1	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
2	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
3	WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)Docket No. UW-021667
4	TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)Volume II Complainant,)Pages 10-21
5	v.)
6) THOMAS WATER SERVICE, INC.,)
7	Respondent.)
8	
9	
10	A hearing in the above matter was
11	held on May 19, 2003, at 6:08 p.m., at Arlington High
12	School, 600 East First Street, Arlington, Washington,
13	before Administrative Law Judge KAREN CAILLE.
14	The parties were present as
15	follows:
16	THOMAS WATER SERVICE, INC., by Richard Finnigan, Attorney at Law, 2405 Evergreen
17	Park Drive, S.W., Suite B-3, Olympia, Washington 98502.
18	
19	THE COMMISSION, by Mary M. Tennyson, Senior Assistant Attorney General, 1300 Evergreen Park Drive, S.W., P.O. Box 40128, Olympia,
20	Washington 98504-0128.
21	
22	
23	
24	Barbara L. Nelson, CCR
25	Court Reporter

	INDEX OF N	WITNESSES		
WITNESS:				PAGE:
JIM WARD				
Statement Regarding Settlement		13		
Examination by Judge Caille		16		
	INDEX TO	EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT:	MARKED:	OFFEI	RED:	ADMITTED:
Joint Exhibit 1	15	15	5	16
Joint Exhibit 2	16	15	5	16
Joint Exhibit 3	(Public	comments	to be	submitted.)

1	JUDGE CAILLE: Good evening, everyone. We
2	are here today for a hearing on a settlement in
3	Docket Number UW-021667. This is the Washington
4	Utilities and Transportation Commission versus Thomas
5	Water Service. This is a general rate filing by
б	Thomas Water requesting an annual increase in
7	revenues of approximately \$49,000, or 100 percent.
8	My name is Karen Caille, and I am the
9	presiding Administrative Law Judge in this
10	proceeding. Today is May the 19th, 2003, and we are
11	convened in the auditorium of Arlington High School,
12	in Arlington, Washington.
13	On May 8th, 2003, the parties filed a
14	proposed settlement agreement that, if approved,
15	would resolve all issues in this proceeding. The
16	proposal would increase rates to produce a revenue
17	increase of \$11,000, or 20 percent.
18	The purpose of today's hearing will be to
19	explore the terms and conditions of the proposed
20	settlement and in order to determine whether the
21	proposal is consistent with the public interest and
22	whether the proposed rates appear to be fair, just
23	and reasonable.
24	So at this point, I will ask the parties to
25	enter their appearances.

MS. TENNYSON: Mary Tennyson, Senior 1 2 Assistant Attorney General, for Commission Staff. MR. FINNIGAN: Richard Finnigan, on behalf 3 4 of Thomas Water. 5 JUDGE CAILLE: Great. Thank you. Let the б record reflect there are no other appearances. And at this time, I will swear in Mr. Ward. 7 MS. TENNYSON: Just, for the record, I 8 9 would like to -- Staff and the Company have agreed we 10 will present Mr. Ward as a witness to discuss the 11 settlement and Mr. Hathaway for the Company. Mr. 12 Ward will provide a narrative description of the 13 terms, and then we can also ask Mr. Hathaway the 14 Company's agreement with it. 15 JUDGE CAILLE: All right. 16 Whereupon, 17 JIM WARD, having been first duly sworn by Judge Caille, was 18 19 called as a witness herein and testified as follows: 20 JUDGE CAILLE: Thank you. You may proceed, 21 Mr. Ward. 22 THE WITNESS: My name is Jim Ward, W-a-r-d. 23 My business address is 1300 Evergreen Park Drive, 24 Olympia, Washington, 98507. Business phone number is 360-664-11 -- 1250. Excuse me. 25

JUDGE CAILLE: All right. It's my 1 2 understanding that you -- that Staff and the Company 3 have reached an agreement, and you will be the person 4 who is going to set out the terms and conditions of 5 that, explain the terms and conditions of that б agreement? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. 7 JUDGE CAILLE: Will you please proceed. 8 9 THE WITNESS: Essentially, what we have for 10 you as a settlement agreement is an agreement between 11 Staff and Company for a revenue increase of 12 approximately \$11,000 per year. 13 Staff would like to point out at this point 14 that this does not include the surcharge. The 15 surcharge was previously approved February 28th, 16 2003. That surcharge was for \$11.59, and is due to 17 expire May 31st, 2004. This is a general rate case 18 that will apply to rates until the company files to 19 change it. 20 What we agreed on was that \$11,000, or 21 approximately 22 percent annual increase. The rates 22 to achieve this are \$47 for the basic charge, with zero allowance. From zero to 800 cubic feet, the 23 24 charge would be \$2.75 per 100 cubic feet. Greater than 800 cubic feet, the charge would be \$4.35. 25

The Company and Staff came to this \$11,000 1 annual increase through adjustments, which are 2 provided in a handout that Staff has made available 3 4 to the customers. There was one item in there that 5 did need to be clarified, that part of the б adjustments the company made would result in 7 bi-monthly billing to the customers. This would allow a savings to the customers. However, they 8 9 would receive a water bill every two months instead of once a month. 10

11 MS. TENNYSON: Mr. Ward, this document you 12 referred to is the one called Thomas Water Service, 13 Inc. Discussion on Settlement, May 19th, 2003? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. It's a two-page 14 15 document with an attachment spreadsheet. 16 MS. TENNYSON: Your Honor, we would like to 17 make that an exhibit, so it's available for the Commissioners on their review and for your review. 18 19 JUDGE CAILLE: Actually, I also wanted to 20 make the settlement agreement an exhibit, as well, so 21 _ _ 22 MS. TENNYSON: Certainly. That should come first, I believe. 23

