Docket No. UE-210829 - Vol. VI

WUTC v. Pacificorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company

October 21, 2024



> <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>

Page 87	Page 8
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 APPEARANCES (Continuing)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	For Alliance of Western Energy Consumers:
In the Matter of:	3 SOMMER J. MOSER
PACIFICORP D/B/A PACIFIC POWER &)	4 Davison Van Cleve
LIGHT COMPANY'S Revised Clean)	107 Southeast Washington Street 5 Suite 430
Energy Implementation Plan.)) Docket UE-210829	Portland, Oregon 97214
) DOCKET OL-210029	6 503.241.7242 sjm@dvclaw.com
,)	7
)	8 For The Energy Project (via videoconference): 9 YOCHANAN "YOCHI" ZAKAI
	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger
	10 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, California 94102
	11 415.552.7272
	yzakai@smwlaw.com
EVIDENTIARY HEARING, VOLUME VI	13 For Northwest Energy Coalition and Renewable
October 21, 2024	Northwest (via videoconference):
October 21, 2024	14 BARBARA CHILLCOTT
Lacey, Washington	15 Western Environmental Law Center
	103 Reeder's Alley 16 Helena, Montana 59601
Pages 87 - 369	406.443.3501
	17 chillcott@westernlaw.org
Administrative Law Judge Connor A. Thompson, Presiding	For Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission:
	19 ELIJAH CETAS
	20 PATRICK OSHIE Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish
* A PORTION OF TESTIMONY IS DESIGNATED CONFIDENTIAL	21 Commission
AND IS SEALED UNDER SEPARATE COVER. *	700 Northeast Multnomah Street
	22 Suite 1200 Portland, Oregon 97232
	23 503.238.0667
	ecetas@critfc.org 24 patri50931@aol.com
Reporter: John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR	25
Page 88	Page 9
APPEARANCES	1 INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS
Washington Utilities and Transportation	2 PROCEEDINGS/WITNESSES: PAGE NO. 3 Opening remarks by ALJ Thompson 107
Commission: David W. Danner, Chair	4 Appearances 107
Ann Rendahl	5 ALJ Thompson's overview of hearing schedule 109
Milt Doumit	6 Discussion re admission of prefiled exhibits 111
Administrative Law Judge:	7 Outstanding motions 130 8 Opening statement by Mr. Rogala 133
	9 Opening statement by Ms. Strauss 136
Connor A. Thompson	10 Opening statement by Mr. Sykes 142
For PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light	11 Opening statement by Ms. Moser 145 12 Opening statement by Mr. Zakai 148
Company:	12 Opening statement by Mr. Zakai 148 13 Opening statement by Ms. Chillcott 149
ZACHARY ROGALA	14 Opening statement by Mr. Cetas 151
PacifiCorp 825 Northeast Multnomah Street	15 MATTHEW McVEE
Portland, Oregon 97232	Direct examination by Mr. Rogala 156
435.319.5010 zachary.rogala@pacificorp.com	16 Cross-examination by Ms. Strauss 157 Cross-examination by Mr. Sykes 174
	17 Cross-examination by Ms. Chillcott 194
For Commission Staff:	Cross-examination by Mr. Cetas 207
JOSEPHINE STRAUSS	18 Redirect examination by Mr. Rogala 219
Machinetan State Office of the	Questions by ALJ Thompson 220 19 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 223
Washington State Office of the	
Attorney General PO Box 40128	
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241
Attomey General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov Public Counsel:	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21 DR. ROHINI GHOSH
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov Public Counsel: ROBERT D. SYKES Washington State Office of the	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov Public Counsel: ROBERT D. SYKES Washington State Office of the Attorney General	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21 DR. ROHINI GHOSH 22 Direct examination by Mr. Rogala 251 Cross-examination by Ms. Strauss 252 23 Cross-examination by Mr. Sykes 281
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov Public Counsel: ROBERT D. SYKES Washington State Office of the	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21 DR. ROHINI GHOSH 22 Direct examination by Mr. Rogala 251 Cross-examination by Ms. Strauss 252 23 Cross-examination by Mr. Sykes 281 Cross-examination by Ms. Moser 289
Attorney General PO Box 40128 Olympia, Washington 98504 360.709.4850 josephine.strauss@atg.wa.gov Public Counsel: ROBERT D. SYKES Washington State Office of the Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue	Questions by Chair Danner 231 20 Questions by Commissioner Doumit 241 Questions by Commissioner Rendahl 246 21 DR. ROHINI GHOSH 22 Direct examination by Mr. Rogala 251 Cross-examination by Ms. Strauss 252 23 Cross-examination by Mr. Sykes 281

Page 91	Page 93
1 INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS (Continuing) 2 PROCEEDINGS/WITNESSES: PAGE NO. 3 DR. ROHINI GHOSH (Continuing) Redirect examination by Mr. Rogala 329	PACIFICORP MATTHEW D. McVEE, VICE PRESIDENT REGULATORY POLICY AND OPERATIONS, EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) MDM-3 Select Party Responses to 129 PacifiCorp Data Requests.
4 Questions by Chair Danner 335 5 JACLYNN SIMMONS	4 MDM-4X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129
Direct examination by Ms. Strauss 338 Cross-examination by Mr. Rogala 340 Redirect examination by Ms. Strauss 350	5 DR 20. 6 MDM-5X Attachment to PacifiCorp 129 Response to Staff DR No. 21. 7
7 DR. ROBERT EARLE	MDM-6X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 8 DR 27.
8 Direct examination by Mr. Sykes 352 Cross-examination by Mr. Rogala 353	9 MDM-7X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 53.
9 STEFAN DE VILLIERS	MDM-8X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 11 DR 57.
Direct examination by Mr. Sykes 360 Cross-examination by Mr. Rogala 361	12 MDM-9X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 58.
12 Addressing housekeeping items 365 13 Adjournment 368	MDM-10X Notice of Cancellation of 129 14 PacifiCorp's 2022 All-Source Request for Proposal, 15 UE-210979, April 3, 2024.
14 15 16	16 MDM-11X Oregon PUC Order 24-297, 129 August 28, 2024.
17 18	MDM-12X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 18 DR 38.
19 20	19 MDM-13X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 61.
21 BENCH EXHIBIT INDEX	20 MDM-14X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129
22 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION MARKED PAGE 23 BR-1 Public Comment Matrix 365	DR 62. 22 MDM-15X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129
Submitted by Public Counsel.	DR 63.
BR-2 PacifiCorp Response to Staff 365 DR 54.	MDM-16X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 24 DR 65.
Page 92	
1 PACIFICORP EXHIBIT INDEX	1 PACIFICORP
2 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 3 PAC-1 2023 CEIP Biennial 129 Report.	MATTHEW D. McVEE, VICE PRESIDENT REGULATORY POLICY AND OPERATIONS, EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) MDM-17X Berkshire Hathaway Investor 129 Letter.
PAC-2 Appendix A – Irrigation 129 Program.	MDM-18x PacifiCorp response to Public 129 Counsel's Data Requests
6 PAC-3 Appendix B – C and I Program. 129 7 PAC-4 Appendix C – Residential 129	No(s). 4-8.
Program	MDM-19X News from the States, August 129
Program. 8 PAC 5 Appendix D. CEIR Bioppiel 129	MIDIN-19X News from the States, August 129 7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate 8 system and split PacifiCorp."
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback.	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate 8 system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1.
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 PAC-7 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests Description 129 Requests 1-20.
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential).	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests - EAG Meeting 13 Question and Notes – May 23-25, 2022.
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). PAC-9 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted).	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests – EAG Meeting Question and Notes – May 23-25, 2022.
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. 10 PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 11 PAC-7 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129 12 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). PAC-9 (Redacted). PAC-10C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential).	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Requests 1-20. 21 Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests – EAG Meeting Question and Notes – May 23-25, 2022. 14 PACIFICORP 17 ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. 10 PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 11 PAC-7 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129 12 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). PAC-9 (Redacted). PAC-10C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential).	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests – EAG Meeting Question and Notes – May 23-25, 2022. 14 PACIFICORP 17 ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE
PAC-5 Appendix D - CEIP Biennial 129	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests - EAG Meeting Question and Notes - May 23-25, 2022. 14 PACIFICORP 17 ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX 18 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 19 RG-1T Direct Testimony. 129
PAC-5 Appendix D - CEIP Biennial 129	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests - EAG Meeting Question and Notes - May 23-25, 2022. 14 PACIFICORP ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX 18 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 19 RG-1T Direct Testimony. 129 RG-2T Rebuttal Testimony. 129
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. 10 PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 11 PAC-7 Incremental Cost Workpaper. 129 12 PAC-8C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 13 (Confidential). 14 PAC-9 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted). 15 PAC-10C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). 16 PAC-11 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted). 17 PAC-11 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted). 18 19 20 21 PACIFICORP MATTHEW D. McVEE, VICE PRESIDENT REGULATORY POLICY	7
PAC-5 Appendix D – CEIP Biennial 129 Report Feedback. PAC-6 Interim Targets Workpaper. 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). PAC-9 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted). PAC-10C *Confidential* Portfolio PS1 129 Interim Targets (Confidential). PAC-11 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted). PAC-11 Portfolio PS1 Interim Targets 129 (Redacted).	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. 11 MDM-22X Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests - EAG Meeting Question and Notes - May 23-25, 2022. 14 PACIFICORP 17 ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 19 RG-1T Direct Testimony. 129 RG-2T Rebuttal Testimony. 129 RG-3 New Renewable Resources. 129 RG-4 Select Party Responses to 129
PAC-5	7 21, 2024, "Lawmakers want RMP to restructure its rate system and split PacifiCorp." 9 MDM-20X PacifiCorp Resp. to RNW/NWEC 129 DR 1. 10 MDM-21X Answers to CRITFC Data 129 Requests 1-20. Attachments to CRITFC Data 129 Requests - EAG Meeting Question and Notes - May 23-25, 2022. 14 15 16 PACIFICORP 17 ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX 18 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 19 RG-1T Direct Testimony. 129 20 RG-2T Rebuttal Testimony. 129 21 RG-3 New Renewable Resources. 129

	Page 95	Page 97
1 2 3 4	PACIFICORP ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE RG-6 Estimated Washington Situs 129 Costs.	COMMISSION STAFF JACLYNN SIMMONS, REGULATORY ANALYST EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE JNS-1HCT Testimony of Jaclynn Simmons 129 (HC).
5 6 7	RG-7 New Resources and 129 Allocations. RG-8X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129	JNS-2 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 6 Staff Data Request No. 6. 7 JNS-3 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
8	DR 12. RG-9X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129	Staff Data Request No. 8. 8 JNS-4 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
9	DR 13. RG-10X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 35.	9 Staff Data Request No. 9. 10 JNS-5 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 10.
11 12 13	RG-11X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 47. RG-12X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129	11 JNS-6 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 12 Staff Data Request No. 17. 13 JNS-7 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
14	DR 52. RG-13X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129	Staff Data Request No. 18. 14 JNS-8 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
15 16	DR 55. RG-14X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 2.	15 Staff Data Request No. 19. 16 JNS-9 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 23.
17	RG-15X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 7.	JNS-10 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 24.
19 20	RG-16X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 34. RG-17X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129	19 JNS-11 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 28. 20 JNS-12 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
21 22	DR 48. RG-18X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 59.	21 Staff Data Request No. 29. 22 JNS-13C PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 36.
23 24 25	RG-19X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 60.	JNS-14 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 24 Staff Data Request No. 39.
	Page 96	5 Page 98
1 2 3 4	PACIFICORP ROHINI GHOSH, DIRECTOR CLEAN ENERGY PLANNING EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE RG-20X PacifiCorp Response to Staff 129 DR 64.	COMMISSION STAFF JACLYNN SIMMONS, REGULATORY ANALYST EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE JNS-15 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 40.
5 6 7	RG-21XC Confidential Supplement to 130 RG-18X. RG-22X Washington Power Cost 129 spreadsheet (and source	JNS-16C PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 Staff Data Request No. 41. JNS-17 Rocky Mountain Institute — 129 Planning to Harness the Inflation Reduction Act: A
8 9	materials). RG-23X PacifiCorp response to Public 129 Counsel Data Requests	Toolkit for Regulators to 9 Ensure Resource Plans Optimize Federal Funding.
10 11 12	No(s). 4-8. RG-24X PacifiCorp 2023 IRP PIM 129 10.13.22 slides.	JNS-18 Oregon PUC rejection of 129 11 PacifiCorp's IRP and CEP In the Matter of PacifiCorp,
13 14	RG-25X PacifiCorp 2023 IRP UTC Staff 129 Comments. RG-26X PacifiCorp 2023 IRP PIM 129	12 d/b/a Pacific Power, 2023 Integrated Resource Plan (LC 13 82 Order 24-073).
15	04.13.23 slides. RG-27X PacifiCorp 2023 GRC Dockets 129	14 JNS-19 Staff's Recommended 129 Conditions List. 15 JNS-20 NewsData Article: OPUC: 129
	UE-230172/210852 Final Order. RG-28X OPUC Docket UM 2193 – 129 PacifiCorp's 2022 AS-RFP	16 PacifiCorp Faces '2- to 4-GW' Shortfall Ahead of 2030 GHG 17 Reduction Target.
16 17	B 1 1 B11 (11 1 2000)	18 JNS-21 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129
L7 L8 L9	Benchmark Bids (March 2023). RG-29X PacifiCorp Acquires 300-MW 129 Wind and Solar Project in	Staff Data Request No. 46.
	RG-29X PacifiCorp Acquires 300-MW 129 Wind and Solar Project in Idaho, NewsData article (March 1, 2024).	19 JNS-22 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 20 Staff Data Request No. 49. 21 JNS-23 2023 California Independent 129
17 18 19 20	RG-29X PacifiCorp Acquires 300-MW 129 Wind and Solar Project in Idaho, NewsData article	19 JNS-22 PacifiCorp Response to UTC 129 20 Staff Data Request No. 49.

Page 99	Page 101
COMMISSION STAFF JACLYNN SIMMONS, REGULATORY ANALYST EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE JNS-25HCT Cross-Answering Testimony of 129	PUBLIC COUNSEL ROBERT EARLE EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 3
Jaclynn N. Simmons (HC). JNS-26C Staff Workpapers for 129 Calculation of Hydro Purchases (C).	RLE-7X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129 4 Revised CEIP, Docket UE-210829, Order 06 Final 5 Order (Oct. 25, 2023). 6 RLE-8X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129
7 JNS-27 Office of Financial 129 8 Management Per Capita Personal Income by County.	Revised CEIP, Docket 7 UE-210829, Appendix A (Oct. 25, 2023).
JNS-28X Staff Responses to 129 PacifiCorp's Data Request Nos. 20-21.	RLE-9X In re SCGHG Complaint, Docket 129 9 UE-220376, Order 06 Granting Motion to Withdraw (Feb. 10, 2023).
11 JNS-29X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 CEP, 129 12 LC 82, Order No. 24-297 (Aug. 28, 2024).	10 RLE-10X In re SCGHG Complaint, Docket 129 UE-220376, Settlement 12 Agreement (Dec. 1, 2022). 13 RLE-11X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129
JNS-30X In re PacifiCorp's HB 2021 129 14 Continual Progress, UM 2345, Ruling Adopting Phased	Case, Docket UE-230172 and 14 UE-210852, Order 08 06 (Mar. 19, 2024).
15 Schedule (Oct. 1, 2024). 16 JNS-31X Exh. MDM-3, Select Party 129 Responses to PacifiCorp Data 17 Requests. 18 JNS 2024	15 RLE-12X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 16 Case, Docket UE-230172 and UE-210852, Attachment A
18 JNS-32X Exh. RG-4, Select Party 129 Responses to PacifiCorp Data Requests. 19 Requests. In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129 Revised CEIP, Docket 129	17 Settlement and Stipulation (Mar. 19, 2024). 18 19
21 UE-210829, Order 06 Final Order (Oct. 25, 2023).	20 21 PUBLIC COUNSEL STEFAN DE VILLIERS EXHIBIT INDEX 22
JNS-34X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129 Revised CEIP, Docket UE-210829, Appendix A (Oct. 24 25, 2023).	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE SDV-1T Response Testimony of Stefan 129 de Villiers.
Page 100	Page 102
1 COMMISSION STAFF JACLYNN SIMMONS, REGULATORY ANALYST 2 EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing)	PUBLIC COUNSEL STEFAN DE VILLIERS EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing) 2 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE
3 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 4 JNS-35X In re Pacificorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and 5 UE-210852, Order 08 06 (Mar. 19, 2024).	SDV-2 PacifiCorp's Response to WUTC 129 4 Staff Data Request No. 9. 5 SDV-3 Berkshire Hathaway Energy 129 Earnings.
JNS-36X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and UE-210852, Attachment A	SDV-4X Public Counsel Responses to 129 7 PacifiCorp's Data Request Nos. 13-28.
8 Settlement and Stipulation (Mar. 19, 2024).	SDV-5X Exh. MDM-3, Select Party 129 9 Responses to PacifiCorp Data Requests.
10 11 12 PUBLIC COUNSEL ROBERT EARLE EXHIBIT INDEX	SDV-6X Exh. RG-4, Select Party 129 11 Responses to PacifiCorp Data Requests.
EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE	SDV-7X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129 13 Revised CEIP, Docket UE-210829, Order 06 Final
14 RLE-1T Response Testimony of Robert 129	14 Order (Oct. 25, 2023). 15 SDV-8X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129
15 L. Earle. 16 RLE-2 Curriculum Vitae. 129 17 RLE-3 PacifiCorp Response to Public 129 Counsel Data Request	Revised CEIP, Docket 16
18 No(s). 1-3. 19 RLE-4X Public Counsel Responses to 129 PacifiCorp's Data Request	18 UE-220376, Order 06 Granting Motion to Withdraw (Feb. 10, 19 2023). 20 SDV-10X In re SCGHG Complaint, Docket 129
20 Nos. 13-28. 21 RLE-5X Exh. MDM-3, Select Party 129 Responses to PacifiCorp Data	20 SDV-10X UE-220376, Settlement 21 Agreement (Dec. 1, 2022). 22 SDV-11X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and
22 Requests. 23 RLE-6X Exh. RG-4, Select Party 129 Responses to PacifiCorp Data	23 UE-210852, Order 08 06 (Mar. 19, 2024).
24 Requests.	25

	Docket No. 0E-210629 - Vol.
Page 103	Page 105
1 PUBLIC COUNSEL STEFAN DE VILLIERS EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing)	1 RENEWABLE NORTHWEST - NW ENERGY COALITION (RNW-NWEC) KATIE WARE - RNW EXHIBIT INDEX (Continuing)
EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 3	2 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE
SDV-12X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and UE-210852, Attachment A Settlement and Stipulation (Mar. 19, 2024). ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY CONSUMERS (AWEC) LANCE D. KAUFMAN EXHIBIT INDEX	KW-12X In re PacifiCorp's 2021 129 Revised CEIP, Docket UE-210829, Appendix A (Oct. 25, 2023). 6 KW-13X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and UE-210852, Order 08 06 (Mar. 19, 2024). KW-14X In re PacifiCorp's 2023 Rate 129 Case, Docket UE-230172 and UE-210852, Order 08 06 (Mar. 19, 2024).
EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE LDK-1T Cross-Answering Testimony of 129 Dr. Lance D. Kaufman. LDK-2 Witness Qualification 129 Statement of Lance D. Kaufman. THE ENERGY PROJECT SHAYLEE N. STOKES EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE SNS-1T Testimony of Shaylee N. 129 Stokes.	UE-210852, Attachment A Settlement and Stipulation (Mar. 19, 2024). 11 12 13 14 RENEWABLE NORTHWEST - NW ENERGY COALITION (RNW-NWEC) CHARLEE THOMPSON - NWEC EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE 16 CT-1T Response Testimony of Charlee 129 Thompson. 18 CT-2 CV of Charlee Thompson. 129 19 CT-3T Cross-Answering Testimony of 129 Charlee Thompson.
Page 104	Page 106
1 RENEWABLE NORTHWEST - NW ENERGY COALITION (RNW-NWEC) KATIE WARE - RNW EXHIBIT INDEX	COLUMBIA RIVER INTER-TRIBAL FISH COMMISSION AJA DeCOTEAU EXHIBIT INDEX
## REAL PROOF STATE STAT	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE AKD-1T Testimony of Aja K. DeCoteau. 129 AKD-2 2022 Energy Vision for the 129 Columbia Basin. COLUMBIA RIVER INTER-TRIBAL FISH COMMISSION JEREMY TAKALA EXHIBIT INDEX EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION ADMIT PAGE JT-1T Testimony of Jeremy Takala. 129 The state of the state

And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers,

For Renewable Northwest and the Northwest Energy

the acronym that they use is AWEC, A-W-E-C.

22

23

24

25

Coalition.

Page 107 Page 109 1 1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Monday, MS. CHILLCOTT: Good morning, Your 2 2 October 21, 2024, at 621 Woodland Square Loop Honor and Commissioners. Barbara Chillcott with 3 Southeast, Lacey, Washington, at 9:00 a.m., before 3 Western Environmental Law Center on behalf of Renewable 4 4 the Washington Utilities and Transportation Northwest and Northwest Energy Coalition. 5 5 Commission: David W. Danner, Chair: and Connor A. The acronyms we use are RNW and NWEC, or N-W-E-C. 6 6 Thompson, Administrative Law Judge, the following Thank you. 7 7 proceedings were continued, to wit: ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you very much. 8 8 And for Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish 9 9 Commission. <<<<<>>>>>> 10 10 MR. CETAS: Good morning. Elijah 11 ALJ THOMPSON: Good morning. We 11 Cetas with Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, 12 are now on the record. It is Monday, October 21st, 12 here with Patrick Oshie. 13 13 2024. The time is 9 a.m. And for the record, we use the acronym CRITFC. 14 14 My name is Connor Thompson. I am an ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you very much. 15 15 administrative law judge with the Washington Let's go ahead and talk about our plans for this 16 Utilities and Transportation Commission, and I am 16 hearing. 17 presiding in this matter along with the 17 First thing this morning, we'll turn to the 18 commissioners. We are here today for an evidentiary 18 admission of prefiled exhibits and testimony. We will 19 hearing in Docket 21 -- or UE-210829, which is 19 then allow for brief opening statements. We had 20 captioned respectfully In the Matter of PacifiCorp, 20 multiple parties indicate that they would like to 21 doing business as Pacific Power & Light Company's 21 perhaps provide an opening statement, but they might 22 Revised Clean Energy and Implementation Plan. 22 waive that opening statement if the other parties are 23 23 Let's go ahead and take short appearances on the willing to waive their opening statement as well. And 24 24 record, starting with the company. so we'll get to that in just a moment. Openings, if 25 MR. ROGALA: Good morning, Your 25 you give them, will be limited to ten minutes each. Page 108 Page 110 1 Honor. Zachary Rogala with PacifiCorp. 1 Before we turn to the cross-examination of 2 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 2 witnesses, following the parties' agreed order of 3 3 And for staff. presentation, we will also address any outstanding MS. STRAUSS: Good morning, Your 4 4 motions. And we will plan on taking a mid-morning 5 5 Honor. Josephine Strauss on behalf of staff. break, if needed, but we'll play that by ear. And, if 6 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 6 needed, we also will take a lunch break. 7 Public counsel. 7 I do anticipate, given the cross time estimates, 8 8 MR. SYKES: Good morning, Your that we will be done early afternoon so as not to 9 Honor. Rob Sykes on behalf of public counsel. 9 interfere with any of the time constraints which were 10 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 10 conveyed to me via e-mail for some of the witnesses. For the Alliance of the Western Energy Consumers. 11 11 However, if we are approaching that 3:00 hour, we can 12 MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your 12 stop and address whether or not any of those witnesses' 13 Honor. Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf 13 conflicts are going to -- to arise and we need to take of AWEC. 14 14 those witnesses out of order. 15 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 15 I just want to remind the parties, again, to keep their microphones muted unless they are speaking and 16 And for The Energy Project. 16 17 MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your 17 also to only use video for those portions of the 18 Honor. Yochi Zakai with The Energy Project. 18 hearing when you have a speaking role. 19 And for the benefit of the court reporter, the 19 If you do have any technical difficulties, please 20 acronym that we use is T-E-P, or TEP. 20 feel free to let us know via the chat and the Zoom 21 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 21 function, but the chat function in the Zoom should only

be used for letting us know of technical difficulties.

If you have any objections to raise, please unmute

Are there any questions before we get to the

yourself and let me know.

22

23

24

25

Page 111 Page 113 1 1 preference if, instead, we should address the rest of admission of exhibits? 2 2 Please go ahead. those other exhibits as they come up in cross. 3 3 MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. I think -- I 4 4 think what we should do is go ahead and very briefly Just one question. I was curious if there's been any 5 5 decision on whether witnesses that haven't previously outline the objection and the reason for that objection 6 been identified for cross-examination can be excused. 6 to each of the exhibits which the parties are objecting 7 7 Specifically for AWEC, that would be Dr. Kaufman. to for the sake of the record. 8 ALJ THOMPSON: Yes. And I apologize 8 My concern with doing otherwise is that we will 9 9 get into cross-examination. Sometimes questions are for not letting you know earlier. We discussed that 10 late Friday, and I did not have time to get the e-mail 10 not asked specifically about an individual exhibit. 11 out before end of day. 11 And I don't want to get to the end of today's hearing 12 But for witnesses for whom cross-examination has 12 and be in a situation where we've not addressed an 13 not been indicated, those witnesses can be excused. If 13 exhibit through cross, but there's an outstanding 14 14 they would like to remain in the room or remain on the objection. 15 15 Zoom, they're welcome to do so. But I do not believe And so I will go ahead and start with the company. 16 that we will have any bench questions for those 16 If you want to identify those exhibits which the 17 witnesses. And if we do, we can address those through 17 company has an objection to and state a brief basis for 18 a bench request. 18 the objection, and I'll go ahead and note that as 19 MS. MOSER: Thank you. 19 you -- you proceed. 20 20 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. Let's go ahead and turn to the admission of 21 First, a quick question, clarifying question to 21 22 22 prefiled exhibits. staff. 23 23 I'll just go ahead and ask: Have the parties had On MDM-6X, this is PacifiCorp's response to Data 24 any opportunity to discuss the admission of prefiled 24 Request 27. We don't have an objection if you're 25 exhibits before today's hearing? I know that 25 looking to use 27D, but I'm not sure if you're also Page 112 Page 114 1 specifically the company and staff had indicated some 1 looking to use 27A through C. 2 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STRAUSS: Let me pull up the exhibit. Sorry. Don't have it in front of me at the moment.

By "D," do you mean at the bottom below D as well? MR. ROGALA: Correct.

MS. STRAUSS: Okay. Yeah, we just plan on using D, and it's mostly for briefing.

MR. ROGALA: Perfect.

Then, Your Honor, we do not have any objections to the use of MDM-6X, DR 27D, and that's understanding that 27A through C will not be used as cross-examination exhibits.

Moving on to MDM-17X. This is the annual Berkshire Hathaway 2023 Warren Buffett letter to shareholders. And we -- we object because we don't think it's relevant. 10-Ks are issued nine months after an IRP is filed, two months after the CEP -- CEIP update. So we think it's not relevant, because only then-current facts and circumstances either prior to and up unto the date of filing should be relevant for consideration whether the CEIP update should be approved by this Commission.

We also think it assumes facts that are not in evidence, because there's no actual evidence that

objections or partial objections to some exhibits, and I want to know if the parties had an opportunity to sort that out before today's hearing.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGALA: No, Your Honor, we did not. But at least from PacifiCorp's perspective, we would waive -- or we'd stipulate to the admission of all unobjected-to data requests at this time, and then we can discuss the staff and PacifiCorp objections after that.

MS. STRAUSS: Staff's in agreement. We'd be happy to waive any objection to unobjected-to exhibits, with the exception of those that were already previously identified last week.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And when does PacifiCorp and staff contemplate raising those objections: As those exhibits come up during cross-examination or when we introduce those witnesses? What makes the most sense to the parties?

MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, I'd -- I don't think I have a preference on five of the six exhibits, but I do think we should address one at the start of the hearing, just 'cause I think it's problematic enough, it should be excluded. But I -- I defer to, yeah, your preference or other party

Page 117

Page 115

PacifiCorp plans to, quote, forego resource acquisitions. And actually, you know, the opposite is true, where we've suspended our upstream dividend, and we have strong ring-fencing protections between both us and Berkshire Hathaway Energy and then again between Berkshire Hathaway Energy and Berkshire Hathaway as our ultimate parent.

But I think our fundamental objection is it calls for speculation because a witness maybe can't speak for Mr. Buffett or Mr. Abel, and I think it kind of cloudies -- clouds the -- the record to have questions on this exhibit. And I'll stop there.

MR. SYKES: And, Your Honor, that's public counsel's exhibit. And I would say that PacifiCorp is making a claim in this hearing that it is limiting resource acquisition based on, among other things, financial metrics. And this statement from Berkshire Hathaway is relevant to that issue about how they're -- about whether or not they are going to invest resources in Washington specifically. And if Mr. McVee can't speak to it, then I would suggest he say so when he's cross-examined rather than rely on the representation of counsel.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. The objection is noted, and I'll go ahead and make a ruling on all of

since that time, it remains confidential attorney work product. So we just don't want kind of the -- the -- the specter of kind of the Utah governor's request to kind of cloud the issues on what to do on PacifiCorp's CEIP update, so I think it's prejudicial enough that both of these exhibits should be excluded.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And for your objections, I believe that the next ones are to exhibits for Rohini Ghosh.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Did you want to hear public counsel's response to the objection?

ALJ THOMPSON: Do you -- do you have a response?

MR. SYKES: I do, Your Honor. Thank you.

One of the contentions PacifiCorp has made in the

One of the contentions PacifiCorp has made in this proceeding is that its allocation methodology constrained its ability to require resources for Washington. This exhibit has to do with whether that allocation methodology might change and might change the facts of this case. So I submit that it's relevant and -- and Mr. McVee should be subject to cross-examination on the issue.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

And before we proceed, Mr. Rogala, if you could

Page 116

this once we get to the conclusion. Thank you very much for your response.

You can go ahead and continue, Mr. Rogala.

MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Moving to MDM-18X and 19X. The first are PacifiCorp's

response to DRs 4A through C. The second is a News from the States article. They both deal with the same subject matter, and this is the Utah governor's request for PacifiCorp to investigate, you know, potential divestments of Rocky Mountain Power from PacifiCorp to try and see if there's any benefits that could accrue to Utah customers.

Similar to the 10-K, we have a relevance objection. This request was made almost a full year after the CEIP update was filed. We filed in November of last year. This request was, I believe, in June of this year. And there's almost a year and a half after the 2023 IRP wrapped up. So while we understand it's an important issue, we just don't think it is relevant to a document that was filed almost a year prior to the governor issuing this statement.

Second, we -- we don't think there's value to their cross-examination exhibit. Because as listed in DRs 4A through C, we have not conducted any analysis at the time when we responded to the DR. And if we have

Page 118

just speak a little bit closer to the microphone. It sounds like there's some -- some troubles hearing you.

MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Moving to RG-21X. This includes both the Excel spreadsheet and supporting power cost exhibits. We have several objections to this cross-exam exhibit.

Primarily, this isn't really a cross-exam exhibit. This is inappropriate surrebuttal testimony. This is Pacifi- -- or sorry -- public counsel-created exhibit based on a compilation of PacifiCorp exhibits and statements from prior dockets in an attempt to calculate some sort of net power cost value.

And because it's a public counsel-created document, this is basically an end run of the Commission's procedural schedule. And for those reasons, we think it should be excluded because we don't have the opportunity to examine public counsel's witnesses on this document, nor do we believe that the Commission should allow for that here because it'll dramatically extend the length of the hearing this morning. So we have an initial kind of procedural due process objection, but we also have evidentiary objections as well.

First, we have authentication concerns. We're not sure that public counsel can authenticate this exhibit.

Page 119

We don't think there's foundation to move it in. Dr. Ghosh is not a power cost witness, and she testified to that fact in her rebuttal testimony.

Dr. Earle has no testimony on this exhibit, so there's no opportunity for the exhibit to be moved in through his testimony.

We also think it's not relevant, as we stated in our surrebuttal testimony and plan -- or in our rebuttal testimony and plan to do so in briefing. This is just not a power cost proceeding. It's not a rate case.

So we think the Commission should exclude this exhibit, because it's -- it's -- simply it's just a collateral attack on same or similar issues from the current PCAM, and we don't want it to cloud the issues here. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Public counsel. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, quick point of clarification.

You said RG-21X. Is this the -- do you mean 22X since the exhibit list got renumbered last night?

ALJ THOMPSON: Oh. Thank you for that clarification. I -- I can clarify that is now RG-22X with the addition of staff's supplement to RG-18X --

and rebuttal, that Washington resources would cost it money and strain its financial metrics, and this shows there would be an offsetting benefit to acquiring situs resources. And for that reason, it is relevant, and it's not a proper surreply.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. MR. ROGALA: And, Your Honor, moving to RG-28X. And I believe this is the right numbering. Thank you, Josephine.

We're looking at OPUC Docket UM 2193. This is PacifiCorp's 2022 all-source RFP benchmark bids. Similar concern to above. We don't think this document is relevant. No bids from the '22 all-source RFP informed the '23 IRP CEIP update.

So we've come across this issue and similar issues in other planning proceedings. I think there's a real danger in bringing in after-the-fact circumstances from when the utility filed its planning document to call into question the company's decision-making that informed that document.

But we just don't think that's relevant, because the company had no knowledge or information of these documents that were filed after the company created and -- sorry -- finished its 2023 IRP update model, or IRP modeling. We have similar -- and I'll stop there.

Page 120

MS. STRAUSS: Okay.

ALJ THOMPSON: -- which is now marked RG-21XC.

MS. STRAUSS: Thank you. Just want to make sure.

ALJ THOMPSON: And for the parties just to know, everything below RG-21XC, which includes RG-22X through RG-31X, has been renumbered, so that would be exhibits -- cross exhibits from public counsel, RNW/NWEC. And I believe that that covers everybody.

But I just did want to clarify that I sent that e-mail out late last night after having had a chance to review staff's motion on -- on Friday.

Public Counsel, if you want to proceed with your response.

MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor.

First, I want to say this is not improper surreply. This is an illustrative exhibit to address testimony that Dr. Ghosh gave on rebuttal. She was asked in DRs whether she had considered the offsetting power cost benefits of Washington procurement to meet CETA requirements, and she said she had not. And this exhibit goes to that issue.

PacifiCorp has said in its testimony, both direct

Page 122

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And is there one more objection that PacifiCorp has to one of the exhibits from RNW/NWEC? And then we'll give them a chance to respond.

MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, we do, and -- okay. I'll just head into that objection as well.

So this is to RG-29X. And this is a NewsData article discussing a PacifiCorp purchase. Similar objection as above. We do not think it's relevant. This article lists a PacifiCorp purchase that was almost half a year after the CEIP update was filed and almost a full year after modeling was wrapped up. We just ask the Commission to keep the proper scope. Then-current facts and circumstances matter, not after-the-fact circumstances, which the company had no knowledge about.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And does counsel for RNW/NWEC have a response to those two objections?

MS. CHILLCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.

22 Thank you.

We believe these exhibits are relevant to this proceeding. PacifiCorp here has testified in this docket that there were no resources available for it to

Page 123

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

meet the 2030 targets. These exhibits go to the accuracy of that testimony. They're relevant because initial bids were submitted to OPUC. OPUC staff commented on what was submitted, and those comments are relevant because they indicate Pac could have potentially procured more affordable cost-competitive clean resources had the RFP not been canceled.

This speaks to the appropriateness of the suspension of the RFP here. You know, and we note that the company has indicated that the bedrock of its supply-side procurement actions for the revised CEIP are the company's 2020 and 2022 all-source RFPs. So we believe that, you know, Exhibit RG-20X and 29X, we have a similar response to those, and then 30X as well. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

And was there an objection to what is now marked RG-30X as well?

MR. ROGALA: There was, Your Honor. I wasn't sure if you wanted me to address that one as well, because I feel like it was different than the other two, but I can address that one next.

Same thing. We believe RG-30X -- this is OPUC Docket LC 82 staff report -- this document is not relevant. So, again, we're here today to discuss

this proceeding. And I will leave it at that. Thank

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

And I'd like to hear the objections from staff quickly while we're -- we're handling objections.

MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, staff's objections to Exhibits JNS-31X and 32X are essentially the same. They're only partial objections to the DRs that include those exhibits that were not DRs that were directed to staff nor responded to by staff. Staff believes there is a foundation and a knowledge issue here since these are not DRs produced by staff. Staff is really unable to comment on the responses in those DRs nor the basis for those responses.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

And was there one other objection to one other exhibit? I think there were two partials and one -one objection.

MS. STRAUSS: Yes. Your Honor. I do apologize. And then also JNS-30X, a relevance objection. This is a scheduling order from an OPEC docket, not substantive -- not of substantive or that would be informed to anything that's at issue in this case, not something that has any connection to this matter.

Page 124

PacifiCorp's '23 IRP and the CEIP update which is based on this document. This modeling was finalized in March

of 2023. CEIP update filed in November of 2023.

Renewable Northwest Exhibit LC 82 staff report, that's

based on the 2023 IRP update and CEP supplement. These

6 documents were filed in April of this year. It's hard 7

for me to imagine how a document that analyzes a

completely separate modeling universe could be relevant for this proceeding, and for that reason, we think it's

not relevant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we also think it's prejudicial and misleading. There's many incorrect assumptions and conclusions in this staff report. But, for example, there is not and has never been a 2022 all-source RFP short list despite staff's conclusion in that report. So we don't want to cloud the record here on this staff report from an Oregon docket. And I'll stop there.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

And I think we already have a response regarding RG-30X, but if counsel would like to respond further, I'd welcome the opportunity to do so.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. And, no, briefly our response is the same as our response to the objections to the prior two exhibits. We believe this Exhibit 30X is relevant to

Page 126

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And would the company like to respond? MR. ROGALA: Yes, Your Honor.

