

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) DOCKET UW-091050
) (<i>consolidated</i>)
)
Complainant,) ORDER 03
)
v.)
) INITIAL ORDER APPROVING
BURTON WATER COMPANY, INC.,) TARIFF FILINGS; APPROVING
) AND ADOPTING SETTLEMENT
Respondent.) STIPULATION ; REQUIRING
) COMPLIANCE FILING
.....)
)
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) DOCKET UW-091051
) (<i>consolidated</i>)
)
Complainant,) ORDER 03
)
v.)
) INITIAL ORDER REJECTING
BURTON WATER COMPANY, INC.,) TARIFF FILINGS; APPROVING
) AND ADOPTING SETTLEMENT
Respondent.) STIPULATION ; REQUIRING
) COMPLIANCE FILING
.....)

1 ***SYNOPSIS:*** *This is an Administrative Law Judge’s Initial Order that is not effective unless approved by the Commission or allowed to become effective pursuant to the notice at the end of this Order. This Order would approve and adopt the parties’ Settlement Stipulation resolving the contested issues in these consolidated cases. By approving the Settlement, the Order approves an increase in annual revenues of approximately 17.8 percent, approves changes to existing miscellaneous charges and allows new miscellaneous charges and changes to tariff language.*

MEMORANDUM

2 **PROCEEDINGS:** This consolidated proceeding involves tariff filings in Dockets UW-091050 and UW-091051, in which Burton Water Company, Inc. (Burton Water or Company) requests a general rate increase (Docket UW-091051) as well as

increases in ancillary charges (Docket UW-091050) for service connection, account set-up, processing Non-Sufficient Funds checks and water availability. The tariff filing in Docket UW-091050 also proposes charges for unauthorized meter lock removal, and clarifies and adds language to tariff rules relating to irrigation, limitation on liability, unauthorized use and cross connection control.

3 **APPEARANCES.** Richard A. Finnigan, attorney, Olympia, Washington, represents Burton Water. Donald T. Trotter, Assistant Attorney General, Olympia, Washington, represents the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission's (Commission) regulatory staff (Commission Staff or Staff).¹

4 **BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY.** Burton Water serves approximately 415 customers on Vashon Island in King County. The Company last filed for a general rate increase in March 2008.

5 On June 30, 2009, Burton Water filed with the Commission in Docket UW-091051 revisions to its currently effective Tariff WN-U2, designed to effect a general rate increase for water service.² In the filing, the Company requested an annual revenue increase of \$60,485, or 37.8 percent. Several customers filed comments with the Commission objecting to the increase.³ After considering the matter at the July 30, 2009, open meeting, the Commission suspended the effect of these tariff changes by complaint and order.⁴

¹ In formal proceedings, such as this, the Commission's regulatory staff participates like any other party, while the presiding administrative law judge and the Commissioners make the decision. To assure fairness, the Commissioners, the presiding administrative law judge, and the Commissioners' policy and accounting advisors do not discuss the merits of this proceeding with the regulatory staff, or any other party, without giving notice and opportunity for all parties to participate. *See, RCW 34.05.455.*

² The Company designated the new tariff sheets as Fourth Revised Sheet No. 22 Canceling Third Revised Sheet No. 22, and Second Revised Sheet No. 23 Canceling First Revised Sheet No. 23. The stated effective date of the tariff filing is August 1, 2009.

³ *See* July 30, 2009, memorandum of Commission Staff filed in Docket UW-091051.

⁴ *Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Burton Water Company, Inc.*, Docket UW-091051, Order 01, Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions (July 30, 2009).

