

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UW 120

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
CROOKED RIVER RANCH WATER	)	MEMORANDUM
COMPANY	)	
	)	
Request for Rate Increase resulting in total	)	
annual revenues from \$806,833 to	)	
\$868,453, or 8.13 percent.	)	

**DISPOSITION: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED**

By motion dated July 2, 2007, Crooked River Ranch Water Company (Crooked River) requests reconsideration of an earlier ruling denying its motion for a protective order. The motion was denied on the grounds that it “makes only generalized, vague assertions of irrelevance, privilege and hardship.”

In its motion Crooked River compares and contrasts its own motion with a motion filed by the Commission Staff (Staff) to compel answers to data requests. Staff’s motion was granted by a ruling dated June 28, 2007. Crooked River argues that Staff’s motion “suffers from the same generalized and vague assertions which are attributed to” its motion. Crooked River requests a hearing regarding both motions. Crooked River states that “at this hearing, the Water Company will present additional legal argument and evidence in support of the Motion for Protective Order.”

Crooked River mischaracterizes the contents of the Staff motion. Staff does explain the relevance of each of its data requests.<sup>1</sup> Each request involves information that is necessary to determine Crooked River’s cost of service.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only instance in which Staff does not explicitly defend the relevance of a request is with respect to Data Request 20, which addresses an adjustment to pension and benefit costs. The subject matter of Data Request 20 (and of each of the data requests) is so plainly related to the rate case that no further showing of relevance is required.

Crooked River's request for a hearing regarding the two motions is denied. Crooked River had the opportunity to offer "legal argument and evidence" in support of its motion for a protective order, which it has filed twice. Crooked River did not file a timely response to Staff's motion.

Crooked River has not yet identified a single Staff data request that is either irrelevant, privileged or would work a hardship. Crooked River's motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 16th day of July, 2007.

---

Patrick Power  
Administrative Law Judge