know if they
22
    are planning to participate?
23
               MS. TENNYSON: I do not believe they are.
               JUDGE SCHAER: All right, thank you.
2.4
25
               Are there any preliminary matters to come
```

1 before the Commission at this time? MS. TENNYSON: No, there are not. 3 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, then this morning, we 4 need to review the issues presented in the matter and 5 develop a schedule for resolving the issues. We will 6 talk about whether there is a need for a protective 7 order. We will talk about discovery. We will talk 8 about a couple of issues that are raised by your 9 transmittal letter, Ms. Taylor, regarding whether there 10 needs to be a rule waiver of the filing rule. And at 11 the end of this matter, we will talk about how you file 12 things. We will talk a bit about alternative dispute 13 resolution. And when we finish, hopefully we will have 14 a procedural outline for how we're going to go forward 15 and get this case decided. 16 So first thing I would like to take up is 17 whether there's going to be a need for a protective 18 order, and in this question, I note that in your 19 transmittal letter, Ms. Taylor, your client already has 20 filed its work papers with a confidential designation. 21 Are you going to be asking the Commission to enter a 22 protective order? 23 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, we are. 2.4 JUDGE SCHAER: Does the Staff have any 25 objection to having a protective order in this

00005 1 proceeding? MS. TENNYSON: No, Staff does not object. 3 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, then a protective order 4 will be issued. 5 The next item I notice in your transmittal letter is that the final paragraph, Ms. Taylor, contains 6 7 what may be a request for waiver of the requirements of 8 WAC 480-09-337, and I would like to discuss that for a moment to see what, if anything, in particular you had 9 10 in mind and find out what, if anything, that does to our 11 ability to get this case done in an expeditious manner. 12 If there are things that should have been filed, that 13 should be before the Commission at the beginning of this 14 proceeding that we don't have yet and that's going to 15 push out time lines, I would like to know that before we 16 talk about what the suspension date should be and talk 17 about a schedule. So do you know what that paragraph is 18 referring to, or would you like just a moment to review 19 that? 20 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, please. Is that the 21 discovery rule? 22 JUDGE SCHAER: Actually, that is the Commission filing requirements. If you don't have a 23 2.4 copy of that rule available, I can get one for you. 25 MS. TAYLOR: 480?

25

1 JUDGE SCHAER: It's 480-09-337, and it's referenced in the last paragraph of your client's transmittal letter. And actually, looking at my rules, 4 I'm a little bit confused about even what you're 5 referring to in the letter. 6 MS. TENNYSON: I believe I could shed some 7 light on that. 8 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, Ms. Tennyson, go ahead, 9 please. 10 MS. TENNYSON: There had been an earlier filing by the company of a general rate case in which 11 12 the Commission Staff rejected the filing because it did 13 not have adequate supporting information, did not have 14 the schedules and detail behind it that the rule 15 requires the filing for a general rate case to contain. 16 And I believe that the request for waiver was primarily 17 a cautionary measure by the company to attempt to avoid 18 a rejection of the filing out of hand. 19 There were some items that Staff felt should 20 have been included in the filing and were not, and I 21 believe that many of those items have been obtained from 22 the company at this point by requests, oral or written. 23 I have, in fact, in my file a transmittal letter. One 24 of the things that I spoke directly with Mr. Finnegan

about was that the filing did not include a copy of the

21

22 23

2.4

25

notice sent to customers, and he did send that, 1 including a written transmittal letter so that we have a record that it was provided. So I believe that was the nature of it. I 5 think any other items that were not included in the 6 filing and Staff still feels are important, we are 7 prepared to issue data requests shortly after this 8 hearing, presuming the discovery rule is invoked without 9 objection, that would fill out the information that we 10 need. 11 MS. TAYLOR: And we would like to invoke the 12 discovery rule. 13 JUDGE SCHAER: I guess the first thing that 14 I'm having a problem with is that the letter refers to 15 WAC 480-09-337, and in looking for that rule, I don't 16 have one in my book, so I have just confirmed that there 17 isn't one in the WAC volume either, so let's first make 18 sure we're all talking about the same rule. 19 MS. TAYLOR: That's quite a good question. 20

JUDGE SCHAER: I think that might be a good place to start our discussion. Was that intended to be a reference to WAC 480-09-330, Ms. Taylor? And again, if you need a copy, I can provide it, and we will look for one.