- 6 Also on June 30, 2009, Burton Water filed with the Commission other revisions to its currently effective Tariff WN-U2, proposing to increase certain charges for items other than water consumption. These charges relate to service reconnection, account set-up, Non-Sufficient Funds (NSF) check charges, and water availability charges, as well as new charges for cross connection site visit, cross connection inspection, and unauthorized meter lock removal. This tariff filing also proposed to clarify rules related to irrigation, and add language on limitation of liability, unauthorized use of service and cross connection control. By complaint and order dated July 30, 2009, following the open meeting on the same date, the Commission suspended the effect of these proposed tariff changes.⁵
- 7 On November 19, 2009, the Commission issued an order consolidating the two dockets and setting a prehearing conference for December 11, 2009.⁶ The order identified Administrative Law Judge Ann E. Rendahl as the presiding officer.
- 8 By letter dated December 10, 2009, the Company and Commission Staff, the only parties to the proceeding, requested the Commission cancel the prehearing conference because the parties had reached an agreement in principle, which, if approved by the Commission, would resolve all of the issues in these dockets.
- 9 On December 23, 2009, the parties jointly filed a Settlement Stipulation (Settlement) with the Commission. On the same day, Commission Staff filed the Testimony of Jim Ward, and the Company filed the Testimony of Jim Garrison, both in support of the Settlement.
- 10 The presiding administrative law judge, Ann E. Rendahl, issued three bench requests to the Company and Commission Staff on January 4, 2010. On January 6, 2010, Staff filed responses to the bench requests. By letter dated the same day, counsel for Burton Water concurred in Staff's responses to the bench requests and reported that

⁵ *Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Burton Water Company, Inc.*, Docket UW-091050, Order 01, Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions (July 30, 2009).

⁶ While the order consolidating and setting the two dockets for hearing was identified as Order 01, the order should have been identified as Order 02 in the respective dockets. For that reason, this initial order is identified as Order 03 in the respective dockets.

the Company has posted the Settlement Stipulation on its Web site. Burton Water filed a replacement letter with the Commission on January 7, 2010.

- 11 **SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.** In the Settlement Stipulation, Burton Water and Staff resolve all disputed issues related to the two suspended tariff filings. The parties agree to a revised general rate increase of \$28,502 (17.8 percent), as well as a revised rate spread and rate design. Tariff sheets implementing the rate spread and rate design for the general rate increase are set forth in Appendix A to the Settlement. The parties also agree to implement the tariff changes proposed in Docket UW-091051, set forth in tariff sheets in Appendix B to the Settlement. The Settlement Stipulation, complete with Appendices A and B, is attached as an attachment to this Order, and incorporated by reference as if set forth in the Order.
- 12 ***Revenue Increase and Effective Date.*** The parties agree that Burton Water should be allowed to increase annual revenues from its customers by \$28,502 (17.8 percent) of test year revenues. The parties agree that the rate changes in the Settlement Stipulation will be effective the first day of the month after the Commission approves the Settlement.⁷
- 13 ***Rate Spread and Rate Design for Revenue Increase.*** The parties agree to an increased rate for customers served by a ready-to-serve charge equal to the base charge for customers served by a ¾ inch meter. The parties also stipulate to an increased base rate for customers served by a 1 inch meter. The rate design for each meter size includes a base charge for zero usage, and three rate blocks with an increasing usage price through each block. Table 1, below, compares the Company's current rates, the rates proposed in its tariff filing in Docket UW-091051 and the rates agreed to in the Settlement.

⁷ Settlement Stipulation, ¶ 9. In response to Bench Request No. 1, Staff and the Company state that the effective date in paragraph 9 of the Settlement applies to tariff changes in both dockets.

Table 1
Comparison of Rates, Rate Design and Rate Spread

Monthly Rate	Current Rate	Proposed Rate	Settlement Rate	
Ready-to-Serve	\$11.00	\$27.88	\$21.59	
Base Rate (3/4 " meter)	\$18.33	\$27.88	\$21.59	
0 – 1,000 Cubic Feet (CF)	\$1.55	\$1.55	\$1.83	
1,001 – 2,500 CF	\$1.55	\$4.00	\$4.71	
Over 2,500 CF	\$4.00	\$6.00	\$6.00	
Base Rate (1 " meter)	\$18.33	\$41.77	\$36.06	
0 – 1,670 CF	\$1.55	\$1.55	0 – 4,175 CF	\$1.83
1,671 – 2,500 CF	\$1.55	\$4.00	4,175-8,350 CF	\$4.71
2,501 – 4,175 CF	\$4.00	\$4.00	Over 8,350 CF	\$6.00
Over 4,175 CF	\$4.00	\$6.00	N/A	N/A

14 The proposed Settlement rates will result in an average monthly bill of \$34.20 based on an average monthly usage of 689 cubic feet, or a 17.8 percent increase.⁸ Table 2, below, prepared by Commission Staff in response to Bench Request No. 2, demonstrates the difference in the average customers rates between current rates and the proposed Settlement rates.

