```
1
     BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
 2.
                           COMMISSION
     In the Matter of the
     Petition of
                                   )
 4
                                   )
    AVISTA CORPORATION, d/b/a
                                 ) DOCKET NO. UE-060181
    AVISTA UTILITIES,
 5
                                  ) Volume I
                                   ) Pages 1 - 12
     for Continuation of the
 6
                                 )
     Company's Energy Recovery
 7
    Mechanism, with Certain
                                  )
    Modifications.
                                  )
 8
 9
10
               A prehearing conference in the above matter
11
     was held on February 21, 2006, at 1:32 p.m., at 1300
12
     South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Olympia,
13
     Washington, before Administrative Law Judge DENNIS
14
    MOSS.
15
16
               The parties were present as follows:
17
               AVISTA CORPORATION, by DAVID J. MEYER,
     General Counsel and Vice President, East 1411 Mission,
     Spokane, Washington 99220; telephone, (509) 495-4316.
18
19
               WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
     COMMISSION, by GREGORY J. TRAUTMAN, Assistant Attorney
20
     General, 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest,
     Post Office Box 40128, Olympia, Washington 98504;
21
    telephone, (360) 664-1187.
22
               PUBLIC COUNSEL, by SIMON J. FFITCH, Assistant
     Attorney General, 900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000,
     Seattle, Washington 98164-1012; telephone, (206)
23
     389-2055.
24
25
    Kathryn T. Wilson, CCR
     Court Reporter
```

1	INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES,
2	by IRION A. SANGER, Attorney at Law, Davison Van Cleve 333 Southwest Taylor, Suite 400, Portland, Oregon 97204; telephone, (503) 241-7242.
3	9/204/ telephone, (303) 241-7242.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	l I)	R	\cap	\mathcal{C}	F.	F.	D	Т	M	G	S	

- JUDGE MOSS: Good afternoon, everyone. My
- 3 name is Dennis Moss. I'm an administrative law judge
- 4 with the Washington Utilities and Transportation
- 5 Commission, and we are convened today for our first
- 6 prehearing conference In the Matter of the Petition of
- 7 Avista Corporation, doing business as Avista Utilities,
- 8 for Continuation of the Company's Energy Recovery
- 9 Mechanism, With Certain Modifications; Docket No.
- 10 UE-060181. Why don't we begin with our appearances,
- 11 and let's start with the Company; Mr. Meyer?
- 12 MR. MEYER: Thank you, Your Honor. David
- 13 Meyer appearing on behalf of Avista. Would you like
- 14 the short form of introduction?
- JUDGE MOSS: For the first prehearing, I
- 16 would like the long form, and then thereafter in our
- 17 proceeding, we will use the short form.
- MR. MEYER: The phone number is (509)
- 19 495-4316. The e-mail address is
- 20 david.meyer@avistacorp.com. Fax number is (509)
- 21 495-8856, and the address is East 1411 Mission Avenue,
- 22 Spokane, Washington.
- JUDGE MOSS: For ICNU?
- 24 MR. SANGER: My name is Irion Sanger. I'm
- 25 here with the law firm of Davis and Van Cleve for the

- 1 Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. Address
- 2 is 333 Southwest Taylor, Suite 400, Portland, Oregon,
- 3 97204. Phone number is (503) 241-7242; fax, (503)
- 4 241-8160, and e-mail is mail@dvclaw.com.
- 5 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Sanger, I confess I did not
- 6 read your appearance filing. Are any of your
- 7 colleagues making appearances in this proceeding, or
- 8 will you be proceeding alone?
- 9 MR. SANGER: No. Matt Perkins and Brad Van
- 10 Cleve were on the notice as well.
- JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. I will note also
- 12 that you filed a petition to intervene on behalf of
- 13 ICNU. Mr. ffitch?
- 14 MR. FFITCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
- 15 Simon ffitch, assistant attorney general for the Public
- 16 Counsel section of the Washington Attorney General's
- 17 office. Address is 900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000,
- 18 Seattle, Washington, 98164-1012. Phone is
- 19 (206) 389-2055; fax, (206) 389-2079; e-mail,
- 20 simonf@atg.wa.gov.
- JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Mr. Trautman?
- MR. TRAUTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 23 Gregory J. Trautman, assistant attorney general for
- 24 Commission staff. My address is 1400 South Evergreen
- 25 Park Drive Southwest, PO Box 40128, Olympia,