I was wondering if that would be staff's objection to 31X and 32X. And we have no concerns with their objection to those exhibits that are not directed to Jaclynn Simmons.

Regarding JNS-30X, however, Jaclynn Simmons discusses LC 82, which is Oregon commission docket. She discusses Order 24-073. She provides that as an exhibit to her testimony. And, importantly, that order has been used by parties in this case to say, in effect, that PacifiCorp needs to issue an RFP to procure clean energy resources to meet the Oregon clean energy goals of that state.

I think that's incorrect factually, and the UM 2345 ruling provides language that clarifies that issue both factually and, from our perspective, as a matter of law as well.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you providing basis for each of the objections which were sent via e-mail. I would ask, before I proceed, if any of the other parties had any other objections to any of the prefiled exhibits or cross exhibits. I do not remember any being indicated,

Page 127 Page 129 1 1 are in Washington. That may be persuasive, but it's but I want to give you the opportunity now if you do 2 2 certainly not binding in any of the decisions, or dicta have any. 3 3 MR. SYKES: Sorry, Your Honor. I'm or writings of the OPUC staff is not binding on this 4 4 Commission. And we will give that its due weight as we trying to get the microphone to work. 5 5 Okay. So public counsel doesn't have any specific move forward. 6 objections to any of PacifiCorp's exhibits. There were 6 And, finally, I will note that to the extent we 7 7 many that were duplicated across several witnesses. have objections to responses to DRs or news articles or 8 8 work papers put together by public counsel, that those And it's not clear whether or how they'll be used for 9 9 any other witness. So those objections might be can be responded to if relied upon in briefing. This 10 10 handled during cross-examination, but we have none at is not our only chance to establish the record. We do 11 this time but wanted to give you a heads-up that there 11 have two rounds of simultaneous briefing. So to the 12 might be further objections. 12 extent that a party relies on that in their briefs, we 13 13 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you for do have reply briefs scheduled in this proceeding, and 14 14 that. those can be addressed through that -- that medium. 15 15 And with that said, I've heard all of the Anything else from any of the parties? 16 MS. STRAUSS: Staff concurs with 16 objections. I will overrule them for the reasons 17 17 stated. And with that, all prefiled exhibits and cross public counsel's statement. 18 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Please go 18 exhibits, excluding what has now been marked RG-21XC, 19 19 which I will get to in just a moment, are admitted at ahead. 20 20 MR. CETAS: CRITFC concurs as well this time into the record. 21 21 and has no objections. (All prefiled exhibits and 22 22 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. I do think cross exhibits, excluding 23 23 that the duplication issue has been somewhat addressed. Exhibit RG-21XC, admitted.) 24 Our rules do require that parties put witnesses on 24 25 notice of potential material which they might be 25 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Do you mean Page 128 Page 130 1 cross-examined on, and so I think it was appropriate 1 22XC, the renumbered? 2 under the rules for PacifiCorp to provide notice. 2 ALJ THOMPSON: 21XC. That one was 3 I do know for the future what we might be able to 3 filed on Friday, and I just want to give --4 do is to introduce those once and mark them once under 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 5 one witness, and then under a subsequent witness you 5 ALJ THOMPSON: -- the 6 can refer back to that initial marking. So, for 6 opportunities --7 example, if it's JNS-30X, you can let a subsequent 7 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Got it. 8 witness know that they may be asked questions about 8 ALJ THOMPSON: -- the opportunity to 9 JNS-30X. That way we don't have the duplication issue. 9 the parties to object to that since it was late filed, 10 And regarding the objections from PacifiCorp and 10 if there are any objections. 11 staff, I do think -- you know, this is an 11 And, with that, I do want to note that we did get 12 administrative proceeding. We are capable, I think, 12 a motion to file a supplemental cross exhibit, which 13 13 has been marked RG-21XC. It was filed by staff on and the commissioners are capable of providing due 14 weight in weighing the relevance of each of the 14 Friday afternoon, October 18th, 2024. 15 exhibits brought in. To the extent that any objection 15 Does any party have any objection to that exhibit 16 pertains to a witness's ability to speak to Berkshire 16 being part of the record? 17 Hathaway's thoughts or Warren Buffett's thoughts or 17 MR. ROGALA: No objection, Your 18 material that they may not have personal knowledge of, 18 Honor. 19 those objections can be made during cross if questions 19 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. I'm seeing 20 go into matters related to knowledge that the specific 20 shaking heads. Okay. 21 witness may or may not have. 21 That exhibit will be admitted into the record as 22 To the extent that we have objections to documents 22 well. 23 (Exhibit RG-21XC admitted.) being brought in from the Oregon Public Utilities 23 24 Commission, I see we have objections from both staff 2.4 25 and PacifiCorp related to documents from the OPUC. We 25 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And I believe

Page 131 1 that deals with the motion that was filed Friday. 2 Are there any other outstanding motions that I've 3 missed besides the one that was filed Friday? 4 MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, staff 5 submitted a motion to revise Jaclynn Simmons' testimony 6 a few months ago just to correct an error. And that 7 motion is still outstanding. 8 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And are there 9 any others? 10 I believe that was the only other one I saw in the 11 record as well. I did review that motion, and I did 12 review the changes. We did not get any objections 13 filed after that motion was submitted, and so that 14 motion is granted at this time as well.

> I want to turn to opening statements. I know that the company had indicated they would waive their opening statement. However, a couple of the parties indicated they would like to provide an opening statement. So before we move into opening statements, I just want to go around the room and ask, for those parties who do plan on giving an opening statement, to indicate that they plan on doing so, and then I will leave it to the company to decide if they would like to provide an opening based on parties' responses.

would you like to provide an opening statement as well? MR. ROGALA: Yes. Your Honor.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. I will just remind the parties that we will keep these under ten minutes. The shorter, I think, the better.

And so let's go ahead and proceed, starting with the company.

MR. ROGALA: Good morning, Your Honor, Commissioners.

From PacifiCorp's perspective, we think there are two cases here today. First, there's PacifiCorp's case. And we request the Commission approve our updated interim targets. And we're primarily focused on the current four-year CEIP planning period, and that's years 2022 through 2025.

Now, we're concerned that our previously approved targets are stale. If we can't update them to reflect current realities, it will result in unreasonable compliance costs for our Washington customers either in the form of short-term REC purchases, which are only a temporary solution, or inflated resource costs by having to find, negotiate, and ultimately bring on a resource soon enough that could contribute meaningfully enough to our interim targets for years 2024 and 2025, or in the worst case, our stale targets could result in

Page 132

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 134

```
Does staff intend to give an opening statement?
       MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Your Honor.
       ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Public
```

So we -- we've heard from the company.

counsel?

Project.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And AWEC? MS. MOSER: Yes, Your Honor, given that other parties haven't waived, the AWEC is prepared to give an opening statement.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And The Energy

MR. ZAKAI: Yes, Your Honor, given that other parties have not waived, we have a very brief opening statement.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And Renewable Northwest and the Northwest Energy Coalition.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Yes, Your Honor, we do plan to give a brief, very brief opening statement. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission.

MR. CETAS: Yes, Your Honor, we plan to give a brief opening statement.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And I will go back to the company. Based on the parties' responses, administrative penalties.

But even with our lowered near-term interim targets -- and, again, that's through 2025 -- our CEIP update gets us to CETA's 2030 goal. And, importantly, we think we can achieve CETA's 2045 standard more than a decade early. And that bears repeating. Our current plan indicates we can achieve CETA's 100 percent renewable requirement by 2032. So we readily acknowledge this CEIP update slows our compliance trajectory in the near term, in the first couple years. But within a decade, we plan to be the first Washington utility to serve our customers with 100 percent renewable energy.

So regardless of the outcome, we hope this context is not lost on the Commission. So that's PacifiCorp's case. But in a rare alignment of parties, I think it's AWEC's position as well.

So now to the second case. The rest of the intervenors are earnestly concerned with the pace of PacifiCorp's energy transition, but most importantly, years '25 through 2030. They're concerned that lowering our interim targets today will prevent compliance by 2030, and because of that concern, the Commission should reject our request and set some sort of example with PacifiCorp, either by holding us to our

Page 137

Page 138

Page 135

current interim targets, which everyone concedes are outdated, or approving our proposed targets, though only with an interlocking web of conditions to address intervenor concerns.

And I think it's important that these two cases are talking past each other. The intervenors, almost to a witness, do not contradict our justifications for lowered interim targets. Many even accept that our justifications are correct: From increased load, to updated thermal resource assumptions, to actual procurement efforts, to relying on the WIJAM. Each of these issues led to verifiable actual reductions in PacifiCorp's interim targets, and they are uncontested.

Instead, these parties are concerned with the precedent it might set if the Commission approves our lowered targets. They want to transform CEIP updates, planning documents, and do a determination of CETA progress, or they want the Commission to assess penalties for even asking the Commission to lower our interim targets even though Washington law allows PacifiCorp to do so. Or they want the Commission to order PacifiCorp to procure resources, something which I think everyone should agree on, a utility Commission has never done before.

So given these two theories of the case, we urge

2023. Seven days later, on November 1st, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2030 biennial update to its

revised CEIP containing drastically revised interim targets. Interim targets are intended to demonstrate a company's path towards CETA compliance.

In its settled and approved CEIP, the company committed to serving retail load with 31 percent renewable non-emitting generation in 2022 and 2023, 40 percent in 2024, 60 percent -- and 60 percent in 2025. Based on these numbers, the company projected serving its retail electric load with an average of 41 percent renewable non-emitting generation over the course of the four-year plan. These were tangible targets that demonstrated progress towards achieving the 2030 compliance requirement.

However, PacifiCorp essentially slashed each of these targets in its biennial update. In its update, PacifiCorp stated it would achieve 31 percent in 2022, 26 percent in '23, 25 percent in '24, and 33 percent in '25, averaging 29 percent over the four-year plan. For context, in 2022, PacifiCorp reported actually serving its retail electric load with 31 percent renewable non-emitting generation.

When the average for the four years is less than the achievement in the first year, one cannot say that

Page 136

the Commission to choose the first and approve our modest updates to reflect reality. But to the extent the Commission shares any of the intervenors' concerns, we ask that you reserve judgment on these issues and address them in our next CEIP, again, which is due in less than a year's time, and it will be focused primarily on the compliance years that intervenors are concerned with: Years '25 through 2029.

So we look forward to the hearing today, and we're happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Staff, if you would like to proceed.

MS. STRAUSS: Good morning, Your Honor and Commissioners. A Clean Energy Implementation Plan, or CEIP, is intended to demonstrate a company's path towards compliance with the Clean Energy Transformation Act, or CETA. It is a regulatory requirement that utilities submit these plans committing to interim targets that demonstrate progress towards CETA's different compliance deadlines, including the 2030 greenhouse gas neutrality mandate.

PacifiCorp filed its first such CEIP in 2021.

This CEIP was eventually revised and resolved through a settlement approved by the Commission on October 25th,

that is progress. Actions speaks louder than words, and PacifiCorp's actions in executing its plan for CETA compliance over the past three years isn't saying very much.

PacifiCorp highlights three main reasons for the reduction in targets. First, it contends that the 2021 revised CEIP was constructed employing MSP, an unapproved allocation methodology that was still in negotiation. Application of the approved methodology, the WIJAM, was a core reason for the reduction in targets due to Washington's smaller share of system renewable and non-emitting resources.

Discussions surrounding the new methodology, like the one incorporated in the revised CEIP, have since been terminated. And under the 2020 protocol, PacifiCorp is required to submit a new methodology. However, in its rebuttal testimony, PacifiCorp -- responding to staff, PacifiCorp vehemently opposed filing a new methodology that allocates more system resources, renewable and non-emitting generation, to Washington. It cited a string of reasons and demanded that staff explain how this would impact customers in other states.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction over the rates or treatment of the company's customers in other

13 (Pages 135 to 138)

Page 141

Page 139

states, just as the Oregon Public Utility Commission does not have power over Washington rates and issues orders based on its regulatory requirements in Oregon, not Washington. PacifiCorp is a multi-jurisdictional utility, and its responsibility to customers in other states is between it and the commissions of those states.

PacifiCorp next cites continuing high energy market prices that led it to revise thermal unit assumptions in its analysis of Washington targets. However, use of thermal units does not excuse PacifiCorp from complying with Washington law. While staff commends and encourages utilities to explore options to limit rate impacts during the clean energy transition, PacifiCorp must still follow the law and make prudent investments to ensure it has access to sufficient renewable non-emitting resources at the lowest reasonable cost.

Finally, PacifiCorp cites the 2022 repricing of bids received in its 2020 all-source RFP, various supply chain concerns, developments in the ozone transport role, and various world events as other reasons justifying their reduction in targets. Staff is sympathetic to these issues and recognizes that the impacts of some of these developments are outside the

compliance deadline.

Indeed, Washington State utilities may need to compete with other out-of-state utilities as deadlines in other states that have similar laws and similar deadlines in those laws also draws near. PacifiCorp's wait-and-see approach is not a plan. It is procrastination.

Evidence submitted by PacifiCorp in this case leaves much for want as the company has failed to show its claim of progress. As the testimony and exhibits demonstrate, PacifiCorp is making no inroads to resource acquisition and is averse to filing a new allocation methodology that allocates more system renewable and non-emitting generation to Washington.

Washington law requires that utilities submit CEIPs to show progress in reaching CETA's mandates. Approving a CEIP update that does not -- not only does not demonstrate progress but actually shows a regression is contrary to law. The burden in this case is on PacifiCorp to demonstrate how its plan shows progress under CETA. It has not done that.

The Commission should not permit PacifiCorp's update unless the company can demonstrate that it is actually making progress towards CETA compliance. If the Commission does permit them to revise their

Page 140

control of the utility. However, many of these are not impacts that are unique to PacifiCorp, and like every other utility in the state, it is still required to comply with Washington law.

PacifiCorp is required to pursue all cost-effective reliable and feasible conservation and efficiency resources in its path towards the 2030 greenhouse gas neutrality requirement. Based on the record and the responses received by -- to staff's data request, staff is unconvinced by the utility's renewable non-emitting generation planning. PacifiCorp has abandoned all efforts -- like canceling its 2020 all-source RFP -- to meet Washington law of the required amount of renewable non-emitting generation by 2030.

Actions speak louder than words, and while its modeling tells a nice story for the eve of 2030, PacifiCorp's actions indicate a severe deficiency in procurement planning that jeopardizes its ability to comply with the law. Plainly stated, this update fails to show how PacifiCorp is showing progress towards CETA compliance. Further delay in acquiring sufficient compliant resources only increases the costs of those resources as more and more utilities start to compete for generating resources with the approaching

Page 142

targets, though, the Commission should order the company to follow staff's eight requirements laid out in its testimony. Actions speak louder than words, and PacifiCorp's actions only demonstrate its intent to procrastinate and thereby jeopardize its ability to meet compliance requirements. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

Public counsel.

MR. SYKES: Good morning, Your Honor and Commissioners.

PacifiCorp filed its biennial CEIP update, substantially lowering its interim targets over this compliance period and over the next compliance period. Public counsel recommends the Commission reject the update and penalize PacifiCorp for its failure to plan for Washington.

Public counsel does not have a specific recommendation for the company's interim targets, but the evidence shows the company's static targets over this compliance period and grandiose targets over the next compliance period are clearly insufficient. PacifiCorp bears the burden of proving its clean energy planning has been adequate, and the evidence shows that PacifiCorp's planning is plainly inadequate and represents another example of PacifiCorp's failure to

plan for Washington's unique circumstances.

CETA sets ambitious green energy targets for the state's electric utilities, but it is also a planning statute, and this is a planning proceeding. Utilities must plan to meet statutory targets while maintaining stable and affordable rates. PacifiCorp, however, does not plan for Washington. It plans for its entire six-state system. This approach ignores that Washington is unique within PacifiCorp's system. Washington has CETA.

The evidence will show that PacifiCorp's systemwide planning ignores CETA and unnecessarily exposes hardworking Washington rate payers to higher costs. The company should be engaging in Washington-specific planning and procuring Washington-specific resources.

In this case, PacifiCorp -- in this case, the PacifiCorp costs and CETA compliance are joined at the hip. PacifiCorp offers a number of excuses for its reduced targets, but one stands out. Higher targets are expensive. Higher targets or situs procurement will stress the company's financial metrics and increase costs to rate payers. The evidence, however, does not support this contention.

PacifiCorp's planning creates unnecessary market

Page 145

Page 146

Washington customers should have a remedy for PacifiCorp's failure to plan, and PacifiCorp clearly needs an incentive, and other utilities should be put on notice that they have planning obligations as well. CETA -- at CETA and the Commission's own rules empower the Commission to penalize PacifiCorp for its failure to comply with CETA. And public counsel recommends the Commission penalize PacifiCorp in the amount of \$1,000 per day until PacifiCorp submits a compliant plan or -- or to impose a penalty it deems appropriate. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

AWEC.

MS. MOSER: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, and Judge Thompson.

From AWEC's perspective, the most important question before the Commission in PacifiCorp's 2023 CEIP biennial update is its proposed reduction to its interim targets for the current planning period, 2022 through 2025. PacifiCorp has testified that a number of changing circumstances necessitate lower interim targets for years 2023, 2024, and 2025, although importantly has not indicated a concern that it will fall short of CETA's 2030 greenhouse-gas-neutral

Page 144

exposure and raises power costs for everyone. The company cites a \$37 million incremental cost to procure additional resources or situs resources but admits it did not consider the offsetting benefits of lower power costs that would be achieved if it procures resources allocated to Washington. Lowering power costs would also reduce the company's PCAM differential, which would improve the company's cash flow and improve its financial metrics.

The Commission should ignore PacifiCorp's contention, 'cause the evidence shows a net benefit to Washington if PacifiCorp procures situs resources in compliance with CETA.

PacifiCorp can offer the Commission no assurance that it will procure sufficient resources to meet the 2030 targets, and its past actions offer little comfort. PacifiCorp admits it did not pursue additional resources it could have in the 2020 RFP. The company canceled its 2022 RFP, which would have brought additional resources on line in this compliance period. In its 2023 IRP, the company represented it would issue an RFP in 2024 for resources to come on line in the next compliance period. But in the IRP update, the company states it does not plan on issuing an RFP.

standard.

In that sense, PacifiCorp's 2025 CEIP will be critical for demonstrating how PacifiCorp will meet CETA's 2030 standard, but the interim targets for the next planning period, which is 2026 through 2029, are appropriately considered in PacifiCorp's 2025 CEIP based on the evidentiary record in that case. They should not be predetermined in this case.

For the current compliance period, approval of PacifiCorp's adjusted interim targets would still ensure that PacifiCorp makes reasonable progress toward meeting CETA requirements. Maintaining PacifiCorp's current higher targets is simply a question of pacing. If PacifiCorp has been imprudent in resource acquisition to date, the remedy for that should not come in the form of higher interim targets for the current compliance period than can be achieved at a reasonable cost.

If the Commission maintains current interim targets, the company will be faced with a choice: To either go out and procure, to the extent that resources are even available, either short- or long-term resources to meet these higher interim targets, or to fall short of its interim targets approved by the Commission.

Page 149

Page 150

Page 147

Both of these circumstances are not a good outcome for customers. If PacifiCorp decides to go out and procure resources but only short-term market resources are available, there would be no incremental value to customers from a CETA compliance perspective. These resources would come at an additional cost to customers but would not serve to support PacifiCorp's long-term CETA compliance. Even if PacifiCorp were to acquire long-term resources, those resources may not be the lowest reasonable cost considering risk resources that allow the company to meet CETA's 2030 greenhouse-gasneutral obligations.

This shifts the risk to customers that PacifiCorp has spent more money than necessary to achieve CETA compliance and leaves the only resource -- recourse for customers to be a likely lengthy and resource-intensive prudence fight which still does not guarantee a good result for customers.

If PacifiCorp decides that achieving higher interim targets is unreasonable, the company takes on the regulatory risk of being out of compliance with the Commission order. If penalties are administered, it is unlikely that they would be recovered in rates. Given this reality, AWEC views it as less likely that PacifiCorp will opt to miss higher interim targets even

Project on the record as supporting CRITFC's recommendations. Specifically, TEP agrees that PacifiCorp should work with the Yakama Nation to address energy sufficiency, weatherization, and DER opportunities in tribal communities and to create a

Thank you for your time this morning.
ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
And RNW/NWEC.

five-year plan for the same.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Good morning, Your Honor and Commissioners. Again, Barbara Chillcott here on behalf of Renewable Northwest and Northwest Energy Coalition. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these opening remarks.

My statement primarily focuses on a recommendation that the Commission reject PacifiCorp's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update and hold the company to the approved interim targets in the 2021 revised CEIP. The basis for this recommendation is the fact that PacifiCorp's dramatically reduced interim targets in the biennial update do not demonstrate progress toward Washington's clean energy transformation standards.

Moreover, our recommendation underscores the need for consistency with the Commission's Order 12

Page 148

at unreasonable cost to customers unless it is truly impossible to procure sufficient resources.

AWEC urges the Commission to consider these realities when considering whether or not to approve PacifiCorp's update -- updated interim targets in this case. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

And The Energy Project.

MR. ZAKAI: Good morning,

Commissioners and Judge Thompson.

The Energy Project recommends that the Commission set a minimum designation of energy benefits to named communities for each of PacifiCorp's distributed energy resource program offerings. TEP supports a 30 percent minimum designation as a reasonable baseline.

TEP also supports a program design where each type of distributed energy resource is offered to named communities. The cross answering testimony of witness Stokes provides recommendations for how to offer enhanced financial incentives for energy efficiency to named communities without opening up the low-income weatherization program to customers who are not income-qualified.

While TEP's testimony did not address CRITFC's recommendations, today I would like to put The Energy

regarding Puget Sound Energy's biennial update, which rejects the utility's proposal to reduce its interim targets for 2022 through 2025 compliance period.

In addition to our concerns on the lack of meaningful progress toward implementing the statutory clean energy standards, we've raised multiple concerns with the modeling that informed PacifiCorp's biennial update. Namely, PacifiCorp assumes renewable resource costs substantially higher than can be found in any comparable data source, 15 to 50 percent higher than the 2023 IRP cost assumptions for Portland General Electric and the California PUC through the early 2030s.

The evidence will show that PacifiCorp artificially inflated its renewable resource cost inputs for the 2021 IRP two-year progress report, which inevitably caused its portfolio modeling tool to select fewer renewable resources than if costs were treated agnostically across technologies. Given the lack of transparency around this modeling and other modeling concerns raised in testimony, we are concerned that PacifiCorp will continually adjust its model to delay procurement, possibly in response to recent wildfire liability issues, which raise challenges to resource procurement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 151

1

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

25

Considering PacifiCorp's substantial compliance need ahead of 2030, we recommend the Commission order PacifiCorp to release an all-source RFP to the market at the time of its 2025 IRP filing next spring, ideally following an accelerated schedule to allow for additional procurement ahead of the 2030 mandate. The Clean Energy Transformation Act grants the Commission the authority to implement flexible regulatory mechanisms where appropriate. And ordering an all-source RFP here appears to be appropriate. Thank

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. And for Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission.

MR. CETAS: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit. My name is Elijah Cetas, and I represent the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, or CRITFC. I believe this is the first time the CRITFC has appeared before the Washington UTC, and I would like to briefly introduce you to CRITFC and its interests.

CRITFC is a technical and policy organization wholly owned by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Indian Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Nez Perce

Page 153

here today is that investment in energy benefits for 2 communities -- investments like weatherization, energy efficiency, demand response technologies, and distributed energy projects -- these are also fish-friendly solutions and treaty-protective

6 solutions. In essence, the more resilient communities 7 are, the more resilient our grid is and the more 8 resilient is the Columbia River.

We view this proceeding as an opportunity for this Commission to develop its understanding of how CETA's requirements that PacifiCorp transform its system to a zero-carbon electric grid can also impact and benefit communities such as the Yakama Nation in PacifiCorp's service territory of Washington. Like other parties, we are concerned by the company's trajectory to achieve its CETA obligations and the risks that a failure to achieve these obligations could pose to vulnerable communities. Three of our four member tribes' reservations are within the service territory of PacifiCorp in Washington and Oregon.

Here we also offer a means to reasonably address the impacts by putting studies into action and providing energy benefits as called for by CETA. In closing, CETA requires that the company understand and address the effects of its decisions while transforming

Page 152

Tribe, and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakama Nation.

CRITFC has advocated for the protection of each of its four member tribes' treaty rights, the enhancement of natural resources guaranteed to the tribes in the treaties of 1855 since it was founded in 1977. Our duties include biological assessment, environmental restoration, fish harvest monitoring and evaluation, and advocacy before judicial and administrative bodies. CRITFC is governed by consensus decision-making, the Fish and Wildlife Committee members of each of its four member tribes.

In recent years, we've become more involved in assessing the holistic basin-wide impacts from the electric system operations and especially how the treaty rights of our member tribes are affected by the electric grid and the rapidly evolving clean energy transition.

In 2022, CRITFC published our most recent tribal energy vision that addresses these impacts and presents a road map of 43 recommendations for how the energy transition in the Northwest can benefit both Columbia Basin salmon, our member tribes and communities all throughout the basin.

One of our most important findings that's relevant

Page 154

1 its system at a reasonable cost and in a reliable way 2 for rate payers. 3

Citizens of the Yakama Nation are impacted by and could benefit from PacifiCorp's actions in compliance with CETA. For these reasons, we advocate for increased investment in energy efficiency programs, weatherization, demand response, and customer-based generation. Investment in these resources at the earliest onset will benefit PacifiCorp and its customers for years into the future. Thank you.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

Okay. Thank you, all, for your opening statements. Let's go ahead and proceed with cross-examination.

If PacifiCorp would like to call its first witness, Matthew McVee, to the stand. Typically we have the witness sit at this table here to my left.

Mr. Oshie, are you okay with the witness sitting next to you in that empty seat? Is that okay with you? MR. OSHIE: Absolutely, Your Honor.

21 That's not a problem.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Okay.

23 Wonderful. Thank you. 24

And if you prefer, you can sit next to counsel. It doesn't -- doesn't really matter, just so long as

	Page 155		Page 157
1	you have a place to sit and we have a microphone	1	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Your Honor.
2	available for you.	2	Thank you.
3	MR. ROGALA: Well, thank you, Your	3	,
4	Honor. We'd like to call witness Matthew McVee.	4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	5	BY MS. STRAUSS:
6	And	6	Q Good morning, Mr. McVee.
7	CHAIR DANNER: Perhaps, Mr. Oshie,	7	Can you hear me all right?
8	you could hand your microphone over to the witness.	8	A I can. Good morning.
9	ALJ THOMPSON: You may have to share	9	Q Great. Thank you.
10	once you get to questions and answer.	10	So to start off with, I would like you to turn to
11	And, Mr. McVee, when you're ready, just please let	11	your Exhibit MDM-2T, at Page 2, Lines 2 through 3. And
12	me know.	12	just let me know when you're there.
13	THE WITNESS: I'm ready, Your Honor.	13	A I'm there.
14	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. If you could	14	Q Can you just confirm that you asserted in your rebuttal
15	please raise your right hand, and I'll swear you in.	15	testimony that PacifiCorp's CEIP biennial update
16	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will	16	continues to show procurement of sufficient resources
17	provide today will be the truth, the whole truth, and	17	to meet compliance in 2030, correct?
18	nothing but the truth?	18	A Correct.
19	THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.	19	Q Okay. Outside of resources acquired from the 2020
20	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	20	all-source RFP, PacifiCorp has only acquired battery
21	You may proceed.	21	storage, correct?
22	MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.	22	A At this time, I believe we're in the process of
23	////	23	procuring battery storage. We did add, and current, we
24	////	24	are putting into service, I believe, a couple wind
25	////	25	generation facilities this year.
	Page 156		Page 158
1	MATTHEW McVEE, having been first duly sworn	1	Q But those are the result of things acquired in the 2020
2	by ALJ Thompson, was	2	all-source RFP, correct?
3	examined and testified as	3	A Well, our 2020 all-source RFP was canceled, so those
4	follows:	4	were resources that we determined, based after
5		5	repricing, were still prudent for us to procure and met
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION	6	our reliability needs.
7	BY MR. ROGALA:	7	Q So sorry. Just to clarify: Your 2020 all-source RFP
8	Q Mr. McVee, good morning.	8	was canceled? Is that what you just said? I believe
9	Can you please state your name and spell it for	9	it's the 2022 that was canceled.
	the record, please.		
10	the record, please.	10	A I believe the 2020 was we got to the short list, but
10 11	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w	10 11	A I believe the 2020 was we got to the short list, but there was repricing of the resources in the 2020.
			A I believe the 2020 was we got to the short list, but there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm.
11	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w	11	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020.
11 12	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e.	11 12	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm.
11 12 13	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp?	11 12 13	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we
11 12 13 14	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations	11 12 13 14	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected.
11 12 13 14 15	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. 	11 12 13 14 15	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020
11 12 13 14 15	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this 	11 12 13 14 15	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP?
11 12 13 14 15 16	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. 	11 12 13 14 15 16	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to those exhibits? 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to those exhibits? A I do not. 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these batteries are not colocated with renewable generation,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to those exhibits? A I do not. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these batteries are not colocated with renewable generation, are they? A I believe that's correct. But I'm not familiar with each one of those projects.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to those exhibits? A I do not. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. We tender this witness for cross-examination. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Staff, I believe you've indicated cross for this	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these batteries are not colocated with renewable generation, are they? A I believe that's correct. But I'm not familiar with each one of those projects. Q And battery storage on its own is not a power-
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Yes. My name is Matthew McVee. M-a-t-t-h-e-w M-c-V-e-e. Q And what is your role at PacifiCorp? A I am vice president of regulatory policy and operations at PacifiCorp. Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to those exhibits? A I do not. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. We tender this witness for cross-examination. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there was repricing of the resources in the 2020. Q Mm-hmm. A So we were not able to procure all of the resources we expected. Q But you still procured some resources from the 2020 all-source RFP? A Yes. We those that we determined were costeffective. Q Okay. So looking at the battery storage, these batteries are not colocated with renewable generation, are they? A I believe that's correct. But I'm not familiar with each one of those projects.

Page 162

Page 159

A That's my understanding, that it's going to draw power,
but it provides other benefits.

Q But it doesn't actually generate power?

A No. It's storage.

Q Okay. Under WAC 480-100-610(4)(a), a utility is

Q Okay. Under WAC 480-100-610(4)(a), a utility is required to pursue all cost-effective, reliable, and feasible conservation efficiency resources and demand response, correct?

A I don't have that reference. I -- I'd have to look at the reference.

Q Okay. Well, subject to check, is that correct?

A Subject to check, yes.

Q Okay. Thank you.

You agree that as the 2030 compliance deadline approaches, utilities subject to CETA in Washington State will all be essentially vying for the same pool of renewable and non-emitting resources, correct?

A Oh. No. I disagree. I think that there's -- because it depends on where they're located and what system they're connected to. So because of the wheeling costs to bring it from a different system, a lot of times you look at where those resources are located, and the cost will significantly increase with wheeling costs.

PacifiCorp's six-state system allows it to interconnect resources to its system and minimize the

And if it's two systems away, then you multiply that.

Q But you don't necessarily know what PSE or Avista's setup is for --

4 A No.

5 Q -- getting power from other states? Okay.

A I don't.

Q Thank you.

Looking at Exhibit MDX-4X. And just give me a minute to pull it up as well. And that should be DR 20.

Do you have that in front of you?

12 A I do.

Q Okay. In your response to this DR, you state
PacifiCorp will be adding resources to meet CETA
requirements to serve its Washington customers. The
timing of such acquisitions, however, requires
flexibility to minimize adverse impacts to customers;
is that correct?

19 A Yes

Q Outside of the resources acquired in the 2020 all-source RFP, PacifiCorp does not currently have any executed contracts for acquisition of these resources, correct?

A For -- I'm sorry. What do you mean by "these resources"?

Page 160

wheeling costs. So I don't -- I mean, based on my knowledge, which is I'm not -- I don't run RFPs for the company, but that there is going to be different pools, subsets of pools for resources.

Q Okay. So your position is that PacifiCorp is going to have access to resources that other Washington State utilities will not have access to?

A They might have access to it, but it's -- the prices are going to be significantly different because of the different location and the potential to wheel. PacifiCorp can interconnect resources in Wyoming, Utah, Oregon, and those can all flow to customers across its six states.

Q And so PacifiCorp has done the math and ensuring that those costs are something that would be beneficial to PacifiCorp over those other utilities.

Is that what you're saying?

A Well, we don't compare to other utilities. We just look at the access. But just as a fact of transmission costs for wheeling, that's generally how we look at it. And it's just that the wheeling costs, you would have to pancake rates to get across two systems. So you're going to be paying a wheeling rate for the system that the generation resource was interconnected, and then you'd have to pay the transmission cost on your system.

Q So you said in DR 20 that you will be adding resources to meet the Clean Energy Transition Act but that it requires flexibility to minimize adverse impacts to customers.

So my question is: Outside of those resources that were received during the 2020 all-source RFP, PacifiCorp does not currently have any executed contracts for other renewable generation resources?

A Well, we're -- we have added -- we're -- well, we're putting into service Rock Creek and Rock River this year. Those are system resources. So there would be a system share that would be going to the benefit of Washington customers. So as far as the other resources, we would be looking to the next RFP to start identifying those.

Q So were those Rock Creek projects ones that areidentified in the 2020 all-source RFP?

A I -- I can't confirm that right now. Subject to check, I believe they might have been identified there, but I'm not sure

Q All right. So outside the 2020 all-source RFP, there are no other contracts outstanding for renewable generation?

A No, it's -- we have to manage our -- our current financial situation, so we've -- we're being very

Page 163 Page 165 1 1 judicious on where we spend the cash and what was -- you know, it was a hope that we would get there, 2 2 agreements that we sign. and we didn't. The second part of the recommendation 3 3 Q Okay. And so there are no contracts or transactions is where we have concerns. 4 4 Q And that second part has to do with submitting a new that are currently -- you're currently engaged in for 5 5 additional resources, correct? allocation methodology that allocates more renewable 6 A I can't speak to the transactions. I'm not in our 6 non-emitting resources to Washington, correct? 7 7 procurement group. They -- I'm not sure what A Yes. Or several, I believe is the recommendation. 8 8 Q And your position is that that second part of that negotiations they've been working on. 9 9 recommendation, about submitting a new methodology that Q Okay. And PacifiCorp does not currently have any RFPs 10 10 for acquisition of renewable or non-emitting generating allocates more resources, that should be rejected, 11 resources, correct? 11 correct? 12 12 A Not at this time. We're waiting for the next planning, A Yes, I do. I believe that's fundamentally unfair. 13 13 because that -- the next IRP is going to be completed Q And discussions between PacifiCorp and the interested 14 parties regarding MSP have been terminated, correct? 14 early next year, and so we're going to wait for that 15 15 information in order to make sure that we have all of A Not MSP. The framework issues work group was 16 the current data and then procure based on that data. 16 terminated because PacifiCorp -- we got to the point 17 Q But the 2021 IRP, I believe, showed you guys needed 17 where we just realized we could not get agreement. And resources which were identified in the 2022 all-source 18 18 so PacifiCorp would be coming up with its own 19 19 RFP; is that correct? allocation methodology to propose to all of the states. 20 20 A At that time, yes. However, the -- with the new data, Q So looking again at your rebuttal testimony, so that 21 21 as we continue our planning, it showed that -same exhibit, but Page 5. And then looking at Lines 10 22 22 essentially that some of the facts that that was based to 11. 23 23 on were changed, and company witness Ghosh can discuss Your testimony states that the Commission has 24 that a little bit more. 24 already approved several adjustments to the CEIP 25 Q But the 2022 all-source RFP was terminated, correct? 25 biennial update in other proceedings, correct? Page 164 Page 166 1 A The 2022? 1 A Correct. 2 Q Yes. 2 Q All right. And the proceedings you're referring to are 3 the 2023 GRC, which was Docket UE-230172, which was 3 A Yes, it was. 4 4 consolidated with Docket UE-210852, correct? Q Okay. So looking at your rebuttal testimony again, so 5 5 MDM-2T, Page 13. A Correct. 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. 6 Q You're not referring to any other proceedings in that 7 Could you repeat that exhibit reference. 7 statement? 8 8 MS. STRAUSS: Yes. MDM-2T. Looking A In the statement, no. I believe that the -- yeah, I 9 at Page 13, Lines 1, through Page 14, Line 7. 9 mean, no, not in this statement. 10 Q (By Ms. Strauss) Just to kind of summarize: You talk 10 Q Okay. So looking at Exhibit MDM-15X. 11 about concerns with staff's condition that the 11 Are you there?

12 Commission order PacifiCorp to submit a new allocation 13 methodology. That's what's discussed at this point in your 14

testimony, correct?

16 A Yes, it is,

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. And PacifiCorp objects to this condition?

A We object to the second part. I mean, we are fine with incorporating the then-current allocation methodology, the approved allocation methodology, which is the first part. We believe that at the time, much like you forecast future prices, we were believing that the framework issues outlined in the 2020 protocol were appropriate to forecast for. But we understand the concern about that, because if you -- I mean, that

12 A Yes, I am.

13 Q Okay. Great.

14 Let's go -- okay. This is PacifiCorp's response 15 to staff DR 63, correct?

16 A Correct.

Q And the response cites the Commission's approval to 17 18 extend the depreciable lives of Colstrip Unit 4 and Jim 19 Bridger's Unit 3 and 4 until the end of 2025, correct?