MS. TAYLOR: I believe it is.

00008 1 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay. MS. TAYLOR: I'm looking at my copy of the 3 rules, and I don't see the reference that you cited, but I do see 330 regarding general rate increases. 5 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, and have you filed all 6 of the information that you have filed in electronic 7 format as well as a paper format? 8 MS. TAYLOR: I do not know at this time. 9 JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, I'm going to tell you 10 that if you have not, I am not going to waive the 11 requirements of WAC 480-09-331 sub B. And if you have 12 not filed your materials electronically, I would like 13 those to be filed electronically within the week, 14 please. And we will be discussing filing requirements 15 later in this prehearing conference, but I would like 16 both parties to strictly adhere to the requirements for 17 electronic filing of documents. 18 MS. TAYLOR: I will confirm that. 19 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you. 20 And then perhaps, Ms. Tennyson, do we have 21 the detailed portrayal of restating actual and pro forma adjustments included; are you aware of that from your 22 23 review? 2.4 MS. TENNYSON: Yes, I believe we do. I don't 25 believe we have it from the company in electronic format

25

at this point, but we do have hard copy. 1 JUDGE SCHAER: All right, and that's required to be in the work papers, and I don't believe they are required to be filed electronically. Actually, they 5 are, excuse me, looking at the rules, so those matters 6 should be provided electronically as well then. 7 Are there any studies that the company relies 8 on that differ in their methodology from studies that 9 have been used in prior rate proceedings? I know the 10 Commission has had particular problems in that area of 11 seeing new studies that use a different methodology but 12 not having the studies required by our rule that use the 13 former methodology and then the description of what in 14 the studies had changed. I'm trying to avoid some of 15 the problems that has caused in other proceedings by 16 addressing that up front in this one. Perhaps as part 17 of your review, Ms. Taylor, you could check into that as 18 well. 19 MS. TAYLOR: I will do that. 20 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you. 21 Is there anything more that we need to 22 discuss in terms of the filing rules? MS. TENNYSON: I don't believe there is. 23 2.4 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you.

I will point out that the items that the

00010 1 company files in response to data requests go to Staff but do not come to the Bench. MS. TAYLOR: Okay. 4 JUDGE SCHAER: And so one of the reasons I 5 like to make sure that what's supposed to be in the file 6 which is available to me is complete is that sometimes 7 there are materials that the Bench needs that the 8 parties have access to the Bench does not have access 9 MS. TAYLOR: Including the electronic 10 11 filings? 12 JUDGE SCHAER: Yeah, I use the electronic 13 materials extensively. 14 MS. TAYLOR: So I copy you on that? 15 JUDGE SCHAER: Actually, if they are filed in 16 the case, then they will be available to me as part of 17 the filing. 18 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. 19 JUDGE SCHAER: Then I believe that you have 20 indicated, Ms. Tennyson, it is your intention to ask 21 that the discovery provisions of WAC 480-09-480 be

triggered and that all of those discovery methods be 23 available in this proceeding; is that correct? 2.4 MS. TENNYSON: Yes, it is.

22

25

JUDGE SCHAER: And do you have any objection

```
1
    to that, Ms. Taylor?
               MS. TAYLOR: No objection.
 3
                JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, then that rule will be
 4
     triggered, and those discovery methods are available.
5
    Encourage the parties, it sounds like you have already
 6
    begun informal discovery, I would encourage you to
 7
    continue informal discovery as if the written prehearing
8
     conference order were already issued triggering that
9
    rule and to work as cooperatively as you can in
10
    exchanging information.
11
               MS. TAYLOR: Can you give me that cite again,
12
    480-09?
13
               JUDGE SCHAER: 480.
14
               Okay, then the next topic I would like to
15
     take up is a schedule for the remainder of the
16
     proceeding, and I believe that you indicated,
17
    Ms. Tennyson, that this is a topic that the parties have
18
    discussed previously. I think perhaps it would be wise
     if we were to go off the record for a few moments to
19
20
    discuss the schedule and what the suspension date is and
21
    how that works into the schedule, so let's go off the
    record for a moment for that purpose.
