1	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON U	UTILITIES	AND	TRANSPORTATION
2				
3	COMMISSION			
4				
5	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)		
б	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	N,)		
7)		
8	Complaina	nt,)		
9)		
10	vs.)	DOCKE	CT NO. UW-040414
11)	Volum	ne II
12	SJM WATER SERVICES, INC.	,)	Pages	s 6 - 11
13)		
14	Respondent	t.)		
15				
16				
17				
18				
19	A prehearing conference in the above matter			
20				
21	was held on July 15, 2004	4, at 9:2	9 a.m	n., at 1300 South
22				
23	Evergreen Park Drive Sout	thwest, O	lympi	a, Washington,
24				
25	before Administrative Law	w Judge K.	AREN	M. CAILLE.

The parties were present as follows: WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, by JONATHAN THOMPSON, Assistant Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington 98504; telephone, (360) 664-1225. SJM WATER SERVICES, INC., by RICHARD A. FINNIGAN, Attorney at Law, 2405 Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Suite B-1, Olympia, Washington 98502; telephone, (360) 956-7001. Kathryn T. Wilson, CCR Court Reporter

8000

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 JUDGE CAILLE: Let's go on the record. Good 3 morning. We are here for a hearing on jurisdiction 4 that was scheduled for today, and the parties prior to this morning have presented me with a stipulation, and 5 б I think what I will do is ask for the appearances, and 7 then if one of the parties would like to summarize the 8 stipulation, that would be great. So let's begin with 9 Staff. 10 MR. THOMPSON: Jonathan Thompson for 11 Commission staff. 12 MR. FINNIGAN: Rick Finnigan appearing on 13 behalf of Respondent. 14 MR. THOMPSON: I guess I could just provide a 15 brief summary of the stipulation, which itself is 16 rather brief, but essentially provides that the Company stipulates to file an initial tariff by July 30th, and 17 18 then it will accompany that data, not necessarily with all of the information that's required under the --19 20 MR. FINNIGAN: Maybe I should interject. The 21 Company has agreed to file financial information for 22 the calendar year of 2003, customer accounts and such 23 usage data as it has available to it. Technically for 24 an initial tariff, there is no data required to be filed. On the other hand, there is more information if 25

you are filing for a general rate increase, so Staff
and Company agreed to sort of this meet point type of
distribution.

4 It's the Company's projection that depending 5 on usage, it would be jurisdictional in any case by the 6 end of the summer, so it agreed to file now and at the 7 rates that it's currently charging as the requirement, 8 and then the projection is that the Company will file a 9 general rate increase in August.

10 JUDGE CAILLE: All right. Do you have 11 anything else to add to that?

12 MR. THOMPSON: I would just add that since 13 Staff hasn't yet seen the financial data, the question 14 remains open whether the rates the Company is currently 15 charging are fair, just, and reasonable, so once Staff 16 has that filing, we want to review it and at that point 17 make our decision whether to go forward with the 18 complaint, or if we conclude that the rates are justified then to ask for dismissal of the complaint, 19 20 and we also have a provision, just in the event the 21 Company didn't comply with its stipulation, that we 22 could file the initial tariff so that we could proceed 23 with a penalty action.

JUDGE CAILLE: I do have a copy of thestipulation, but mine doesn't have the signatures, so

we will need one with signatures to go into the file. 1 2 I'll make sure the records center gets this original. 3 Then just so that it's clear, we had set a 4 tariff filing date of July the 25th, and that will now be superseded by the July 30th date that's in the 5 б stipulation of the parties, so in that respect, the 7 prehearing conference order is amended, and I commend 8 the parties for their coming to an agreement on this, 9 and I hope that you continue to agree, and if not, I'll 10 hear from Staff, and either way I'll hear from Staff; 11 correct? 12 MR. THOMPSON: Right. One possibility is 13 that we could pick a date for a status conference, 14 particularly since Mr. Finnigan is indicating the 15 Company may file for a rate increase in August, and we 16 could proceed with a complaint proceeding potentially 17 and then have the new rate filing, which would force us 18 to revise our schedule anyway, so probably the best we can do just so we have some date out there. 19 20 JUDGE CAILLE: Let's go off the record so we 21 can look at calendars. 22 (Discussion off the record.) 23 JUDGE CAILLE: We've had an off-record

24 discussion and have concluded not to set a date for 25 status. The parties have agreed to play it by ear and

see whether one will be necessary, and either there will be a motion for dismissal filed or there will be a request for a status conference, and that may be joined with a prehearing conference for a general rate increase for this company. Does that accurately reflect what we discussed? б MR. FINNIGAN: Yes. JUDGE CAILLE: Is there anything further from anyone this morning? I'll get an order out as quickly as I can, and thank you very much, and I'll also get this filed with the records center. Thank you. (Prehearing conference concluded at 9:39 a.m.)