20 21 Q Okay. And you assert that the extension of the 22 lives -- of the lives of these thermal resources are a 23 basis for the vision of the PacifiCorp interim targets, 24

25 A Well, I believe it's -- it is part of the changed

Page 167 Page 169 1 what impact any specific resource will have on its circumstances, yes. 1 2 Q Okay. However, the Commission's order approving the 2 credit, correct? 3 extension of the lives of these facilities was issued 3 A I believe that it's approximately 25 percent. I mean, 4 on March 19th, 2024, correct? 4 subject to check. Again, I'm not in the finance group. 5 A Correct. Our filing was much -- it was ten months or 5 But somewhere around 25 percent of the cost of a PPA 6 11 months before that. 6 would be attributed as debt. And so as far as the --7 7 Q Yeah. the impact to the credit metrics, we don't know. But 8 So the biennial update was filed well before that, 8 we do know that, with each one, we're going to have 9 9 correct? that 2025 percent impact to the -- the credit metrics. 10 A Yes. 10 Q And what is the impact of battery storage? 11 Q Okay. So the extension of those thermal resources was 11 A All PPAs, it depends on the cost. So I'm not -- I'm 12 not actually known at the time that you submitted the 12 not personally aware if there's a difference between biennial update, correct? 13 13 battery storage versus wind resources. 14 14 A Oh. Well, PacifiCorp was proposing that, and I believe Q Now, this is turning a little bit again towards just the parties were discussing that in settlement before 15 CETA. The rules in 480-100-610 lays out when a utility 15 16 16 must achieve specific deadlines for the clean energy 17 Q But it was not approved by the Commission at the time 17 transition. that the biennial update was submitted? 18 You're generally aware of that rule, correct? 18 19 A Approved by the Commission, no. But, I mean, again, 19 A Generally, yes. 20 20 Q Okay. And in the rules, a utility must demonstrate proposed by the Commiss- -- proposed by the company in that it's making progress towards CETA standards, 21 the -- at the beginning of the rate case. And, you 21 22 22 know, we were going through settlement negotiations, correct? 23 23 discussing with the parties. A I'm not sure of the exact language. 24 Q Okay. So I want to talk a little bit about the credit 24 Q I will present to you that the rules say a utility 25 metrics that you referred to. 25 needs to make progress. Page 168 Page 170 1 PacifiCorp's repeatedly asserted that it is A Okay. 1 2 concerned with its credit metrics, correct? 2 Q Okay. You agree that the interim targets demonstrate 3 3 A Correct. how the utility will make such progress towards meeting 4 Q Okay. And it is concerned how the acquisition of 4 those standards, correct? 5 resources will impact those credit metrics? 5 A I -- I'm generally aware that there's -- it sets out 6 6 the filing requirements and the process for it. So I 7 Q Okay. But it cannot numerically substantiate how 7 can't testify to the -- the specific language I don't 8 8 acquisition of one resource will impact its credit over have in front of me. I do know it has also the 9 a different resource, correct? 9 biennial updates and the chance to change the interim 10 A That's correct. We don't -- the credit ratings -- we 10 targets, yes. 11 get to go off the metrics, but the actual ratings are 11 Q Sure. 12 12 But the interim targets are the measure of how a done by the rating agencies. 13 Q Okay. So PacifiCorp can't say, for example, that 13 utility is making progress, correct? 14 acquiring a wind resource will bring down its credit 14 A I'd have to look at the actual language. I'm not --15 15 metrics by a certain amount, correct? Q Well, subject to check. 16 16 A Again, I'm -- I --A No. Generally there's an imputation of -- so there's 17 17 two different -- there's the debt and the actual equity MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, I'd like to 18 investments. And so say a power purchase agreement is 18 object here just briefly. I think a lot of these 19 generally viewed as debt, but at a lower percentage, so 19 questions are asking witness McVee to determine what he 20 not a hundred percent, like taking out a loan or 20 believes are the legal interpretation of CETA statutes 21 issuing commercial paper. So the more resources that 21 and regulations. And I haven't objected up until this 22 we sign as a PPA, you know, that's going to impact at a 22 point, because I think it's generally helpful to have 23 different level at some portion of the cost of that 23 those discussions, but I think we're past the point of 24 24 PPA. where there's value here, and Mr. McVee is being asked 25 25 Q Okay. So, but PacifiCorp cannot state with certainty to provide his interpretation of governing authorities,

```
Page 171
                                                                                                                              Page 173
 1
                                                                         1
          and I don't think that's appropriate for this witness,
                                                                                 establishing just and reasonable rates.
 2
                                                                         2
          and we should save that for legal briefing.
                                                                                    So it is going to have to be -- you can't operate
 3
                     ALJ THOMPSON: I agree to the extent
                                                                         3
                                                                                 the utility at a least-cost basis, because you still
 4
                                                                         4
         that we're asking for what the definition of making
                                                                                 have to serve load. You still have to meet State
 5
          progress means. That is a legal interpretation. And
                                                                         5
                                                                                  requirements. You know, you could -- if it was simply
 6
          to my understanding, Mr. McVee is not an attorney or
                                                                         6
                                                                                 taking a least cost as an extreme, then we would be
 7
                                                                         7
          testifying to the legal definitions contained in
                                                                                 looking at, you know, trying to avoid certain costs
 8
         Commission rules, so we'll sustain and move to the next
                                                                         8
                                                                                 that might be imposed in certain states, you know, for
 9
                                                                         9
         question, please.
                                                                                  say policy purposes. So you could say, well, it's a
10
       Q (By Ms. Strauss) The standard laid out in CETA, that
                                                                        10
                                                                                 least cost, so, you know, that resource, because of the
11
          utilities achieve targets at the lowest reasonable cost
                                                                        11
                                                                                 property tax in a certain location, no matter what the
12
          considering risk, correct?
                                                                        12
                                                                                 benefits are, would be -- you know, would not be
13
       A I believe so, ves.
                                                                        13
                                                                                 reasonable.
14
       Q Okay. And in your testimony, you stated that CETA
                                                                        14
                                                                                    So I also think that our terminology is generally
15
          requires a least-cost approach to compliance, correct?
                                                                        15
                                                                                 least cost -- least cost, risk-adjusted; or least cost,
16
        A I -- I did. That is the typical way we refer to it.
                                                                        16
                                                                                 least risk. We've used all of those terms. All of
17
          It's referred to in different ways in each one of our
                                                                        17
                                                                                 that means that we're looking at it in totality, so all
18
         states. But that's how we refer to it within the
                                                                        18
                                                                                 of the components of the resource. So I believe
19
                                                                        19
                                                                                  it's -- it -- "least reasonable cost" and "least cost,"
          company.
20
       Q So it's not exactly a least-cost approach, then,
                                                                        20
                                                                                 I believe, are interchangeable terms as far as the
21
          correct?
                                                                        21
                                                                                 utility's perspective.
22
                                                                        22
                     MR. ROGALA: Same objection, Your
                                                                                             MS. STRAUSS: Okay. That's all my
23
                                                                        23
         Honor. This is the same issue where staff is asking
                                                                                 questions. Thank you.
24
          witness McVee to determine whether a factual statement
                                                                        24
                                                                                             ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
25
          in his testimony aligns with the Washington statutory
                                                                        25
                                                                                    Public Counsel, I believe you've indicated cross
                                                      Page 172
                                                                                                                              Page 174
 1
         language of what planning approach is required for
                                                                                 as well.
 2
                                                                         2
         CETA, and I don't think that's the role for Mr. McVee.
                                                                                             MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                                                                         3
         I think that's the role for legal briefing.
                                                                                             ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
 4
                                                                         4
                     MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, if I may
 5
                                                                         5
                                                                                             CROSS-EXAMINATION
         respond briefly.
 6
                     ALJ THOMPSON: You may.
                                                                         6
                                                                                 BY MR. SYKES:
 7
                     MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, McVee --
                                                                         7
                                                                               Q Good morning, Mr. McVee.
 8
                                                                         8
         Mr. McVee is a vice president of regulatory policy at
                                                                               A Good morning.
 9
         PacifiCorp. He should be very well aware of what the
                                                                         9
                                                                               Q Can we please turn to your rebuttal testimony, MDM-2T.
10
         standards are that he needs to be complying with in
                                                                        10
                                                                               A Yes
11
         that role. This is merely asking about a term that
                                                                        11
                                                                               Q But I'm looking at Page 8, Lines 1 through 11.
12
         PacifiCorp has been using as a statement to identify
                                                                        12
                                                                               A Yes.
13
                                                                       13
         its approach to CETA compliance and how that compares
                                                                               Q You're testifying here that procuring additional
14
         to what the statute is actually asking.
                                                                       14
                                                                                resources, be it a situs resources or otherwise, might
                     ALJ THOMPSON: I'm going to go ahead
15
                                                                       15
                                                                                risk exposing customers and the company to increased
                                                                       16
16
         and overrule. You do use that language in your
                                                                                costs; is that correct?
                                                                        17
17
         testimony. So if you could provide your opinion, I'd
                                                                               A That's correct, yes.
18
                                                                        18
         appreciate it. Thank you.
                                                                               Q Okay. And can you look at Page 16, 20.
19
                     THE WITNESS: I mean, from my
                                                                        19
                                                                               A Page 16 of my --
20
         perspective, in my interaction with the planning group,
                                                                        20
                                                                               Q That'd be your --
21
         I mean, the -- nothing is ever least cost, so that's
                                                                        21
                                                                               A -- rebuttal testimony?
22
                                                                        22
                                                                               Q Yes.
         not an absolute. It's always the least reasonable
23
         cost. We just always use "least cost" as the -- the
                                                                        23
                                                                               A Line 20?
24
                                                                        24
                                                                               Q Line 20. And we're going to 17, 7, of the next page.
         language. 'Cause you could not have -- and if least
25
                                                                        25
         cost was an unreasonable approach, then we wouldn't be
                                                                               A Yes, I see that.
```

Page 175 Page 177 1 Q Okay. And here you're testifying that procurement 1 net power costs with the company? 2 might strain the company's financial metrics; is that 2 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, I think I'd 3 correct? 3 object at this point. The general rate case order 4 4 A Yes. speaks for itself. And witness McVee, to my knowledge, 5 5 Q Are you familiar with the company's PCAM? does not have any testimony in his direct or rebuttal 6 6 testimony that discusses the impact of net power costs, A Generally familiar, yes. 7 Q Okay. It allo- -- it -- generally speaking, it 7 and so I would object to this line of questioning. 8 allocates a difference in actual power costs to base 8 MR. SYKES: May I respond, Your 9 power costs between the customer and the company; is 9 Honor? 10 that right? 10 ALJ THOMPSON: You may. 11 A That's correct. 11 MR. SYKES: Your Honor, DRs have 12 Q Okay. Can you please turn your attention to 12 been issued on the issue of net power costs. Costs Exhibit MDM-18X. 13 13 have been an issue in this proceeding. And the general 14 A I'm there. 14 rate case Order 06 was actually submitted by PacifiCorp 15 Q And just bear with me. I accidentally closed the --15 for cross-examination of Robert Earle. So I would say 16 closed the exhibit on my end. 16 that if it speaks for itself, it speaks for itself for 17 I'd like you to look at DR 5 -- DR 5C, in 17 both parties and shouldn't come in at all. But if 18 particular -- on Page 3 of the exhibit. 18 PacifiCorp's going to bring it in, then we should be 19 MR. ROGALA: DR 5 or 4? 19 allowed to discuss the general rate case as well. 20 MR. SYKES: DR 5. 20 MR. ROGALA: And, Your Honor, I'd 21 MR. ROGALA: I don't think -- oh. 21 like to have one quick response. Costs are relevant 22 22 DR. There we are. Okay. Thank you. here in regards to the impacts to our credit profile 23 and the repricing that was experienced in the 2020 23 MR. SYKES: Yes. DR 5C. 24 THE WITNESS: I'm there. 24 all-source RFP, but net power costs are not an issue in 25 Q (By Mr. Sykes) Okay. This DR poses a hypothetical of 25 this proceeding, nor is the company's revenue Page 176 Page 178 what would happen if the actual power cost was lowered 1 requirement. 1 2 2 closer to the base power cost. And so I think this line of question again is 3 3 Does that look correct to you? collateral attack on the company's net power cost 4 4 A Yes, I see it. proceedings, and I don't think it's appropriate to go 5 Q Okay. And your answer is that if the actual power cost 5 down this line of questioning. 6 was lowered, that would improve the company's financial 6 ALJ THOMPSON: I will withhold a 7 metrics: is that correct? 7 ruling for the moment and hear the question in its 8 8 A I believe that the more revenue the company brings in entirety and the answer, and then we'll come back. 9 at this time, that helps. 9 Because I don't think we've -- we've gotten to the 10 Q Okay. 10 point that you're trying to make, and Counsel. A So --11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you 11 12 Q Increased cash flow would improve the company's 12 repeat the question. 13 financial metrics; is that right? 13 MR. SYKES: Yes. 14 Q (By Mr. Sykes) Did the Commission find that renewable A Correct. Generally, that's correct. 14 15 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the company's 20 -- 2023 15 resources lowered net power costs? 16 general rate case? 16 A We have -- I can't remember the specific finding, but I 17 17 A Yes, I am. believe that there was some language in it. I believe Q Okay. Do you recall the Commission's discussion in 18 18 it's generally true that renewable resources -- adding 19 that -- in their final order regarding in the net power 19 a certain level of renewable resources because they're 20 cost effects of renewable energy? 20 a zero-fuel-cost resource, so that when they're 21 A I believe -- I mean, I believe I recall them. It's 21 generating, you know, that is -- you remove the fuel 22 22 cost aspect, but you also have the issue of when do been a while --23 Q Okay. 23 they generate, when do they not, because it's a 24 24 A -- since I've read through that order. non-dispatchable resource. 25 25 Q The Commission noted that renewable energy would lower So if you were to look at it, you know, in more

Page 179 1 granularity, you would -- you know, if you looked at an 2 hour-by-hour basis, you might not have generation at 3 certain times. So the wind doesn't blow all the time. 4 Solar, sun doesn't shine all the time. So you have to 5 balance those out. 6 That's the advantage of batteries. Then you can 7

store generation from the system when it's cheap, like in the afternoon when you have -- in certain times of the year, when California will pay you to take solar generation, you can store that and then use that at different times.

Q Okay. But the -- the question was about the Commission's finding in that order about net power cost being lowered?

14 15 A I mean, I think it's highly dependent on the situation. 16 I'm not sure that I can speak to that in every 17 situation. But as we add more renewables, just like 18 we've been adding renewables over the past 20 -- I 19 mean, almost 20 years, it has lowered net power costs 20 for the company and for our customers. And we've been 21 adding a significant amount of renewables over that 22 period of time, and that has been reducing net power 23 cost. But there's going to be a point when you -- we 24 need to develop some dispatchable resources that may be 25 fuel-dependent.

in 2022; is that correct?

A That's correct. For resources, I think we're in '27 and '28 mostly.

4 Q Okay. Were those intended to bring any resources on

5 line for the current CETA compliance period? 6 A I don't believe any of the resources in that RFP,

7 subject to check. 8

Q Subject to check?

A Yeah.

1

2

3

9

10

11

20

22

24

1

3

6

14

19

Q Okay. Would it have brought 1345 megawatts of nameplate capacity? Does that sound about right?

12 MR. ROGALA: Clarification: Is that

13 overall for the '22 all-source RFP?

14 MR. SYKES: Let's say overall. 15

MR. ROGALA: Okay.

16 THE WITNESS: Yeah, subject to 17

check

18 Q (By Mr. Sykes) Okay. And that was canceled?

19 A The 2022 RFP?

Q Yes.

21 A Yes, it was.

Q The 2023 IRP, the initial IRP, the company -- or the

23 company indicated that it planned to initiate an RFP in

2024; is that correct?

25 A I -- I can't recall what -- about the plan document --

Page 180

Page 182

- Q And in this case and in that general rate case, PacifiCorp has contended that there's a benefit to geographical diversity; is that correct?
- 4 A Yes, we believe so.

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Okay. So geographical diversity has to do with where a resource is physically sited?
 - A Yes. So we've got, you know, wind generation in the Columbia Gorge and then wind generation in Wyoming and some other states. But the Wyoming has a much higher capacity factor, so we're able to take advantage of that for our customers.

Q But physical siting does not -- is not the same as allocation; is that correct?

A That's correct. We site for the -- to get the best resources, the most cost-effective locations.

Q I want to change gears here briefly.

ALJ THOMPSON: Before you do, I'm just going to note for the record: The objection is overruled. The questions and the point being made went directly to long-term planning and costs which have been brought up and made an issue.

You can go ahead and proceed with your next line of questioning.

MR. SYKES: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q (By Mr. Sykes) Mr. McVee, the company initiated an RFP

- Q Okay. Can I --
- 2 A -- witness Ghosh made.
 - Q Can I present to you that the 2023 IRP made that
- 4 statement?
- 5 A Yes.
 - Q Did the company initiate an RFP in 2024?
- 7 A Did not believe so. Our 20 -- yeah, I believe we
- 8 terminated the 2022 in 2024, and then with the issues
- 9 surrounding the changed federal regulations and our
- 10 financial situation, and given the potential
- 11 liabilities that we were -- we were facing, I don't
- 12 know if it was the -- I think the decision was it was
- 13 not the best time to issue an RFP.

Q Quick side point: What are the liabilities the company was facing?

- 15 16
- A Well, I mean, I think it's been fairly public about the
- 17 liabilities for various wildfire lawsuits.
- 18 Q The draft 2025 IRP is due in January; is that right?
 - A I believe so, subject to check, yes.
- 20 Q Do you suspect it'll identify a resource need in four 21 years?
- 22 A I have not seen the draft IRP, but I do know that our
- 23 load is growing generally, so ...
- 24 Q Does the company expect to commence an RFP in 2025?
- 25 A I believe that's the expectation. But, again, it'll

Page 183 Page 185 1 1 depend on -- the specific RFP, I mean, that will all do a two-year progress, which is essentially our next 2 2 depend on the planning studies. IRP for filing, but we also do updates in between 3 Q The company's pursuing a nuclear resource; is that 3 4 4 Q And do you know, if Natrium is delayed further, whether riaht? 5 5 A We have been working with a developer that is looking PacifiCorp will meet the 2030 statutory target? 6 6 A I would have to defer to company witness Ghosh about at a different type of nuclear resource. 7 7 Q Is that TerraPower? the impacts to the 2030. I know that, you know, 8 8 that's -- again, we need the dispatchable for 2045. A That's correct. 9 Q Okay. And that project is called Natrium; is that 9 Q Understood. 10 10 correct? You testified a moment ago about liability the 11 A Yes. So it's essentially salt storage --11 company's facing, particularly wildfire liability? 12 Q Yes. 12 A Correct. Yeah. 13 13 A -- with nuclear. Q Okay. Have you -- do you have a copy of MDM-17X? Q And that's the -- projected to come on line in 2023; is 14 14 A I do. 15 15 Q And your position in the company is a vice president of that right? 16 A I believe so. But I'm -- I -- I'm -- I haven't checked 16 regulatory affairs? 17 recently. 17 A Regulatory policy and operations. 18 Q And it was initially planned to come on line in 2028? 18 Q Regulatory policy and operations. 19 19 Do you -- do you pay attention to what's going on A I believe that is true. I know that there was some 20 20 at the Berkshire Hathaway Energy and Berkshire Hathaway fueling issues with development. 21 21 Q Has a build permit been issued? level of the -- the structure? 22 22 A I can't speak to that. I don't know. TerraPower is A I read news reports at the Berkshire Hathaway, 23 23 the -- you know, they're the main driving force, so... Incorporated, you know. I'm not privy to any of those 24 Q Do you know how many megawatt-hours of generation 24 discussions. Berkshire Hathaway Energy that 25 Natrium is planned to -- anticipated to generate? 25 essentially gets -- you know, those are discussions Page 184 Page 186 1 with our parent, and so there's some services that are 1 A Not off the top of my head, no. 2 2 centralized there. IT, for example, has generally MR. ROGALA: And just as helpful, 3 3 some of these specific questions on, you know, Natrium moved to that. 4 4 generation capacity, they may be better directed to But as far as decision-making, I -- I get some 5 5 Dr. Ghosh. I'm not objecting. I'm just -information down from BHE, such as their -- like, their 6 MR. SYKES: Noted. 6 suspension of dividends so that that cash can be 7 MR. ROGALA: Helpful to the extent 7 retained by the company. 8 8 Mr. McVee can't answer. Q Have you reviewed the Berkshire Hathaway investor Q (By Mr. Sykes) What does PacifiCorp plan to do if letter from 2023? 9 9 10 Natrium is delayed further? 10 A I read it when it came out, yes. 11 11 Q When it came out, when it was released? A Again, that's part of our planning process. There's --12 I know that there's frequent discussions with 12 A Yeah. 13 13 TerraPower as far as the statement of the development. Q Okay. Can you turn to that exhibit, please? 14 You know, I think one of our concerns as -- as a 14 A I'm there. 15 15 utility, as we're approaching not only the state Q Okay. I'm looking at Page 13 of that exhibit. 16 16 mandates but just decarbonizing our own generation A Yes. 17 17 fleet, is that we still need dispatchable resources, so Q Okay. Third paragraph, last sentence. "Berkshire can 18 we need dispatchable non-emitting resources, and there 18 sustain financial surprises, but we will not knowingly 19 is very few out there. 19 throw good money after bad"? 20 So I do think this is -- you know, that's --20 21 that's part of the planning process to assess new 21 Q Okay. Has PacifiCorp viewed investment in Washington 22 22 as throwing good money after bad considering -options as we go, new facts, what's the status, and 23 23 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor. that's why the -- we do IRPs every two years, and then 24 24 we do an update every year. For Washington, we do an Q (Continuing by Mr. Sykes) -- wildfire liabilities? 25 25 I -- we file an official IRP every four years and then MR. ROGALA: That's -- that's --

Page 187

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that calls for speculation on one hand, and I think it's prejudicial on the other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As noted at the beginning of the hearing, Mr. McVee has no personal knowledge of the statements contained -- or the intent behind the statements in this letter, and more importantly, there's substantial rate protection measures between both PacifiCorp and Berkshire Hathaway Energy as well as between BHE and Berkshire Hathaway, so I believe it's not relevant to try and establish any sort of connective tissue from what Warren Buffett says as chairman of Berkshire Hathaway to PacifiCorp's CEIP update. And, again, this document was issued, you know, almost a -- almost a vear after our '23 IRP was concluded.

MR. SYKES: Your Honor, may I respond?

ALJ THOMPSON: You can respond. MR. SYKES: So, Your Honor, he testified moments ago about wildfire liability. This particular portion of the letter is about wildfire liability. He has testified that he has -- he read the letter when it was released. And throughout this proceeding, PacifiCorp has contended that assumptions change throughout the planning process. So what they have said or when the -- the document was initially

our system to prevent that -- you know, the potential for wildfire ignitions. We're investing in batteries to help with the reliability of the system in a non-emitting way.

We do continue to invest for the benefit of our Washington customers. The issue is, you know, we have to plan and manage the business, and so we have to invest in a prudent manner based on the information that we have at the time.

Q And moving on. PacifiCorp's eastern subsidiary is Rocky Mountain Power; is that correct?

A It's not correct. We're one company. That's a business name. So it's -- our company is PacifiCorp. We do business as Pac Power in California, Oregon, Washington. We do business as Rocky Mountain Power in Wyoming, Utah, and Idaho.

Q Understood. Okay.

As VP of regulatory affairs, presumably you have knowledge of Rocky Mountain Power's operations in these states, correct?

21 A I have knowledge of PacifiCorp's operations across all 22 six states, yes.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with the Utah legislature's recent request for a report: Company restructuring?

25 A I am, yes.

Page 188

filed is relevant, but the assumptions continue to change, as PacifiCorp has alleged in this proceeding many times. And I think it's a fair question to ask whether the company intends to continue investing in Washington considering wildfire liability.

ALJ THOMPSON: To the extent the question goes to the witness's knowledge or lack thereof regarding the opinions of Berkshire or the -the company generally for which he may or may not have full authority to speak for, the question needs to be restated to ask for the witness's opinion, if you could, please.

And we'll overrule if you will restate the question to ask for the witness's opinion.

MR. SYKES: Let me ask a little bit more directly.

Q (By Mr. Sykes) Does PacifiCorp intend to continue investing in Washington considering -- considering wildfire liability?

A Yes, we do. I think the issue is, you know, we have to manage a bunch of different aspects about utility, and we can't look at one particular item without identifying the ramifications, you know, across all of our service. And so we have been investing. We continue to invest. We're addressing the hardening of

Page 190

1 Q Okay. The idea there was to limit collaboration 2 between the six states PacifiCorp serves; is that 3 right?

4 A So limit collaboration?

Q To align different states with their policy objectives.

A I think that's one of the concerns. Oregon -- the Oregon commission ordered a similar study in 2016.

Q The study for Utah is due in November; is that right?

9 A Correct. Yes.

> Q Okay. And in discovery, you testified that no one else has been done; is that right?

12 A No, we're looking at -- I mean, to look at restructuring, what we learned from 20 -- 2016/2017 review is that, at that time, because of how we finance the company, it would essentially cost \$4 billion to start addressing how you'd split it apart, and then we started identifying a bunch of operational issues.

So this report, we know there is no possible way to do a thorough analysis short of 18 to 24 months to look at it, because you would have to split all of the components apart. Every agreement we have, we would have to look at splitting those apart, reassigning portions, duplicating contracts. We'd have to look at how we do markets. We'd have to assess the impacts on the mortgage and whether we'd have to redeem the

	Page 191		Page 193
1	mortgage. And then you'd have to figure out the	1	
	• • • •	2	system. And then is it situs for Washington, situs for
2	structure. So we don't have an analysis. We are		Oregon. In the future, there'd be potentially situs
3	looking at what we would need to start doing to do an	3	for California, 'cause it has its own clean energy.
4	analysis.	4	Plus situs for Utah cities. And then you have customer
5	Q And the Western states on your system, they have	5	choice programs.
6	stronger green energy initiatives relative to Wyoming	6	And so I have the potential for a lot of RFPs that
7	and Utah, for example; is that correct?	7	would be competing for resources. And so that is one
8	A With an exception of the Utah cities. So there is	8	of the issues that, as we go to more situs, it's going
9	legislation several years ago. Two or three years ago,	9	to be more and more difficult, and we have to address
10	I believe. Several of the Utah cities got legislation	10	how we're going to do that.
11	for them to go a hundred percent green. And so they	11	Q Okay. But the allocation methodology, itself, does not
12	are looking at trying to decarbonize generation for	12	prevent situs allocation?
13	their loads.	13	A It doesn't. It just makes it so that we have to change
14	Q And PacifiCorp has contended that the delay in reaching	14	a lot of other aspects of our day-to-day operations.
15	a new allocation methodology has has resulted in, in	15	MR. SYKES: That's all I have for
16	part, with to the lower interim targets?	16	this witness, Your Honor.
17	A Well, it's a changed assumption. And so the assumption	17	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
18	when we're looking, we just essentially we were	18	I believe, next, Renewable Northwest and NWEC have
19	working on the framework that was established in the	19	indicated some cross-examination
20	2020 protocol. And that framework was what we used as	20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor.
21	the assumption in the original CEIP and revised CEIP.	21	ALJ THOMPSON: of this witness.
22	However, what we have started to realize is that	22	Yes.
23	it was getting parties were not able to get a	23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Do you mind
24	consensus around that, and so we were exploring	24	if we take a break now?
25	different options as far as how the allocation	25	ALJ THOMPSON: Yeah, that is
	Page 192		Page 194
	<u> </u>		1490 171
1	methodology would go. And so that brought us to that	1	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have
1 2	methodology would go. And so that brought us to that bigger concern that we are using something that is much	1 2	
			absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have
2	bigger concern that we are using something that is much	2	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for
2	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to	2 3	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions
2 3 4	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we	2 3 4	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench.
2 3 4 5	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just	2 3 4 5	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's
2 3 4 5 6	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed.	2 3 4 5 6	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington?	2 3 4 5 6 7	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more situs, that means that the company has to start	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more situs, that means that the company has to start changing every aspect of that. And then, as I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more situs, that means that the company has to start changing every aspect of that. And then, as I addressed in my testimony, it does get to a little bit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more situs, that means that the company has to start changing every aspect of that. And then, as I addressed in my testimony, it does get to a little bit of issues that PacifiCorp would have to work out about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. CHILLCOTT:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	bigger concern that we are using something that is much more speculative. And so much like the change to forward, you know, market price curves, you know, we decided that, for the update, we should go back to just what has been filed. Q And is the allocation methodology does it prevent PacifiCorp from allocating from situs allocating resources to Washington? A The allocation methodology does not. We can do situs resources. The problem we have is it significantly changes the operation of the company once you start adding more and more situs resources. Because right now we dispatch as a single portfolio for the benefit of all of our customers. That's how we operate. That's how we participate in the market. It's how we procure. And so when you start looking at more and more situs, that means that the company has to start changing every aspect of that. And then, as I addressed in my testimony, it does get to a little bit of issues that PacifiCorp would have to work out about how do you do procurement when you have the potential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	absolutely fine. I believe when we return, we have approximately 13 more minutes of cross-examination for you, Mr. McVee, from the parties and then questions from the bench. Would 15 minutes be sufficient? Okay. Let's return at 11:10 a.m. We are now off the record. (Pause in proceedings from 10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) ALJ THOMPSON: All right. Checking to see if we're okay. Okay. Welcome back, everybody, from our brief recess. Let's please be back on the record. I believe that the next party who's indicated cross-examination for Mr. McVee is Renewable Northwest and NWEC. And you may proceed. Thank you. MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. CHILLCOTT:

Page 198

Page 195

Could you please turn back to your rebuttal testimony at Exhibit MDM-2T, at Page 23. And let me know when you're there.

A I'm there.

Q Great.

Regarding Renewable Northwest's recommendation that the Commission direct PacifiCorp to issue an all-source RFP, you testified here at Lines 1 through 4 that — that Renewable Northwest does, in fact, direct — ask the Commission to direct PacifiCorp to issue an all-source RFP to be released to the market no later than April 2025, with further mandated procurement, if necessary, ahead of 2030. And then you went on to testify that this would be an unprecedented step for the Commission.

Did I read that correctly?

17 A That's correct.

Q Do you agree that if the Commission directed PacifiCorp to issue an all-source RFP, that the RFP could lead to the company identifying cost-effective resources that it could then proceed to contract with?

A I mean, I think that's a -- you know, that is one of the possibilities, yes, that it could.

Q Okay.

A I also think that there's, you know, other

CEIP. And so, you know, there's -- you know, there's the potential that it could inform going forward, but I don't think it will inform 2030 compliance deadline.

Q Okay. Okay. So just so I'm clear: So I would imagine
you would agree that the decisions -- the Commission's
decision here isn't in isolation, that the company will
be kind of moving forward with its, you know, plans to
meet deadlines in the, you know, near term and as of
2030 based on the Commission's deci- -- the outcome of
this proceeding, correct?

A Well, I'm sorry that I'm struggling to -- to answer that, or it might appear, but it's -- you know, the CETA deadline in the statute is 2030.

Q Right.

A We're showing that we're meeting that. The -- as we go through the planning process, we'll use updated information to identify how that's approaching. We are looking at new planning processes. Those were -- you know, we -- in our 2023 IRP update, which is not part of the -- the Washington cycle, as I mentioned before.

We're looking at different modeling techniques to address the different state requirements, so that's going to inform our planning going forward.

We're looking at, you know, the potential for situs resources, and so that's going to inform how

Page 196

complications, because we would -- around that same time, we would be completing the next IRP, developing the next CEIP, and there would, you know, also possibly be another RFP, also our system RFP.

Q Okay. Thanks.

In this proceeding, would you agree that the Commission's decision will inform how the company will meet CETA deadlines?

A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that question.

Q Sure.

Would you agree that the Commission's decision in this proceeding, whatever that may be, will serve to inform how the company will comply with CETA deadlines going forward?

A Well, I don't think it'll inform how we comply with the 2030 deadline. I think this really gets to interim targets and, you know, specifically to, you know, what happens in '24 and '25. And that's the -- kind of the -- the dates of the update, the biennial update that we're filing that we're requesting changes to.

There could be additional discussion in the order regarding the next compliance period, which would inform the next CEIP. But, again, that's going to be based on, you know, information that we have now, which may be outdated when we complete the next RFP, next

1 operations go.

We are developing for a proposal an allocation methodology, because the 2020 protocol is going to expire at the end of next year in our other states.

So there's a lot of moving parts, and so I'm not sure that the decision in this case is going to directly inform, specifically because at least the company's position is, I mean, this is about the modifications to the interim targets based on the information that we had.

You know, could there be additional direction from the Commission? Yes. You know, may there be other dockets, policy dockets from the Commission or rulemakings that set some of the standards as we go, as we learn from this first effort at clean energy planning? There's a lot of things that can change.

Q Thanks.

Turning back to your testimony, you indicated that having the -- the Commission ordering the company to issue an all-source RFP would be an unprecedented step; is that true?

22 A Yes.

Q Would you agree that the -- that CETA entrusts the Commission with the responsibility to ensure continual progress toward meeting the clean energy mandates?

Page 199

A I'm trying to recall the -- the language. I'm not sure if it's ensure meeting those or -- or just -- I can't remember the exact language, but I believe the -- the Commission does have a responsibility to make sure utilities, and utilities have an obligation under the statute, to meet the deadline set in CETA, which is 2030 for kind of the net zero and 2045, a hundred percent non-emitting.

Q Would you also agree that in its implementation of CETA, it is conceivable that the Commission may decide to alter the traditional regulatory landscape for planning and procurement when a utility is not making the required progress?

MR. ROGALA: I think I'd object on this issue. So what I believe counsel is trying to do is ask witness McVee to opine on whether CETA statutory language that allows for reasonable progress can be squinted at and allow the Commission to take an unprecedented step and direct an all-source RFP in 2025. And that's a question of the Commission's authority. And I think it's better served for legal briefing.

MS. CHILLCOTT: And if I may respond, Your Honor.

ALJ THOMPSON: You may.

discusses the latter, that we shouldn't ask this witness's question on the interpretation of Washington law

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you, both, for the basis and the response.

I'm going to go ahead and overrule to the extent that we're asking Mr. McVee for his opinion. I will note that counsel will have an opportunity to brief the legal issues and provide us briefing on the extent of what the statute says under Washington law. But to the extent that the question asks for Mr. McVee's opinion and relates to the testimony on Page 23 of 2T, you can go ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Sure.

Q (By Ms. Chillcott) So, Mr. McVee, would you also agree that in its implementation of CETA, it is conceivable that the Commission may decide to alter the traditional regulatory landscape for planning and procurement where a utility is not making the required progress?

A Yes, the Commission has broad discretion on how to address and implement CETA. I think that -- but as I pointed out in my testimony, you know, there is a -- it raises a lot of issues.

Page 200

MS. CHILLCOTT: Mr. McVee, in his testimony at Page 23, starting at Line 4, discusses his opinion with regard to the Commission's authority and opined that it would be inappropriate to -- for the Commission to order the issuance of an RFP outside of a rulemaking process to investigate the Commission's authority, so I would just point the -- Your Honor to Mr. McVee's own testimony, which is what I'm getting at here

MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, that assumes facts not in evidence. The question on Page 24 of Matt's rebuttal testimony, starting on Line 4, aligns with our objection. Says, question: Quote, "Could the Commission's new statutory authority be addressed in briefing in this docket?" and -- end quote. And Mr. McVee's response discusses, "That said, however, this is a significant issue of first impression which should mandate the need for, at minimum, a broader rulemaking process open to all parties."

So I don't think this discussion about where this question of law should be addressed is the same as Renewable Northwest's question about what the law allows for. One is a question of substance, and one is a question on forum. And I think because Matt's only

Page 202

You know, how is that procurement supposed to be done? Is it -- you know, is it going to be procurement because we're a multistate utility? Is it directing all-source procurement that's not supported by -- sorry -- an all -- all-system procurement that's not supported by a system study? Or is it situs?

And then if it's situs for the reasons that I stated before in responding to public counsel, is it -- does -- how we address that? How do we change our operations?

In addition to that, I believe that, you know, this -- it's a very complex environment for utilities to operate in right now, and we are expanding greatly. We're trying to address new statutes that implement energy policy, sometimes diverting -- and diverging energy policy among our states, or at least apparently diverging. I want to say that, you know, some of the eastern states that have different energy policies or at least let's say appears to introduce new energy policies are also trying to keep those costs to that state.

But we have to incorporate all of that. In addition to that, we are greatly expanding our -- our outreach in planning. We're trying to incorporate equity into the aspects of our planning and

Page 206

Page 203

decision-making. All of those things. There are a lot going on. And in a situation where we make a filing, we're updating interim targets based on the specific facts as they've changed, which we believe is fundamental to prudent utility operation.

To address that without addressing all of those broader policies about ratemaking, you know, that's -- we think that making those decisions in this limited, isolated situation is not going to be helpful, because, you know, regardless of arguments about whether it's precedential or not, it would most likely be precedential for other utilities, and they would not -- they're not in this proceeding. They wouldn't be able to -- to kind of raise objections or -- or valid points to that sort of development.

So I believe that making a decision in this based on two interim targets the last two years in our first Clean Energy Implementation Plan, you know, is -- it opens up the risk to essentially adverse consequences that we haven't identified.

Q Okay. Thanks.