Table 2
Average Bill Comparison

Average Monthly Usage 689 cubic feet	Current Rate	Proposed Rate	Settlement Rate
Base Rate (3/4 inch meter)	\$18.33	\$27.88	\$21.59
Usage – 689 cubic feet	\$10.68	\$10.68	\$12.61
Average Monthly Bill	\$29.01	\$38.56	\$34.20
Increase From Current Rates		32.9 %	17.8 %

The parties filed proposed tariff pages to implement these rates as Appendix A to the Settlement.

15 **Miscellaneous Charges.** The parties agree that the proposed changes to miscellaneous and ancillary charges in the proposed tariff filed in Docket UW-

⁸ See Staff's Response to Bench Request No. 2, filed January 6, 2010; see also Burton Water Replacement Letter in Response to Bench Requests, filed January 7, 2010.

091050 should be implemented as originally filed.⁹ The parties also agree that the proposed tariff changes in Docket UW-091050 will become effective on the first day of the month after the Commission approves the Settlement.¹⁰

16 The proposed tariff changes, as outlined in Mr. Ward's testimony and in Table 3 below, include:

- An increase in the **service reconnection fee** to \$50.00 to compensate the Company for the expense to send a service technician to a customer's property to reconnect or turn on services, as well as administrative costs.
- An increase in the **account set-up fee** to \$20.00 to compensate the Company for the cost to send a service technician to inspect a customer's property to ensure it is ready for service, take an initial meter reading, and administrative costs.
- An increase in the **NSF check charge fee** to \$40.00 to compensate the Company for the cost of processing NSF charges and administrative costs.
- An increase in the water availability charge to \$25.00 to allow the Company to recover the administrative cost of researching property water availability.
- A new charge of \$50.00 to recover the costs for a **cross connection site visit** to determine if a potential cross connection hazard exists, and administrative costs.
- A new **cross-connection inspection charge** of \$35.00 per hour to allow the Company to recover the costs for its service technician to perform a service inspection to determine if an actual or potential cross connection hazard exists.
- A new **unauthorized meter lock removal charge** of \$150.00 to compensate the Company for the time and materials used in implementing this new procedure.
- **Tariff rule language** changes addressing:
 - Clarification of **Irrigation rules** concerning irrigation use during water system priority uses (fire flow) and best practices for irrigation water uses;
 - **Limitation on the Company's liability;**

⁹ Settlement, ¶ 12. The parties attached as Appendix B to the Settlement the original tariff pages filed in Docket UW-091050.

¹⁰ See Staff's Response to Bench Request No. 1, filed January 6, 2010; see also Burton Water Replacement Letter in Response to Bench Requests, filed January 7, 2010.

- **Unauthorized use of service** to define unauthorized water use, practices to stop unauthorized service;
- **Cross connection control requirements** established by the state Department of Health.

Table 3
Rate Comparison

Ancillary Charge	Current Rate	Proposed Rate
Service Reconnection	\$20.00	\$50.00
Account Set-Up	\$10.00	\$20.00
NSF Check	\$5.00	\$40.00
Water Availability Letter	\$8.00	\$35.00
Cross Connection Site Visit	NA	\$50.00
Cross Connection Premise Inspection	NA	\$25.00 per hour
Unauthorized Meter Lock Removal	NA	\$150.00

17 ***Authorized Return on Rate Base.*** The parties agree that, if needed for reporting or accounting purposes, the Company may use an overall rate of return of 10.1 percent, and an authorized return on equity of 12 percent.¹¹

18 **TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT.** Commission Staff witness Mr. Ward evaluated the Company's accounting records, financial statements, annual reports, tax returns, current tariff and responses to Staff data requests in evaluating the Company's tariff filings.¹² Mr. Ward evaluated expense and income data submitted by the Company. After evaluating each expense category to determine whether each component of expense was well documented, a reasonable and prudent business expense and an allowable business expense, Mr. Ward determined the resolution of the tariff filings on the terms described in the Settlement is in the public interest.¹³ Based on the

¹¹ *Id.*, ¶ 13. See Ward, Exh. JW-1T at 12:17 – 13:18, for an explanation of the calculation of the rate of return and return on equity.

¹² Ward, Exh. JW-1T at 4: 17 – 5:6.

