

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON**

UW 120

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

**DISPOSITION: MOTION DENIED**

Staff served its data requests nos. 1-58 on May 4, 2007, in this proceeding. On May 10, 2007, Staff served data requests nos. 59-68.

On May 29, 2007, the Commission received Crooked River Ranch Water Company’s (Crooked River) motion for a protective order asking for various forms of relief from Staff’s requests. Crooked River asked for more time to respond, while questioning the relevancy of some of the questions. Crooked River alleged that full compliance with the requests would “work a substantial hardship” on the Company.

On June 7, 2007, Staff filed its response to Crooked River’s motion. Staff stated 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.

By ruling dated June 8, 2007, I denied Crooked River’s motion.

On June 7, 2007, Staff also filed a motion for an order compelling Crooked River to respond, and respond more fully, to enumerated data requests. Crooked River did not file a response to Staff’s motion.

By ruling dated June 26, 2007, I granted Staff’s motion.

On June 28, 2007, the Commission received from Crooked River a second motion for a protective order, with an attached affidavit.<sup>1</sup> In its June 28th filing Crooked River simply repeats the statements it made in its May 24th filing.

I have already denied the motion as filed on May 24th. For purposes of this ruling I treat the motion as a late-filed response to Staff's motion to compel that I granted on June 26, 2007.

In the motion and the supporting affidavit Crooked River makes only generalized, vague assertions of irrelevance, privilege, and hardship. The company does not refer to even one data request specifically, so that I can consider the merits of its claims.

In its motion to compel, Staff did address the relevance of each of the subject data requests. Staff's showing of relevance stands in stark contrast to the vague claims advanced again by Crooked River.

The motion is denied.

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 28th day of June, 2007.

---

Patrick Power  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The motion itself is signed and dated June 13, 2007, by Timothy R. Gassner, attorney for Crooked River. The certificate of service, also executed by Mr. Gassner, is dated June 13, 2007. Attached to the motion is a notarized affidavit of James R. Rooks, dated June 19, 2007. If similar inconsistencies are observed, the Commission will take further action.