You know, I think my question was mostly getting at, you know, I guess, in other words, like, CETA implementation may not necessarily look like business as usual here -- right? -- given the critical and

some benefit for that, because then you can still take advantage of least-cost dispatch but still meet state energy policies. And so we're looking at ways to make this transition the least cost for our customers.

Q Thanks.

Let's turn now to Exhibit MDM-20X.

Do you have that in front of you?

8 A I do.

- Q Great.
- 10 A I'm there.
 - Q Okay. Great.

And so this is Data Request 1 from Renewable Northwest and NWEC to PacifiCorp. And in that data request, we ask for bid information for the 2020 all-source RF- -- RFP and the 2022 all-source RFP that inform the company's 2023 IRP filings, correct?

17 A Yes

- Q And in response, the company indicated that it had no bid information to provide for the 2022 all-source RFP and it relied only on 2022 bid refreshes from the 2020 all-source RFP bids; is that right?
- A I believe so, yes.
 - Q So it looks like the company based their renewable resource cost escalation in its 2023 IRP on bid information received from one RFP process; is that

Page 204

time-sensitive steps that must be taken to meet CETA mandates, and it sounds like what -- your testimony really went to that. So would you agree with that?

A I mean --

Q We're kind of in a different place here with CETA implementation and things, correct?

A I mean, that's a broad question. I mean, you know, is there new things? Yes. Is the -- is it time-sensitive? I think we have another plan that takes us through '29, and we have, you know, five more years to get projects on line.

You know, so I do think that there is time. I think, you know, otherwise, I mean, that first CEIP, you know, getting that first CEIP right the first time, you know, that's difficult. And especially difficult as we're trying to navigate all of the other issues.

So I do think we have another RFP, and we've got other options as well to address this. So we don't have to go through the RFP. If there's smaller resources, we can ask for exemptions as we find them. You know, we are trying to figure out how we can incorporate situs resources to address kind of that diverging the states' kind of different energy policies and how we'll incorporate and still be able to operate.

We do believe that market participation provides

right?

A Again, I don't -- I was not part of the procurement process in this, and this was prepared by Dan MacNeil and Ron Schrier for Tom Burns, so I believe that is the -- the general basis for this. You know, one of the issues was the repricing that we got in the 2020 RFP. You know, that was issued, you know, prior to COVID. Got bids. And then with all of the -- the issues after that, those were just not reliable, so we were just trying to figure out, re-analyzing based on repricing.

And the 2022, we just ran into other issues. So, yeah, I mean, our -- the -- the cost information was limited because of the -- what we faced with those two RFPs.

Q Mm-hmm.

Are you aware of any other examples in which a utility's IRP reflects inflated renewable resource costs based on bid information received out of a single RFP process?

A No. But I don't track other utilities' IRPs over kind of the general kind of high level.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Got it.
Thank you, Mr. McVee. That's all I have.
ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

	Page 207		Page 209
1	And I believe that CRITFC has indicated some cross	1	kind of the tribal communities as part of the the
2	for this witness as well.	2	vulnerable communities that we need to address.
3	You can go ahead and proceed when you're ready.	3	MR. CETAS: Your Honor, if I may,
4	MR. CETAS: Thank you, Your Honor.	4	for the record, just point to the section. That's 4A.
5	I just noticed that I'm no longer in the Zoom	5	19.405.120(4)(A), Section iii, and it's yeah, does
6	meeting, so my video is not appearing. Apologies. If	6	identify Indian communities.
7	you give me one second, I'll be able to join again.	7	Q (By Mr. Cetas) Okay. Let's go to your data requests.
8	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Go	8	So this is MDM-21X and 22X.
9	ahead and take your time.	9	A I'm there.
10	MR. CETAS: Okay. I'm back in.	10	Q Okay. So we asked whether PacifiCorp had met with
11	Thank you.	11	Yakama Nation tribal council after the passage of CETA.
12		12	Is that correct?
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION	13	A I believe so. Yes.
14	BY MR. CETAS:	14	Q And we asked about whether PacifiCorp had inquired with
15	Q Good morning, Mr. McVee.	15	council about the condition of buildings on the
16	A Good morning.	16	reservation, weatherization needs?
17	Q It still is morning.	17	A Yes. I believe that was one of
18	I want to start by discussing a little bit about	18	Q And
19	your service territory in Washington and CETA	19	A the requests.
20	obligations.	20	Q Sorry. Thank you.
21	So PacifiCorp's service territory includes a	21	And PacifiCorp stated that had not met with tribal
22	segment of the Yakama Nation Reservation; is that	22	council?
23	correct?	23	A That's correct. We have been meeting with
24	A Yes, that is correct.	24	representatives from Yakima Power.
25	Q And PacifiCorp acknowledges this territory is an area	25	Q Okay. And that representative is a Mr. Ray Wiseman,
	D 200		D 010
1	Page 208	1	Page 210
1	where highly impacted communities reside?	1	general manager of Yakima Power?
2	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct.	2	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct.
2 3	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted	2	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's
2 3 4	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by	2 3 4	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG?
2 3 4 5	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151?	2 3 4 5	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes.
2 3 4 5 6	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes.	2 3 4 5 6	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one
2 3 4 5 6 7	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy	2 3 4 5 6 7	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach requirement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022? A The EAG?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach requirement? A Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022? A The EAG? Q Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach requirement? A Correct. Q To communities and also to Indian tribes, subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022? A The EAG? Q Yeah. A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach requirement? A Correct. Q To communities and also to Indian tribes, subject to check?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022? A The EAG? Q Yeah. A Yes. Q And PacifiCorp went to the stakeholders in Yakima
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where highly impacted communities reside? A Correct. Q And CETA statutorily defines highly impacted communities to include Indian country as defined by 18 USC Section 1151? A That's my understanding, yes. Q And CETA mandates, among other actions, energy assistance programs for highly impacted communities? A I believe so, yes. Q For the record, that's RCW 19.405.120. Specifically under this provision of CETA, it mandates that utilities make programs and funding available starting in 2021 for these communities? A Subject to check. Q Subject to check. Okay. And then submit a biennial assessment of these programs, subject to check? A Yes. Q Okay. And under this assessment, there's an outreach requirement? A Correct. Q To communities and also to Indian tribes, subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	general manager of Yakima Power? A That's correct. Q Okay. Mr. Wiseman is a member of PacifiCorp's Washington EAG? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. And PacifiCorp met with Mr. Wiseman on one occasion after 2021 to 2024? A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Let's talk about that EAG meeting. So this is part of the attachment MDM-22X. So that group was convened in May of 2022? A I'm sorry. Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.3? Q No. Sorry. This is an attachment. Yeah, this is CRITFC Data Request 1.3, and then there's an attachment which has PacifiCorp's meeting notes and the structure of the group, and that's MDM-22X. A Thank you. Q Okay. So the group convened in May 2022? A The EAG? Q Yeah. A Yes.

Page 211 Page 213 1 1 A Yes, I see that. though. 2 Q Okay. And in this attachment, it shows the responses 2 Q Okay. And in this same period, it distributed more 3 PacifiCorp gathered from the meeting and the takeaways? 3 than 20 million -- I believe the number is 23.8 million 4 4 throughout Yakima County? A Yes, I believe so. 5 Q Okay. And in the takeaways from the meeting notes --5 A Are you referring to CRITFC Data Request 1.6? 6 and, specifically, this is in the section labeled 6 Q Yes, I am now. 7 7 "Opportunities for PacifiCorp to Engage and Share A Yes, I see for home energy, low-income weatherization, 8 Information," on Page 3. 8 Wattsmart business energy efficiency projects, it was 9 9 PacifiCorp noted that, quote, "Ray is very 23.8 million. 10 10 interested in community solar as an opportunity to Q Okay. So these four programs are bundled together in 11 engage and bring benefits to hard-to-reach customers"? 11 that estimate? 12 12 A I see that. A I believe so, yes. 13 13 Q Okay. And there's not a next step listed in the Q Okay. And does PacifiCorp conduct outreach for those 14 14 document, correct? four programs together? 15 15 A There is follow-ups lower down on that page. A That I don't know. Q Okay. But not a follow-up related to the community 16 Q Okay. That's fine. 16 Going to 1.7. Of that 23.8 million invested in 17 17 solar point? 18 Yakima County, PacifiCorp responded to our data request 18 A I don't see one, no. 19 Q Okay. And this 2022 discussion with Mr. Wiseman was 19 that approximately two million was provided to census tracts on the Yakama Nation Reservation lands. 20 20 the only discussion indicated in the data requests for 21 21 meeting with a representative of Yakama Nation to Do you see that? 22 22 discuss weatherization, energy efficiency? A I see that. 23 23 A I believe so. But we've partnered our local energy Q Okay. And to your knowledge, is that based on the 24 efficiency group in -- I believe has been working with 24 census tracts exclusively? So -- sorry. Was that based on the -- the tracts of land, or 25 the local organizations and working with -- or, I 25 Page 212 Page 214 believe, subject to confirmation, but that there've was there a finer sort of tool for understanding how 1 1 2 2 been ongoing discussions before this and outside of the -- those benefits were distributed? 3 3 this to talk about energy efficiency. A Well, as far as the -- the tracking, we had -- I mean, 4 4 Q Okay. And to your knowledge, has -- have these previously we were -- we were tracking by ZIP code, is 5 5 discussions included representatives from Yakama my understanding, and then --6 Nation? 6 Q Okay. 7 A I believe so. I believe it was looking at just Yakima 7 A -- we've gone to census tract to be -- because it 8 8 Power, but I'm not -- I have not been engaged in that. provided a little bit more granularity. 9 9 I don't -- we have a different group that works on 10 10 Okay. I want to go back to your response to -energy efficiency. 11 Q Okay. Moving forward in our data requests, I want to 11 your response testimony, MDM-2T. 12 talk a bit about the conservation, what we refer to as 12 So you responded in your testimony -- and I don't 13 think there's a need to necessarily cite this, but you 13 conservation dollars but which -- so PacifiCorp refers 14 14 to as systems benefit charge adjustments. This is on responded in your testimony to our witness Ms. DeCoteau's four recommendations; is that right? 15 Data Request 1.5 from MDM-21X. 15 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Is there a 16 A Yes. 17 17 page reference? Q And you understood those recommendations to be to work 18 MR. CETAS: I apologize. We did not 18 with the Yakama Nation on weatherization; e.e., 19 put pages down in this document. 19 distributed energy? 20 ALJ THOMPSON: I believe it's Page 6 20 A Along with the modeling impacts of Columbia Basin's 21 of the PDF. 21 hydroelectric generation and developing a community 22 22 MR. CETAS: Thank you. benefit indicator specifically for -- or to reflect 23 Q (By Mr. Cetas) So we asked from Yakima County, during 23 Yakama Nation treaty rights. 24 24 Q Okay. And also to develop a plan to achieve these 2021 to 2024, PacifiCorp collected more than 25 25 \$40 million in the system benefits charge adjustments? targets as well.

Page 215 Page 217 1 Is that your understanding? 1 discussions, are those part of under PacifiCorp's 2 2 A For energy efficiency, yes. control? 3 3 Q Yeah. Okay. A Yeah. And I think that's important to go. But you 4 And you said that PacifiCorp is committed to -- to 4 still have to have participation. Not everyone is 5 this work, to working with the Yakama Nation? 5 going to want to invite organizations in to go through 6 A Yes. I think we're -- we're still developing and 6 parts of their house. They may not. These are 7 7 trying to figure out, you know, how we can most individual customers and their comfort level with that. 8 effectively implement and expand those efforts. 8 Q Okay. So going back to your response to NWEC and 9 9 Q Okay. staff, you said it's still your position that the 10 10 A So, yes, we have -- as far as the -- the first two company will work with the advisory groups to designate 11 recommendations to work with the Yakama Nation, we want 11 that 27 percent? 12 12 to expand our outreach. And then the five-year plan, A That's correct. We believe that's fundamentally part 13 13 we're actively engaging and trying to figure out more, of the outreach, is to -- to work with our advisory 14 14 you know, a longer-term way to approach that. group. 15 15 Q And to achieve that 27 percent, PacifiCorp would Q Okay. I want to refer back in the same response 16 testimony to -- and connect the dots to your response 16 presumably develop a plan? 17 to NWEC's witness Thompson and staff's witness Simmons. 17 A Yeah, we have a set of programs, and so it'd be 18 And I believe this is on Page -- yeah, this is on 18 incorporated in that plan, and their components -- the 19 Page 12, and this is when you respond to staff's 19 entire plan or components would be previewed with the 20 20 EAG. Condition 7. 21 21 You say, 27 percent of benefits measured across Q And you'd -- you'd combine the 27 percent commitment to 22 company's distributed energy resources flow -- or you 22 the programs? You'd have them speak to one another, in reply, of those 25 -- -7 percent, the company will work 23 23 other words? 24 with our relevant advisory groups to designate that; is 24 A I'm sorry. The -- the 27 percent commitment with the 25 that right? 25 programs? Page 216 Page 218 Is that still your position? 1 Q Mm-hmm. 1 2 2 A Yes, that's my position. A But all the programs would kind of flow in towards, you 3 3 I'm sorry. What was the line number for that? know, with the target of meeting that goal --4 4 Q Oh. Apologies. That's Line -- sort of 6 through 8 --Q Okay. 5 5 A Yep. A -- of 20 -- 27 percent. 6 Q -- on 12. 6 Q And presumably this could involve outreach 7 Okay. That's still your position? 7 communication with the Yakama Nation about reservation 8 8 A Yes, subject to -- our concern is that the actual needs? participation is beyond our control, and so we have no A Yes. I think that would be -- I mean, that would be 9 9 10 10 one of the -- the components of it. I mean, that's -problem with this being the target to work with, but we 11 11 believe it should be nonbinding, because if we -- we it's -- it's -- our customers in that community, that 12 12 would be one of the -- the communities that we would can try to get participation, but if there is no 13 13 participation, we may not be able to meet that 27 clearly develop a target plan for. I mean, recognizing 14 14 that that's a sovereign nation, so I think we're really Q Are incentive programs within PacifiCorp's control, in 15 15 interested in expanding the outreach with the Yakama 16 your opinion? 16 Nation. 17 A We can create incentives. But the -- you know, it 17 MR. CETAS: Okay. That concludes my questions. Thank you. 18 still requires the participation. And then there's a 18 19 question of how much -- how many customer dollars do 19 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 20 you add to advertising and incentive programs, you 20 Mr. Rogala, do you have any redirect? 21 know, and you may still not get that level of 21 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, actually, 22 22 just one very short line of questioning following up on participation. And so you've got to figure out what's 23 cost-effective. 23 CRITFC's question. 24 Q Mm-hmm. 24 //// 25 And is -- are -- is outreach and needs assessment 25 ////

you can store and serve, or you're going to have to

And do you recall during staff's questions, you

methodologies, those conversations had ceased?

mentioned that the framework discussions for allocation

have new technology that's dispatchable to meet all the

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

hours.

Docket No. UE-210829 - Vol. VI Page 219 Page 221 THE WITNESS: Yes. We terminated 1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 1 2 2 BY MR. ROGALA: the negotiations of the framework issues work group, 3 3 Q Mr. McVee, you were just asked several questions about and we're working on our -- PacifiCorp has essentially 4 whether the company will work with our relevant 4 taken the opportunity to develop its protocol, because 5 5 advisory groups and whether this would include outreach we realized we were not going to get agreement with 6 to the tribal nations. 6 stakeholders across six states. 7 7 Isn't it correct that PacifiCorp recently hired a ALJ THOMPSON: And do you have a 8 tribal liaison to facilitate those engagement efforts 8 nonbinding estimate as to when PacifiCorp might be able 9 as well? 9 to put forward that methodology to the State? 10 10 A That's correct. THE WITNESS: So we are -- we have a 11 Q And do you think that tribal liaison would be, you 11 deadline of December 31, 2025. So we will be filing 12 know, instrumental in facilitating that stakeholder 12 something next year to get approval for a new 13 13 engagement? allocation methodology. 14 14 A I believe so. You know, that's one of the things that ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. 15 we've expanded, and we know other -- you know, several 15 THE WITNESS: And just to -- it will 16 of the other organizations that we deal with have --16 either be a full allocation methodology, or we may 17 have started to do, is try to get more transparency and 17 identify certain increments to kind of allow us 18 someone -- and staffing dedicated to working with the 18 additional time. 19 tribal nations in our service area, and so that is 19 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And I actually 20 within the scope of that position. 20 have a fifth question. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 21 You mentioned that the company is considering ways 22 22 No further questions. to incorporate situs resources. 23 23 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Do you anticipate that the new allocation 24 And I believe we do have a couple of questions 24 methodology will have that flexibility built in and 25 from the bench. If it's okay with the commissioners, 25 anticipate the needs for perhaps situs resources for Page 220 Page 222 1 I'll go ahead and start. 1 individual states? 2 2 I think I just have four quick questions for you. THE WITNESS: I mean, I anticipate 3 3 Do you recall during Mr. Rogala's opening we're going to have to deal with it somehow. The 4 statement, I believe he said that the company would 4 question is how many other things does it change. And 5 5 meet the 2045 mandate set by CETA by 2032? Is that the so that's something we've been working on throughout 6 correct date? 6 the negotiation process. You know, we were able to get 7 THE WITNESS: That's what the 7 agreement with the parties to the negotiations in the 8 8 current -- or the biennial update is showing, yes. framework issues work group to kind of disclose -- I 9 believe it was late last year or early this year --ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And you agree 9 10 with that assessment? 10 status. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. I mean, I think 11 And, you know, we had taken input from the parties 12 that's where we're looking at the renewable energy. 12 and switched from the framework that was outlined in 13 13 You know, I think that, you know, as we go forward, we the 2020 protocol. And based on concerns that were 14 14 just have to -- it's -- getting to a hundred percent raised by several stakeholders in multiple states --15 is -- the company's always said that that is 15 both on the east and west side of our system -- we 16 technology-dependent. Because of the need to -- you 16 started looking at a new option which essentially would 17 either have to store a lot of renewable energy, and 17 allow us to kind of prioritize non-emitting resources 18 you're going to have to build renewable energy so that 18 to states with state policy, and so they would get a 19 19 larger share early, and then that share in those

34 (Pages 219 to 222)

particular resources would decrease over time as we

added more renewables to replace emitting resources.

that we're working on. Those sorts of ways to address

that allocation of the system resources, you know, are

difficult, but they allow for system dispatch, and that

You know, so there's different options like that,

20

21

22

23

24

25

allows us to participate in markets and keep the costs as low as possible.

However, we do recognize that that is potentially problematic in certain states, and so we're looking at as many options as we can. But it does lead to issues regarding dispatch, priority of dispatch, priority of procurement. So we were -- that pivot was -- that was suggested by some of the parties we thought was very beneficial, but we were -- we just realized that negotiations were not going to result in something we could file in a timely manner.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you for the clarifications.

Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning, Mr. McVee. It's still "good morning."

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Good

18 morning.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So in your testimony today, you -- you stated that the decisions about resource procurement will -- will depend on the next RFP.

Is PacifiCorp considering committing to conduct an RFP in the next -- as a result of the next IRP?

THE WITNESS: I'm -- I -- I hesitate

Page 225

Page 226

We believe that we will be able to get past that in the next couple years. But we do have to manage all of our issues, all of our financial issues, making sure that we're not subjecting customers to higher cost of debt, that we're solvent, and we're still able to provide service and be, you know, a reliable provider of electric service to our customers. But I don't see how we -- we don't at this time issue an RFP.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And in the past, PacifiCorp has conducted its IRP on a systemwide basis even though Washington has requested a state-specific IRP, correct?

THE WITNESS: Well, Washington has a different approach. But, again, we're a multistate utility, and so we have to kind of look at that approach. We do, a sense, a separate run, including social cost of greenhouse gas, but we also believe that there's been benefits that have flown -- or flowed to our customers in Washington of having that broad planning.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, regardless of whether you agree or not that that provides a benefit to Washington, does a significant reliance on the market for Washington drive the decision for whether there should be an RFP, or does it

Page 224

only because I'm not in the procurement group, but I believe that we have to. I mean, I believe that we're in a position where, you know, most likely we will have to do that. Because that next RFP is going to be looking at those resources in 2029, maybe in 2030. And so it's -- there's resource needs beyond the system just for compliance. So all indications that I've received from our planning group is that, yes, that there would be an -- an RFP issued.

Our concern is that RFP being -- you know, the system RFP is going to allow for the best resources to serve all of our customers, and it spreads the risk so you don't have the risk going to any particular state for any particular resource, so that kind of drops that requirement.

Then we go, and what we did with the last RFP, which the 2022, is we came up with a -- the hierarchy. So you had system resources then after that, because we have to benefit all of our customers, State compliance resources, and then customer choice. And so that was the priority in resources.

So every indication is yes. The only hesitation I have is that it's depending on the -- the IRP. It's depending on our -- you know, I believe that those resources will hopefully be past our financial issues.

get washed out in the system RFP?

Meaning the need for an RFP, if the IRP -- and I might be getting my acronyms mixed up here. If -- if the system IRP doesn't show a need for an RFP and yet the Washington -- you know, the run is showing a market reliance, how does -- how does PacifiCorp justify not doing an RFP when there's significant market reliance in Washington?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think it depends on where the state of the market is.

So, I mean, the state of the market has increased over the past, I believe, three years. But prior to that, the market had been lower. And so I think that there is, you know, the potential that relying on a market when the prices are lower than incremental costs of generation that would be situs allocated would be cheaper and more beneficial for customers. But with the market increasing, now we're looking at a different reality.

And so in that situation, yes, that's when we would start looking at is there a different way to address CETA or address the -- the needs of the load beyond CETA actually just for least-cost service with the market.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But market

Page 227 Page 229 1 1 IRP update. And then the 2023 IRP was our progress reliance is not a resource, is it? 2 2 THE WITNESS: It's not a resource, report. And then we did a 2023 IRP update. And then 3 3 no. But it could be cheaper for customers. We do -that update is when we started to introduce new 4 in the planning, we do maintain some open position, 4 modeling. And company witness Ghosh can talk a little 5 5 because it allows us to go to the market when market bit more about that. 6 prices are better. And you have to analyze that 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in 7 7 compared to the addition of resources. your rebuttal testimony -- and I'll -- at MDM-2T, at 8 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. You 8 Pages 7 to 9, that's where you discuss your concerns 9 9 with staff's primary recommendation to reject the also spoke to conducting planning and resource 10 10 procurement in a prudent manner. company's CEIP biennial update, correct? 11 Do you remember that? 11 THE WITNESS: I believe so, yes. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So do you 13 13 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So agree that there is a risk of disallowance if the 14 does the company view prudence on a systemwide basis or 14 company continues not to complete RFPs, does not 15 on a Statewide basis when it's considering potential 15 purchase resources in a timely manner, and then has to 16 prudence? 16 buy resources at a significant cost to meet the 2030 17 THE WITNESS: Both. I mean, we have 17 standard? 18 to show prudence of all of our action in each one of 18 THE WITNESS: I believe that -- I our states for those system resources. So when we're 19 19 believe that there's a risk either way. I do believe 20 looking at a system resource, we have to make sure that 20 that there's a risk to, as we go through the planning it's going to work for all of the states. That's why 21 21 process, the issue of if we're starting to get towards 22 we're starting to look at how can we -- you know, how 22 '29, '30, and we haven't started to work on 23 23 do we incorporate situs, because then you can address procurement, then there could be adverse issues, 24 that on a state-by-state basis. 24 because then we have adequate time to address. We've 25 The issues that we're still trying to go 25 got the market conditions. We're looking at that. We Page 228 Page 230 1 through -- I mean, this first Clean Energy 1 have new forward price curves. So we could start 2 2 Implementation Plan process is, you know, showing where procuring resources in the next, you know, two or three 3 the gaps are. And one of those is, well, how do you do 3 years and then have them in place in '29, 2030, for 4 4 fair procurement? compliance. 5 5 So, you know, we feel like looking at the system What the concern is, is that we need -- we're 6 in general first is the best way to do it, and then you 6 trying to plan for that least cost or least reasonable 7 can start layering in situs. And that's what we 7 cost approach. And so right now we believe that there 8 started to do in this last IRP run. We started to look 8 is too much risk for us, too much risk to our metrics 9 at how can we do system and then what is needed for 9 that could increase the cost of debt, make it harder 10 Washington compliance, what's needed for Oregon 10 for us to find capital, and those could have long-term 11 compliance, where do those overlap. And so we're 11 consequences. If we continue to not issue RFPs unless 12 improving our planning processes to start addressing 12 we're procuring under other means, seeking waivers of 13 13 this. competitive bidding requirements, procuring smaller 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: When you say 14 resources and able to address it that way, then, yes, I 15 the last IRP process, that was the 2023? 15 think there's concern, but we do have other options. THE WITNESS: It's what we call the 16 16 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So --17 2023 IRP update. And so that was provided for 17 so why should the Commission not disallow costs as 18 informational purposes in Washington. In Washington, 18 unreasonable if the company continues to wait and push 19 we have the 2021 IRP, and then the 2021 IRP progress 19 out resource acquisition to the very end, which could 20 report, I believe, is the name for what we refer to 20 have significant cost impacts on customers? 21 them on our website and in other jurisdictions that 21 THE WITNESS: Well. I think we 22 have the two -year IRP cycle. We have the '21 IRP and 22 believe that the cost impacts to customers are more --23 then the '23 IRP. 23 there's more at risk now than later. You know, 24 We also do an update in between those, and so 24 that's -- I don't think that there's any -- there 25 you'd have the 2021 IRP, and then the next year, '21 25 hasn't been any challenge to our modeling in this

Page 231 Page 233 1 filing. And so the supporting documentation shows that 1 look at the six-state region? 2 2 the least reasonable cost approach is to procure in a THE WITNESS: At that point, we were 3 3 timely manner for compliance. looking at a -- we were looking at the system resources 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think 4 first --5 reasonable -- Renewable Northwest and NWEC actually did 5 CHAIR DANNER: Mm-hmm. 6 contest some of the modeling, but I will leave it 6 THE WITNESS: -- with the plan that, 7 7 after the system, we would look at the state -- any there. 8 CHAIR DANNER: Good afternoon. 8 resources needed for state compliance and then 9 9 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. resources for customer choice programs. The issue, 10 CHAIR DANNER: It is now afternoon, 10 though, is that if we're looking at system resources, 11 SO... 11 our Washington customers would get somewhere between 7 12 So I wanted to ask you. You said this morning 12 and 8 percent. There is also a change in kind of that the 2022 all-source RFP was canceled in part due 13 13 the -- the relative load of our Washington customers 14 to the liability issues -- the cash flow issues that --14 and the -- to the system, and so we have low growth in 15 or financial issues that came after the wildfire 15 Washington, which increases kind of the absolute kind 16 liability issues arose, but you also said federal 16 of megawatt-hours that we need for compliance, but at 17 regulation. And by that I assume that you were talking 17 the same time, there is greater load growth in other 18 about -- and I think you mentioned in your testimony --18 parts of our system, so the share was going down. 19 the ozone transport rule. 19 And so, but that's still a significant part. If 20 Is that -- is that the federal regulation you were 20 you're thinking 7 to 8 percent of the -- the benefits 21 of any new non-emitting or renewable generation flowing 21 referring to? 22 THE WITNESS: That was one. I don't 22 to Washington customers, that decreases that 23 23 have the -- I don't believe that I have the -- the incremental need, and so we don't have to overprocure 24 actual notice to the -- the bidders that it goes 24 as much to meet state compliance. 25 through, the different reasons behind the termination. 25 So it was -- it's a combination of factors where Page 232 Page 234 1 But, yes, the OTR was part of that. 1 we have to look at, well, how much for the system and 2 CHAIR DANNER: So I'm curious. 2 then how much for the state. But essentially we just 3 Because the OTR has to do with basically the -- it 3 ran into a situation much like the 2020 RFP where our 4 4 limits fossil fuel emissions across the state lines. underlying assumptions were we didn't believe they 5 5 But the all-source RFP was for renewable and could -- they were valid any longer. 6 non-emitting resources. 6 And so at that point, we're concerned that how do 7 So what's -- what is it that's in the OTR that is 7 you move forward and show prudence when you don't even 8 8 affecting the ability of -- that would have affected know if all of the assumptions in your study are valid 9 the ability of the -- of the RFP to go forward in 2022? 9 and you know some of them have gone away. 10 THE WITNESS: So the -- the main 10 CHAIR DANNER: But you knew that you 11 part of -- my understanding is the main part -- again, 11 were going to need some non-emitting resources, don't 12 not -- I can't get into the details of the -- kind of 12 you? 13 13 THE WITNESS: Yes, of course. We the -- the underlying aspects of it. But 14 14 fundamentally, that was an all-source RFP to meet what need more non-emitting resources for Washington. The 15 15 was identified as a system need. And so those would be same with Oregon as we progress to their standard in for system resources. We have to look across the 16 16 2030. So we do know we need that, but we're also 17 17 entire system. looking holistically at the company's situation. And 18 18 And in looking at that, essentially what you have so we have that issue. 19 is a significant change to all the underlying use. 19 In addition, we have that issue that we have to 20 Because the OTR would essentially shut down, I believe, 20 mange our cash on a day-to-day basis right now. And so 21 summer operations at multiple thermal units operated by 21 then we have to look at the metrics, the credit 22 22 metrics, what are the long-term impacts of that. the company. 23 23 Essentially, we don't have the capital at this point to CHAIR DANNER: And so at no point 24 24 build our own, so we're looking at our purchase were you looking at a -- at an RFP that would have 25 25 basically focused on Washington. You are only going to agreements. And then we essentially had to determine

Page 235 Page 237 1 1 what is the best place to put that cash to essentially dispatch in those hours when your batteries are not 2 2 maintain the metrics in the best way that we can. available. Because right now you have some, you know, 3 3 We didn't want to drop down too much, because then 2-, 4-, 6-, 8-, maybe 12-hour batteries. So we need 4 4 the credit costs are going to increase substantially, some additional technology. 5 5 and that's going to affect our customers. 'Cause this Now, that might be longer-term storage like 6 is a capital-intensive. We have to go out for capital 6 hydrogen. Because hydrogen, essentially you're going 7 7 all the time. We have repairs that we have to do on to have to split water to create the hydrogen, burn it 8 the lines. We've got the reconductoring, the wildfire 8 9 9 mitigation that we have to do, hardening of the system. There may be additional resources you could put in 10 And so through that process, we determine that the best 10 different locations to offset essentially the timing --11 thing to do was to start looking at where do you get 11 wind blowing at night, solar in the afternoon -- so 12 the best bang for the buck, and that is through assets 12 that you can take advantage of that. But are you --13 13 that will help us with reliability. planning for all of those things together, you still 14 14 CHAIR DANNER: Mm-hmm. may need something for, you know, those periods of time 15 THE WITNESS: That's what led --15 in the winter when the wind's not blowing and you don't 16 CHAIR DANNER: All right. 16 have the solar generation. 17 THE WITNESS: -- to the batteries. 17 So I think it's -- you know, it's very complex to 18 CHAIR DANNER: And you're not aware 18 look through this. But we do believe, at least with 19 of any other federal requirements that had changed 19 our current planning and what we've been hearing from 20 during this period? 20 TerraPower, that they'll be available, and that would 21 THE WITNESS: I believe that there 21 be a resource that could be used specifically for 22 22 was a list of reasons in that notice. We refer to the states that are looking for non-emitting generation 23 23 notice and put a link in the filing to the -and -- and 24/7/365 service. 24 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. 24 CHAIR DANNER: Well, I'm -- I'm very 25 THE WITNESS: -- Commission. 25 hopeful that that comes to fruition. Page 236 Page 238 1 CHAIR DANNER: Then we'll look at 1 My question is, though: I mean, this is a 2 2 it. technology that you've already admitted that 20 --3 THE WITNESS: I can't recall all of 3 you're moving from 2028 to 2030. It could very well go 4 4 those. I know OTR was one of the big ones. I think beyond that. And yet you're saying with certainty --5 5 there was a couple others, subject to check, but I or at least I heard your counsel say with certainty --6 can't recall those. 6 that you're going to be able to meet the 2045 standard 7 CHAIR DANNER: All right. And then 7 by 2032. 8 8 you just mentioned -- in response to Judge Thompson's What -- what if that technology doesn't come forward? What if it's not available? What if it 9 questions, you said that you'll be able to meet CETA's 9 10 2045 mandate by 2032, but you said that it would be 10 doesn't come to fruition? 11 11 THE WITNESS: I think we have -- an technology-dependent. 12 Does that mean that it's -- you can meet it only 12 entire industry has another 13 years to start working 13 if technologies that are not currently available are 13 on what are the -- the other technologies, and that's 14 14 made available? Is that what you're saying? what the continuing planning process does. It allows

THE WITNESS: Yes. And I might have to defer to company witness Ghosh on this. But that's -- one of the fundamental issues that, you know, based on my understanding, is that the dispatchability, you know, to when you have capacity factors of 20, 30, 40 percent for renewable generation, you're going to have to install a significant number of batteries, and you'll probably have to overbuild for a lot of those

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

resources.

If you get new technology that is non-emitting, you know, that's -- you can then rely on that to

us to keep evaluating new technologies. I think one of the issues as a -- as a regulated utility -- and this kind of gets to those broader kind of policy issues -- when we have these new statutes, how are we going to start addressing them? There's a lot of questions that need to be answered. It is a question of, you know, how do we as a regulated utility, when we're kind of -- essentially prudent

management leads us to use proven technology. You know, we get recovery once something's in service.

That's going to be hard when we're trying to

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 241

Page 242

Page 239

develop a new technology. Utilities are not situated. We don't have the regulatory policy set up. We are not -- we're generally risk-averse. We want to keep the costs as low as possible for customers. But I think the entire industry has that issue. And utilities are going to have to approach things in a different way to start developing new technology. Because there's no other buyers for it, but at the same time, utilities are in a position where it's very difficult to justify taking a chance on new technology.

You know, in -- 20 years ago, there were some efforts for coal gasification. And I don't believe that any of those projects really worked out. And utilities ended up taking a write-off. It was a -- it was a tough lesson for a lot of those utilities.

CHAIR DANNER: So if you get to 2045 and none of these new technologies come to fruition, what do you do at that point?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think that's where the legislature anticipated the risk there, and I think that's the -- the reliability kind of off-ramp. And that's, you know, why I know parties may misinterpret, you know, the statements by a utility that, you know, we will comply, you know, subject to costs, subject to reliability. And really what it does

technologies that are coming out. One of the ones that they've most recently told me about is thermal plants that are gas that can switch to hydrogen.

And so then, you know, you may have the possibility, if you can, you know, get adequate hydrogen sources and you can store enough at the time when you have energy, that you could then switch over.

So I don't think our position is that there won't be. We believe and we're actively working on trying to develop the technologies that will allow for that.

CHAIR DANNER: I guess, put another way: Do you believe that it is not possible to comply with CETA using technologies that are available today? THE WITNESS: I mean, I would have

to defer to our planners that know more. I mean, I think it would require a significant amount of overbuilding.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So, yeah, thank you, Your Honor. Not to be redundant, but to follow up on my colleague's questions, and maybe to put -- frame it a different way.

Okay. You want to take your -- your target to 2025 down to 33 percent, which from 31 percent to 33,

Page 240

is comes down to reliability.

You know, it's that issue of if we can't serve customers, then do we want to go to a hundred percent? How much do we want to pay to go to a hundred percent? You know, if it is putting a battery on every block and, you know, taking, you know, millions of acres of land for solar and wind, that's probably not going to be popular with a lot of the people that live in the areas where you're building. And so we have to figure out how -- what that balance is. But we -- the primary purpose of a utility is to provide reliable service, and that means you turn on the light switch and it goes on. And so I think we have to plan for that, and it's going to take some time.

So I'm not saying that -- I'm not trying to kind of foreshadow not being able to comply, but it's going to take the entire industry to start moving towards developing new technology, is my understanding.

CHAIR DANNER: So is it your position, then, that compliance with CETA is not possible without the development of new technologies?

THE WITNESS: I would defer to those that know the new technologies. I'm -- I'm not looking at all of the new options. I know that I've talked to our procurement group, and they said there's some new

that's -- that's a flat trend line. Haven't plotted it, but that's a pretty flat trend line, right?

s a pretty flat trend line, right?

THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. And then you say, okay, but we'll get to 80 percent by 2030. And, by the way, we'll get to a hundred percent, counsel says, by 2032, and you -- you deflected that, you know, to some degree. That's -- and by anybody's terms, that's a pretty massive spike -- wouldn't you say? -- from 2025 at 33 percent to meet CETA at 20 -- forget about 2032 for the moment -- just to get to 2030?

THE WITNESS: I mean, I'm trying to get -- wrap my head around the -- the -- the slope is great. But for Washington, we're serving 140,000 customers. This is not, you know, taking our full system there. It is -- it's -- you know, this is -- I believe it's our fourth-largest state. So I don't believe that it is that large a step. And company witness Ghosh, I believe she has the numbers for what it is.

So I think we can add resources between now and then, and we can meet 2030. It is -- as a percentage basis, it may seem like a lot, but on a actual megawatt basis, it's not going to be as large. You know, is it

Page 243

going to require the addition of additional resources, severe expansion to get to 2030? Yes. Is it going to -- I mean, is it going to increase costs? Yes.

If we advance that, is it going to increase costs more than what it would if we plan and time it to meet compliance? I believe that's what the studies are showing, is that we're going to be saving customers money by pushing it out.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And, you know, and I understand all the issues that you're facing today, you know, to sort of want to sort of delay these decisions. But, you know, we're sort of faced with a question that counsel again said, Look, we have today's case and, you know, 2025 case. But, you know, the question is: Should we have confidence that you can go -- you can meet that slope?

