

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

In re the Matter of)
)
AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a)
AVISTA UTILITIES) DOCKET NO. UE-010395
)
Request Regarding a Surcharge in Electric)
Rates)
_____)

**PREHEARING BRIEF OF THE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS
OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES**

S. Bradley Van Cleve
Melinda J. Davison
Davison Van Cleve, P.C.
1000 SW Broadway, Suite 2460
Portland, Oregon 97205
Phone: (503) 241-7242
Fax: (503) 241-8160
mail@dvclaw.com
Of Attorneys for the Industrial Customers
of Northwest Utilities

DATED September 17, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
A. Procedural Summary.....	3
B. Avista’s Petition and Schedule 93.....	5
C. Staff and ICNU Proposals	7
1. The Staff Proposal.....	7
2. The Schoenbeck and Thornton Proposals	8
III. ARGUMENT.....	9
A. Avista’s Request Does Not Meet the WUTC Standard for Interim Rate Relief.....	9
1. The PNB Standard	10
2. Avista’s Proposed Surcharge Does Not Meet the PNB Standard.....	12
3. The Commission Should Not Allow Avista to Use the Proposed Surcharge as a “Stopgap” for its Financial Requirements	15
B. Avista’s Unregulated Operations Are a Substantial Cause of its Current Financial Condition.....	17
C. The Issues Raised by the Petition are More Appropriately Addressed in a General Rate Case	20
D. The Proposed Surcharge Violates the Stipulation.....	22
1. Avista Should Allow the Deferral Balance Elimination Plan to Work	22
2. Avista’s Proposed Surcharge is Not Consistent with the Terms of the Stipulation.....	24

a.	Avista Was Aware of the Deteriorating Hydro Conditions at the Time of the Stipulation	24
b.	Avista has Misrepresented a Fundamental Assumption Upon Which the Stipulation was Predicated	25
c.	The Imposition of a West-Wide Price Cap was not Unanticipated	26
3.	Avista has not Submitted a Petition to Alter, Amend, or Terminate the Stipulation.....	27
E.	The Staff Proposal is Unwarranted and Promotes Rate Shock	27
1.	Staff Has Not Demonstrated That Avista Meets the PNB Standard for Interim Rate Relief.....	28
2.	Staff's Uniform Cents per kWh Rate Spread is Unjustified, Unduly Burdensome, and Promotes Rate Shock	30
a.	Avista's Institutional and Industrial Customers Cannot Bear the Rate Impact that Results from a Uniform Cent Per kWh Rate Design	30
b.	Staff Has Not Justified its Uniform Cents Per kWh Proposal.....	32
F.	If Interim Relief is Warranted, the Commission Should Adopt the Schoenbeck Proposal.....	34
1.	The Schoenbeck Proposal is Based on Actual Costs and Conditions	35
2.	The Schoenbeck Proposal Allocates the Proper Amount of Risk Between Ratepayers and the Company.....	36
3.	The Schoenbeck Proposal Continues the Deferral Period and Allows Consideration of Avista's Additional Costs in the Future	36
IV.	CONCLUSION	37