

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

WJ 8/UW 120

In the Matter of)
)
CROOKED RIVER RANCH WATER)
COMPANY,)
)
An Investigation Pursuant to ORS 756.515)
to Determine Jurisdiction. (WJ 8))
_____)

RULING

In the Matter of)
)
CROOKED RIVER RANCH WATER)
COMPANY)
)
Request for Rate increase resulting in total)
annual revenues of \$868,453. (UW 120))

DISPOSITION: MOTION DENIED

On May 4, 2007, Michael Dougherty of the staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon directed initial data requests to Crooked River Water Company (Crooked River) in docket UW 120. By motion dated May 24, 2007, the Crooked River Ranch Water Company (Crooked River) requests a “protective order” that would allow it “additional time to compile information and respond to the request as well as a determination as to the relevancy of the requested information and the limits of the PUC’s investigative authority.”

Crooked River asks that “certain matters not be inquired into and that the scope of discovery be limited to . . . matters . . . which are relevant to the Water Company’s operations and the basis for the Water Company’s current rates and service charges.” According to Crooked River, the data request includes vague and open ended requests for information, and responses would work a hardship on Crooked River.

In support of its motion, Crooked River supplied the Affidavit of James Rooks, general manager. Mr. Rooks elaborates on the work required by Crooked River to respond.

On June 7, 2007, Staff filed its response to Crooked River's motion. Staff also filed a motion to compel responses from Crooked River in docket UW 120.

In its response Staff notes that Crooked River's motion should have been filed in docket UW 120, not docket WJ 8. Staff states that its requests are common practice in utility matters and should not require lengthy time for response. Staff argues that historical data and personnel information are routine matters for rate case discovery.

The motion is denied. Though it should have been filed in docket WJ 8, that is not the grounds for the denial of the motion. The request is vague and overly broad. It lacks specificity, even if it otherwise had merit.

As noted above, Staff filed a motion to compel in docket UW 120. Crooked River is able to raise all of its concerns with Staff's data requests in its response to the Staff motion.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 8th day of June, 2007.

Patrick Power
Administrative Law Judge