Now, you just said, Look, there are other ways that we can do it. You know, small number of customers, 130,000 customers. You know, "Don't worry," sort of thing. But I've heard a lot of uncertainty, which, of course, there's uncertainty. You know, is the technology going to be there? you know.

So ultimately, you know, you -- you know, if needs being, go out to the market and, you know, big costs, but that's -- that slope is not just getting there.

commissions so that there'll be some understanding of how much would be -- of the system resources would be allocated. And then we can start moving forward with actual resources. So instead of incurring a cost just to meet a target that is not supported by the data right now for '24 and '25, we'll start procuring resources.

And so to a certain extent, the procurement of resources to serve Washington customers, so for the benefit of Washington customers, is going to come later, no matter what. Meeting the interim standards is not going to give long-term res- -- provide long-term resources for Washington customers. And we believe anything we do is going to be more expensive if we move it forward. The more we can plan for it, run the RFP, be able to -- the utility be able to dictate the terms of the RFP, the more we can manage those costs for customers.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. All right. So what I'm hearing you say is, Look, you know, 2025, even if we're at 33 percent, 130,000 cust -- we can get there -- even if technology doesn't catch up with us, even if we're not able to, we'll be able to with this -- in this market get to our 2030 goal. If we have to, we'll go to the market, and we'll -- you

Page 244

It's also a slope or up-ramp in -- potentially in costs to the customers. So it's a really -- clearly a difficult situation for us. And just to say, you know, "Hey, we'll -- you know, we'll be okay in 2030. Just -- you know, just kick us out to 2025," that's not an easy analysis, and you know that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is not an easy analysis. I mean, I think the industry is -- is being challenged right now. But I don't believe that changing our interim targets for '24 and '25 is going to change that trajectory. So, I mean, the -- we're not going to be able to have a resource built for 2025.

So the result is, either way, we either have to essentially go out and start buying on the short-term market, whatever's available, procuring RECs, whatever's available, to try and get to something that is not supported by the data that we have right now. And then because of that outflow of cash could cause long-term kind of consequences for the company and its customers, or we go out in the next RFP and the next CEIP. We'll have data. We'll be able to identify where that -- where the company is, where it's moving forward.

Shortly after that, or around the same time, we'll have an allocation methodology in front of the

Page 246

know, we'll be able to do that easily.

Is that the bottom line?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, for 2030 goal? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: We'll be able to get there. That is the -- the goal of the procurement. That is what the studies are showing. You know, the data that we have today is still showing that meeting that 2030. And so that's -- you know, that is a net zero, so that is not dependent on the new technology.

So the -- the real issue is that's the only way to get resources that will be providing the benefits to customers for 10, 20, 30 years in the future instead of short term meeting these interim targets which would just be a cost, 'cause we're not going to have actual resources. We're not putting steel in the ground to serve customers for '24 and '25. We would just be meeting through other means.

And so really it is -- our position is we need that next study to give us a little time to essentially address the issues, improve our planning, improve our financial position, and then we start procuring.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right.

Thank you. Nothing further. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Now it's

Page 247 Page 249 1 "good afternoon." So just one more question. 1 (Witness excused.) 2 So on Page 3 of your rebuttal testimony, starting 2 3 at Line 20 and then continuing on to the top of Page 4, ALJ THOMPSON: At this time, it is 3 4 you state that, "...any conclusion that PacifiCorp has 4 12:25 p.m. I would propose that perhaps we take a 5 5 not demonstrated reasonable progress needs to evaluate lunch break at this time. 6 the actual reasons for PacifiCorp's lowered interim 6 Does 35 minutes to 1 p.m. sound sufficient, or do 7 7 targets. That is especially the case where, like here, the parties need additional time for a break? 8 the Commission has not provided any guidance on what 8 And I will note, before I get answers from the 9 9 'reasonable progress' requires." parties, I believe that the Commissioners do have a 10 Is it your testimony that the company can't 10 hard stop time today at 4, 4 p.m., and so I will note 11 address how it's demonstrating reasonable progress 11 that we are through our first witness, but we have a 12 towards the CETA requirements unless the Commission 12 few more to go. And the time estimates for Mr. McVee 13 tells it what that means? 13 were a little bit shorter than actuals, so let's take 14 THE WITNESS: No. But this -- that 14 that into consideration before answering. 15 is not the intent. The issue is that from the 15 I'll go ahead and start. It looks like AWEC has a 16 company's perspective, reasonable progress has to be 16 response. 17 evaluated, you know, based on the entirety of the 17 MS. MOSER: Yes. I hate to be the 18 circumstances. And so the Commission has not defined 18 person that says this, but as a nonlocal -- just, I 19 reasonable progress. And we believe that reasonable 19 think 35 minutes is pretty tight. If we don't want to 20 20 progress can be shown and it'll be blocky. So go a full hour, I think at least 45 would be kind of 21 reasonable progress may be not a trend line of any 21 helpful. particular slope unless the Commission goes through a 22 22 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Does anybody 23 23 process and sets and says, You need to be at 50 percent else have any thoughts? Company? Staff? Public 24 by this date, 75 percent by this date. 24 counsel? CRITFC? And anybody online? 25 But we also believe that that's not appropriate. 25 Okay. We will go ahead and go with 45 minutes. Page 248 Page 250 1 1 We will be off the record. We will reconvene at We don't think the -- the Commission should do that; 2 2 that it has to look at the situation that each utility 1:15 p.m. 3 3 is in, their ability to procure, whether it is going to (Pause in proceedings from 4 4 12:26 p.m. to 1:18 p.m.) be less expensive for customers for procurement to be 5 5 timed for later or to be timed earlier. 6 I believe that the parties in this case have 6 ALJ THOMPSON: Good afternoon, 7 really been pointing to we want procurement right away 7 everyone. Welcome back. I hope you-all had time to 8 8 grab a bite to eat. It is now 1:18 p.m. We will go and not looking at the holistic impact of that. And so ahead and be on the record. 9 I believe that the Commission has not defined that 9 10 reasonable progress is 25 percent per year, so the 10 Mr. Rogala, if you would like to call your next 11 company is not targeted for that. Instead, we're 11 witness. 12 trying to manage like a prudent utility: Look at all 12 MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 of the issues, how it affects it, what's most 13 First, a brief thanks to Sommer Moser. The extra 14 14 15 minutes was much appreciated for lunch. cost-effective for customers, and base it on the data. 15 15 And we'd like to call Dr. Rohini Ghosh to the And so it's -- you know, absent that direction on 16 16 what reasonable progress means, we believe that there stand. 17 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. is a reasonable progress requirement. We also believe 17 18 And, Dr. Ghosh, if you could please raise your that we're meeting it by timing it and making sure that 18 19 we're looking at how we're going to do it in the least 19 right hand when you're ready. Thank you. 20 reasonable cost way. 20 Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I 21 provide today will be the truth, the whole truth, and 22 22 nothing but the truth? don't have any further questions. 23 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. I 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, I do. 24 think that concludes the questions for you. You may be 24 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 25 25 excused. Thank you. You may proceed.

	Page 251		Page 253
1	MR. ROGALA: Thank you.	1	Q Okay. And by extension, the interim targets, correct?
2	Witt. 100/LD t. Thank you.	2	A That is correct.
3	DR. ROHINI GHOSH, having been first duly sworn	3	Q Okay. And PacifiCorp's interim targets in the
4	by ALJ Thompson, was	4	currently approved 2021 revised CEIP were based on the
5	examined and testified as	5	2021 IRP, correct?
6	follows:	6	A Sorry. I think I blacked out as you were speaking.
7		7	The current approved interim CEIP clean target
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION	8	clean interim clean energy interim targets are based
9	BY MR. ROGALA:	9	off of the 2021 integrated resource plan.
10	Q Dr. Ghosh, can you please state and spell your name for	10	Q Okay. Great.
11	the record, please.	11	And in the 2021 IRP, PacifiCorp used what were
12	A Yes. My name is Rohini Ghosh. R-o-h-i-n-i G-h-o-s-h.	12	the what were then the most recent NREL numbers at
13	Q And can you please state your position at the company.	13	the time as inputs for the price of renewables,
14	A I'm currently the director of clean energy planning at	14	correct?
15	PacifiCorp.	15	A I do believe that is correct.
16	Q And I understand you submitted several exhibits in this	16	Q Okay. And prior to 2022, PacifiCorp was using the most
17 18	proceeding. Do you have any clarifications or corrections to	17	recently available NREL information for pricing to price renewables in its IRP modeling, correct?
19	those exhibits?	19	A I do believe that is generally correct.
20	A No, I do not.	20	Q Okay. And is it standard practice in the utility
21	MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor.	21	industry to use the most recently available NREL
22	We tender this witness for cross-examination.	22	information for renewable pricing?
23	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	23	A I can't speak to whether or not other utilities
24	I believe, staff, you've indicated cross for this	24	specifically use the NREL ATB, or annual technology
25	witness. You can go ahead and proceed.	25	baseline. But, yes, I would believe that all utilities
	Page 252		Page 254
1	MS. STRAUSS: Thank you, Your Honor.	1	are using whatever the most recently available forecast
2		2	of renewable cost information is.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION	3	Q Okay. Thank you.
4	BY MS. STRAUSS:	4	And so to the best of your knowledge, for example,
5	Q Good afternoon, Dr. Ghosh. How are you?	5 6	Avista or PSE, they use the NREL information for
6 7	A Good afternoon. I'm good. Nice and full. Q Excellent.	7	renewable pricing?
8	So just a few questions for you today.	8	A I can't confirm that, because I have not read their latest integrated resource plans.
9	The costs that PacifiCorp assign to renewable	9	Q Okay. Now, looking at the 2022 repricing of the bids
10	resources are inputs in its IRP modeling, correct?	10	PacifiCorp initially received in the 2020 all-source
11	A Correct. I assume you mean just any inputs regarding	11	RFP, the reprice bids were higher than those that were
12	resource cost assumptions, yes.	12	initially received, correct?
13	Q Yes. Okay.	13	A That is correct. My understanding is, you know, we
14	And this modeling informs procurement decisions?	14	received a large number of bids in the 2020 all-source
15	A Yes. Our typical strategy and cycle at the company is	15	RFP that was initiated sometime in 2019. We received
16	to run an integrated resource plan that company witness	16	those bids. It was quite a long process to even get
17	McVee did state that we update a full IRP every two	17	through the initial analysis, and there were other
18	years. And usually based on any near-term need that is	18	delays in signing those contracts. And then come 2022,
19	identified and described in our action plan, which is	19	many developers I think all developers probably
20	usually the next two to six years, that is usually then	20	requested to reprice their bids. There were even some
21	the basis for going out and doing some kind of request	21	developers that dropped out entirely because they were
22	for proposals for projects to fill that need.	22	no longer able to provide those projects at those
23 24	Q Okay. And the IRP also then forms the basis for the	23	originally stated prices.
4	CEIP, correct?	24	Q Okay. Thank you.
	A That is correct	2 5	And after the hid repricing PacifiCorn changed
25	A That is correct.	25	And after the bid repricing, PacifiCorp changed

Page 255 Page 257 1 1 the pricing of renewables in its IRP modeling, correct? it up. 2 2 A Correct. In the 2023 IRP that was filed in the spring ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. So if 3 of 2023, PacifiCorp's IRP team did reflect actual cost 3 everybody could please just give us a minute so that we 4 increases that we were seeing in the near term, and 4 can look through the list of participants online. I 5 5 that's reflected in the renewable resource costs think the two just left. 6 primarily out through 2028. And I believe 2028 through 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So for 7 7 2032, those manual increases, as they're being called, counsel in the room, if you look at the participant 8 were linear- -- linearly decreased until being phased 8 list on Zoom and see if there's anybody who you are 9 9 aware has not signed an NDA for your clients, that out in 2032. 10 10 Q So those manual increases, or adders, they started -would be helpful. 11 you started adding those to the IRP modeling in 2022, 11 MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, there was 12 correct? 12 an attorney from the Sanger law office earlier. And 13 13 A It was first added in the 2023 IRP that came out. I'm not sure if they've joined again as another party 14 Q Okay. Thank you. 14 or under a phone, but I just want to make sure that 15 they're not on the line for this part of the call, 15 And these adders, they were the difference between the NREL numbers and the 2022 repriced bids, and that 16 16 'cause they're not a intervenor to the proceeding, nor difference was then added on the NREL number? 17 17 do I believe they've signed an NDA. 18 18 A I believe that is accurate. I didn't work on those MS. CHILLCOTT: Your Honor, this is 19 specific cost adjustments, but my understanding is the 19 Barbara Chillcott for Renewable Northwest. And that 20 20 person has left the -- the Zoom room, as indicated in NREL AT B is fuel-type-specific, technology-type-21 21 specific prices. And we took an average of the costs the chat. 22 that we were seeing for a specific technology type, and 22 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you for 23 23 I do believe that that difference or that percentage of that. 24 that difference was essentially added on top of the ATB 24 The party that's just labeled "PacifiCorp," do we 25 prices. 25 know who that is from the company? That's the witness. Page 256 Page 258 1 MS. STRAUSS: Okay. Your Honor, I 1 Okay. 2 do have some questions that could potentially be 2 MS. STRAUSS: We're just checking on 3 3 touching on confidential information coming up. How a couple other staff members, Your Honor. 4 would you like to handle that at this point? 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. I 5 5 ALJ THOMPSON: Just looking around was going to say, there's a lot of staff on the... 6 the room. And, Counsel, please feel free to help me 6 ALJ THOMPSON: And for those staff 7 verify. Do we have anybody in the room who has not 7 members who are present online, if you know that you 8 8 have not signed a confidentiality agreement in this signed an agreement? MS. STRAUSS: This is just 9 9 proceeding or you're not subject to one, I would just 10 confidential information, not highly confidential. 10 ask that you take the proactive step and either 11 identify yourself in the chat or -- or leave the room 11 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. 12 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But we also 12 at this time. 13 13 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Your have to go to the --14 14 Honor, will this need to be a separate transcript of ALJ THOMPSON: And --15 15 the confidential portion? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- the ALJ THOMPSON: Yes. If we could 16 16 phone --17 17 ALJ THOMPSON: Right. just note on the transcript. There'll be one that will 18 18 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- and see have the public section, and then there will be a 19 19 who's on there. separate -- the pages will continue on, but there'll be 20 ALJ THOMPSON: And then we will just 20 a confidential section, if that makes sense. Okay. 21 take a brief moment to look online for those who have 21 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So are we all 22 22 good? signed confidentiality agreements and looking back. 23 23 MS. STRAUSS: I think we're good on Ryan, do you have a list of confidentiality 24 24 agreements? staff's end, yes. 25 25 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank MR. SMITH: Not on hand. I can pull

	Page 259		Page 271
1	you.	1	So I don't work directly on RFPs or on resource
2	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Does any other	2	procurement. You know, just kind of hear what comes
3	party recognize anybody online that from their side	3	out of them. My understanding, when we went into the
4	who has not signed a confidentiality agreement?	4	2023 IRP, you know, where we had just refreshed all of
5	I see shaking of heads.	5	the 2020 all-source RFP bids, that 2022 refresh which
6	(Confidential transcript	6	was then being represented in our near-term
7	portion begins under	7	acquisitions in the IRP, the company was just of you
8	separate cover.)	8	know, based on that was our latest market information,
9	35panate 331311)	9	the company very clearly could see that we were not
10		10	going to be able to procure resources at such a low
11		11	price as what was being seen in the NREL ATB.
12		12	And I understand that it's hard to verify that
13		13	information. This is based on highly proprietary
14		14	information. I, myself, don't actually even see these
15		15	kinds of bids when they come in in our company. And so
16		16	it's just a representation of what we believed was the
17		17	actual market conditions that would have impacted
18		18	near-term procurement.
19		19	That being said, what I will offer is we have
20		20	received a lot of feedback on this. We are now, you
21		21	know, going towards the 2025 IRP and CEIP cycle where
22		22	we're stepping a couple of years out from that
23		23	information. And so we are not including any renewable
24		24	resource escalators or inflations to the price in the
25		25	2025 cycle.
	Page 270		Page 272
1		1	So I will offer that, that as we've stepped a
2		2	couple of years out, we have opted to not include that
3		3	information in lieu of using what the NREL forecast
4		4	shows us and hoping that, you know, we can go out to
5		5	the market and get things at that price.
6		6	Q So is PacifiCorp now taking those adders out in 2025
7		7	versus in 2032?
8	(Non-confidential proceedings	8	A Correct. There will not be any adders beyond what is
9	resume as follows.)	9	in the NREL forecast.
10		10	Q Okay. So those graphs we just saw, basically you're
11	Q (By Ms. Strauss) Thank you for your patience,	11	moving that dot backwards from 2028 to 2025?
12	Dr. Ghosh?	12	A Yes. And updating to whatever the latest forecast is.
13	So PacifiCorp contends that these adders are	13	Q Using those NREL numbers?
14	necessary because they represent reality, correct?	14	A Correct.
15	A Correct.	15	Q Okay. Looking at Exhibit JNS-4.
16	Q But these are based only on the repricings from a	16	A Just confirming: This is PacifiCorp's response to
17	single RFP?	17	Washington UTC Data Request 9?
18	A I do believe that is true.	18	Q Yep. That's the one.
19	Q And this repricing occurred at the height of the supply	19	A All right. I'm there.
20	chain issues resulting from COVID, correct?	20	Q You state in that DR that the 2023 IRP update
21	A I do believe that is true.	21	identified battery resources in the preferred
22	Q Okay. And is it PacifiCorp's position that the supply	22	portfolio, correct?
23	chain issues that were present in 2021 and 2022 are	23	A Correct.
24	still persisting at the same level today?	24	Q And this was after those adders were incorporated into
25	A So I will provide a couple clarifications here.	25	the 2023 IRP, correct?

Page 276

Page 273

A Correct. The resource adders were in the 2023 IRP as well as they were still present in the '23 IRP update.

Q Okay.

Okay. So we're going to switch a little bit.

Looking at renewable resources generally -- this is not a specific exhibit -- the only renewable or non-emitting resources procured by PacifiCorp since 2020 to serve Washington load were those resources that came out of the 2020 all-source RFP, correct?

10 A Generally that is correct.

Q And no -- no resources were procured as part of the 2022 all-source RFP?

13 A That is correct.

Q And PacifiCorp is not currently in negotiations for any renewable or non-emitting resources?

A No. But we are pursuing bilateral negotiations for valuable significant storage resources.

Q But those batteries are not colocated with any generating resource, correct?

A No, they're not. But something that I did want to add to the statements that company witness McVee made earlier: It's not just that we have capital constraints right now. We do. We have -- we have limited capital. We have a limited budget. And we are having to work within that to make resource

batteries are placed around the system with adequate transmission access to the rest of our system, those wind power plants that are typically curtailed might be able to continue to generate and actually charge those batteries that will discharge it, you know, in during the next day at 5 p.m. when that's highly valuable.

So while it is true that the generation that comes out of a battery is not CETA-compliant and we don't ever count it as such, it is still very much the case that with significant storage capability on our system, like, you know, 500 megawatts' worth of batteries that we are considering, could really increase the capacity factors of our wind and our solar fleet around our system. And so it's overall definitely a net benefit. And these batteries and standalone storage systems are really important for our ability to reliably provide power as we bring on more intermittent generation.

And I think the technology around colocating a battery with say a wind plant, I think, has just not been as -- I'm not sure if it's -- if it's the technological constraints or the economic constraints, but it's just generally been found that it's just more efficient to do that standalone storage, though we are pursuing Green River as solar plus storage colocated project, which you can see in my Exhibit RG-3, in the

Page 274

procurements and acquisitions in the near term that will best serve all of our customers.

And something that has become very apparent to us, you know, through our last kind of peak cycles in this last summer, in this last winter, is we have a pretty great need for some firm capacity, for some reliable energy in a few very, very high-energy-cost hours. And renewable resources, unfortunately, don't provide that same level of reliability benefit unless you're building megawatts on megawatts, and you have to build quite a bit to get, you know, a relative certainty in how much you get.

So given that we have limited capital constraints right now with all of the -- the financial hurdles that we are facing, as company witness McVee has tested [sic] to, those batteries are the best use of that. And while they are not colocated -- and you're correct in identifying that -- it's still the case that those batteries do provide an opportunity for something like excess wind generation to charge it at night.

So typically we might have wind power plants in Wyoming that are very productive in the middle of the night. Power is not very valuable in the middle of the night, because there's not that much demand. And so even though the battery's not colocated, if the

table of new resources, which I'd have to find.

But you can see that we did pursue Green River Solar 1 and 2. It's a PPA we did identify through the 2020 all-source. That is an example of a fairly significant project with solar colocated with battery, and we will see how that performs. But I just really want to stress that the benefits from batteries are very, very high for the reliability benefits and, I think, absolutely necessary to facilitate this transition. Because we just really, really have a strong need for firm capacity. And storage will help us reduce our reliance on market purchases in those peak need hours.

Q Okay. But the batteries aren't actually giving Washington a larger share of the renewable or non-emitting resources from the system?

A So that somewhat remains to be seen. Because we don't yet have these significant batteries in operations, I don't have, like, the data for you. And I don't think we've been able to run a counterfactual on the IRP yet, though that's something that we should look at.

Our expectation is having more storage resources on the system will hopefully lead to less curtailment of our renewable resources. And so if that's the case, that wind plant in Wyoming that Washington customers

Page 280

Page 277 1 take a share of will generate more RECs in a given 1 2 2 year, and so Washington customers would receive a share 3 of that higher number of RECs. I don't have the data 3 4 4 to back it up until they go into operations, but that's 5 5 absolutely our expectation. 6 Q But that's all conjecture. There's no actual basis to 6 7 7 determine that that's -- that's what will happen? record. 8 8 A I don't have the actuals for you. But it is very much 9 9 the case that we have a lot of wind that gets generated 10 at very low-value hours and ultimately gets curtailed. 10 11 And so having more storage on the system, that's 11 12 essentially a place for that power to go. 12 13 13 Q Okay. But what's also likely is that these batteries question was answered. get charged from generation say from a natural gas 14 14 15 15 plant, correct? 16 A I mean, that's possible. But natural gas generators --16 17 17

I mean, of course it depends if this is a base load or a peaking unit. But our natural gas generators are not typically generating as much during kind of a low-value hour. So the economics are such that batteries typically get charged when power is very, very, very cheap. That's typically when there's an excess of wind or an excess of solar. And then they discharge during a high-value hour, like peak demand hour. They can only discharge for maybe four to eight hours. But

MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, if I may. ALJ THOMPSON: Please go ahead. MS. STRAUSS: I'm just trying to make sure we have a very clear record of Dr. Ghosh's responses, and some of her responses are quite lengthy. and I'm just trying to make sure we have a clear

ALJ THOMPSON: I don't necessarily want you to go through the entire response, but if there is a clarifying question that can be asked, if you could reframe your question, I'll allow you to go ahead and ask, but I do believe that that particular

Q (By Ms. Strauss) Okay. So, Dr. Ghosh, just to be clear: The batteries don't increase the percentage of resources that are allocated to Washington under the current allocation agreements?

A I think the line of questioning is more confusing now. Because now you're talking about generation from a resource and allocations of resources, which I consider to be two very separate issues.

Q Okay. I can go into that a little bit.

So there's -- there's an allocation agreement that allocates percentages of power amongst PacifiCorp states, correct?

Page 278

that's a super high-valued hour.

And so then the same hour, gas might be generating, but I don't think it's as likely that gas will char- -- as an example that natural gas will charge the battery. But, yes, it is -- you know, we can never track exactly what goes into the battery, but again, the economics tell us that it's likely to be charged by this excess wind or excess solar.

Q Okay. So but at the end of the day, a battery is not actually generating additional power. It's just storing power that's already been generated?

A Correct.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q And it's not increasing the allocation that Washington receives from renewable resources on other parts of the system?

MR. ROGALA: Now, I think I'm going to object, 'cause this has been asked and answered. Staff asked Dr. Ghosh if a battery would increase the share of CETA-compliant energy that our pre-existing CETA-compliant resources would provide to Washington, and she says yes, because if these wind resources can continue to blow throughout the nighttime when they would normally be curtailed, that does increase the share of CETA-compliant energy that is currently serving -- that would be serving Washington customers.

A Correct. I assume you're referring to the 2020 1 2 protocol, and of course there's WIJAM specific to 3 Washington.

Q Yes.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

So the batteries, themselves, don't actually amend those agreements?

7 A None of our resource selections that we are talking 8 about or resource acquisitions would impact 9

Q Okay. So the allocations that are in those agreements remain the same?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. Thank you. That's it.

> So I want to look at the update, the -- the biennial update, itself.

In that update, PacifiCorp said it'll be serving load with 60 percent renewable non-emitting generation by 2029, correct?

A That sounds correct, yes.

20 Q Okay. So under the projections in the biennial update, 21 PacifiCorp estimates getting to 33 percent in 2025, 22 correct?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q And then it estimates jumping from 33 percent in 2025 25 to 62 percent in 2029?

WOIC	v. Pacificorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company		Docket No. UE-210829 - Vol. V
	Page 281		Page 283
1	A That is correct.	1	receive about 40 megawatts of that. So that would
2	Q Okay. So PacifiCorp is estimating it's going to take	2	probably be around 3 to 5 percent of our 2030 need
3	roughly five years to double the renewable non-emitting	3	Q Okay.
4	capacity for serving Washington retail load?	4	A in terms of targets.
5	A Based on then-current modeling inputs and assumptions,	5	Q Can you please turn to your rebuttal testimony, RG-2T.
6	that is correct.	6	And I'm looking at Page 13, Lines 9 through 11.
7	Q But then it's anticipating jumping from 62 percent to	7	A I am there.
8	82 percent between 2029 and 2030, correct?	8	Q You're asked here to explain the cost implications for
9	A That is also correct.	9	Washington customers if the Commission rejects the
10	Q And PacifiCorp canceled its 2022 all-source RFP,	10	biennial update interim targets.
11	correct?	11	Am I reading that correctly?
12	A That is correct.	12	A Yes. That is correct.
13	MS. STRAUSS: That's all my	13	Q And can you turn to 14, Lines 3 through 5?
14	questions, Your Honor.	14	A Yes.
15	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	15	Q Here you testify that this does not consider any
16	Public Counsel, you can go ahead and proceed.	16	offsetting power cost benefits which would reduce net
17	MR. SYKES: Thank you.	17	cost of the resource and reduce the impact on rates?
18		18	A That is correct.
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION	19	Q Can you please turn to RG-22X.
20	BY MR. SYKES:	20	A Sorry. Give me a second. I got too much in this
21	Q Good afternoon, Dr. Ghosh.	21	binder.
22	A Good afternoon.	22	MR. ROGALA: Maybe while Dr. Ghosh
23	Q Earlier we heard some questions from the bench about	23	is finding that witness [sic], I'll just lodge my
24	new technologies.	24	objection now. I don't think there's foundation for
25	Are you familiar with the Natrium project by	25	this exhibit.
	Page 282		Page 284
1	TerraPower?	1	ALJ THOMPSON: The data request?
2	A Yes.	2	MR. ROGALA: Are we talking about
3	Q Would you agree that's a new technology?	3	the PCAM
4	A Yes, I believe small modular nuclear reactors are a new	4	MR. SYKES: Not yet.
5	technology as it relates to nuclear.	5	MR. ROGALA: exhibits?
6	Q Has PacifiCorp calculated the effect of a Natrium delay	6	MR. SYKES: No, not not yet.
7	on the company's 2030 target?	7	MR. ROGALA: Oh. I haven't
8	A I don't believe we've explicitly considered a delay so	8	renumbered my I will pull back that
9	much as a scenario in which it just doesn't occur. I	9	THE WITNESS: Yeah, mine are
10	don't have that portfolio in front of me. But we	10	MR. ROGALA: objection.
11	actually submitted it as part of our 2024 annual	11	THE WITNESS: also
12	progress report. It was part of our conditions from	12	MR. ROGALA: I was looking at the
13	our refiled CEIP. So we did do an analysis where there	13	wrong one.
14	was no Natrium at all and what would what would the	14	THE WITNESS: Mine are also not
15	portfolio look like and what would the recast targets	15	numbered correctly.
16	look like, but I unfortunately don't have that in front	16	Okay. So this is
17	of me.	17	MR. SYKES: Maybe it's try 21X.
18	Q I think the I think the as far as the target,	18	Maybe I have it wrong. This is the PacifiCorp DR
19	PacifiCorp would miss CETA's 2030 target by 3 percent.	19	responses to public counsel.
20	Does that sound right to your	20	MR. ROGALA: R-21X?
21	A That sounds reasonable	21	THE WITNESS: Oh. Wait.
22	Q recollection?	22	ALJ THOMPSON: I believe, for
23	A because I believe Natrium the generator plus the	23	clarification for counsel, before the update last
24	storage unit can generate about 50 megawatts' worth of	24	night, I believe this was 22X, and it is now 23X. It's
25	capacity, and Washington customers are forecasted to	25	the responses to DRs.

	Page 285		Page 287
1	MR. ROGALA: Oh.	1	the 2021 and the 2023 IRPs.
2	THE WITNESS: Through	2	Q Okay. And the 2021 IRP, following that, the company
3	MR. ROGALA: Okay. Let's let's	3	issued a all-source RFP for 2022; is that correct?
4	just is it is it staff DR 64 or public counsel	4	A That is correct.
5	DRs 4 through 8?	5	Q Okay. And as Mr. McVee
6	MR. SYKES: The exhibit should be	6	A Or wait. Sorry. Let me think about the timing.
7	public counsel DRs 4 through 8.	7	Yes, I believe that the '21 IRP was filed in
8	MR. ROGALA: Okay. Perfect. Thank	8	September of 2021, and the 2022 all-source RFP was
9	you.	9	filed was initiated a few months later, yeah.
10	THE WITNESS: I've got it.	10	Q Okay. And the 2022 RFP, as Mr. McVee testified
11	Q (By Mr. Sykes) Okay. And Data Request 8 on the last	11	earlier, some of those resources or most of those
12	page of the exhibit. You were asked if the company has	12	resources would have come on line during the 2027 or
13	performed any calculation at the offsetting power cost	13	2028 period?
14	benefits to its \$37 million incremental cost estimate.	14	A That is correct. I'm not familiar with the full range
15	And you answered in this DR that PacifiCorp has	15	of bids, but I think just given the time it takes for
16	not done that analysis; is that correct?	16	
17	A That is correct. That would require a full IRP run	17	developers to get their project completed, the time it takes for us to contract, we did not expect them to
18	·	18	·
19	that we would have had to have assumed the past the	19	reasonably come on line at least before 2026. Q Okay. And the 2025 IRP is due soon, I think in
	current interim targets were binding, the ones from the		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
20	refile, to get kind of a full portfolio cost view, and	20	January; is that right?
21	we have done that analysis.	21	A The 2025 IRP is due, I believe, March 31st, 2023 [sic],
22	Q Okay.	22	but we do have a draft coming out
23	A That's correct.	23	Q Okay.
24	Q And at 8C, at the last sentence, you answer that there	24	A in January.
25	likely would be a reduction in power costs as a as	25	Q Correct. My mistake.
	Page 286		Page 288
1	Page 286 a as a associated with additional resource?	1	Page 288 If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources,
1 2	a as a associated with additional resource?	1 2	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources,
	a as a associated with additional resource?A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of,		If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026.
2	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind 	2	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources,
2 3	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't 	2	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right?
2 3 4	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to 	2 3 4	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive
2 3 4 5	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't 	2 3 4 5	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we
2 3 4 5 6	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. 	2 3 4 5 6	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP,
2 3 4 5 6 7	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? 	2 3 4 5 6 7	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation generally looks like for Washington customers, but I'm 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation generally looks like for Washington customers, but I'm not really aware of, you know, Washington's short 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. AWEC, you can go ahead and proceed. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation generally looks like for Washington customers, but I'm not really aware of, you know, Washington's short position relative to other states. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. AWEC, you can go ahead and proceed. I think you've indicated cross.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation generally looks like for Washington customers, but I'm not really aware of, you know, Washington's short position relative to other states. Q Okay. Were you involved in the are you involved in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. AWEC, you can go ahead and proceed. I think you've indicated cross. MS. MOSER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 a as a associated with additional resource? A Yes. I do believe that's true just from the offset of, you know, basically zero-cost variable energy from wind or solar offsetting some fuel costs. But we don't anticipate that those benefits would be enough to offset the entire incurred capital cost of that resource. Q Okay. But the analysis hasn't been done? A This is correct. Q Okay. So counsel earlier stated that you're not a power cost expert, and I understand that. But are you familiar with PacifiCorp's PCAM, how it works? A Honestly, no. Q Okay. Let's ask it this way. Are you familiar that are you aware that PacifiCorp's six-state system pardon me leaves Washington short on generation relative to its load? A I'm not really aware. I know what the WIJAM allocation generally looks like for Washington customers, but I'm not really aware of, you know, Washington's short position relative to other states. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If the 2025 IRP identifies a need for resources, the company would likely issue an RFP for 2026. Does that sound about right? A I think it would be called a 2025 RFP, because I think it will be issued in 2025. It takes months to receive bids, so it's, I think, definitely expected that we could issue the RFP nearly concurrently with the IRP, and by the time we receive bids and are ready to start analyzing them, we would have well completed the IRP. Q Okay. And when do you expect resources would come on line from that RFP? A I think the earliest, the absolute earliest could be 2027, but I think more reasonably we are expecting 2028 and 2029. Q Okay. A And I say all of that not as the expert, but that is what I'm hearing. MR. SYKES: Okay. That's all I have. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. AWEC, you can go ahead and proceed. I think you've indicated cross.

And these would be the estimated costs for the

by looking at the revised 2021 CEIP targets, which are

A That is correct. I believe that I did this calculation

extra shortfall for Washington?

22

23

24

25

Page 289 Page 291 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 1 1 in Row 8 -- my eyesight is terrible; sorry -- Row 9, 2 2 BY MS. MOSER: compared to Row 10, which had, you know, the lower 3 3 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Ghosh. How are you? near-term interim targets from our biennial update. 4 4 A Good afternoon. And essentially if you just multiply that by the 5 5 Q Dr. Ghosh. Apologies. forecast -- and this is our current retail sales 6 6 A It's okay. forecast, which, you know, notably is actually higher 7 7 Q So I am going to focus on a pretty singular issue than what was in our 2021 CEIP, so even that 40 percent 8 that's in your rebuttal testimony. That's the 8 multiplied by that is going to result in a higher 9 9 incremental cost estimate. number of megawatt-hours. 10 10 And then I'm going to refer to another exhibit, And I simply came up with, you know, the 11 which I think has been marked as RG-6. And I think it 11 additional shortfall from where we would reasonably 12 12 expect to be in those years, you know, given the higher might just be efficient if we just have that available 13 13 targets. 14 A Are you prepared to pull it up? 14 And then in order to come up with the cost, which 15 15 Q I can share my screen, if that's just -- that is I believe is what you had highlighted in Row 29; is 16 16 that correct? 17 A That's okay with me, because I don't -- I don't think I 17 Q Yes. 18 have a printout of it. 18 A To come up with an estimate of that incremental capital 19 19 Q Okay. Let me do that now. cost without doing, you know, an entire run, this 20 20 Okay. Can you see this okay? really assumes best-case scenario that we could 21 21 reasonably go out, sign a PPA tomorrow, and have 22 Q Okay. So if we turn to your rebuttal testimony 22 however many megawatts that would be required to supply 23 23 starting at Page 13. this situs assigned to Washington. 24 A I'm there. 24 So in order to come up with just a cost, a 25 Q Okay. Starting in the Q & A, or this section, 25 dollar-per-megawatt-hour estimate, I referred to the Page 290 Page 292 1 Section D, it's talking about the, I guess, 1 levelized cost of energy estimates that we actually 2 PacifiCorp's best estimate or current estimate of 2 last published in our '23 IRP update just because that 3 incremental cost associated with meeting the higher 3 was the most recent. And if you look at Column C, 4 4 interim targets recommended by staff, correct? which is highlighted in blue, I simply chose the 5 5 A Correct. cheapest resource option. 6 Q And then the company is -- your testimony is that that 6 And so this is based off of a Wyoming wind 7 would cost at least \$37 million on a Washington 7 resource, a proxy resource, inclusive of PTCs, which 8 8 allocated basis? are production tax credits that, you know, do provide a 9 A That is correct. In terms of the incurred capital 9 bit of a subsidy for those resources. And I simply 10 costs. 10 multiplied that megawatt-hour shortfall in the given 11 Q Right. 11 year by the corresponding price per megawatt-hour in 12 And so to get to this calculation, you refer to a 12 that Column C. And if you look across all the other 13 work paper that's in Footnote 31, and that is this work 13 columns, those are other example proxy resources at 14 paper, as I understand it? 14 different locations or different technology types, also 15 A Yes. That is correct. 15 without a PTC, if you wanted to know what that looked Q Okay. So I just want to make sure that I understand 16 16 17 how this -- I guess, first, how this number has been --17 And I chose the cheapest possible resource as a 18 been calculated. 18 really low-range estimate of what that might cost. 19 So if I look at these cells for '24 and '25, 19 And, again, that's assuming I could go out and sign a 20 there's about a little shy of seven million and then 20 PPA for a long-term resource today and have that be 21 almost 31 million. 21 available in 2024. This is definitely, you know, a

best -- a best scenario for long-term resources.

the most conservative estimate that could -- the

company could develop based on the resource

Q Okay. And so bottom line, this is -- your estimate is

22

23

24

Page 296

Page 293

information -- cost information that you have at this point?

A Yes. Definitely the lowest-cost estimate.

Q Okay. And these are all for long-term proxy resources.