24 JUDGE CAILLE: So let's mark the settlement 25 agreement between Staff and the Company as Joint

Exhibit Number 1. And is this second one a joint 1 2 exhibit, as well? MS. TENNYSON: Yes, it is. 3 4 JUDGE CAILLE: The handout that has been 5 provided at this hearing will be marked Joint Exhibit Number 2. Is there any objection? Then those are б admitted into the record. 7 THE WITNESS: At this point, that's the 8 9 basic settlement that has been arrived at by Staff and the Company. Staff is available for questions, 10 11 if you have any. 12 13 EXAMINATION BY JUDGE CAILLE: 14 15 ο. I have a couple of questions, Mr. Ward. 16 And these are just pretty much clarification. So 17 what was the average customer bill under the original filing for the rate increase? 18 19 Currently, the customers are paying Α. 20 approximately \$62 per month, on average. The 21 proposed filing would have brought that up to 22 approximately \$120 on average. Q. Okay. You answered my other question about 23 24 62. And this -- the proposed settlement will be what? What will be the average customer bill for 25

1 that?

2	A. Average customer bill for this water
3	system, using approximately 917 cubic feet per month,
4	will be approximately \$74 for the average water bill.
5	I would like to add, plus the \$11.59 surcharge,
6	which, as I pointed out earlier, is due to expire May
7	31st, 2004. So until May 31st, 2004, the average
8	bill should be approximately \$85.66.
9	Q. All right. And this \$11.59 surcharge
10	relates to the water was it the water plan? And
11	it's my understanding, from what I've read, that that
12	portion is only the portion that applies to these
13	customers. It's not a portion that applies to the
14	two other
15	A. Right. Let me add some history there.
16	Q. Yes, if you will.
17	A. Approximately five years ago, Thomas Water
18	did do a water system plan. The cost of that plan at
19	that time did include three water systems. One of
20	the water systems, the Meadowbrook system, was
21	subsequently sold to the customers of that system.
22	The now Kackman Creek water system was subsequently
23	sold to those water customers. What is left is the
24	Meadow Ridge water system being the only water system
25	

1 Staff has looked at it and the Company has 2 agreed to all the charges have been appropriately 3 assessed to both the Meadowbrook customers and the 4 Kackman Creek customers. What is presented in the 5 \$11.59 is only the portion applicable to the Meadow 6 Ridge water customers.

Q. Thank you. If you'll just bear with me a
moment, let me see if I have any other questions. At
paragraph six of the settlement agreement, Mr. Ward,
just so I'm clear, what occurred was that, on Staff's
recommendation, the company filed for this surcharge,
I think you said it was in February? It was approved
in February, February 28th.

14 A. It was approved, yes.

15 Q. And that was taken out of the rates as the 16 rate case was filed, and that monthly surcharge will 17 expire May 2004, you said?

May 31st, 2004, that surcharge will expire. 18 Α. Yes, it was Staff's recommendation to remove that 19 20 from the general rates, which normally stay in effect 21 until the company refiles. This separation allows 22 the surcharge to remain in effect as long as the 23 water system plan is in effect. The plan does have 24 an expiration date of May 31st of 2004, and the surcharge has the same expiration date. 25

All right. Do you have any idea how much 1 Q. 2 the changes in the billing will be saving the 3 Company? Perhaps it's a Company question. 4 Α. I do have the information that was provided 5 by the Company. The Company consultant told me they б would save approximately \$2,231 per year by going to 7 a bi-monthly billing system. There would be less frequent meter reads, less frequent bills sent out. 8 9 JUDGE CAILLE: Thank you. All right. I have no further questions of you, Mr. Ward. Does the 10 11 Company witness wish to state anything or -- I have 12 no questions. 13 MR. FINNIGAN: You have no questions? JUDGE CAILLE: No. 14 15 MR. FINNIGAN: No, Your Honor. We'll 16 simply put on the record that the Company supports 17 the settlement. JUDGE CAILLE: All right. Now, at this 18 point what will happen is that I will -- we will take 19 20 this evidence back to the Commission, along with your 21 statements that will be made later this evening, and

22 the Commission will deliberate on this settlement. 23 And what the Commission looks at, as I mentioned 24 earlier, is whether this is in the public interest,

whether the rates are fair, just and reasonable. 25

1	The Company has asked for an order by or
2	for the rates to take effect by June 1st. I think
3	the Commission will try to meet that deadline,
4	although the Commission has other matters, too. So
5	I'm hoping that we will be able to reach they will
б	be able to reach a decision by then. And what will
7	happen is that an order will come out and it will
8	inform all of you what the Commission's decision was.
9	So at this point, if there's nothing further to come
10	before the Commission
11	MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, just to make
12	sure that it's clear on the record, the Company is
13	waiving the initial order.
14	JUDGE CAILLE: Oh, thank you, yes. I need
15	that.
16	MR. FINNIGAN: I was looking to see if it's
17	in the settlement agreement, and it's not.
18	JUDGE CAILLE: Yes. I will note for the
19	record that Counsel for Thomas Water has indicated
20	that the Company is waiving an initial order. That
21	would be an order that would be coming from me. So
22	instead, the order will come directly from the
23	Commission. Is Staff in agreement with that?
24	MS. TENNYSON: Yes, we are.
25	JUDGE CAILLE: Thank you. Anything

further? All right. Then this settlement hearing is
 concluded and is taken under advisement.

So at this point, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that the Company and Staff are available for you to ask questions. I am going to leave the room, and so perhaps you'll be a little freer in asking б your questions without me here. And then, once you've gone through that period, we will have the public meeting, where the court reporter will take down each of your statements, if you wish to make a statement for the Commission. Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 6:23 p.m.)