```
00001
     BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
 2
                          COMMISSION
   SPOKANE COUNTY,
                                  ) DOCKET NOS. TR-950332
 4
                                                TR-950333
                   Petitioner,
                                                 TR-950334
 5
                                                 TR-961353
             VS.
                                                 TR-970009
 6
                                                 TR-980936
   UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
                                                 TR-980937
 7
                                                 TR-980938
   COMPANY,
 8
                                    VOLUME I
               Respondent. ) Pages 1 - 5
10
11
             A prehearing conference in the above matter
12 was held on July 12, 1999 at 10:25 a.m., at 1300 South
13
   Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington,
14 before Administrative Law Judge C. ROBERT WALLIS.
15
16
              The parties were present as follows:
17
             THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
   COMMISSION STAFF, by JEFFREY D. GOLTZ, Senior Assistant
   Attorney General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive
18
   Southwest, Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington
19
   98504.
   Also Present: MICHAEL ROWSWELL, Rail Carrier
20 Compliance Specialist.
21
             UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD, by WILLIAM J.
   SCHROEDER, Attorney at Law, 717 West Sprague Avenue,
22
   Suite 1200, Spokane, Washington 99201 (via bridge.)
23
              SPOKANE COUNTY, by ROBERT B. BINGER, Deputy
   Prosecuting Attorney, West 1115 Broadway Avenue,
24
   Spokane, Washington 99260 (via bridge.)
25 Kathryn T. Wilson, CCR
```

Court Reporter

```
00002
 1
                    PROCEEDINGS
 2
             JUDGE WALLIS: Let's be on the record,
   please. This is a prehearing conference in the matter
   of Spokane County versus Union Pacific Railroad Company
   in Dockets TR-950332 et al. This prehearing conference
 5
   is being held before the Washington Utilities and
 7
   Transportation Commission on July 12th, 1999, pursuant
   to due and proper notice to all interested persons.
9
             Let me call for appearances at this time and
10
   start with the Petitioner, the County.
11
             MR. BINGER: My name is Robert Binger,
12
   B-I-N-G-E-R, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, West 1115
13
   Broadway, Spokane, 99260.
14
             JUDGE WALLIS: And the Respondent?
             MR. SCHROEDER: William Schroeder
15
16
   representing Union Pacific Railroad Company.
17
   address is 717 West Sprague Avenue, Suite 1200,
18
   Spokane, Washington, 99201-3505.
19
             JUDGE WALLIS: For the Commission?
20
             MR. GOLTZ: Jeff Goltz, attorney generals'
21
   office, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive, Olympia,
22
   98504-0128.
23
             JUDGE WALLIS: My name is Robert Wallis, and
   I have been assigned by the Commission to preside on
24
```

this matter.

21

22

23 24

25

In discussions prior to going on the record, we have addressed scheduling matters. The prior prehearing conference order served on April 26th, 1999, contemplated that a report would be prepared and would 5 be available in June of this year. It turns out that that report has not yet been prepared and issued, but 7 the County indicates that they expect it can be mailed on Wednesday of this week or Monday of next week. 9 Following that, the County will be engaging 10 in internal discussions regarding engineering and 11 commissioner preferences, and the parties will be 12 engaging in negotiations on the issues involved in 13 these proceedings. The parties are optimistic that 14 many and perhaps even all issues may be resolved, and 15 the Commission certainly encourages negotiations and 16 encourages settlement of that sort. 17 18 19

It is expected that some form of hearing will be required and the opportunity during that hearing for members of the public to present testimony to the Commission. It is also possible that settlement negotiations may not be quite so successful as the parties anticipate. Consequently, we will be scheduling a hearing and reserving three days for that hearing with the understanding and the expectation that we will not require all three of those days. We will

be scheduling a time during the evening of the first day when members of the public may be heard.

Mr. Rowswell of the Commission staff is going to be working with our administrative assistant and with personnel from the County to help the Commission identify appropriate hearing location or locations to hold these proceedings.

We looked at the tasks that need to be done following the issuance of the report and have determined that the week of October 11th is an appropriate time to schedule the hearing to begin on the Monday of that week at ten o'clock in the morning to allow people to come over in the morning if they desire to do that. It is, as I mentioned, possible that resolution of all issues may lead to a change in this schedule, and we certainly encourage the parties to work toward that result.

Let me ask if there is anything that I have omitted or anything that parties would like to add to this discussion. Let the record show that there is no response. I'm going to forward the file to our administrative assistant, ask her to work with Mr. Rowswell and the County, and see that we get a notice of hearing prepared and served.

In conjunction with this, I'm going to

25

suggest that we schedule a prehearing conference approximately two weeks prior to the start of the hearing. That would be during the last week in September. Do parties have any particular conflicts 5 during that week that we should avoid? MR. GOLTZ: I do. I have to be to an 7 attorney generals' office meeting, a three-day meeting the 29th, 30th and 1st, so either the 27th or 28th, 9 that would be better. 10 JUDGE WALLIS: Mr. Schroeder? 11 MR. SCHROEDER: Either of those two days are 12 fine with me, Judge. 13 JUDGE WALLIS: Mr. Binger? 14 MR. BINGER: Those days would be fine with 15 the County. 16 JUDGE WALLIS: So we will look at that for 17 schedule. Is there any reason why we cannot anticipate 18 using a teleconference for that prehearing conference? 19 Let the record show there is no negative response and 20 we'll plan it on that basis. Is there anything further 21 to come before the Commission? It appears there is 22 not. I want to thank everybody for attending and certainly wish you well in your negotiations. 23 24 (Prehearing conference concluded at 10:30 a.m.)