- 1 Washington, 98504. My telephone number is (360)
- 2 664-1187. Fax number is (360) 586-5522, and my e-mail
- 3 is gtrautma@wutc.wa.gov.
- 4 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you. Are there any other
- 5 appearances? I see none in the hearing room. Anyone
- on the conference bridge line who wishes to enter an
- 7 appearance today? Hearing none, I think we can proceed
- 8 directly to the only petition to intervene today of
- 9 which I'm aware, and that is of ICNU. Is there any
- 10 objection?
- 11 MR. MEYER: No objection.
- MR. TRAUTMAN: No.
- JUDGE MOSS: Hearing no objection, the
- 14 petition is granted. Has discovery commenced?
- 15 MR. MEYER: It has not. We are available, of
- 16 course, any time.
- 17 JUDGE MOSS: Of course the discovery rule is
- 18 invoked in a proceeding such as this, and everyone is
- 19 familiar with the rules at WAC 480-07-400, et seq. We
- 20 will talk about whether we want to make any
- 21 modifications to the discovery schedule as we talk
- 22 about the procedural schedule. Do the parties perceive
- 23 the need for a protective order in this proceeding?
- MR. MEYER: Yes, we do.
- 25 JUDGE MOSS: Standard protective order?

- 1 MR. MEYER: Please.
- JUDGE MOSS: Highly confidential provisions?
- 3 MR. MEYER: Shouldn't require that.
- 4 JUDGE MOSS: We can always amend if that
- 5 should come up. I'll see to that in the next day or
- 6 two.
- 7 That does bring us then directly to the
- 8 procedural schedule. I will just note for the record
- 9 that I did have brief informal conversations with both
- 10 Mr. Trautman and Mr. Meyer concerning the procedural
- 11 schedule. They between themselves had some discussion
- 12 and were separated by about a month on hearing dates,
- 13 and I appreciate that advance notice because it gave me
- 14 an opportunity to discuss the matter with the
- 15 Commissioners, and I know their preferences, which will
- 16 inform our discussion today.
- 17 So why don't I just start with that, and then
- 18 I'll let you go off the record a little bit and see if
- 19 you can arrange the intermediary dates, and then we'll
- 20 come back, perhaps, with an agreed schedule, or I have
- 21 some ideas of my own if you can't do that.
- The Commissioners' preference is to have the
- 23 hearing in May, and their goal is to complete this
- 24 proceeding by the end of June. So with that in mind, I
- 25 have looked at the calendar very closely and have seen

- 1 what dates are available in the second half of May, and
- 2 I will state that I have a preference for May 18 and
- 3 19, a Thursday and a Friday. I'm assuming about two
- 4 days. Does that seem about right to everybody? I have
- 5 the filing here, and I actually haven't even read all
- 6 the testimony, and it strikes me we are looking at no
- 7 more than a two-day hearing.
- 8 MR. MEYER: I would agree.
- 9 JUDGE MOSS: So that's why I picked two days,
- 10 18 and 19. I'm working around availability dates, that
- is to say, the Commissioners' availability, so that's
- 12 why these dates are your basic choices. As I say,
- 13 those are my preferred dates, but as optional dates, we
- 14 could go with May 15 and 16, which is the Monday and
- 15 Tuesday of that same week, or we could go with the
- 16 Thursday and Friday of the following week. That would
- 17 be the 25th and 26th.
- Mr. Meyer, you had expressed when we
- 19 discussed the matter something about the week of May
- 20 22nd, so that would be the end of that week. Now, May
- 21 22nd is also available, but I don't think, particularly
- 22 for a short hearing, that it makes a lot of sense to
- 23 start on one day, send everybody home, and come back
- 24 two days later. The middle of that week is
- 25 unavailable. I don't have any other helpful

- 1 information. Would the parties like to have the
- 2 opportunity to go off the record and discuss this among
- 3 themselves and make some suggestions when we come back
- 4 on the record?
- 5 MR. TRAUTMAN: I would just then want to ask
- 6 on the briefing, and then the reason I'm asking is
- 7 because I had had some scheduled time I was going to be
- 8 gone, out of the country, actually, between May 28th,
- 9 which is a Sunday, and June the 7th.
- 10 So I guess given those dates, I prefer the
- 11 18th and the 19th. It would at least give me the week
- 12 before that to do the briefing, but I don't know how
- 13 long the Commission would like from when -- I assume if
- 14 it's one round of briefs, from when the Commission
- 15 would want the briefs to come in until the order is
- 16 issued. I would like some guidance on that.
- 17 JUDGE MOSS: I can give you some guidance on
- 18 that as well. Earlier is something I can always agree
- 19 to, but in terms of later, I just put June 30th as an
- 20 aspirational date for the order for purposes of my own
- 21 ruminations about this, and I backed up from that 21
- 22 days to June 9th as a date on which I would like to get
- 23 briefs. Now, I'm flexible, and I could actually take
- 24 them a little later than that too and still meet the
- 25 aspirational date.

