

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)	DOCKET NO. UT-040788
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)	
)	
Complainant,)	ORDER NO. 13
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER CORRECTING ORDER
VERIZON NORTHWEST INC.,)	NO. 11
)	
Respondent.)	
)	
.....)	

1 **Synopsis:** *This order corrects two inadvertent omissions from Commission Order No. 11, served October 22, 2004.*

2 The Commission served its 11th order in this docket on October 22, 2004, which denied Verizon’s request for interim rate relief. The order contains two inadvertent errors.

3 First, at page 41, footnote 72 (footnoting text at page 40 of the order) should read,

⁷² Verizon brief, page 23, paragraph 86, citing WUTC v. Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Cause No. U-73-57, Second Supplemental Order (1974)

4 Second, text that discussed the dissent was inadvertently omitted from the majority order. The following text should be inserted following paragraph 151, at page 53 of the order:

Discussion of dissent.

We acknowledge the dissent to this order offered by our distinguished colleague and chairwoman. While we respect the views she presents, we believe that the public interest is better served by maintaining the clear, easily discernible test that we reaffirm in this order.

We believe that the record in this docket demonstrates that Verizon's Washington intrastate operations do not draw support from any other jurisdiction; cash flow from the Washington operations is sufficient for the needs of those operations, and there is no demonstrated contribution to the Washington operations from any other jurisdiction. The only demonstrated shortfall is in profits, to the shareholders, as would be the case in a stand-alone operation.

We also believe that the grant of temporary rates in open meeting items is not precedent for a contested request for interim rates, as the open meeting result is almost always agreed by the company and Staff . The Commission often has greater flexibility in a settlement situation than it might if a matter were litigated. Here, the decision is made after a thorough review of the available evidence. Verizon, which bears the burden of proving its need in an adjudicated rate proceeding, has failed to carry that burden.

- 5 By this order, the Commission Corrects Order No. 11 in this docket and inserts the footnote and text above into the order.

Dated at Olympia, Washington, and effective this 25th day of October, 2004.

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

RICHARD HEMSTAD
Commissioner

PATRICK OSHIE
Commissioner