22
23
                (Discussion off the record.)
2.4
                JUDGE SCHAER: Let's be back on the record
25
    after a scheduling discussion and also a discussion of
```

2.4

the water rules and the Commission's filing requirements. I would first like to note that there is, in fact, a WAC 480-09-337 and that it was adopted and became effective December 31st, 1999, and is not yet in certain rule books but is certainly the filing rule that governs this proceeding.

And looking at that rule, I would like to be sure that the parties review this rule and that the matters that are required are provided, and I have asked Rainier View to review the items that are listed here and to make electronic copies of those items available as part of its filing in this matter.

In a few moments, we will be discussing filings that are required and how they should be filed, and I will be seeking to have anything that's filed with the Commission in this matter filed electronically simply because that makes our work more efficient and also helps us to avoid any missing of items that we can not use search engines for when they are not available electronically. It helps us make sure that what we do is both efficiently done and is complete and accurate.

In terms of a schedule for the remainder of the proceeding, parties had discussed this before the hearing, which I commend you for, and I believe, Ms. Tennyson, that you have that schedule available. I

1 would ask you to read it into the record at this point. MS. TENNYSON: Thank you. Rainier View Water will pre-file its direct testimony and supporting exhibits on October 26th. The Commission Staff will 5 pre-file its direct testimony and supporting exhibits on 6 December 5th. Rainier View will file its rebuttal 7 testimony and exhibits on December 21st. The hearing 8 dates will be January 14th and 15th, 2002. And the 9 parties will submit simultaneous briefs on January 31st, 10 2002. 11 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you. And I believe as 12 part of our discussion, we discussed the benefits of the 13 parties preparing an outline at the end of the hearing 14 that each will follow in writing the briefs so that 15 issues that are disputed between the parties are clearly 16 framed and can be discussed in a way that we're talking 17 apples to apples in making comparisons and making 18 decisions, and I believe you indicated that the parties 19 would be willing to provide that outline at the end of 20 the hearings. Is that correct, Ms. Tennyson? 21 MS. TENNYSON: That is correct. JUDGE SCHAER: And do you agree with that, 22 23 Ms. Taylor? MS. TAYLOR: Yes. 2.4

25 JUDGE SCHAER: And with the rest of the

1 schedule as well? MS. TAYLOR: Yes. 3 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you. 4 Okay, the next item on my agenda for this 5 hearing is a discussion of filing requirements and 6 copies of materials. As we discussed a moment ago, I 7 find it very useful to have electronic copies of all 8 matters that are filed, and it is the Commission's 9 request that all filings should be directed to the 10 Commission's secretary at the Commission's address, 11 which will be provided in the order, or by hand delivery 12 to the Commission's secretary through the Commission's 13 records center. 14 An original plus 10 copies of all pleadings, 15 motions, briefs, and other pre-filed materials must be 16 filed with the Commission. We determine the number of 17 copies by reviewing the Commission's internal 18 distribution list and finding out how many copies we're 19 actually going to need to distribute in the building and 20 then give you that number so that you will not need to 21 make the usual original plus 19. We don't want to waste 22 paper. We also don't want the records center to have to make extra copies of things that come in, so that 23 2.4 original plus 10 will be adequate for our needs in this 25 matter.

25

1 We also ask the parties to furnish separately a 3.5 inch IBM formatted high density diskette including the filed documents in PDF format, Microsoft Word 97 or later, or Word Perfect 6.0 or later format. 5 Filings by facsimile may be allowed on 6 request by a party or required by the Bench if necessary 7 to expedite a particular process. In general, filing by 8 facsimile is not available unless it is approved in 9 advance. When filing by facsimile is allowed or 10 required, please use the Commission's facsimile number, 11 which is (360) 586-1150. 12 Are there any questions about those filing 13 requirements? 14 MS. TAYLOR: No questions. 15 JUDGE SCHAER: Thank you. MS. TENNYSON: Your Honor, I think it would 16 17 be also appropriate to specify a format for spreadsheets 18 since we are talking accounting adjustments, and 19 certainly I know the format we use here at the 20 Commission is in Excel format, and many times companies 21 do not keep their books in that format, so we would ask that electronic copies of any spreadsheets or exhibits 22 23 be filed in Excel format. JUDGE SCHAER: And do you have that format 2.4

available to you, or does your client, Ms. Taylor; do

```
1
    you know?