- 1 The main problem I have is that I have to
- 2 work around the Commissioners' availability. I am at
- 3 their FX, so whatever they can do I will do, but there
- 4 is less control in the other direction.
- 5 So June actually looks pretty good in the
- 6 early part of the month. It's the later part of that
- 7 month that's a problem in terms of my being able to get
- 8 with them. I'm willing to be somewhat flexible about
- 9 that June 9th date in terms of looking forward, but I
- 10 don't want it to slip too far. Or we could move it
- 11 back if you all want to do an expedited transcript and
- 12 do the briefs early, or you could always ask the
- 13 indulgences of your chief judge to assign a different
- 14 assistant attorney general, Mr. Trautman.
- 15 MR. TRAUTMAN: I don't think that's going to
- 16 happen. We are already shorthanded by many attorneys.
- JUDGE MOSS: Does that help you?
- 18 MR. TRAUTMAN: If you would indulge to moving
- 19 it to the next week, how late?
- 20 MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, I think I need to
- 21 interject before this gets too far down the line --
- 22 JUDGE MOSS: Let me interrupt. Let's do this
- off the record and we'll come back on if we need to.
- 24 (Discussion off the record.)
- 25 JUDGE MOSS: We have had some discussion off

- 1 the record and have arrived at a procedural schedule
- 2 that works from everyone's perspective, so I will put
- 3 that into the record and it will appear as part of the
- 4 prehearing order, and then we will take up another
- 5 issue that Mr. ffitch has raised off the record.
- 6 The first date on our procedural schedule
- 7 will be March 29th and 30th, which we are setting aside
- 8 for settlement conference. I will mention that the
- 9 parties should feel the freedom to change that, but we
- 10 do like to be notified if you want to change that date
- 11 so that we are at least abreast of what's going on in
- 12 the case in that way.
- 13 The next date is the Staff and Intervenor
- 14 testimony, the response testimony, on April 21st. The
- 15 Company rebuttal testimony will be May 12th, and after
- 16 the May 12th date, we will revise the response time for
- 17 data requests to three business days after the date of
- 18 receipt.
- 19 We will plan to exchange exhibits on May
- 20 23rd. That will not be on the procedural schedule. I
- 21 will send out a notice approximately a week ahead that
- 22 will detail the procedures for that. I would like to
- 23 get your cross-examination estimates at the same time.
- 24 Briefs June 16th, and I think one round of
- 25 briefing will be sufficient, which brings me to a point

- 1 Mr. ffitch raised, which is the question of the scope
- 2 of the proceeding, and I think it's fair to say that
- 3 what the Commission is interested in seeing in this
- 4 proceeding is the development of a rather more full
- 5 record on the subject of the ERM than we had in the
- 6 recently completed rate proceeding. Of course, Avista
- 7 has stated its position and the modifications it
- 8 proposes in its initial filing, so you have that to
- 9 respond to, and if there are alternative proposals,
- 10 they will be brought forward, I'm sure.
- 11 So yes, the ERM is on the table in the same
- 12 sense it would have been reviewed six or eight months
- 13 from now under the original. We are substituting this
- 14 review for that review, so to the extent parties
- 15 contemplated review under the original agreement, this
- 16 is taking the place of that. Although in this case, it
- 17 will, I'm sure, lead to an order. Anything else about
- 18 schedules or scoping?
- 19 MR. TRAUTMAN: Did you state the hearing
- 20 dates on the record?
- JUDGE MOSS: May 25th and 26th for the
- 22 hearing dates. I may have missed it.
- I checked with our records center, and in
- 24 this proceeding, we will need the original plus 12
- 25 copies. We will get the prehearing conference order

- 1 out in the next couple of days as well as a protective
- 2 order. We will only have another prehearing conference
- 3 if we need one to deal with some sort of motions
- 4 practice or whatever, so you let me all know, and let
- 5 me know too if the parties want to have the assistance
- of a settlement judge, mediator, and I can talk to
- 7 Judge Wallis and see if there is someone available to
- 8 do that, and if the Commission thinks it's appropriate
- 9 to do so, it will assign someone, so let us know. Is
- 10 there anything else?
- MR. MEYER: Nothing from us, thank you.
- 12 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you all very much. I
- 13 appreciate your being here today and look forward to
- 14 working with you to resolve the case.
- 15 (Prehearing conference adjourned at 2:10 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24