These aren't specific resources that PacifiCorp has in

A No. These are long-term proxy resources.
Q Okay. And it's possible that the company could rely on short-term resources to meet higher targets in the current planning period, correct?

A Yes. That is correct. Though I don't have any evidence currently of what short-term resource options are. I don't know if now is a good opportunity, but I will offer that the company has recently issued a short-term RFP, so we are soliciting bids for short-term energy for Q3 of 2025 to help meet peak needs next year, and we have specifically included two product options that we are requesting bids for that look for CETA-compliant, you know, REC-bundled energy.

But I don't know if we will have received any viable bids for those products, and even if we did, you know, I'm not sure it's enough if we're talking about needing to meet these short-term shortfalls -- these near-term shortfalls. Sorry.

Q Okay. And no indication at this point -- either

costs for resources that PacifiCorp could procure to meet its currently approved interim targets in the current planning period could be much higher than \$37 million?

A Like I said, I don't have any current estimates, but I think that my expectation is this is the low end. And to do something more drastic, especially with short-term contracts, would likely cost more.

MS. MOSER: Okay. Thank you. No further questions.

THE WITNESS: Thanks.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

I believe that Renewable Northwest and NWEC hasindicated cross for this witness as well.

And you can go ahead and proceed when you're ready.

17 MS. CHILLCOTT: Yes, Your Honor.
18 Thank you. I'm just -- yeah, thanks. Just waiting for
19 the screen share to end.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. CHILLCOTT:

Q Good afternoon, Dr. G

Q Good afternoon, Dr. Ghosh. My name is Barbara Chillcott.

25 A Good afternoon.

Page 294

through IRP analysis or, as you've indicated, the -the recently issued RFP -- of what pricing would be,
so --

A No. But, you know, as many people have talked about today, there's obviously a lot of competition out here, I think for CETA-compliant resources, short term or long term. And, you know, it's definitely -- this is definitely the best-case scenario of, I think, an affordable resource. It's very possible that the actual prices, particularly in the near term to get something this quickly, would be higher.

Q Okay. And in -- so going back to long-term costs and going back to this work paper with the \$35 Wyoming wind with PTC that was the basis for your \$37 million incremental cost estimate, I just want to confirm, or if you can clarify: You didn't choose that because you thought that Wyoming wind with PTCs at that price point was a more likely resource option for the company. It was just based on pure cost as the most conservative estimate; is that correct?

A That's correct. I didn't want to get accused of using too high of a price, so I just picked the lowest number I could find.

Q Okay. Okay. And just one last question. Would you agree that it's possible that actual **Q Hi.**

Could you please turn to your rebuttal testimony, again Exhibit RG-2T, at Page 23.

4 A I am there.

Q Great.

So starting on Line 6, you testified that -- and this is going back to the issue with the -- the adders that you talked about with staff earlier.

You testified that PacifiCorp agrees that it manually inflated renewable costs but was justified in doing so because of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the COVID epidemic.

Is that correct?

14 A Yes, that is correct.

Q The COVID-related global and domestic supply chain issues were not limited to resources required for renewable energy development, were they?

A I'm not an expert on how that impacted other parts of our markets.

Q Okay. But in your testimony, you do discuss that, you know, as a justification for the company's inclusion of the -- the adders for renewable resources, that that was one of the reasons, was COVID-related supply issues; is that true?

A I think we cite COVID as one of the reasons. But in

Page 300

Page 297 actuality, you know, I may not know what all of the reasons were that contributed to the developers repricing. It definitely seemed like the most obvious one, and there were obvious supply chain issues going on. But, you know, regardless, what we saw was developers needing to reprice all of their original bids in 2022. Q You saw that for developers for renewable resource projects, right? A Correct. Largely renewable resource projects. There

was a much smaller repricing that impacted storage resources.

Q And just to clarify: The company did not apply any

Q And just to clarify: The company did not apply any cost escalators to the other resources, other emitting resources, right?

A I do not believe there were any cost escalators for emitting resources.

Q There were also emitting resources in PacifiCorp's 2020 all-source RFP final short list, right?

A I honestly do not recall. So I won't say no.

The 2020 all-source RFP was that, an all-source
RFP. So anything could have been bid in. I'm not
personally aware of resources that weren't wind, solar,
or storage, but I don't want to commit to that. And I
don't remember what the rest of the -- the RFP list

was other information to consider.

And, you know, generally in the 2023 IRP, you know, we were considering our proxy -- our long-term proxy resource options were generally non-emitting resources for the most part, if not entirely.

Q Thanks.

And so turning back to Page 23 of your rebuttal testimony at RG-2T, you – you testified that the issue with – you know, so as you know, my clients are – have concerns about their adder for renewable resources. You testified that, you know, PacifiCorp had addressed this issue in multiple venues. And then in Footnote 47, you – as an example, you bring up the meeting from October of 2022, the – the PIM; is that correct?

16 A Yes, that is correct.

Q And could you please turn to Exhibit RG-24X.

18 A Sorry. I think my numbers are a little mixed up.
19 Which exhibit is that?

Q Yeah, so it's this -- it would be the slide deck from
 the October 13, 2022, IRP PIM meeting. And I think it
 might be off by a number if the numbers weren't updated
 after last night's change.

A Sorry. I've got two binders, and this one's giving up on me.

Page 298

looked like.

Q So, I guess, going back to the use of the -- the renewable resource cost escalators: Would you agree that if PacifiCorp's portfolio modeling tool applied cost inputs for real-world events like COVID on a technology or agnostic basis, the outcome of that modeling would have been different?

A I'm not sure I understand your question. Can you restate that, please.

Q Yeah. I can just rephrase.

What I'm really getting at is, you know, if the company would have applied kind of this cost escalation or across the board and not just isolated that to renewable resources, would the outcome -- don't you agree the outcome would be different?

A Okay. So if I'm understanding your question, you're saying that if there were renewable -- if there were -- sorry -- if there were higher costs being observed for all technology types and those had been applied across the board, that would have changed results.

I mean, I think that's a -- technically a true statement. But, again, I can't confirm that there were other resource types other than wind, solar, and storage being considered in the 2020 all-source RFP at least in the short lists. So I don't know that there

Okay. I am at the public input meeting slide deck from October 13th, 2022.

Q Great.

Could you please turn to Page 4 or Slide 4 of that exhibit.

6 A Yes. I am here.

Q Okay. Great.

And then the third bullet down, it says, "Wind, solar, and battery storage equipment are impacted by the supply change issues and worldwide inflation and tariffs on solar equipment. Demand for this equipment is also high."

Is this the -- to your knowledge, is this the meeting in which the company informed stakeholders initially about this -- about the cost escalation for the renewable resources?

A I do believe so. If it was -- if this information was provided to stakeholders prior to this meeting, it's possible, but I don't currently have record of it.

Q Okay. And then on the next slide, Slide 5 -- and these are the -- kind of the same -- this is basically depicting in graphical form what the point was made above about the -- the cost to increase, correct?

24 A That is correct.

25 Q There's no recording or transcript from that October

Page 301

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13th, 2022, meeting, is there?

A No. Prior to the most recent IRP cycle, as in the 2025 IRP cycle and the ongoing stakeholder process, we actually did not record meetings. In the past, we had chosen not to because we thought that not recording meetings helped garner a lot more public discourse. And, of course, we were operating in a weird post-COVID world where we were doing everything remote rather than in person.

But starting this year, we have started recording all of our public input meetings. And we do make those available, I believe, to the public. And so that is a key change in our 2025 IRP stakeholder process.

Q Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Were you at this meeting, or did you attend virtually or in person?

- A I honestly cannot recall. I listened in to a lot of IRP public input meetings. But if I was not on deck to present, which I was not in this meeting, I don't remember.
- Q Yeah, that's okay.

Are you aware at this meeting that stakeholders raised concerns about the information shared by the company with regard to the use of cost escalators for renewable resources?

and I'm aware that there was definitely some concerns expressed with not being able to present those results in January of '23.

Q So PacifiCorp did not provide any portfolio modeling results to stakeholders as part of the 2023 IRP development process prior to finalizing and filing the IRP, did it?

A I can't recall off the top of my head if something was provided between, you know, the time of this feedback form and the ultimate filing.

And I'll also point out, the '23 IRP was a bit interesting in timing. So we filed the 2023 IRP, which was known as the 2021 two-year IRP progress report in Washington. We filed it with all commissions March 31st, 2023. And then we gave all of our stakeholders notice that this was an opportunity for public comment to kind of address those concerns that they didn't have time to digest the modeling.

And then we did allow stakeholders to provide feedback. And we subsequently filed an amended final version of the 2023 IRP, I believe May 31st, 2023, with all of our six commissions.

And so that is actually why there's kind of a funny timing on that filing and there's -- there's two, and it's because we tried to give 60 days in between if

Page 302

- A The only feedback that I'm aware of is what's in writing. And I do believe that there has been written feedback to that effect.
- Q And you're also aware that staff expressed some disappointment in that -- in the kind of lack of information leading into this meeting about the use of the cost escalators?
- A I can't confirm that.
 - Q Could you please pull up Exhibit 20- -- RG-25X, which -- and if your numbering is off, it's the PacifiCorp stakeholder feedback form for the 2023 IRP.

12 A Got it. 13

- Q Have you reviewed this document before?
- A I have reviewed it since it was submitted as a cross exhibit.
- Q Okay. Great.

So, I guess, you know, we're just -- this exhibit kind of is from, you know, staff and demonstrates kind of the staff was disappointed, you know, quote, that the company did not at its January 13, 2023, PIM discuss its draft 2023 IRP preferred portfolio results,

And, I guess, you know, the question is: You're aware that staff was also concerned, correct?

A Yes. I'm aware of the feedback in this feedback form,

Page 304

- there was any really important feedback or additional sensitivities that needed to be addressed during that time, because we knew that, you know, we had gotten a little bit behind on our schedule of -- of getting all
- 4 5
 - of that out ahead of time.
 - Q So given that, the kind of the -- the tight time frame there, would you expect that stakeholders would -would have had the opportunity to request model run revisions or, you know, for example, to understand the effects of the renewables cost escalators?
 - A You know, it's hard for me to speak to this now. Looking back, it feels like so long ago and kind of a blur. You know, at the very least, the renewable cost escalators were presented in October of 2022, which was, you know, still several months before both the March and the May filing.

Again, you know, I am aware of this written feedback. I don't know -- I don't remember off the top of my head how much additional feedback or requests there were to look into alternatives to those renewable cost escalators, but at the very least, stakeholders were aware before the portfolios were filed. Again, I don't recall how much feedback we got between the March and the May filings. And it could -- it could have been enough time, and it could not have.

I will say, you know, to -- to redo all of the renewable cost assumptions and run a new suite of portfolios could have potentially been too big of an ask in that time frame for the IRP. It's hard for me to really comment on that.

But, you know, there was time between the filing of the IRP and the filing of the Clean Energy Implementation Plan update. The biennial CEIP update was filed November of 2023. And while I was not the primary point person when that filing was being made, I don't -- and I -- you know, subject to check, I don't specifically recall receiving feedback in that process to this extent and being asked to run, you know, different portfolios for the purpose of the CEIP. And we do have a separate CEIP engagement process that we hold meetings a couple times in the year, and we try to -- to bridge that communication gap between filing of an IRP and filing of a CEIP.

So, you know, there was at least, I think, opportunity there to have provided that feedback and ask for additional modeling.

Q Got it. Okay. Thanks.

So if you could please turn to the next exhibit, which is what is -- should be marked RG-26X, and it's the slides from the April 13th, 2023, PIM meeting.

1 modeling recommendations, correct?

- 2 A Based on the time from when people would have received
- 3 the data disk, yes, that is true. But they would have
- 4 at least had, again, the public information about what
- the escalators were, how big they were, what they
- looked like, and at least the preferred portfolio
- 7 outcomes prior to that.
- Q Okay. But before April 14th, they were kind of
 operating with not a full suite of information, I
 guess, to base --
 - A They did not have the portfolio resource files. That's true.
 - Q Great.

11

12

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

Could you please now turn to -- back to your rebuttal exhibit, or rebuttal testimony at Exhibit RG-2T and then Page 25.

- 17 A I am there.
- 18 Q Great.

So here, starting at Line 9, you're responding to RNW and NWEC's criticism of PacifiCorp's thermal resource assumptions, so -- and, you know, referencing testimony from Renewable Northwest about questionable reasoning.

You indicate that, starting on Line 14, this argument is unsupported and the Commission should

Page 306

Page 305

Page 308

- A Yes, I believe I am there.
- Q Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- So if you turn to Slide 4 of that exhibit, Page 4.
- A Yes. I'm there.
- Q So this kind of is a summary, it looks like, of the 2023 IRP filing status, right?
- A Yes. I think that details the timeline I was just
 talking about.
 - Q Great.

So it looks like -- so the IRP was filed March 31st, 2023. And then this is, I think, what you were just speaking to: The extended public comment period began on April 1st?

- 14 A Correct.
 - Q And then April 14th, the public data disks were provided, which is -- looks like the day after this meeting.

And then the comment period ended on April 30th?

- A That's correct. That's what I see here.
- Q Great.

So it looks like that left -- so if you kind of look at a calendar -- about ten business days for stakeholders to access, understand, and analyze PacifiCorp's IRP data to find and quantify the renewables cost escalators, then prepare and submit

- disregard my client's concern on this point. Instead,
 consistent with the Commission's decision and
 PacifiCorp's 2023 general rate case, the Commission
 should conclude that PacifiCorp's thermal resource
 assumptions are reasonable and should be used to inform
 the interim targets in the CEIP biennial update.
 - Did I read that right?
 - A Yes. I believe that's correct.
- 9 Q And are you familiar with -- well, you can just quickly
 10 turn to, if you can, Exhibit RG-27X. And that would be
 11 the 2023 -- or the March 19th, 2024, final order in
 12 that rate case, which I believe you were referring to
 13 in your testimony; is that correct?
- 14 A Yes, I believe that is correct.
- Q So PacifiCorp filed the -- this biennial CEIP update onNovember 1st of 2023, right?
- 17 A That is correct.
- Q And then the Commission's order in this general rate case was issued on March 19th of this year, right?
- 20 A That is correct.
- Q So does the Commission's final order in the general rate case discuss or make any connection between the
- decision in the GRC and its relevance to the company's
- 24 biennial CIP -- CEIP update?
- A This is a very long order that I've read one time.

Page 309

But, no, I do not believe it specifically references the biennial CEIP update.

Q So do you agree that the Commission never gave PacifiCorp the direction to base its IRP or its biennial CEIP update on the outcome of the 2023 general rate case?

A So I'm not -- I don't know if I would answer that question "yes" or "no," because I -- I'm not sure I completely understood the phrasing. But a little bit of context that I will supply.

It was in the spring of 20- -- or actually, I guess, very early in 2023 that we would have been doing the 2023 IRP. And in the '23 IRP, we do come up with a CETA-compliant portfolio. You know, we basically don't put out that IRP without having that. And so, you know, in the beginning of 2023, when we were doing what would those CETA interim targets look like, that ultimately requires us to make some post-modeling determinations of allocations and kind of assess the need for Washington customers based on that.

And if you recall in our refiled CEIP, in our original 2021 CEIP, we were using then-future assumptions that we thought we would realign Chehalis to be a hundred percent, which actually was a very significant supply of thermal energy. You know, we

guesses about the future. And, you know, it is -- it is fortunate that the company was vetting that proposal and eventually got buy-in.

But I also want to comment on the way that I believe Renewable Northwest and NWEC was characterizing these assumptions in their testimony, which is what I disagreed with, was it sounded like the company was looking at market conditions and then arbitrarily making assumptions in its IRP modeling about thermals. And that's just not correct.

The coal lives of units like Jim Bridger 3 and 4 or Colstrip, the natural gas conversion of Jim Bridger 1 and 2, those are fully based on a completely endogenous optimized IRP modeling. Those have been fully justified in whatever prudency review that has been required, and that is based off of, you know, the full suite of information about the forecast. Those were not simply based off of, you know, one year of market data or something like that.

And I -- I perceived the comments in Renewable Northwest and NWEC's testimony to be characterizing it as such. The lives of those units, the conversion, that was already justified in the IRP model. If that had not been selected, we would not have had the option of allocating it to Washington customers.

Page 310

have since, starting in the 2023, we thought, Okay, well, there is -- there has not been a successful proposal that we knew of at the time to realign Chehalis, so we thought, Okay, we should -- we should align our thermal assumptions with what we think is representative of reality.

Quite frankly, I go to regulation. I go to revenue requirement. And I say, Hey, what do allocations look like today? What should I be basing this off of?

And the company, at the time, I believe -- I do not work on rate cases, and so I also kind of defer to company witness McVee to clarify -- I believe at the time the company was working on the proposals to both extend Washington customers' participation in coal units through the end of 2025 as well as proposed participating in Jim Bridger 1 and 2 after they convert to natural gas.

So in the 2021 IRP, we did not actually include Washington customers in that natural gas conversion, because at the time, we had no way of knowing if that, you know, was reasonable or not. And by the time we were sitting in 2023, I was hearing that, yes, there's significant benefits to Washington customers, and so we aligned those assumptions. Again, we have to make

Page 312

But in terms of choosing the allocations, yes, we aligned that with the proposal. That was, you know, my best guess of the future. So I think it's worth reiterating that when we do our planning, we don't have a crystal ball. It's been ever complicated by state-specific policies and really needing to adapt the way that we do our IRP.

And, you know, we are making strides. I'll put a plug for the IRP team. They're doing great work. And they're making strides to get -- get to a point where the tool has really evolved to do that. But we just didn't quite have that capability when we did the '23 IRP.

So sorry. I know that I gave a long-winded answer. Feel free to re- -- recast your question so I can give you a "yes" or "no." But I just wanted to provide that context to kind of why I was disagreeing with the -- the position that RNW and NWEC were taking.

Q It's helpful. Thank you.

Let me just see here.

Let's move on to back to your testimony, your rebuttal testimony, at Page 26.

A Okay. I'm there.

24 Q Starting at Line 8.

And so this is about the 2022 all-source RFP that

Page 313 1 we've talked about a bit today. 1 So just beginning underneath the graphic there, it 2 In your testimony, you -- you testify that there 2 says, "Staff would assert PacifiCorp had other resource 3 was no initial short list from the 2022 all-source RFP options available to it in '23 and '24 when it chose to 3 and then the OPUC staff was incorrect when they 4 4 pursue its current de facto strategy of increased 5 concluded otherwise; is that correct? 5 reliance on coal power, higher levels of market purchases, and bilateral storage contracts." 6 6 A Yes, that is correct. And we've provided that same 7 7 clarification to the Oregon commission staff in that It goes on on the next page after kind of a series 8 8 of redacted information and says, "Yet the company other proceeding. 9 Q And in that other proceeding, are you aware of if staff 9 chose to take resource actions that increased reliance 10 has issued a revised report or -- or any other --10 on market purchases, bilaterally contract for storage 11 anything in writing to clarify their understanding 11 at unknown prices, build more gas plants, increase 12 after whatever you've submitted to clarify to them? 12 reliance on coal plants and speculative CCUS Does that make sense? technology, all while falling short of emission 13 13 14 14 reduction targets." A Yeah. I think the only thing that has been in writing 15 15 Did I read that correctly? is probably their data requests asking for their short 16 list and us telling them there's no short list. 16 A Yes, you did read that correctly. Q When you were testifying earlier about OPUC staff's --17 Q Mm-hmm. 17 18 18 that they were incorrect regarding their conclusion A I'm not sure that they have had any kind of revised 19 statement to acknowledge the -- that misunderstanding. 19 that there were other resources available, is this 20 Q Will you please turn to Exhibit 20- -- RG-28X. This is 20 the -- is this what you were referring to? the March 13th, 2023, letter from PacifiCorp filed in MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, I'd like to 21 21 22 the UM 2193 docket. 22 object twice here. A Got it. I am there. 23 23 First, again, if you look at the top of that 24 Q Great. 24 Page 10 that NWEC began with, this is the '23 IRP 25 So on March 13th, 2023, PacifiCorp filed in this 25 update. This is a document a year after we filed the Page 314

Page 316

OPUC docket its benchmark bid evaluations for the 2022 all-source RFP, correct?

A Yeah, these aren't evaluations really. They're just benchmark bids. So these are -- benchmarks refer to projects that the company is looking into as self-built, or -- I don't know -- based on the naming conventions, I'm not -- I'm not sure if this includes build-to-transfer agreements, BTAs, which do get financed similarly.

But essentially this is just a bunch of benchmarks that the company found projects that could be self-built, and these get reviewed by the IEs, the independent evaluator, and they typically would get analyzed against market bid information to see if any of them are competitive.

Q Thanks.

And so now could you please turn to Exhibit RG-30X, which is a redacted staff report dated August 1st, 2024.

20 A Yes. I am there.

21 Q Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

25

And so if you could please turn to Page 10. And that's also PDF Page 10 of that staff report.

24 A This is a heavily redacted page, correct?

Q Yeah. That's right. Correct.

IRP. So this has no relevance to the '23 IRP nor to the CEIP update.

And I'd also like to object that Dr. Ghosh has already testified that there is no final short list in the '22 all-source RFP. That's a well-known fact. And Oregon commission is incorrect in this.

But I need to make those two objections.

ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. Those objections have been noted. I believe we dealt with the first at the beginning of the proceeding. And to the extent that Dr. Ghosh has already answered a question regarding what resources were, weren't available, and the accuracy of this document, that has been noted as well.

I'd ask counsel to not re-ask that question but to continue along with your line of questioning. And the Commission will give that its due weight moving forward. Thank you.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Your

Q (By Ms. Chillcott) And one question about, I guess, the -- this nonexistent list.

PacifiCorp actually acquired the development rights to a project, a 300-megawatt wind and solar project in Idaho -- right? -- that emerged from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 320

Page 317

2022 all-source RFP, correct?

A That's incorrect, actually. So I assume you're referring to the ARCO project that was, I think, actually brought in in your other exhibit.

And so, one, I don't believe that was found through the 2022 all-source RFP process. I believe it was being explored as a build-to-transfer agreement. Just, you know, we have people on our company that are always out there, looking for projects, keeping tabs on what's available. And I believe that when, you know, nobody could acquire this resource from the originally planned developer, they sold the rights to develop in the future this ARCO project to PacifiCorp.

So I just really want to clarify. This is not any form of significant financial investment. It is not a commitment. It is simply PacifiCorp acquiring the rights to build in the future at any point in time should they choose. I believe this is standard utility practice, a way of keeping our options open.

And, again, just for context on timing, the 2022 all-source RFP, I believe we received market bids in the spring of 2023, in March sometime, and it wasn't until the summer that the RFP team had even gone through that list and determined bids that were conforming or nonconforming. And all that means is,

Q (By Ms. Chillcott) The last thing on this, Dr. Ghosh, is whenever you referred to market bids, what do you mean by "market bids"?

A Yeah, so there's a distinction between what we call benchmark bids, which is what was referred to in that earlier exhibit, and then there are market bids.

So benchmarks are simply PacifiCorp goes out and looks for projects that could be self-built, like I was saying earlier. They just go and look for options. Doesn't necessarily mean we build them often or at all.

And then when we do something like an RFP of any kind, that's an issuance to the market where we're requesting the bids. And all of that bid information that comes in because of that initiation of an RFP, those are what we call market bids. And so typically when we're talking about some kind of short list in an RFP, we're usually referring to a short list of market bids. And I would -- that's what I was clarifying that we never got there in the 2022 all-source RFP.

Q Gotcha. So okay. That's fine. Great.

21 Sorry. Thank you.

So just last line of questioning on -- back to your rebuttal testimony at Page 26.

24 A Yes.

Q And starting at -- let's see -- Line 20. You testified

Page 318

was this bid even eligible? 'Cause we do receive bids that are not eligible sometimes.

And then from that process onwards, they would have begun to -- to narrow down an initial short list, but then the RFP was paused in September of 2023 before the RFP team could make and/or publicize that determination.

I don't know what information the OPUC staff are referring to, to be perfectly honest. It might be the benchmark bids, which are not market bids. It might be the 2022 refresh of the 2022 -- of the 2020 all-source. I really can't speak to what -- what they are referring to.

Q Okay. Fair enough.

ALJ THOMPSON: And quickly, Counsel. I apologize for interrupting you. But I just wanted to check regarding the number of questions that you have left. I'm just looking at the time and the time estimate that was given, and I just wanted to see where we're at.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Yeah. I will say I probably have about five more minutes, if that's okay. ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Go ahead and proceed.

MS. CHILLCOTT: Okay.

that you disagree with RNW witness Ware's statement

that effectively PacifiCorp does not plan to acquire
 new resources through RFPs before 2030 CETA target.

But if supported by the then-relevant modeling,
 PacifiCorp does intend to issue a 2025 RFP; is that

5 PacifiCorp does intend to issue a 2025 RFP; is that 6 correct?

A Yes, that is correct.

Q And we've heard testimony today regarding the company's -- I don't think you've gone so far as make the commitment to issue an RFP in 2025, but would you say -- I guess, what is your characterization of the company's intent with regard to issuing a 2025 RFP?

A Yeah, I won't speak for the company or the procurement team. I have no authority to do so. But what is within my purview is how we plan to meet our 2030 targets. And so that is my personal priority. That's the goal for my team.

And so we -- you know, based on massively changed circumstances, we had absolutely no choice but to -- to pause and ultimately terminate the 2022 all-source RFP. That's just the unfortunate reality of -- of -- of

having to manage a utility and a company like this.

But the 2025 IRP and subsequent CEIP, I think,

will represent a very important, much-needed refreshment, not just to the inputs and assumptions

21

22

23

24

25

I have no further questions.

Turning to CRITFC.

THE WITNESS: Thanks.

ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. CETAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Page 321 Page 323 1 1 And we'll be brief. and -- and current circumstances, but in our modeling 2 2 approach. 3 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** Something we have sort of spoken to -- spoken to a 3 4 4 BY MR. CETAS: little bit today is, you know, the risk of overbuilding 5 5 when we do things like situs state-specific Q Good evening, Dr. Ghosh. I want to ask you some 6 6 questions or actually in an exhibit we attach for your procurement. And so the IRP team's been working on 7 7 revising its tool so that we can actually do a final colleague Mr. McVee. But they were sponsored --8 8 they're data requests sponsored by you. So I'd like to integrated portfolio that balances all of these 9 9 ask you some questions about them. But you won't need state-specific needs and specifically for Washington 10 10 customers so that we can try to avoid that overbuild this information if --11 and yet meet those targets. 11 A Okay. 12 12 Q -- you don't have it. And so, you know, I can't say that we absolutely 13 A I don't have --13 commit, because I don't have that authority. But, you 14 14 know, we fully intend to -- to model and address our Q Okay. 15 15 A I can get them, but -need and to come up with a viable action plan for 2030. 16 And my best guess is that will involve, you know, both 16 Q Okay. I can project it as well too, or read it off. 17 17 A We probably have copies. system and state-specific procurement possibly, and 18 18 Q Okay. that needs to be supported by that IRP. And, you know, 19 19 MR. ROGALA: And, Elijah, are we we will issue an RFP. 20 20 asking about CRITFC DRs 1 through 20? Again, I have no authority to commit, but I would 21 21 be very shocked if we didn't. And if we didn't, it MR. CETAS: We're asking -- yes. 22 22 And specifically questions around CRITFC DR 1.8 to must be another global epidemic. 23 23 Sorry. I don't say I predicted it. 1.10, which are about customer benefits indicators. 24 Q Okay. Thanks. 24 THE WITNESS: Got it. Okay. I So just to clarify: Pac has made no, you know, 25 25 believe I have the whole set. Just direct me to the Page 322 Page 324 1 firm commitment to procure any additional resources 1 specific number. 2 before 2030. And given that, PacifiCorp has shared no, 2 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which 3 quote/unquote, specific action supporting its biennial 3 exhibit is this? 4 4 MR. CETAS: Sorry. This is MDM-22X. update, correct? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. 5 5 A Sure. I think for us, we were really focused on the 6 near-term targets and recasting those in our biennial 6 MR. CETAS: And we maybe don't need 7 update, because we felt that was the most important 7 this. I'm going to just ask broad questions right now. 8 8 thing to recast, and that was really based on what we Q (By Mr. Cetas) So PacifiCorp collects customer 9 could do at the time. 9 benefits indicator data as part of its obligations 10 10 under CETA; is that right? It is the case perhaps that there's not any firm 11 action plan out there right now for what that path of 11 A I believe that's correct. 12 resource acquisition looks like through 2030, though of 12 Q And these CBI reflect the information PacifiCorp 13 13 course we have shown a couple -- you know, we've done a collects around vulnerable communities and the impacts 14 couple IRPs now that have shown some proxy resource 14 they face as a result of energy decisions? 15 15 selection to get there. But, again, the 2025 IRP and A That's one aspect. We do name and track some CBIs and metrics that are related to our entire customer base in 16 CEIP, I think, will be absolutely vital in determining 16 17 17 that action plan. And I firmly believe it gives us terms of things like environmental impacts or, you 18 enough time to procure those resources in the next CEIP 18 know, other improvements. 19 period. 19 But, yes, we do have specific mandates to consider 20 MS. CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Dr. Ghosh 20 low-income, highly impacted communities. We are

currently developing our working definition and

with a ton of stakeholder input.

measuring methodology -- it's a weird way to say

that -- for vulnerable populations. We're doing so

And, yes, so we have -- some of our CBI metrics

21

22

23

24

Page 327

Page 328

Page 325

are more focused on those specific populations, and many of our CBI metrics we report for, you know, both all customers and those subgroups.

Q And the CBIs that you report for all customers, are those what you refer to as portfolio CBIs?

A Not necessarily. The portfolio CBIs are meant to differentiate CBIs and metrics that are specifically reported off of our IRP portfolio. Because CBIs are customer benefit indicators, most of that information or outcomes that we want to impact are so localized in terms of, you know, that specific customer or customer class that it benefits or impacts, it can be hard to model or track that in an IRP, because it's just really, really high level. So we have some portfolio CBIs which are things that we track at the portfolio level. And I would say that those are meant to represent benefits at all customers in Washington.

Q And those portfolio CBIs, they can inform the resource decisions?

A Yes. And I admit we are -- we were very new in this in our first IRP CEIP cycle. We're getting -- we're getting better at it. And so at -- as of now, it's information we report. And so to the extent that you might have a range of variant portfolios that we want to consider as the optimal CEIP portfolio, those CBI

of adding to that overall quantity in the air, and it's -- it's global. It doesn't matter where you emit it.

Local pollutants, particularly SOx and NOx -- and if I tell you what those are, I will say them wrong, so I don't want to embarrass myself -- but these are examples of local pollutants, which can be generated at a thermal emitting plant. And the -- the significance of local pollutants like these is they stay in a higher concentration closest to the plant.

And there are other sources of these emissions, not just an electricity generator. And so there are other factors in a community that might impact how much of that local pollution level there is. But it's actually something that we model in our IRP and can look at. And so we want to think about can we look at that for Washington-located plants or plants that are located within a certain number of miles from Washington customers. And, you know, could we -- could we look at the offsetting benefit of -- of offsetting in local pollution emission.

So sorry. That was kind of a long answer, but that is -- that is something we're thinking about.

Q Thank you.

And could portfolio CBI -- could they be -- could

Page 326

metrics we report could help identify which portfolio is preferred. It hasn't really swayed the outcome in the last IRP and CEIP cycle. But I think we're working on improving our -- our methods around that.

Q And you're working on additional proposed portfolio CBI?

A Yes. I don't know if we've had a chance to talk about it in the public sphere. We will hopefully do so in the New Year in our equity advisory group meetings. But, yes, we have been thinking about this question of how do you consider somewhat more localized benefits or impacts of a portfolio.

So usually our portfolio CBIs are really focused on, you know, total -- total emissions, total renewable energy added to the portfolio. Energy unserved is one of them, which is a measure of reliability, but pretty much all of our portfolios have very little energy unserved, because they're designed that way.

So a new portfolio CBI that we are planning to -to roll out once we get stakeholder feedback and buy-in
is the impact of local pollutants. So we -- we
typically focus on global pollutants, which is
greenhouse gas emissions or -- or carbon dioxide.
Because a global pollutant is something that, once it's
emitted into the air, it's just considered to be kind

they have an impact on RFPs?

A I think so. Again, we're sort of in the early phases. In the 2022 all-source RFP, which, yes, was ultimately terminated, but something new in that RFP was we had an equity questionnaire. And I think this was more borne out of, you know, other equity -- evolving equity requirements in Washington policy.

But in this next RFP, we are trying to figure out -- and, again, this is something that we've got to get buy-in from our interested parties and make sure it makes sense to everybody. But we are trying to adapt and grow from that equity questionnaire approach and figure out, you know, what types of questions can we ask developers and what other non-price score impacts can we build in for a type of resource, either based on its fuel type or its location, that would let us have a non-price score that might weight more because of its positive impact towards a CBI or metric.

MR. CETAS: Okay. Thank you. No more questions.

THE WITNESS: Thanks.
ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
And does the company have any redirect for this witness?

MR. ROGALA: Yes, Your Honor. I'll

lowest-cost option. And so I think it was absolutely

know, all the time, using our best judgment, when we

And then moving to another line of question on

reasonable to reflect our reality. We do that, you

set up our IRP models.

Q Thank you.