¹³ *Id.*, at 5: 9-22.

overall Staff analysis, Mr. Ward finds the Settlement revenue requirement is reasonable, and results in rates that are fair, just and reasonable.¹⁴

- 19 Mr. Ward identifies that the primary need for the rate increase is the Company's investment in a new storage tank, which is now operational. Staff agrees that the Company prudently incurred the plan investment, but finds that only half of the investment for the tank is appropriately included in rate base: The plant was added in the middle of the test year, and averaging the beginning and end of test year plant balances results in half of the investment being placed in rate base at this time.¹⁵
- 20 Mr. Ward asserts that the rate design – a ready-to-serve rate,¹⁶ and base monthly charges with zero water use for customers served by ¾ inch and 1 inch meters, with three rate blocks with increasing usage prices – is consistent with rate designs the Commission has approved for other water companies.¹⁷ Mr. Ward also claims this to be a conservation-oriented rate design.¹⁸
- 21 With respect to the miscellaneous and ancillary charges the Company proposed in Docket UW-091050, Mr. Ward asserts that the proposed charges are appropriate as they reflect a reasonable and prudent charge for service the Company renders, and are consistent with the charges of other Commission-regulated companies.¹⁹ Mr. Ward

¹⁴ *Id.*, at 7:1-2; 14:5-6.

¹⁵ *Id.*, at 7:3-10. While Burton Water intends to make a tariff filing in the first quarter of 2010 to recover the other half of its investment, Mr. Ward notes that nothing in the Settlement binds the Staff or the Commission from treating any future Burton Water tariff filing, such as recovery for the remaining plant investment, in any particular way. *Id.*, at 7:8-13.

¹⁶ A “ready-to-serve” rate applies to any property owner who has a completed, signed and accepted water service application, who has paid all applicable fees required for water service connection, and for whom the Company has installed the direct connection from the water system to the applicant's property line, but to whom the Company does not yet provide water. *See Id.*, at 8:18-23.

¹⁷ Ward, Exh. JW-1T at 8:3-15.

¹⁸ *Id.*, at 8:9-10.

¹⁹ *Id.*, at 9:13 – 10:3.

further states that “each charge reflects the policy that costs should be borne by the ratepayer causing the utility to incur the cost.”²⁰

22 Company witness Mr. Garrison supports the Settlement as” a compromise that balances the cost of pursuing this matter to hearing with reaching a result that is acceptable.”²¹ While Mr. Garrison expresses concern that the Company should have received a higher revenue requirement and that the rate design for customers with one inch meters does not encourage conservation, he notes the Company agreed to the Settlement as a prudent resolution of the issues.²² On behalf of the Company, Mr. Garrison urges the Commission to adopt the Settlement.²³

23 **DISCUSSION AND DECISION:** In considering settlement agreements, the Commission “may accept the proposed settlement, with or without conditions, or may reject it.”²⁴ The Commission must “determine whether a proposed settlement meets all pertinent legal and policy standards.”²⁵ The Commission may approve settlements “when doing so is lawful, when the settlement terms are supported by an appropriate record, and when the result is consistent with the public interest in light of all the information available to the commission.”²⁶

24 The proposed Settlement resolves all disputes over the proposed tariff filings in Dockets UW-091050 and UW-091051. The Settlement results in an early resolution of the parties’ disputes, even prior to a prehearing conference, and conserves valuable party and Commission resources that would otherwise be devoted to litigation. The Commission supports parties’ informal efforts to resolve disputes without hearings.²⁷

²⁰ *Id.*, at 10:3-4.

²¹ Garrison, Exh. JG-1T at 1:10-11.

²² *Id.*, at 1:13 – 2:3.

²³ *Id.*, at 2:15-18.

²⁴ WAC 480-07-750(2).

²⁵ WAC 480-07-740.

²⁶ WAC 480-07-750(1).

²⁷ WAC 480-07-700.