               MS. TAYLOR: I believe so; I will confirm
 3
    that.
               JUDGE SCHAER: Okay, thank you.
5
               MS. TAYLOR: But I believe we do.
 6
               JUDGE SCHAER: If you do, then please use
 7
    that. If there is a problem ever with format, then
8
    please do contact Ms. Tennyson, and we do have some very
9
    good computer support at the Commission and can figure
10
    out how to resolve some problems of working with one
11
    format and converting it to another if we can get the
12
    right people talking to each other, and we're happy to
13
    do that.
14
               MS. TAYLOR: Sounds great, thank you.
15
               JUDGE SCHAER: I would like a brief
16
    discussion at this point of the issues that parties see
17
     coming before the Commission. I understand that this is
18
     a general rate filing and that there are probably going
19
     to be many adjustments proposed, and Staff may not know
    yet which ones of those it will have concerns about.
20
21
    But are there some bigger issues that are going to be
22
    presented that the parties are familiar with at this
23
    point?
2.4
               Ms. Tennyson, would you like to go first?
25
               MS. TENNYSON: Certainly. We have had some
```

2.4

meetings with the company representatives and
Mr. Finnegan to discuss some of them, and I have also
had a brief discussion with Mr. Finnegan yesterday that
we might meet again sometime in the next couple of weeks
to try to reach agreement, stipulated most of the
numbers, have reached stipulations on those.

I think there's a couple of major issues and then some other minor adjustments, but the major issues relate to imputation of taxes to the company. This company is a Sub Chapter S corporation, and therefore the corporation does not pay income taxes, and the company's rates, proposed rates, include imputed income taxes for the company, and Staff does dispute that.

There is an issue of treatment of ready to serve revenues that the company has been collecting. The company has not included those in its regulated revenues but has treated them as non-regulated revenues. Staff believes those should be included in the operating income of the company, and that therefore affects the rates.

I believe there are some issues relating to salary amounts for particular individuals affiliated with the corporation and amounts of rent paid by the corporation for its offices.

And certainly there's other minor

2.4

adjustments, but I believe those would be the major issues we would be contesting.

JUDGE SCHAER: And are you aware of other major issues, Ms. Taylor?

MS. TAYLOR: I'm not aware of any other major issues.

JUDGE SCHAER: Okay. I will refer both parties to the Commission rules about alternative dispute resolution and settlement and indicate that it is the Commission's policy to encourage alternative dispute resolution where it is useful and can resolve issues or partially resolve issues and encourage you to continue your discussion about stipulations that may remove the need for fact findings on numbers that the parties can agree to or other matters that the parties can agree to.

I will also indicate that the Commission will make available on request services of an administrative law judge, probably a judge other than me unless I would then not be doing the rest of the proceeding, to discuss either in the role of a settlement judge or a mediator whether there is possible resolution of any other issues that you might want to frame and bring to us in that way. So I am pleased to hear that you have had conversations ongoing and would encourage you to

continue those, and the Commission can be useful to the parties in helping reach some kind of a resolution. Please know that those kinds of services are available 4 and that we are willing and happy to help resolve what 5 we can. 6 So at this point, we have triggered the 7 discovery rule, we will have a protective order, we have 8 a schedule for the remainder of the proceeding, we have 9 discussed filing requirements, we have discussed in 10 general the issues that are before the Commission. Is 11 there anything further that needs to come before the 12 Commission this morning? 13 MS. TENNYSON: Staff does not have anything. 14 MS. TAYLOR: Rainier does not have anything 15 else. 16 JUDGE SCHAER: All right, then thank you for 17 your participation and cooperation, and this hearing 18 will be adjourned. 19 (Hearing adjourned at 10:15 a.m.) 20

21 22 23

2.4 25