Natrium.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 329 Page 331 1 be -- I'll be brief. 1 I understand the concern that if Natrium doesn't 2 2 come on line like we plan for it to come on line, that REDIRECT EXAMINATION 3 3 could leave a, in your words, a 3 to 5 percent gap in 4 BY MR. ROGALA: 4 the company's compliance position by 2030. 5 Q First, I'd just like to start with these renewable cost 5 But a resource not coming on line on this 6 assumptions. And I think we've really lost sight of 6 commercial operation deadline, is that a problem that's 7 7 the forest here. unique with just Natrium, or is it a problem with all 8 8 resources? Dr. Ghosh, no one contests that bid repricing from 9 9 the 2020 all-source RFP actually happened, correct? A I think at least in recent history, it's been a problem 10 A I believe that's correct. 10 with all resources. You know, we've seen developers of 11 Q And as a result, we purchased close to two gigawatts of 11 other technology types end up having significant delays 12 resources at these inflated prices, correct? 12 in the timing of when they can get stuff on line. 13 A I believe that's correct. We -- we're bringing on line 13 It's -- it's unfortunate. I'm not really aware of why. 14 1900-plus megawatts of capacity. 14 I don't know a lot about sourcing materials and all of 15 15 Q And would it surprise you to know that all of these that and getting, you know, probably permits. But I do 16 purchases that were included in our 2023 general 16 think it's unfortunately a risk for most new projects 17 electric rate case and which are now in our revenue 17 that you want to bring on line. requirements, that the Commission approve the full rate 18 Q And would you agree that it's routine contracting 18 19 recovery of these resources based on these higher 19 practice that there are contractual provisions about 20 20 delayed commercial operation deadlines? So in the prices? 21 A I wasn't really aware of that, but that doesn't 21 event Natrium does not come on line by 2030, there's 22 some sort of contractual recourse in that hypothetical 22 surprise me, because we need the significant renewable 23 growth for CETA. 23 situation? 24 Q And so then to put a point to it, would it have been 24 A I'm not familiar with the terms of our Natrium 25 reasonable, in your opinion, to on one hand actually 25 contract. Page 330 Page 332 1 buy two gigawatts of resources at these higher prices, 1 One thing I will offer, though, is we did learn 2 but then on the other, not include those prices in the 2 some lessons from the 2020 all-source RFP. And because 3 3 2023 IRP/CEIP update based on an average of what we of delays in signing contracts, developers were able to 4 4 actually saw and what we, in fact, procured resources just reprice things or pull out. And so we have 5 from? 5 learned lessons from that process, and that has been 6 6 A I don't think it would have been reasonable, because I built into the RFP. 7 7 I don't know the specifics. But I believe there think the problem is, you know, we run the risk of 8 8 running an IRP that has near-term renewable resource are, you know, different provisions in the contracts costs that are artificially low. And based on that, we 9 9 that developers sign when they submit bids. That 10 10 might select a lot of stuff in the near term and then hopefully helps disincentivize their ability to just 11 11 go out and realize we can't get this at this price. walk away unscathed, to hopefully give us some 12 12 insulation against that. But we -- we can't control it And so I believe it was a reasonable assumption 13 13 based on very significant repricing that we were seeing 14 Q And I appreciate that. And I'm not trying to downplay 14 in the market. And at the end of the day, you know, I 15 the concerns with Natrium. I wanted to bring some 15 do believe utilities know what the options really are. 16 16 perspective to it. I mean, we are always reviewing our options, looking at 17 17 self-build projects, looking at PPAs. You know, we're So let's -- let's talk to your 3 to 5 percent 18 18 always evaluating for what is going to be the next example here. 19

59 (Pages 329 to 332)

So let's say Natrium does not come on line. Can

thing, but megawatt-hours are another. And so I think

it might be helpful to have some context on this

A Would you like me to share a work paper where I can

potential definition.

you provide some context to what a 3 to 5 percent miss

would mean for PacifiCorp? Because percentages are one

20

21

22

23

24

Page 333 Page 335 1 show you where the numbers come from, or should I just 1 hard at 3 p.m. -- you know, three million 2 2 say it? megawatt-hours of renewable generating stuff. And so 3 Q I defer to the -- the witness, Commission, I guess. that's -- that gets us just to 77 percent of that -- of 3 4 4 that interim target goal. THE WITNESS: Your Honor, can I 5 share a work paper on my screen? 5 So it's -- you know, it's a -- it's a concern, 6 ALJ THOMPSON: You may. You can 6 obviously, partly because it's -- it's dispatchable, 7 7 also just say it, if you'd like. reliable generation, and replacing that is probably the 8 THE WITNESS: I don't know. I'll 8 real concern. But, you know, I think at that point, we 9 9 just share it, if I can do this correctly. will know the risks in 2028. And if we need to get a 10 Okay. Sorry. This is going to be hard to see. 10 little bit more extra renewable resources to cover 11 Try to make these numbers bigger. 11 that. I think we can. 12 So this is the -- the summary calculation of our 12 But I think the real risk is -- is just not having 13 interim targets that were submitted in our CEIP 13 enough dispatchable stuff to provide reliability. 14 biennial update that are the subject of today's 14 That's the real risk. Same with -- same with peakers. 15 conversation. And I -- I did just want to bring some 15 Peakers don't run very much in a year. They're 16 16 probably, like, 1 percent of our targets during any of context here 17 So up here on Row 3 is our retail sales forecast. 17 these years. But those non-emitting peakers are really 18 18 essential for making sure that we can reliably provide So this determines our entire need trajectory, right? 19 Our -- our interim targets are based off of how many 19 power. 20 20 REC-generating resources that we can supply to meet MR. ROGALA: Wow. That was great. 21 that need. 21 Thank you, Dr. Ghosh. No further questions. Thank 22 And so in 2030, which is, you know, our first year 2.2 23 of -- of GHG-neutral compliance, we expect to serve 82 23 ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. 24 percent of that retail sales with either, you know, 24 Any questions from the bench? 25 non-emitting or renewable resources. And I -- we do 25 CHAIR DANNER: No, I just -- very Page 334 Page 336 1 categorize those slightly differently, though it is 1 quickly. 2 2 expected that they all must generate renewable energy So when your counsel was talking about if you 3 3 credits in order to -- to satisfy this. don't meet a contract, there are provisions in that 4 4 contract for delays. But there's no replacement power And so in Row 7, we have what is made up by 5 5 nuclear and non-emitting peakers. And in Row 8 we have that are part of those contracts as far as you know. 6 basically everything else, so wind, solar, hydro, the--6 It's just about damages or not having to -- to pay 7 the standard stuff. 7 whatever bill? 8 8 And so, you know, 186,000 megawatts on meeting a THE WITNESS: Yeah, I believe that's 9 four-million-megawatt-hour need in 2030 is made up 9 the case. 10 of -- of nuclear and non-emitting peakers. And for 10 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. 11 perspective, you can see kind of how small that number THE WITNESS: You know, I'm -- I'm 11 12 12 is. not aware of --13 13 So the number of megawatt-hours that we are ALJ THOMPSON: All right. So far as getting from the Natrium plant forecasted in 2030 to 14 14 you know. All right. THE WITNESS: -- a different 15 serve, you know, Washington customers their -- their 15 16 system share, it's only 186,000 megawatt-hours. Again, 16 version, yeah. 17 that's, like, barely 5 percent of that total retail 17 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. 18 18 That's all the questions I have. 19 And so it's definitely conceivable that if we were 19 ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 20 sitting in 2028 and we found out there was to be a 20 I believe that concludes all of the questions for 21 delay, we could probably go out and sign a PPA or -- or 21 you. You may be excused at this time. 22 explore some other means to fill 186,000 22 (Witness excused.) 23 23 megawatt-hours. It's just for perspective really not 24 24 ALJ THOMPSON: And I believe that that much. Meanwhile, we're projecting bringing on 25 25 the next witness is staff's witness. And so once 3. -- three million -- I'm sorry; numbers are -- are

	Page 337		Page 339
1	Dr. Ghosh is able to close down, we can go ahead and	1	No. 3 is IRA, IIJA.
2	call our next witness.	2	No. 4 is resource acquisition.
3	And I will remind the parties just quickly that	3	No. 5 is 2025 resource acquisition.
4	I I believe the commissioners still have a hard stop	4	No. 6 is minimum designation and program design
5	at 4:00.	5	regarding distributed resources.
6	MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, do we	6	No. 7 is resource adequacy.
7	oh.	7	I think I missed one. My apologies.
8	ALJ THOMPSON: Sorry. Go ahead,	8	No. 6 No. 6 should be interim targets.
9	Mr. Rogala.	9	No. 7 should be minimum designations and program
10	MR. ROGALA: I apologize. Dr. Ghosh	10	design.
11	was just shutting her computer. Do we need	11	And then No. 8 is resource adequacy.
12	MS. STRAUSS: She has her own.	12	So the next portion of my corrections will be in
13	MR. ROGALA: Okay. Got it. Okay.	13	Exhibit JNS-1HCT(R).
14	MS. STRAUSS: Staff calls Jaclynn	14	On Page 3, Line 6, it currently states OPCU also
15 16	Simmons.	15 16	ordered the company to start a new RFP. That correction is that the OPCU ordered a docket to
17	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. And if you could please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in.	17	initiate an investigation of their own legal ability to
18	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will	18	issue make the company issue an RFP and to get an
19	provide today will be the truth, the whole truth, and	19	outcome of that RFP.
20	nothing but the truth?	20	And then additionally, I have one more correction.
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.	21	And that is on Page 13 of my testimony as well,
22	Yes.	22	Lines 11 through 12. It states the allocation of the
23	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	23	resources to Washington changed from dynamic allocation
24	You can go ahead and proceed.	24	to using MSP to set percentage through WIJAM. It's the
25	////	25	opposite. It was set percentage to a dynamic
	Page 338		Page 340
_			J = 0 1 0
1	JACLYNN SIMMONS, having been first duly sworn	1	allocation.
2	JACLYNN SIMMONS, having been first duly sworn by ALJ Thompson, was	1 2	
	•		allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that?
2	by ALJ Thompson, was	2 3 4	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And
2 3 4 5	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows:	2 3 4 5	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12.
2 3 4 5 6	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION	2 3 4 5 6	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other
2 3 4 5 6 7	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS:	2 3 4 5 6 7	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now. A Yes. For Exhibit JNS-19, staff recommendations conditions list, the numbering is incorrect. And for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly. I just have three lines of questions. They're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now. A Yes. For Exhibit JNS-19, staff recommendations conditions list, the numbering is incorrect. And for the record sorry; I got to get to it the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly. I just have three lines of questions. They're mostly just clarifying questions. First, I'd like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now. A Yes. For Exhibit JNS-19, staff recommendations conditions list, the numbering is incorrect. And for the record sorry; I got to get to it the numbering should be as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly. I just have three lines of questions. They're mostly just clarifying questions. First, I'd like to discuss your concerns with our interim targets.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now. A Yes. For Exhibit JNS-19, staff recommendations conditions list, the numbering is incorrect. And for the record sorry; I got to get to it the numbering should be as follows: No. 1 is public participation plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly. I just have three lines of questions. They're mostly just clarifying questions. First, I'd like to discuss your concerns with our interim targets. Now, I understand staff has strong objections to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	by ALJ Thompson, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. STRAUSS: Q Good afternoon, Ms. Simmons. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A Jaclynn Simmons, S-i-m-m-o-n-s. Q Ms. Simmons, did you submit testimony and exhibits in support of your testimony today? A Yes. Q And do you have any corrections or alterations you need to make to that testimony or any of those exhibits? A Yes, ma'am. I have three corrections. Q Okay. Could you please list those now. A Yes. For Exhibit JNS-19, staff recommendations conditions list, the numbering is incorrect. And for the record sorry; I got to get to it the numbering should be as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	allocation. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which page was that? THE WITNESS: That is Page 13. And that would be Line 11 through 12. Q (By Ms. Strauss) Ms. Simmons, do you have any other corrections or alterations you need to make? A No, ma'am. MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. The company can go ahead and proceed. MR. ROGALA: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROGALA: Q Afternoon, Ms. Simmons. A Good afternoon. Q We have the sun. The rain has stopped shining. So let's get through these quickly. I just have three lines of questions. They're mostly just clarifying questions. First, I'd like to discuss your concerns with our interim targets.

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I do want to ask you one line of questions

such that if there's a material change in

or suspend any future RFP.

regarding your recommendation that we could not cancel

First, would staff be open to a revised condition

circumstances, PacifiCorp could seek Commission

Page 341 Page 343 1 wouldn't result in reasonable progress. And I get 1 approval to cancel, suspend, or otherwise terminate an 2 2 that. And I'm not here to argue or discuss those RFP from the '25 IRP/CEIP? 3 concerns right now. I just want to focus on staff's 3 A Staff did not discuss this internally, so I would not 4 analysis of our interim targets. 4 be able to answer that question. 5 5 So I'd like to direct you to JNS-31X. Q Do you think PacifiCorp should have that ability to do 6 6 A Okay. 7 7 Q And on your response to PacifiCorp DR 1, it appears A PacifiCorp already has the ability to be able to file 8 that staff does not contest that PacifiCorp correctly 8 anything with the Commission and request an exemption 9 incorporated the WIJAM in the CEIP update, correct? 9 from an order. So there's already that ability built 10 10 Q And on DR 2, staff agrees PacifiCorp correctly Q And do you think PacifiCorp should have the ability to 11 11 12 incorporated several relevant planning assumptions and 12 request an amendment of a Commission decision that conditions from the Commission's recent approval in 13 would prevent us from canceling or suspending an RFP? 13 14 14 PacifiCorp's '23 general rate case, correct? For -- for -- for example, you know, what if we don't 15 15 receive any cost-effective bids in the RFP? A Correct. 16 Q And on to 4, DR 4. It appears staff agrees that 16 MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I'm going PacifiCorp correctly updated its resource procurement 17 17 to just object. This is the exact same question from the 2020 all-source RFP to reflect actual as 18 18 counsel just asked of Ms. Simmons, and she responded 19 opposed to planned resources, correct? 19 already. 20 20 MR. ROGALA: This is a specific A And just to clarify, that's for the biennial update? Q Yes. Sorry. I didn't make that clear. 21 example of what could be a material change in 21 22 A That is correct. 22 circumstances. And I think it's relevant to hear just Q And then same exhibit to DR 6. Staff did not submit 23 23 how broad this condition could be or could not be. And 24 any conflicting evidence that discredits the 24 I just want to walk down a few examples of where we 25 justifications for our updated interim targets, 25 think a suspension or a canceling of an RFP would be Page 342 Page 344 1 correct? And I'm speaking specifically on our 1 justified. 2 2 modeling. ALJ THOMPSON: I will go ahead and 3 3 A At the time of the status request, staff did not have overrule the objection to the extent that counsel is 4 4 any issues or reflect any issues in its testimony about asking for responses on specific examples with the 5 5 the company's modeling. However, after reading caveat that the witness has already indicated they 6 Ms. Ware's testimony and doing some data requests to 6 cannot speak for staff and this is the witness's 7 the company, staff has some concerns about the price 7 opinions. I would also ask counsel to keep these 8 8 adders to the modeling. examples very limited in number. Q Thank you. I appreciate that. MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 9 10 Okay. Moving to staff's Alternative Condition 5. 10 Q (By Mr. Rogala) Ms. Simmons, would it be reasonable to 11 MR. ROGALA: For everyone's benefit, 11 cancel the -- any RFP from the 2025 IRP or CEIP if 12 this is the condition that would prevent PacifiCorp 12 there's a material change in state policy; for example, 13 13 if the Climate Commitment Act is repealed this from canceling, suspending, or otherwise terminating an 14 RFP that could originate from the '25 IRP or CEIP 14 November? 15 15 update. A It would be reasonable for the company to submit a Q (By Mr. Rogala) As an initial matter, I think your 16 16 request for exemption of the order. 17 17 position is it's much more reasonable than NWEC and Q And then I think I only have two more examples. 18 18 Renewable Northwest's position, because you're not Would it be reasonable to request an exemption if 19 asking the Commission to order us to procure resources. 19 our next multistate allocation methodology no longer

requires additional resources in the near term? For

example, with a realignment of PacifiCorp resources,

for example, with some sort of assignment of all of a

MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, I'm going

converted Chehalis generation facility to serve

Washington customers?

20

21

22

23

24

Page 345

to object. This is an improper hypothetical that's beyond the scope of Ms. Simmons' testimony at this point.

MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, we've already limited this line of questioning down pretty dramatically. I have this hypothetical and then one more. I think this gets to the point about how broad or narrow this condition should be.

ALJ THOMPSON: I will go ahead and overrule. We will consider how broad the hypothetical is and just ask for a response to the question, please.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat your

MR. ROGALA: Happy to.

Q (By Mr. Rogala) Ms. Simmons, would it be reasonable for PacifiCorp to have the ability to cancel or suspend an RFP from a future 2025 IRP action plan if, for example, our next multistate allocation methodology removed the need for additional Washington resources; for example, assigning all of Chehalis generation to serve Washington customers?

A If the allocation methodology you're speaking of has already been approved by the Commission, then staff believes that it would be reasonable for the -- the company to file a request for an exemption of the

Q What was staff's response when asked whether staff could provide additional discussion for why impacts to other states from staff's recommendation were not relevant?

5 A You just want me to read the response to you?

Q Correct.

A "The Washington UTC only regulates actions" -- "utility actions in Washington State or actions that impact Washington customers. Impacts to customers in other states are outside the jurisdiction of Washington UTC and not subject to staff review. See RCW 80.01.040.

"PacifiCorp Data Request 10 asked questions related to whether staff considered impacts to other states because Washington UTC does not have authority over cost allocations adopted by other jurisdictions. These questions were not relevant to the biennial CEIP update."

Q Thank you.

And then moving to 21C. PacifiCorp asked: Is it staff's position that a public utility's compliance with its legal obligations and mandates outside of the state of Washington is not relevant to proceedings before the Commission?

What was your response in Subpart C?

A "No. Staff objected to the relevance of the specific

Page 346

order.

Q Thank you.

auestion.

Then final examples: What if procurement would either, A, trigger CETA's cost cap, or, B, materially impact our financial profile and credit metrics? Would those provide reasonable circumstances to request an amendment of the Commission's order approving this condition?

A Again, the company can submit a request for an exemption, submit all the evidence, and it can be reviewed by the Commission.

Q Thank you.

And I just have one more line of questioning, and I'd like to discuss staff Alternative Condition 2.

MR. ROGALA: For everyone's benefit, this is the condition that would have PacifiCorp submit several new allocation methodologies in our next rate case to increase the share of PacifiCorp's non-emitting or renewable resources that serve Washington customers.

Q (By Mr. Rogala) I want to explore several of the implications from this condition to our customers in other states.

Ms. Simmons, can you turn to JNS-28X. This is your response to DR 20. $\label{eq:control}$

A I'm there.

Page 348

question in DR 10. Staff is not arguing that compliance with legal obligations in other states is never relevant in proceedings before the Commission."

Q Thank you.

And so based on those two responses, the Commission can confirm that staff has not analyzed implications that could result from its alternative recommendation to PacifiCorp's customers in other states, correct?

A Can you repeat your question.

Q The -- based on your read of your responses to DRs 20 and 21, the Commission can confirm that staff has not analyzed implications that could result from staff's alternative recommendation to PacifiCorp's customers in other states, correct?

A No. Staff's responsibility is to Washington State.

Q And, for example, staff has not analyzed if PacifiCorp has any non-emitting or renewable resources in other states that could actually be allocated to Washington, correct?

21 A No.

Q And, in fact, PacifiCorp does not have any CETA-compliant resources that are not curr

CETA-compliant resources that are not currently in

24 customer rates, correct?

25 A Can you repeat your question.

	Page 349		Page 351
1	Q And to the point, there is no pool of unallocated	1	Okay. I think that concludes the questions. You
2	CETA-compliant resources that are not currently in	2	can go ahead and be excused at this time.
3	customer rates, correct?	3	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
4	A Staff is unsure of that.	4	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
5	Q And staff has not analyzed any rate implications to	5	(Witness excused.)
6	customers in other states from a forced realignment of	6	(Withess exedeed.)
7	PacifiCorp resources?	7	ALJ THOMPSON: And with that, we'll
8	A No.	8	turn to public counsel here in just a moment to call
9	Q And, finally, staff has not analyzed implications to	9	your next witness. And I'm going to look into the
10	PacifiCorp's compliance with other state energy	10	
	policies that could result with a forced realignment;	11	exhibit question.
11 12		12	MS. STRAUSS: Thank you.
	for example, realignment of resources that are		MR. SYKES: Your Honor, public
13	contributing to Oregon's clean energy policies,	13	counsel calls Dr. Robert Earle as its first witness.
14	correct?	14	ALJ THOMPSON: Good afternoon,
15	A No, staff analyzed what was in front of us and per	15	Dr. Earle. If you could please raise your right hand,
16	Washington State only.	16	and I'll swear you in.
17	MR. ROGALA: I appreciate that.	17	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will
18	Ms. Simmons, no further questions. Thank you.	18	give today will be the truth, the whole truth, and
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	19	nothing but the truth?
20	ALJ THOMPSON: And does staff have	20	THE WITNESS: I do.
21	any redirect?	21	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
22	MS. STRAUSS: Just one brief	22	Public Counsel, you can go ahead and proceed.
23	question, Your Honor.	23	////
24	////	24	////
25	////	25	////
			Page 352
1		1	_
1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	1	DR. ROBERT EARLE, appearing remotely, having
2	BY MS. STRAUSS:	2	been first duly sworn
3	Q Ms. Simmons, in staff's work, does staff ever look at	3	by ALJ Thompson, was
4	rate impacts to other customers in other states?	4	examined and testified as
5	A In energy planning, we do not.	5	follows:
6	MS. STRAUSS: Thank you, Your Honor.	6	
7	ALJ THOMPSON: And any questions	7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	from the bench?	8	BY MR. SYKES:
9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: This is just	9	Q Dr. Earle, good afternoon.
10	a clarification.	10	Can you please state and spell your name for the
11	Looking at the exhibit book and also the exhibit	11	record.
	_		
12	list, the link includes a reference saying this data	12	A My name is Robert Earle, R-o-b-e-r-t E-a-r-l-e.
12 13	response is due but hasn't been received yet.	12 13	Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor
13 14	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the	13 14	Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding?
13	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has	13 14 15	Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding?A I did.
13 14	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in	13 14 15 16	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those
13 14 15 16 17	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record.	13 14 15 16 17	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits?
13 14 15 16 17 18	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will	13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not.
13 14 15 16 17	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record.	13 14 15 16 17	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits?
13 14 15 16 17 18	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will	13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will double-check on that. And I can let the company know	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not. MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will double-check on that. And I can let the company know or staff know if we've not received that, and we can go	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not. MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will double-check on that. And I can let the company know or staff know if we've not received that, and we can go ahead and make sure that that is put into the record.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not. MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will double-check on that. And I can let the company know or staff know if we've not received that, and we can go ahead and make sure that that is put into the record. It could have been that I put the wrong link into our	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not. MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Counsel for the company, you can go ahead and
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	response is due but hasn't been received yet. Is that has that been actually filed with the Commission? This is 28X, JNS-28X. 'Cause if it has not yet, then it needs to be submitted and included in the record. ALJ THOMPSON: Commissioner, I will double-check on that. And I can let the company know or staff know if we've not received that, and we can go ahead and make sure that that is put into the record. It could have been that I put the wrong link into our exhibit list, but I'll double-check that right now.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q And, Dr. Earle, did you submit testimony and sponsor exhibits as part of this proceeding? A I did. Q Do you have any corrections or adjustments to those that testimony or exhibits? A I do not. MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the witness for cross. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Counsel for the company, you can go ahead and proceed.

Page 353 Page 355 1 1 Q Sure. **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 2 2 BY MR. ROGALA: Can you please confirm that your testimony does 3 3 Q Dr. Earle, afternoon. not contest that our CEIP update correctly uses the 4 4 WIJAM in our resource allocation assumptions? A Good afternoon. 5 Q Now, I understand you have strong concerns with 5 6 PacifiCorp's long-term planning and recent increases in 6 Q Can you point me to where in your testimony you contest 7 7 Washington net power costs. that we correctly use the WIJAM? 8 I understand those concerns. I don't share them, 8 A Well, let me -- let me give you a general answer, and 9 9 but I understand them. But I'm not here to discuss then we can shuffle through my testimony. 10 10 those issues today. Instead, I'd like to focus on the I think that the -- there's an important 11 justifications for PacifiCorp's decreased interim 11 distinction that we disagree about. But the 12 12 targets. distinction is between shared resources that are Can you please turn to RLE-5X and your response to 13 13 subject to WIJAM and situs resources from Washington 14 14 DR 2A, please. that are not. 15 15 A I'm sorry. DR... So to the degree we're talking about situs 16 Q 2A. 16 resources, which are possible under WIJAM, as Mr. McVee 17 17 said earlier, then, no, because -- because, A 5X? 18 Q Should be 5X. 18 unfortunately, PacifiCorp did not study or consider 19 19 A I have as 5X: Selected party responses to PacifiCorp situs resources. To the degree that resources are 20 20 data requests, exhibit of Matthew D. McVee. shared, I didn't look at the arithmetic around the 21 Q Correct. And that MDM-3 should be -- includes several 21 percentages assigned to Washington of those shared DRs, and one of them includes your response to DR 2A. 22 22 resources. I believe it's at the bottom of that list of exhibits. 23 23 Q And I can understand your concern around the 24 A No. I see Commission staff DRs, and then I see 24 potentiality for situs resources. But when looking at 25 RNW/NWEC DRs. I don't see any directed towards me. 25 the narrower question of whether we use the post-MSP Page 354 Page 356 1 methodology from the revised CEIP or whether we, in I'm looking at Exhibit MDM-3. Is that the right 1 2 2 exhibit? fact, use the WIJAM in this proceeding, you did not 3 3 Q It should be. I show it on mine. contest that we used the WIJAM correctly? 4 4 MR. SYKES: Counsel -- Counsel, are A Again -- again, I -- I want -- I want to be clear. I 5 5 you looking at RG-4 maybe? don't contest that you use the WIJAM correctly as it 6 6 MR. ROGALA: Maybe my numbering's applies to shared resources. 7 off again, but let's try RG-4. 7 Q Moving on to the next line of question. Similar vein. 8 8 Can you please confirm that your testimony does Q (By Mr. Rogala) Do you see -- can you see DR 2A and 9 not refute that our actual procurement from the 2020 9 10 A I have it labeled RLE-6X, RG -- Exhibit RG-4. 10 all-source RFP was lower than what the company had 11 11 actually planned for in the '21 revised CEIP? Okay. Yes. 2A. 12 MR. ROGALA: Thank you, everyone, 12 A I -- I don't refute that. As a matter of fact, I think 13 13 for brief runaround there again. that's one of the problems, that PacifiCorp did not 14 Q (By Mr. Rogala) Okay. Response to DR 2A. 14 follow through, as Mr. McVee said in his testimony --15 Now, when asked whether public counsel analyzed or 15 paraphrasing here -- that they didn't want to go 16 16 identified any errors with the company's retail load through the analytical exercise for the rest of the 17 17 assumptions in the CEIP update, you confirm that public resources in the 2020 RFP. 18 18 counsel did not do so, correct? Q And to your knowledge, after the Commission approved 19 A Correct. 19 full rate recovery for all of these resources, no party 20 Q And then just a few brief general questions about your 20 raised the argument that you just raised that the 21 testimony. 21 company should have engaged in some sort of subsequent 22 Can you please confirm that public counsel does 22 procurement effort that could have informed our 23 not contest that our CEIP update correctly uses the 23 procurement efforts from the 2020 all-source RFP? 24 24 WIJAM in our resource allocation assumptions? A I'm -- I'm sorry. I got lost in the question. Do you 25 25 A I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question. mind repeating, please?

	510 v. Facilicorp d/b/a Facilic Fower & Light Company			
	Page 357		Page 359	
1	Q To your knowledge, did any party in the company's 2023	1	MR. ROGALA: And I appreciate that.	
2	rate case similarly argue that the company's resource	2	And, Dr. Earle, no further questions. Thank you.	
3	procurement efforts from the 2020 all-source RFP were	3	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
4	unreasonable or otherwise imprudent for not engaging in	4	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	
5	even more repricing negotiations?	5	Any redirect?	
6	A I'm not aware of that.	6	MR. SYKES: No, Your Honor.	
7	Q Next question.	7	ALJ THOMPSON: Any questions from	
8	Can you please confirm that your testimony does	8	the bench?	
9	not contest that our CEIP update assumes that	9	Okay. Dr. Earle, thank you for your testimony.	
10	Washington customers will receive service from Colstrip	10	You are excused at this time.	
11	Unit 4 and Jim Bridger Units 3 and 4 through 2025?	11	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	
12	A You're ask I'm sorry. You're asking me to confirm	12	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	
13	that Washington customers will receive service from	13	(Witness excused.)	
14	those facilities?	14		
15	Q Correct. Yeah.	15	ALJ THOMPSON: And, Public Counsel,	
16	A Yes, they will.	16	I believe the last witness is yours to call as well.	
17	Q And can you please confirm that your testimony does not	17	MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Public	
18	contest that our CEIP update assumes that Washington	18	counsel calls Stefan de Villiers to the stand.	
19	customers will continue to receive electricity from Jim	19	ALJ THOMPSON: And if you could	
20	Bridger Units 1 and 2 through 2029 after both units	20	please raise your right hand, and I'll swear you in.	
21	have been converted to run on natural gas?	21	Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will	
22	A I believe that assumption is in is in the update,	22	provide today will be the truth, the whole truth, and	
23	yep.	23	nothing but the truth?	
24	Q And can you please confirm that your testimony does not	24	THE WITNESS: I do, Your Honor.	
25	contest that our CEIP update assumes that Washington	25	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	
	Page 358		Page 360	
1	retains a system share of Chehalis and Hermiston	1	You can go ahead and proceed, Counsel.	
2	natural-gas-fired plants?	2		
3	A Washington does retain a share. Correct.	3	STEFAN DE VILLIERS, having been first duly sworn	
4	Q So it's fair to say that our CEIP update is consistent	4	by ALJ Thompson, was	
5	with the revenue requirement realities in the company's	5	examined and testified as	
6	current revenue requirement, correct?	6	follows:	
7	A I'm not sure what you mean by "revenue requirement	7		
8	realities."	8	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
9	Q It's kind of a vague question, so I will strike the	9	BY MR. SYKES:	
10	question and move on to a different one.	10	Q Good afternoon, Mr. de Villiers.	
11	All four of the prior examples, Dr. Earle just	11	Can you please state and spell your name for the	
12	to refresh your memory, that's actual procurement	12	record.	
13	efforts, Colstrip Units 4 and Jim Bridger Units 1	13	A Yes. My name is Stefan de Villiers. That's Stefan,	
14	through 4, and realignment of Chehalis and Hermiston	14	S-t-e-f-a-n, de Villiers, d-e, space, V-i-l-l-i-e-r-s.	
15	all those prior examples are now reflected in	15	Q And, Mr. de Villiers, did you submit testimony and	
16	PacifiCorp's current revenue requirement, correct?	16	sponsor exhibits in this proceeding?	
17	A So I believe they are from the 2023 GRC proceeding. I	17	A I did.	
18	think the the the problem is, is the results of	18	Q Do you have any corrections to that testimony or those	
19	those are the result of decisions made that excluded	19	exhibits?	
	Washington from being considered separately in in	20	A I do not.	
20			MR. SYKES: Your Honor, I tender the	
21	the IRP and in the CEIP, in the biennial update.	21		
21 22	the IRP and in the CEIP, in the biennial update. Washington was not considered separately because of	22	witness.	
21 22 23	the IRP and in the CEIP, in the biennial update. Washington was not considered separately because of its and should have been because of its net short	22 23	witness. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	
21 22 23 24	the IRP and in the CEIP, in the biennial update. Washington was not considered separately because of its and should have been because of its net short position. It was perfectly possible for PacifiCorp to	22 23 24	witness. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Mr. Rogala, you can go ahead and proceed.	
21 22 23	the IRP and in the CEIP, in the biennial update. Washington was not considered separately because of its and should have been because of its net short	22 23	witness. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	

	Page 361		Page 363
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION	1	Q Great.
2	BY MR. ROGALA:	2	Then moving on to DR 19. Can you please confirm
3	Q Afternoon, Mr. de Villiers.	3	that, when asked what renewable energy interim target
4	A Hi there.	4	would, in fact, demonstrate reasonable progress for
5	Q Similar to the prior two witnesses, I just have a few	5	, ,
6	clarifying or confirming questions. I'd like to ask a	6	CETA purposes, public counsel declined to provide a
7		7	specific target, correct?
	few questions about your penalty recommendations.		A In yes, in this case, public counsel's response
8	Can you please turn to RLE-4X. And this might	8	reflects the fact that our determination of
9	be have the same problem. It might be 5X. But I'm	9	PacifiCorp's progress towards CETA targets is not based
10	looking for DR 15.	10	on a specific set of interim targets, but rather, on a
11	A That is in RG-4, or?	11	holistic evaluation of its CEIP.
12	Q Should be an RLE-4X.	12	Q Perfect.
13	A Oh.	13	And last question, and we will be done. Same
14	Q I'm looking at public counsel's responses to DRs 13	14	exhibit, DR 22.
15	through 28, and I'm looking at DR 15 specifically.	15	Can you please confirm that, when asked what is
16	A I have that in front of me.	16	public counsel's maximum requested penalty, public
17	Q Perfect.	17	counsel stated that penalties would accrue daily,
18	Can you confirm that when asked to list every	18	quote, from the date of the Commission order in this
19	proceeding where public counsel has requested penalties	19	docket authorizing them until PacifiCorp develops a
20	against a Washington utility, you only listed two	20	CETA-compliant CEIP and that CEIP is approved by the
21	proceedings, correct?	21	Commission, end quote?
22	A We have provided some cases in which public counsel has	22	A You read that correctly.
23	recommended penalties.	23	MR. ROGALA: Thank you, Mr. de
24	Q Correct.	24	Villiers. No further questions.
25	And there's only two, correct?	25	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
-	Page 362	_	Page 364
1	A In this response, there are two.	1	Any redirect?
2	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16.	2	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just
2	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list	2	Any redirect?
2 3 4	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the	2 3 4	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two.
2 3 4 5	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a	2 3 4 5	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2 3 4 5 6	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example,	2 3 4 5 6	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES:
2 3 4 5 6 7	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how – how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission. Q But this was not an example where a party did not first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how — how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Any questions from the bench?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission. Q But this was not an example where a party did not first file a pleading or request to initiate a penalty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Any questions from the bench? Okay. I think that concludes all the questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission. Q But this was not an example where a party did not first file a pleading or request to initiate a penalty proceeding, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Any questions from the bench? Okay. I think that concludes all the questions for you. You may be excused at this time. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission. Q But this was not an example where a party did not first file a pleading or request to initiate a penalty proceeding, correct? A No. But I do not have intimate awareness of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Any questions from the bench? Okay. I think that concludes all the questions for you. You may be excused at this time. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A In this response, there are two. Q And then same exhibit, next DR, on 16. Can you please confirm that, when asked to list every proceeding that you are aware of where the Commission has, in fact, issued penalties against a Washington utility, you do not cite a single example, correct? A I don't believe there's an example cited here where public counsel has requested a penalty and the UTC has authorized it. Q So then same exhibit, DR 17. Can you confirm that when asked to list every proceeding where the Commission has issued penalties without a party first filing a pleading or requesting to initiate a penalty proceeding, you do not cite a single case, correct? A Again, this this response, similar to the other responses, talks about how penalties are authorized by statute and provides an example of a case in which a penalty has been issued by the Commission. Q But this was not an example where a party did not first file a pleading or request to initiate a penalty proceeding, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Any redirect? MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Just one. Two. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SYKES: Q Mr. de Villiers, is it your understanding that CETA and the rules administering CETA authorize penalties against a utility? A Yes, that is my understanding. Q When was CETA enacted? A CETA was signed into law in 2019. Q Okay. And how how many CEIP cycles have we gone through? A Yes, there are three investor-owned electric utilities that are subject to CETA, and each has only submitted one CEIP in 2021. MR. SYKES: Thank you. No further questions. ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you. Any questions from the bench? Okay. I think that concludes all the questions for you. You may be excused at this time. Thank you.

	v. I admostp d/b/a I admot ower a Light Company		DOCKET NO. 0E-210025 - VOI. V
	Page 365		Page 367
1	ALJ THOMPSON: We do have a couple	1	was looking for somebody to jump forward and say, "We
2	of housekeeping items to address before we adjourn	2	think we can get it done in 20," and everyone to agree,
3	today.	3	but we'll go ahead and proceed with that.
4	Does public counsel have an estimate as to when we	4	Are there any questions from the parties regarding
5	can expect public comments that have been received to	5	any other housekeeping items before we adjourn?
6	be filed in the docket?	6	MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, did you
7	MR. SYKES: Yes, Your Honor. Yes.	7	want to have a page limit for the replies?
8	So we have requested a deadline for public comment for	8	ALJ THOMPSON: We will go ahead and
9	today. And we will have an exhibit on the 28th by end	9	we'll go with 20 for now. If there is a request to go
10	of by end of day.	10	beyond 20, that can be filed via motion.
11	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.	11	And I will also note just one other housekeeping
12	For the purposes of marking that, let's go ahead	12	item. On the or the DRs 20 and 21 that I said I
13	and mark that as Bench Exhibit 01. And then I believe	13	would look up, those were submitted, not with the
14	we also will have another request forthcoming, and	14	initial filing of the cross exhibits, but I believe a
15	we'll go ahead and mark that one as No. 2, as we	15	day later. And I did find those in the record. So
16	discussed earlier in today's proceeding.	16	those are in the record, and there's no need to file
17	MS. STRAUSS: Your Honor, sorry.	17	those.
18	Just for clarification. Is that second bench request	18	And, Mr. Rogala, it looked like you might have one
19	for that DR 54?	19	other okay.
20	ALJ THOMPSON: It is.	20	Does anybody else?
21	MS. STRAUSS: Okay.	21	CHAIR DANNER: Your Honor, can you
22	ALJ THOMPSON: That's correct.	22	tell me the date of the reply briefs?
23	And if if we want to file that before there's a	23	ALJ THOMPSON: The date of the reply
24	formal notice that goes out for that, that's fine, and	24 25	briefs is November 27th.
25	we can go ahead and just mark that as other response to	25	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you.
	Page 366		Page 368
1	No. 2.	1	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. I believe that
2	MS. STRAUSS: Okay. Thank you.	2	concludes our matters today. I want to thank all the
3	ALJ THOMPSON: Thank you.	3	parties, witnesses, and representatives for attending
4	We do have two rounds of simultaneous post-hearing	4	today.
5	briefs, with the first due November 12th of 2024. By	5	We are adjourned and off the record. Thank you.
6	rule, we have a page limit of 60. However, do the	6	(Proceedings adjourned at
7	parties have any thoughts on page limits for that	7	3:56 p.m.)
8	initial round of briefing for a number under 60?	8	
9	MR. ROGALA: Your Honor, my gosh, I	9	
10	don't think we'll go close to 60 pages. But would you	10	
11	allow the parties to submit a motion if they would like	11	
12	to exceed 60 pages? But I don't intend to.	12	
13	ALJ THOMPSON: We can we can do	13	
14	that, but I'll give the other parties an opportunity to	14	
15	respond quickly.	15	
16	AWEC, go ahead.	16	
17	MS. MOSER: I don't think we're	17	
18	going to exceed 60 pages either, so I think a motion is	18	
19	appropriate.	19	
20	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay.	20	
21 22	MS. STRAUSS: I don't believe staff	21 22	
23	would exceed 60 pages either.	22	
23	MR. SYKES: Public counsel will not exceed 60 pages.	24	
25	ALJ THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. I	25	
I	7.20 1110Wil Gold, Olay, Hallicyou, I		

			T.
	Page	369	
1	STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR,		
2) ss a certified court reporter County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do		
3	hereby certify:		
4	That the foregoing proceedings were taken in my		
5	presence and were adjourned on October 21, 2024, and thereafter were transcribed under my direction; that the		
6	transcript is a full, true and complete transcript of the said proceedings and was transcribed to the best of my		
7 8	ability; That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel		
9	of any party to this action or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially		
10	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;		
	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand		
11 12	this 1st day of November, 2024.		
13 14			
15	John M.S. Botelho, CCR, RPR		
16	Certified Court Reporter No. 2976 (Certification expires 5/26/2025.)		
17 18			
19 20			
21 22			
23 24			
25			