- 25 While there was no hearing in this proceeding, the parties provided detailed written testimony in support of the Settlement, creating a record for decision. The testimony by Mr. Ward for Staff and Mr. Garrison for the Company identified areas of dispute and detailed discussion about the reasons to support a “prudent compromise.”²⁸ The record is sufficient to support the tariff changes in the proposed Settlement. Further, Mr. Ward’s testimony demonstrates that the terms of the Settlement are consistent with principles of law, policy, and regulatory accounting.
- 26 The Commission has received comments from 25 customers on the general rate increase filing, with 21 opposed to the increase, three in support and one undecided.²⁹ The Company and Staff have made efforts to make the Settlement Stipulation available to interested customers: The Company has posted a copy of the Settlement – including the rates for recurring water service – on its Web site, and Staff sent a copy of the agreement by mail or e-mail to 23 of the 25 customers who have filed comments about the tariff filings.³⁰ No customer has filed a comment with the Commission concerning the proposed Settlement.³¹
- 27 The Commission recognizes the customer comments on the general rate increase filing, but must establish rates for water companies that are fair and reasonable for customers, and sufficient to allow the Company the opportunity to recover reasonable operating expenses and earn a reasonable return on investment.³² The general rate increase resulting from the Settlement is less than half of the amount the Company requested – about an 18 percent increase rather than a 38 percent increase. After a detailed examination of the Company’s records, Staff determined the rates to be fair, just and reasonable. Finally, the miscellaneous tariff changes are reasonable in that

²⁸ Garrison, Exh. JG-1T at 2:15-16.

²⁹ See July 30, 2009, memorandum of Commission Staff filed in Docket UW-091051; see also Staff response to Bench Request No. 3, filed January 6, 2010.

³⁰ See Staff Response to Bench Request No. 3, filed January 6, 2010; see also Burton Water Replacement Letter in Response to Bench Requests, filed January 7, 2010.

³¹ Staff Response to Bench Request No. 3, filed January 6, 2010.

³² See *People’s Organization for Washington Energy Resources v. Washington Utilities & Transportation Comm’n*, 104 Wn.2d 798, 807-13, 711 P.2d 319 (1985) (describing ratemaking principles and process).

they allow the Company to recover the costs it incurs in particular circumstances, and the charges only apply to particular customers, not all ratepayers.

- 28 Consistent with WAC 480-07-750, the Commission should find that the approval and adoption of the Settlement Stipulation is in the public interest, that the Settlement Stipulation is supported by an appropriate record, and that approving the agreement is lawful. The presiding administrative law judge recommends the Commission approve and adopt the parties' Settlement Stipulation to resolve the disputed issues pending in this proceeding.
- 29 The parties have attached to the Settlement Stipulation tariff pages to implement the rates and terms agreed to in the Settlement. These pages are missing appropriate issue and effective dates, as the tariff pages in Appendix B reflect the original dates as filed in Docket UW-091050. After the deadlines for seeking administrative review of this Order, or if the parties request this Order become effective before that date under WAC 480-07-825(7)(b), the Company must file tariff pages in the respective dockets in compliance with this Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 30 Having discussed above in detail the evidence received in this proceeding concerning all material matters, and having stated findings and conclusions upon issues in dispute among the parties and the reasons therefore, the Commission now makes and enters the following summary of those facts, incorporating by reference pertinent portions of the preceding detailed findings:
- 31 (1) The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission is an agency of the State of Washington, vested by statute with authority to regulate the rates, rules, regulations, practices, and accounts of public service companies, including water companies.
- 32 (2) Burton Water is a "public service company" and a "water company," as those terms are defined in RCW 80.04.010 and used in Title 80 RCW. Burton Water is engaged in Washington in the business of supplying water services to the public for compensation.
-

- 33 (3) On June 30, 2009, Burton Water filed revisions to its currently effective tariff
in two dockets seeking a general rate increase for water service and to increase
certain miscellaneous charges, add other charges and modify tariff rule
language.
- 34 (4) The Commission suspended the filings on July 30, 2009, following an open
meeting held the same day.
- 35 (5) The Commission consolidated the two filings for hearing and scheduled a
prehearing conference for December 11, 2009.
- 36 (6) On December 10, 2009, the day before the scheduled conference, the
Company and Commission Staff notified the Commission it had reached a
settlement in principle, requesting the conference be cancelled.
- 37 (7) On December 23, 2009, the parties filed a Settlement Stipulation that, if
approved, would resolve all pending issues in the proceeding, together with
the testimony of Staff witness Jim Ward and Company witness Jim Garrison.
- 38 (8) The existing rates for water service Burton Water provides are insufficient to
allow the Company to meet prudently incurred expenses.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

39 Having discussed above all matters material to this decision, and having stated
detailed findings, conclusions, and the reasons therefore, the Commission now makes
the following summary conclusions of law, incorporating by reference pertinent
portions of the preceding detailed conclusions:

- 40 (1) The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission has jurisdiction over
the subject matter of, and parties to, these proceedings.
- 41 (2) The general rate increase proposed in tariff revisions Burton Water filed June
30, 2009, and suspended by prior Commission order, were not shown to be
fair, just or reasonable and should be rejected.

