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AVISTA CORP.
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JURISDICTION: WASHINGTON
CASE NO.: UE-220053 & UG-220054
REQUESTER: Public Counsel
TYPE: Data Request
REQUEST NO.: PC – 320
DATE PREPARED: 09/07/2022
WITNESS: Elizabeth Andrews
RESPONDER: Liz Andrews
DEPT: Regulatory Affairs
TELEPHONE: (509) 495-8601
EMAIL: liz.andrews@avistacorp.com

SUBJECT: RE: Re: RY1 and RY2.

REQUEST:

Please: a. Provide the calculations in Excel with formulas intact and all supporting data showing how the Company calculated the ROEs and RORs for each business for RY1 and RY2 in Tables 2 and 3. b. Confirm that to arrive at the ROEs and RORs in Tables 2 and 3, the Company used the revised revenue requirement proposed by Public Counsel and the rate base and the common equity balances proposed by the Company in this case for RY1 and RY2 instead of Public Counsel’s adjusted rate base and common equity. If you are not confirming, please explain in detail how the ROEs and RORs were determined

RESPONSE:

See Andrews Rebuttal workpapers provided to all parties. Labeled “Electric Model – WP” and “Nat Gas Model WP”.

To arrive at the ROEs and RORs in Tables 2 and 3, the Company used the revenue requirement as proposed by Public Counsel, using the rate base and common equity balances proposed per the Settlement for RY1 and RY2.
ELIZABETH M. ANDREWS WORK PAPER “ELECTRIC MODEL – WP” IS PROVIDED IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT ONLY DUE TO ITS VOLUMINOUS SIZE WHEN PRINTED AND IN PDF FORMAT