- 42 (3) The existing rates for water service that Burton Water provides in Washington are insufficient to allow the Company to recover prudently incurred expenses.
- 43 (4) The Settlement Stipulation the parties filed in this proceeding on December 23, 2009, if approved, would result in rates for Burton Water customers that are fair, just, reasonable and sufficient.
- 44 (5) The Settlement Stipulation, included as an attachment to this Order together with Appendices A and B to the Settlement Stipulation, and incorporated by reference as if set forth here, should be approved by the Commission as a reasonable resolution of the issues presented.
- 45 (6) Approval and adoption of the Settlement Stipulation is lawful, supported by an appropriate record, and is in the public interest.
- 46 (7) Burton Water should be authorized and required to make a compliance filing to recover rates reflected in the Settlement Stipulation to effectuate the terms of this Order. *WAC 480-07-880(1)*.
- 47 (8) The Commission Secretary should be authorized to accept by letter, with copies to all parties to this proceeding, a filing that complies with the requirements of this Order. *WAC 480-07-170; WAC 480-07-880*.
- 48 (9) The Commission should retain jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties to this proceeding to effectuate the terms of this Order. *RCW Title 80*.

ORDER

THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

- 49 (1) The proposed tariff revisions Burton Water Company, Inc., filed with the Commission on June 30, 2009, in Docket UW-091051, and suspended by prior Commission order, are rejected.

- 50 (2) The proposed tariff revisions Burton Water Company, Inc., filed with the Commission on June 30, 2009, in Docket UW-091050, and suspended by prior Commission order, are approved.
- 51 (3) The Settlement Stipulation the parties filed on December 23, 2009, which is included as an attachment to this Order together with Appendices A and B to the Settlement Stipulation and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full here, is approved and adopted in full resolution of the issues in this proceeding.
- 52 (4) Burton Water Company, Inc., is authorized and required to make a compliance filing including such new and revised tariff sheets as are necessary to implement the requirements of this Order.
- 53 (5) The Commission Secretary is authorized to accept by letter, with copies to all parties to this proceeding, a filing that complies with the requirements of this Order.
- 54 (6) The Commission retains jurisdiction to effectuate the terms of this Order.

DATED at Olympia, Washington and effective January 8, 2010.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

ANN E. RENDAHL
Administrative Law Judge

NOTICE TO THE PARTIES

This is an Initial Order. The action proposed in this Initial order is not yet effective. If you disagree with this Initial Order and want the Commission to consider your comments, you must take specific action within the time limits outlined below. If you agree with this Initial Order, and you would like the Order to become final before the

time limits expire, you may send a letter to the Commission, waiving your right to petition for administrative review.

WAC 480-07-825(2) provides that any party to this proceeding has twenty (20) days after the entry of this Initial Order to file a *Petition for Administrative Review*. What must be included in any Petition and other requirements for a Petition are stated in WAC 480-07-825(3). WAC 480-07-825(4) states that any party may file an *Answer* to a Petition for review within (10) days after service of the Petition.

WAC 480-07-830 provides that before entry of a Final Order, any party may file a Petition to Reopen a contested proceeding to permit receipt of evidence essential to a decision, but unavailable and not reasonably discoverable at the time of hearing, or for other good and sufficient cause. No Answer to a Petition to Reopen will be accepted for filing absent express notice by the Commission calling for such an answer.

RCW 80.01.060(3) provides that an initial order will become final without further Commission action if no party seeks administrative review of the initial order and if the Commission fails to exercise administrative review on its own motion. You will be notified if this order becomes final.

One copy of any Petition or Answer filed must be served on each party of record with proof of service as required by WAC 480-07-150(8) and (9). An Original and (8) copies of any Petition or Answer must be filed by mail delivery to:

Attn: David W. Danner, Executive Director and Secretary
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

ATTACHMENT