	1	ı	1	
A	accused 294:21	actions 123:11	237:4,9 243:1	255:19 352:16
A-W-E-C 108:23	achieve 134:5,7	138:1,2 140:16,18	249:7 278:10	administered
a.m 107:3,13 194:6	137:18 147:14	142:3,4 144:16	286:1 291:11	147:22
194:8,8	153:15,17 169:16	154:4 208:7 315:9	304:1,19 305:21	administering
abandoned 140:12	171:11 214:24	347:7,8,8	322:1 326:5	364:8
Abel 115:10	217:15	actively 215:13	344:20 345:19	administrative
ability 117:18	achieved 144:5	241:9	347:2	87:16 88:6 107:6
128:16 140:19	146:17	actual 114:25	additionally 339:20	107:15 128:12
142:5 232:8,9	achievement	135:10,12 168:11	address 110:3,12	134:1 152:9
248:3 275:16	137:25	168:17 170:14	111:17 112:22	admission 90:6
332:10 339:17	achieving 137:14	175:8 176:1,5	113:1 120:19	109:18 111:1,21
343:5,7,9,11	147:19	216:8 231:24	123:20,22 135:3	111:24 112:7
345:16 369:7	acknowledge 134:9	242:24 245:4	136:5 148:24	admit 92:2,23
able 128:3 158:13	313:19	246:15 247:6	149:4 153:21,25	94:18 95:3 96:3
180:10 191:23	acknowledges	255:3 271:17	193:9 197:22	97:3 98:3 99:3
203:13 204:24	207:25	277:6 294:10,25	201:23 202:9,14	100:3,13 101:2,22
207:7 216:13	acquire 147:8	341:18 356:9	203:6 204:18,22	102:2 103:2,10,18
221:8 222:6 225:1	317:11 320:2	358:12	209:2 222:23	104:2 105:2,15
225:5 230:14	acquired 157:19,20	actuality 297:1	226:22,22 227:23	106:2,9 325:20
236:9 238:6	158:1 161:20	actuals 249:13	229:24 230:14	admits 144:3,17
240:16 244:12,21	316:23	277:8	246:21 247:11	admitted 129:19,23
245:16,16,23,23	Acquires 96:19	adapt 312:6 328:11	303:17 321:14	130:21,23 238:2
246:1,5 254:22	acquiring 121:3	add 157:23 179:17	365:2	adopted 347:15
271:10 275:4	140:22 168:14	216:20 242:22	addressed 113:12	Adopting 99:14
276:20 303:2	317:16	273:20	127:23 129:14	104:16
332:3 337:1 343:4	acquisition 115:16	added 162:9 222:21	192:21 200:15,22	advance 243:4
343:7	141:12 146:15	255:13,17,24	299:12 304:2	advantage 179:6
absent 248:15	161:22 163:10	326:15	addresses 152:20	180:10 205:2
absolute 172:22	168:4,8 230:19	adder 299:10	addressing 91:12	237:12
233:15 288:12	322:12 339:2,3	adders 255:10,15	188:25 190:16	adverse 161:17
absolutely 154:20	acquisitions 115:2	270:13 272:6,8,24	203:6 228:12	162:3 203:19
194:1 276:9 277:5	161:16 271:7	273:1 296:7,22	238:19	229:23
320:19 321:12	274:1 280:8	342:8	adequacy 339:6,11	advertising 216:20
322:16 330:19	acres 240:6	adding 161:14	adequate 142:23	advisory 215:24
accelerated 151:5	acronym 108:20,23	162:1 178:18	229:24 241:5	217:10,13 219:5
accept 135:8	109:13	179:18,21 192:13	275:1	326:9
access 139:16 160:6	acronyms 109:5	255:11 327:1	adjourn 365:2	advocacy 152:9
160:7,8,19 275:2	226:3	addition 119:24	367:5	advocate 154:5
306:23	Act 98:8 136:18	150:4 202:11,23	adjourned 368:5,6	advocated 152:3
accidentally 175:15	151:7 162:2	227:7 234:19	369:5	affairs 185:16
accrue 116:11	344:13	243:1	Adjournment	189:18
363:17	action 153:22	additional 144:3,18	91:13	affect 235:5
accuracy 123:2	227:18 252:19	144:20 147:6	adjust 150:22	affirm 155:16
316:13	321:15 322:3,11	151:6 163:5	adjusted 146:10	250:20 337:18
accurate 255:18	322:17 345:17	174:13 196:21	adjustments	351:17 359:21
	369:8,9	198:11 221:18	165:24 212:14,25	affordable 123:6
	I	I	l .	I

143:6 294:9	111:23 113:4,15	154:11,22 155:5,9	181:13 195:8,11	allocations 95:6
after-the-fact	113:18 115:25	155:14,20 156:2	195:19 198:20	279:20 280:9,10
121:17 122:16	116:3 127:19	156:23 171:3	199:19 202:4	309:19 310:9
afternoon 110:8	133:6 151:2,6	172:6,15 173:24	205:15,15,19,21	312:1 347:15
130:14 179:8	154:13 172:15	174:3 177:10	231:13 232:5,14	allow 109:19
231:8,9,10 237:11	180:22 195:13	178:6 180:17	254:10,14 271:5	118:19 147:11
247:1 250:6 252:5	201:6,13 207:3,9	187:17 188:6	273:9,12 276:4	151:5 199:18
252:6 281:21,22	220:1 249:15,25	193:17,21,25	281:10 287:3,8	221:17 222:17,25
289:3,4 295:23,25	250:9 251:25	194:10 199:25	297:19,21,21	224:11 241:10
338:8 340:17,18	279:2,12 281:16	201:4 206:25	298:24 312:25	279:11 303:19
351:14 352:9	288:21 295:15	207:8 212:20	313:3 314:2 316:5	366:11
353:3,4 360:10	304:5 318:23	218:19 219:23	317:1,6,21 318:11	allowed 177:19
361:3	337:1,8,24 340:12	220:9,22 221:7,14	319:19 320:20	allows 135:20
agencies 168:12	344:2 345:9	221:19 223:12	328:3 329:9 332:2	159:24 199:17
agnostic 298:6	350:21 351:2,22	248:23 249:3,22	341:18 356:10,23	200:24 223:1
agnostically 150:19	352:22 360:1,24	250:6,17,24 251:4	357:3	227:5 238:14
ago 131:6 185:10	365:12,15,25	251:23 256:5,11	all-system 202:5	alter 199:11 201:19
187:19 191:9,9	366:16 367:3,8	256:14,17,20	alleged 188:2	alterations 338:15
239:11 304:12	air 326:25 327:1	257:2,22 258:6,16	Alley 89:15	340:7
agree 135:23	Aja 106:1,3	259:2 279:2,8	Alliance 89:2 103:9	alternative 342:10
159:14 170:2	AKD-1T 106:3	281:15 284:1,22	108:11,22	346:14 348:7,14
171:3 195:18	AKD-2 106:4	288:20 295:12	allo- 175:7	alternatives 304:20
196:6,11 197:5	align 190:5 310:5	316:8 318:15,23	allocated 144:6	ambitious 143:2
198:23 199:9	aligned 310:25	322:23 328:22	226:16 245:3	amend 280:5
201:17 204:3	312:2	333:6 335:23	279:16 290:8	amended 303:20
220:9 225:22	alignment 134:16	336:13,19,24	348:19	amendment 343:12
229:13 282:3	aligns 171:25	337:8,16,23 338:2	allocates 138:19	346:7
294:25 298:3,15	200:13	340:11 344:2	141:13 165:5,10	amount 140:14
309:3 331:18	ALJ 90:3,5,18	345:9 349:20	175:8 279:24	145:8 168:15
367:2	107:11 108:2,6,10	350:7,18 351:4,7	allocating 192:8,8	179:21 241:16
agreed 110:2	108:15,21 109:7	351:14,21 352:3	311:25	analysis 116:24
agreement 101:12	109:14 111:8,20	352:21 359:4,7,12		139:10 190:19
102:21 112:11	112:15 113:3	359:15,19,25	117:20 138:8	191:2,4 244:6,8
165:17 168:18	115:24 117:7,12	360:4,23 363:25	141:13 164:12,19	254:17 282:13
190:21 221:5	117:24 119:17,22	364:20 365:1,11	164:20 165:5,19	285:16,21 286:8
222:7 256:8 258:8	120:2,6 121:6	365:20,22 366:3	180:13 191:15,25	294:1 341:4
259:4 279:23	122:1,18 123:16	366:13,20,25	192:7,10 193:11	ANALYST 97:1
317:7	124:18 125:3,15	367:8,23 368:1	193:12 198:2	98:1 99:1 100:1
agreements 163:2	126:1,20 127:13	all-source 93:14	220:24 221:13,16	analytical 356:16
234:25 256:22,24	127:18,22 130:2,5	121:11,13 123:12	221:23 222:24	analyze 227:6
279:17 280:6,10	130:8,19,25 131:8	124:14 139:20	244:25 278:13	306:23
314:8	132:3,6,10,15,20	140:13 151:3,10	279:17,23 286:19	analyzed 314:14
agrees 149:2 296:9	132:24 133:3	157:20 158:2,3,7	338:25 339:22,23	348:6,13,17 349:5
341:11,16	136:12 142:7	158:16 161:21	340:1 344:19	349:9,15 354:15
ahead 98:16 107:23	145:12 148:7	162:6,17,21	345:18,22 346:17	analyzes 124:7
109:15 111:2,21	149:8 151:12	163:18,25 177:24	354:24 355:4	analyzing 288:9
	•	•	1	1

			•	
and/or 318:6	92:8 99:23 101:7	approves 135:15	192:20 324:15	assurance 144:14
Ann 88:4	102:16 105:4	approving 135:2	aspects 188:21	ATB 253:24 255:24
annual 104:8	Application 138:9	141:17 167:2	193:14 202:25	271:11
114:14 253:24	applied 298:4,12	346:7	232:13	attach 323:6
282:11	298:19	approximately	assert 166:21 315:2	attachment 93:6
answer 136:10	applies 356:6	169:3 194:2	asserted 157:14	100:7 101:16
155:10 176:5	apply 297:13	213:19	168:1	103:4 105:9
178:8 184:8	appreciate 126:21	April 93:15 96:23	assess 135:18	210:10,14,15
197:11 201:13	172:18 332:14	124:6 195:12	184:21 190:24	211:2
285:24 309:7	342:9 349:17	305:25 306:13,15	309:19	Attachments 94:12
312:15 327:22	359:1	306:18 307:8	assessing 152:14	attack 119:14
343:4 355:8	appreciated 250:14	arbitrarily 311:8	assessment 152:7	178:3
answered 238:20	approach 141:6	ARCO 317:3,13	208:16,19 216:25	attempt 118:11
278:17 279:13	143:8 171:15,20	area 207:25 219:19	220:10	attend 301:15
285:15 316:11	172:1,13,25	areas 240:9	assets 235:12	attending 368:3
answering 148:18	215:14 225:14,16	argue 341:2 357:2	assign 252:9	attention 175:12
249:14	230:7 231:2 239:6	arguing 348:1	assigned 291:23	185:19
answers 94:10	321:2 328:12	argument 307:25	355:21	attorney 88:16,22
249:8	approaches 159:15	356:20	assigning 345:20	117:1 171:6
anticipate 110:7	approaching	arguments 203:10	assignment 344:22	257:12 369:8,9
221:23,25 222:2	110:11 140:25	arithmetic 355:20	assistance 208:8	attributed 169:6
286:5	184:15 197:17	arose 231:16	associated 286:1	Aug 96:22 99:12
anticipated 183:25	appropriate 128:1	article 96:20 98:15	290:3	104:13
239:20	145:10 151:9,10	116:7 122:9,11	assume 231:17	August 93:16 94:6
anticipating 281:7	164:24 171:1	articles 129:7	252:11 280:1	314:19
anybody 249:22,24	178:4 247:25	artificially 150:15	317:2	authenticate
256:7 257:8 259:3	366:19	330:9	assumed 285:18	118:25
367:20	appropriately	AS-RFP 96:17	assumes 114:24	authentication
anybody's 242:8	146:6	asked 113:10	150:8 200:11	118:24
apart 190:16,21,22	appropriateness	120:21 128:8	291:20 357:9,18	authorities 170:25
apologies 207:6	123:8	170:24 209:10,14	357:25	authority 151:8
216:4 289:5 339:7	approval 146:9	212:23 219:3	assuming 292:19	188:10 199:21
apologize 111:8 125:20 212:18	166:17 221:12 341:13 343:1	278:17,18 279:10	assumption 191:17 191:17,21 330:12	200:3,7,14 320:14 321:13,20 347:14
318:16 337:10		283:8 285:12 305:13 343:18	357:22	authorize 364:8
apparent 274:3	approve 133:12 136:1 148:4	347:1,12,19	assumptions	authorized 362:10
apparently 202:16	329:18	354:15 361:18	124:12 135:10	362:18
appear 197:12	approved 114:23	362:3,12 363:3,15	139:10 150:11	authorizing 363:19
appearances 88:1	133:16 136:25	asking 135:19	187:23 188:1	available 122:25
89:1 90:4 107:23	137:6 138:9	170:19 171:4,23	234:4,8 252:12	146:22 147:4
appeared 151:19	146:24 149:18	170:17 171:4,23	281:5 305:2	155:2 208:13
appearing 207:6	164:20 165:24	313:15 323:20,21	307:21 308:5	236:13,14 237:2
352:1	167:17,19 253:4,7	342:19 344:4	309:23 310:5,25	237:20 238:9
appears 151:10	295:2 340:25	357:12	311:6,9 320:25	241:13 244:15,16
202:19 341:7,16	345:23 356:18	asks 201:11	329:6 341:12	253:17,21 254:1
Appendix 92:4,6,7	363:20	aspect 178:22	354:17,24 355:4	289:12 292:21
	200.20		55,21 555.1	

201 12 215 2 10	1 1106 10 22		100 05 101 10	202 21 20 6 1
301:12 315:3,19	bad 186:19,22	basin-wide 152:14	130:25 131:10	303:21 306:1
316:13 317:10	balance 179:5	basing 310:9	151:19 156:24	308:8,12,14 309:1
Avenue 88:22	240:10	basis 113:17 125:14	157:22,24 158:8	310:11,13 311:5
average 137:11,24	balances 321:8	126:21 149:19	158:10,22 162:19	316:9 317:5,6,10
255:21 330:3	ball 312:5	166:23 173:3	163:17 164:21	317:18,21 322:17
averaging 137:20	Bands 152:1	179:2 201:5 206:5	165:7,12 166:8,25	323:25 324:11
averse 141:12	bang 235:12	225:11 227:14,15	167:14 169:3	329:10,13 330:12
Avista 254:5	Barbara 89:14	227:24 234:20	171:13 173:18,20	330:15 332:7
Avista's 161:2	109:2 149:11	242:24,25 252:21	173:25 176:8,21	336:8,20,24 337:4
avoid 173:7 321:10	257:19 295:23	252:23 277:6	176:21 178:17,17	353:23 357:22
aware 169:12,18	barely 334:17	290:8 294:14	180:4 181:6 182:7	358:17 359:16
170:5 172:9	base 175:8 176:2	298:6	182:7,19,25	362:8 365:13
206:17 235:18	248:14 277:17	batteries 158:20	183:16,19 187:9	366:21 367:14
257:9 286:16,19	307:10 309:4	179:6 189:2	191:10 193:18	368:1
286:21 297:23	324:16	235:17 236:21	194:1,14 199:3,15	believed 271:16
301:22 302:1,4,24	based 115:16	237:1,3 273:18	202:11 203:4,16	believes 125:11
302:25 303:1	118:10 124:1,5	274:16,19 275:1,5	204:25 205:22	170:20 345:24
304:17,22 313:9	131:24 132:25	275:11,15 276:7	206:4 207:1 208:9	believing 164:22
329:21 331:13	137:10 139:3	276:14,18 277:13	209:13,17 210:5,8	bench 91:21 111:16
336:12 357:6	140:8 146:7 158:4	277:20 279:15	210:25 211:4,23	111:18 194:4
362:4	160:1 163:16,22	280:5	211:24 212:1,7,7	219:25 281:23
awareness 362:24	189:8 196:24	battery 98:22	212:20 213:3,12	335:24 350:8
AWEC 103:9	197:9 198:9 203:3	157:20,23 158:19	215:18 216:11	359:8 364:21
108:14,23 111:7	203:16 205:23	158:24 169:10,13	217:12 219:14,24	365:13,18
132:6,8 145:13	206:10,19 213:23	240:5 272:21	220:4 222:9 224:2	benchmark 96:18
147:24 148:3	213:25 222:13	275:8,19 276:5	224:2,24 225:1,17	121:11 314:1,4
249:15 288:21	236:18 247:17	278:5,6,9,18	226:12 228:20	318:10 319:5
366:16	252:18 253:4,8	300:9	229:11,18,19,19	benchmarks 314:4
AWEC's 134:17	270:16 271:8,13	battery's 274:25	230:7,22 231:23	314:10 319:7
145:17	281:5 292:6,25	bear 175:15	232:20 234:4	beneficial 160:15
	294:19 307:2	bears 134:6 142:22	235:21 237:18	223:9 226:17
B	309:20 311:13,16	bedrock 123:10	239:12 241:9,12	benefit 108:19
B 92:6 255:20	311:18 314:6	began 306:13	242:18,19,20	121:3 144:11
346:4	320:18 322:8	315:24	243:6 244:9	152:22 153:12
back 128:6 132:25	328:15 329:19	beginning 167:21	245:14 247:19,25	154:4,9 162:12
178:8 192:5	330:3,9,13 333:19	187:3 309:16	248:6,9,16,17	180:2 189:5
194:12,13 195:1	348:5,11 363:9	315:1 316:10	249:9 251:24	192:14 205:1
198:18 207:10	baseline 104:8	begins 259:7	253:15,19,25	212:14 214:22
214:10 215:15	148:15 253:25	begun 318:4	255:6,18,23	224:19 225:23
217:8 250:7	basically 118:14	behalf 108:5,9,13	257:17 270:18,21	245:10 274:9
256:22 277:4	232:3,25 272:10	109:3 149:12	279:12 282:4,8,23	275:14 325:9
284:8 294:12,13	286:3 300:21	believe 111:15	284:22,24 286:2	327:20 342:11
296:7 298:2 299:7	309:14 334:6	116:16 117:8	287:7,21 290:24	346:15
304:12 307:14	basin 106:5 152:23	118:18 120:10	291:15 295:13	benefits 116:11
312:21 319:22	152:24	121:8 122:23	297:16 300:17	120:22 144:4
backwards 272:11	Basin's 214:20	123:13,23 124:25	301:12 302:2	148:12 153:1,23
				<u> </u>

	<u> </u>	1		1
159:2 173:12	288:6,8 293:15,18	blacked 253:6	299:13 331:17	326:20 328:10
211:11 212:25	293:21 297:7	block 240:5	332:15 333:15	buyers 239:8
214:2 215:21	314:4 317:21,24	blocky 247:20	bringing 121:17	buying 244:14
225:18 233:20	318:1,10,10 319:2	blow 179:3 278:22	329:13 334:24	
246:12 276:7,8	319:3,5,6,13,15	blowing 237:11,15	brings 176:8	C
283:16 285:14	319:18 332:9	blue 292:4	broad 201:22 204:7	C 92:6,7 99:6 114:1
286:5 310:24	343:15	blur 304:13	225:19 324:7	114:12 116:6,24
323:23 324:9	biennial 92:3,8	board 298:13,20	343:23 345:7,10	292:3,12 347:24
325:12,17 326:11	137:2,17 142:11	bodies 152:9	broader 200:19	CAISO 98:21
Berkshire 94:3	145:19 149:16,21	book 350:11	203:7 238:17	calculate 118:12
102:5 114:15	150:1,7 157:15	borne 328:5	brought 128:15,23	calculated 282:6
115:5,6,6,18	165:25 167:8,13	Botelho 87:25	144:20 180:21	290:18
128:16 185:20,20	167:18 170:9	369:1,15	181:10 192:1	calculation 99:6
185:22,24 186:8	196:19 208:16	bottom 114:5 246:2	317:4	285:13 290:12,24
186:17 187:8,9,11	220:8 229:10	292:23 353:23	BTAs 314:8	333:12
188:8	280:15,20 283:10	Box 88:17	buck 235:12	calendar 306:22
best 180:14 182:13	291:3 305:8 308:6	BR-1 91:23	budget 273:24	California 89:10
224:11 228:6	308:15,24 309:2,5	BR-2 91:24	Buffett 114:15	98:21 150:12
235:1,2,10,12	322:3,6 333:14	break 110:5,6	115:10 187:11	179:9 189:14
254:4 274:2,16	341:20 347:16	193:24 249:5,7	Buffett's 128:17	193:3
290:2 292:22,22	358:21	bridge 305:17	build 183:21	call 121:18 154:15
312:3 321:16	big 236:4 243:24	Bridger 310:17	220:18 234:24	155:4 228:16
330:21 369:6	305:3 307:5	311:11,13 357:11	274:10 315:11	250:10,15 257:15
best-case 291:20	bigger 192:2	357:20 358:13	317:17 319:10	319:4,15 337:2
294:8	333:11	Bridger's 166:19	328:15	351:8 359:16
better 133:5 184:4	bilateral 273:16	brief 109:19 113:17	build-to-transfer	called 153:23 183:9
199:21 227:6	315:6	132:14,18,18,23	314:8 317:7	255:7 288:4
325:22	bilaterally 315:10	194:12 201:8	building 240:9	calls 115:8 187:1
beyond 216:9 224:6	bill 336:7	250:13 256:21	274:10	337:14 351:13
226:23 238:4	billion 190:15	323:1 329:1	buildings 209:15	359:18
272:8 345:2	binder 283:21	349:22 354:13,20	built 221:24 244:12	cancel 342:21
367:10	binders 299:24	briefing 114:8	332:6 343:9	343:1 344:11
BHE 186:5 187:8	binding 129:2,3	119:9 129:9,11	bullet 300:8	345:16
bid 205:14,19,20	285:19	171:2 172:3	bunch 188:21	canceled 123:7
205:24 206:19	biological 152:7	199:22 200:15	190:17 314:10	144:19 158:3,8,9
254:25 297:22	bit 118:1 163:24	201:9 366:8	bundled 213:10	181:18 231:13
314:1,14 318:1	167:24 169:14	briefly 113:4	burden 141:19	281:10
319:13 329:8	188:15 192:21	124:23 151:20	142:22	canceling 140:12
bidders 231:24	207:18 212:12	170:18 172:5	burn 237:7	342:13 343:13,25
bidding 230:13	214:8 229:5	180:16	Burns 206:4	Cancellation 93:13
bids 96:18 121:11	249:13 273:4	briefs 129:12,13	business 107:21	cap 346:4
121:13 123:3	274:11 279:22	366:5 367:22,24	189:7,13,14,15	capability 275:10
139:20 205:21	292:9 303:11	bring 133:22	203:24 213:8	312:12
206:8 254:9,11,14	304:4 309:9 313:1	159:21 168:14	306:22	capable 128:12,13
254:16,20 255:16	321:4 335:10	177:18 181:4	buy 229:16 330:1	capacity 180:10
271:5,15 287:15	bite 250:8	211:11 275:17	buy-in 311:3	181:11 184:4

236:19 274:6	193:3 235:5	357:9,18,25 358:4	329:23 363:5,9	change 117:20,20
275:12 276:11	244:18 246:15	358:21 363:11,20	364:7,8,11,12,16	170:9 180:16
281:4 282:25	257:16 278:17	363:20 364:13,17	CETA's 134:4,5,7	187:24 188:2
329:14	318:1 350:15	CEIPs 141:16	136:21 141:16	192:3 193:13
Capita 99:8	caused 150:17	cells 290:19	145:25 146:4	198:16 202:9
_	caveat 344:5	census 213:19,24	147:11 153:10	222:4 232:19
	CBI 324:12,25	214:7	236:9 282:19	233:12 244:11
273:22,24 274:13	325:2,25 326:6,19	Center 89:15 109:3	346:4	299:23 300:10
286:6 290:9	327:25 328:18	centralized 186:2	CETA-compliant	301:13 342:24
291:18	CBIs 324:15 325:4	CEP 98:11 99:11	275:8 278:19,20	343:21 344:12
capital-intensive	325:5,6,7,8,15,18	104:13 114:18	278:24 293:19	changed 163:23
235:6	326:13	124:5	294:6 309:14	166:25 182:9
captioned 107:20	CCR 87:25 369:1	certain 168:15	348:23 349:2	191:17 203:4
carbon 326:23	369:15	173:7,8,11 178:19	363:20	235:19 254:25
case 100:4,7 101:13	CCUS 315:12	179:3,8 221:17	Cetas 89:19 90:14	298:20 320:18
· ·	ceased 220:25	223:4 245:8	90:17,24 109:10	339:23
103:4 105:6,9	CEIP 92:3,8 99:20	327:18	109:11 127:20	changes 131:12
117:21 119:11	99:23 101:4,6	certainly 129:2	132:22 151:15,17	192:12 196:20
125:24 126:12	102:13,15 104:22	certainty 168:25	207:4,10,14 209:3	changing 145:22
133:12,25 134:16	105:4 114:18,22	238:4,5 274:11	209:7 212:18,22	192:20 244:10
134:18 135:25	116:15 117:5	Certification	212:23 218:17	char- 278:4
141:8,19 143:17	121:14 122:12	369:16	322:25 323:4,21	characterization
143:17 146:7,8	123:11 124:1,3	certified 369:1,16	324:4,6,8 328:19	320:11
148:6 167:21	133:14 134:3,9	certify 369:2	cetera 302:22	characterizing
176:16 177:3,14	135:16 136:5,16	CETA 120:23	chain 139:21	311:5,21
177:19 180:1,1	136:23,24 137:3,6	135:17 136:18	270:20,23 296:15	charge 212:14,25
198:6 243:14,14	138:7,14 141:17	137:5 138:2	297:4	274:20 275:4
247:7 248:6	142:11 145:19	140:21 141:21,24	Chair 88:4 90:19	278:5
274:18 275:9	146:2,6 149:19	143:2,10,12,18	91:4 107:5 145:14	charged 277:14,21
276:24 277:9	157:15 165:24	144:13 145:5,5,7	151:15 155:7	278:8
308:3,12,19,22	187:12 191:21,21	146:12 147:5,8,14	231:8,10 232:2,23	Charlee 105:14,16
309:6 322:10	196:3,23 197:1	153:16,23,24	233:5 234:10	105:18,19
329:17 336:9	204:13,14 229:10	154:5 159:15	235:14,16,18,24	chat 110:20,21
341:14 346:18	244:21 252:24	161:14 169:15,21	236:1,7 237:24	257:21 258:11
357:2 362:16,19	253:4,7 271:21	170:20 171:10,14	239:16 240:19	cheap 179:7 277:22
363:7	282:13 290:25	172:2,13 181:5	241:11,18 335:25	cheaper 226:17
cases 133:11 135:5	291:7 305:8,14,15	196:8,13 197:13	336:10,17 367:21	227:3
310:12 361:22	305:18 308:6,15	198:23 199:6,10	367:25	cheapest 292:5,17
cash 144:8 163:1	308:24 309:2,5,21	199:16 201:18,23	chairman 187:11	check 159:11,12
176:12 186:6	309:22 316:2	203:23 204:1,5	challenge 230:25	162:18 169:4
231:14 234:20	320:23 322:16,18	207:19 208:3,7,11	challenged 244:9	170:15 181:7,8,17
235:1 244:18	325:21,25 326:3	209:11 220:5	challenges 150:24	182:19 208:14,15
catch 245:22	333:13 341:9	226:22,23 240:20	chance 120:13	208:17,23 236:5
categorize 334:1	342:14 344:11	241:13 242:10	122:4 129:10	305:11 318:17
cause 112:23	347:16 354:17,23	247:12 309:17	170:9 239:10	checked 183:16
144:11 172:24	355:3 356:1,11	320:3 324:10	326:7	checking 194:10
			l	l

250.2	11010	1 117 / 110 15	201 24 200 12	170 14 100 7
258:2	clarification 119:19	cloud 117:4 119:15	291:24 309:13	178:14 190:7
Chehalis 309:23	119:23 181:12	124:16	321:15 331:2,2,21	195:7,10,15,18
310:4 344:23	284:23 313:7	cloudies 115:11	332:19 333:1	198:12,13,19,24
345:20 358:1,14	350:10 365:18	clouds 115:11	comes 237:25 240:1	199:4,10,18 200:5
Chillcott 89:14	clarifications	coal 239:12 310:15	271:2 275:7	201:19,22 230:17
90:13,17,24 109:1	156:18 223:13	311:11 315:5,12	319:14	235:25 247:8,12
109:2 122:21	251:18 270:25	Coalition 89:13	comfort 144:17	247:18,22 248:1,9
124:22 132:17	clarifies 126:17	104:1 105:1,14	217:7	283:9 307:25
149:10,11 194:18	clarify 119:23	108:25 109:4	coming 165:18	308:3 309:3 313:7
194:22 199:23	120:12 158:7	132:16 149:13	241:1 256:3	316:6,17 329:18
200:1 201:16,17	294:16 297:13	code 214:4	287:22 331:5	333:3 342:19,25
206:23 257:18,19	310:13 313:11,12	collaboration 190:1	commence 182:24	343:8,12 345:23
295:17,22,24	317:14 321:25	190:4	commends 139:13	346:11 347:23
316:19,21 318:21	341:20	collateral 119:14	comment 91:23	348:3,6,12 350:15
318:25 319:1	clarifying 113:21	178:3	125:13 303:16	353:24 356:18
322:20	279:10 319:18	colleague 323:7	305:5 306:12,18	362:5,13,20
chillcott@wester	340:22 361:6	colleague's 241:22	311:4 365:8	363:18,21
89:17	class 325:12	collected 212:24	commented 123:4	Commission's
choice 146:20	clean 87:5 94:17	collects 324:8,13	comments 96:13	118:15 145:5
193:5 224:20	95:1 96:1 107:22	colocated 158:20	123:4 311:20	149:25 166:17
233:9 320:19	123:7 126:14,14	273:18 274:17,25	365:5	167:2 176:18
choose 136:1	136:15,17 139:14	275:24 276:5	commercial 168:21	179:13 196:7,11
294:16 317:18	142:22 149:16,22	colocating 275:18	331:6,20	197:5,9 199:20
choosing 312:1	150:6 151:7	Colstrip 166:18	Commiss- 167:20	200:3,6,14 308:2
chose 292:4,17	152:17 162:2	311:12 357:10	commission 87:2	308:18,21 341:13
315:3,9	169:16 193:3	358:13	88:3,14 89:18,21	346:7
chosen 301:5	198:15,25 203:18	Columbia 89:18,20	97:1 98:1 99:1	Commissioner
CIP 308:24	228:1 251:14	106:1,5,8 109:8	100:1 106:1,8	90:19,20,20
circumstances	253:7,8,8 305:7	109:11 132:20	107:5,16 109:9,11	117:10 129:25
114:20 121:17	349:13	151:13,17 152:22	114:23 118:19	130:4,7 151:16,16
122:15,16 143:1	clear 127:8 197:4	153:8 180:8	119:12 122:14	164:6 193:20,23
145:22 147:1	279:4,6,15 341:21	214:20	126:9 128:24	212:16 223:15,19
167:1 247:18	356:4	Column 292:3,12	129:4 132:21	225:9,21 226:25
296:11 320:19	clearly 142:21	columns 292:13	133:12 134:15,24	227:8,13 228:14
321:1 342:25	145:2 218:13	combination	135:15,18,19,21	229:6,12 230:16
343:22 346:6	244:2 271:9	233:25	135:23 136:1,3,25	231:4 241:20
cite 214:13 296:25	Cleve 89:4 108:13	combine 217:21	138:24 139:1	242:4 243:9
362:6,15	client's 308:1	come 112:17 113:2	141:22,25 142:1	245:19 246:4,23
cited 138:21 362:8	clients 257:9 299:9	121:15 144:22	142:14 144:10,14	246:25 248:21
cites 139:8,19	Climate 344:13	146:16 147:6	145:6,8,18 146:19	256:12,15,18
144:2 166:17	close 329:11 337:1	177:17 178:8	146:25 147:22	257:6 258:4,13,21
cities 191:8,10	366:10	183:14,18 238:8	148:3,11 149:16	258:25 324:2,5
193:4	closed 175:15,16	238:10 239:17	151:2,7,14,18	340:2 350:9,18,24
Citizens 154:3	closer 118:1 176:2	245:10 254:18	153:10 164:12	commissioners
claim 115:15	closest 327:10	271:15 287:12,18	165:23 167:17,19	107:18 109:2
141:10	closing 153:24	288:10 291:14,18	171:8 176:25	128:13 133:9
111.10	Library 133.27	200.10 271.17,10	171.0 170.23	120.13 133.7

				1 ago 011
136:15 142:10	179:20 180:25	234:17 247:16	240:20 243:6	conclude 308:4
145:15 148:10	181:22,23 182:6	282:7 296:21	331:4 333:23	concluded 187:14
149:11 219:25	182:14,24 185:6	308:23 320:9,12	347:20 348:2	313:5
223:14 249:9	185:15 186:7	331:4 342:5	349:10	concludes 218:17
337:4	188:4,9 189:12,13	354:16 357:1,2	compliant 140:23	248:24 336:20
commissions 139:6	189:24 190:15	358:5	145:9	351:1 364:22
245:1 303:14,22	192:12,19 195:20	comparable 150:10	complicated 312:5	368:2
commit 297:24	196:7,13 197:6	compare 160:18	complications	conclusion 116:1
321:13,20	198:19 205:18,23	compared 227:7	196:1	124:15 247:4
commitment	215:23 217:10	291:2	comply 140:4,20	315:18
217:21,24 317:16	219:4 220:4	compares 172:13	145:7 196:13,15	conclusions 124:12
320:10 322:1	221:21 227:14	compete 140:24	239:24 240:16	concurrently 288:7
344:13	229:4,14 230:18	141:3	241:12	concurs 127:16,20
committed 137:7	232:22 236:16	competing 192:24	complying 139:12	condition 164:11
215:4	242:19 244:19,22	193:7	172:10	164:17 209:15
Committee 152:11	247:10 248:11	competition 294:5	components 173:18	215:20 342:10,12
committing 136:20	249:23 251:13	competitive 230:13	190:21 217:18,19	342:23 343:23
223:23	252:15,16 257:25	314:15	218:10	345:8 346:8,14,16
communication	271:7,9,15 273:21	compilation 118:10	computer 337:11	346:21
218:7 305:17	274:15 285:12	Complaint 101:8	concedes 135:1	conditions 98:14
communities	287:2 288:2 290:6	101:11 102:17,20	conceivable 199:10	135:3 229:25
148:13,18,21	292:25 293:8,14	complete 196:25	201:18 334:19	271:17 282:12
149:5 152:23	294:18 297:13	229:14 369:6	concentration	311:8 338:21
153:2,6,13,18	298:12 300:14	completed 163:13	327:10	341:13
208:1,4,8,13,22	301:24 302:20	287:16 288:9	concern 113:8	conduct 213:13
209:1,2,6 218:12	310:11,13,14	completely 124:8	121:12 134:23	223:23
324:13,20	311:2,7 314:5,11	309:9 311:13	145:24 164:25	conducted 116:24
community 211:10	315:8 317:8	completing 196:2	192:2 216:8	225:10
211:16 214:21	320:13,22 328:23	complex 202:12	224:10 230:5,15	conducting 227:9
218:11 327:13	339:15,18 340:12	237:17	308:1 331:1 335:5	Confederated
company 88:9	342:7 344:15	compliance 133:19	335:8 355:23	151:23,24 152:1
107:24 112:1	345:25 346:9		concerned 133:16	confidence 243:15
113:15,17 121:22 121:23 122:16	350:19 352:22	136:21 137:5,15	134:19,21 135:14	confidential 87:20
121:23 122:16	356:10,21	138:3 140:22	136:8 150:21	92:12,13,15,16 96:5 104:3 117:1
131:16,23,25	company's 87:5 107:21 121:19	141:1,24 142:6,13 142:13,20,21	153:15 168:2,4 234:6 302:24	256:3,10,10
131:10,23,23	123:12 136:16	142:13,20,21	concerns 118:24	258:15,20 259:6
137:6,10 141:9,23	137:5 138:25	143.18 144.13,20	126:5 135:4 136:3	confidentiality
142:2 143:14	142:18,19 143:22	147:5,8,15,21	139:21 150:4,6,21	256:22,23 258:8
144:2,19,21,24	142.18,19 143.22	150:3 151:1 154:4	164:11 165:3	259:4
146:20 147:11,20	175:2,5 176:6,12	157:17 159:14	184:14 190:6	confirm 157:14
149:17 153:24	176:15 177:25	171:15 172:13	222:13 229:8	162:18 254:7
160:3 163:23	178:3 183:3	181:5 196:22	299:10 301:23	294:15 298:22
167:20 171:19	185:11 198:8	197:3 224:7,19	303:1,17 332:15	302:8 348:6,12
174:15 175:9	205:16 215:22	228:10,11 230:4	340:23 341:3	354:17,22 355:2
176:8 177:1	220:15 229:10	231:3 233:8,16,24	342:7 353:5,8	356:8 357:8,12,17
				22 3.3 22 7.3,12,17

				1 490 070
357:24 361:18	consistent 308:2	99:2 100:2 101:1	164:15 165:6,11	314:2,24,25 317:1
362:3,12 363:2,15	358:4	102:1 103:1 105:1	165:14,25 166:1,4	320:6,7 322:4
confirmation 212:1	consolidated 166:4	139:8 186:24	166:5,15,16,19,20	324:11 329:9,10
confirming 272:16	constrained 117:18	238:14 247:3	166:24 167:4,5,9	329:12,13 341:9
361:6	constraints 110:9	contract 195:21	167:13 168:2,3,9	341:10,14,15,19
conflicting 341:24	273:23 274:13	287:17 315:10	168:10,15 169:2	341:22 342:1
conflicts 110:13	275:21,21	331:25 336:3,4	169:18,22 170:4	347:6 348:9,15,20
conforming 317:25	constructed 138:7	contracting 331:18	170:13 171:12,15	348:24 349:3,14
confusing 279:18	Consumers 89:2	contracts 161:22	171:21 174:16,17	353:21 354:18,19
conjecture 277:6	103:9 108:11,22	162:8,22 163:3	175:3,11 176:3,7	357:15 358:3,6,16
connect 215:16	contained 171:7	190:23 254:18	176:14,14 180:3	361:21,24,25
connected 159:20	187:5	295:8 315:6 332:3	180:13,14 181:1,2	362:7,16,23 363:6
connection 125:24	containing 137:3	332:8 336:5	181:24 183:8,10	365:22
308:22	contemplate	contractual 331:19	185:12 189:11,12	correction 339:16
connective 187:10	112:16	331:22	189:20 190:9	339:20
Connor 87:16 88:7	contended 180:2	contradict 135:7	191:7 195:17	corrections 156:18
107:5,14	187:23 191:14	contrary 141:19	197:10 204:6	251:18 338:15,17
consensus 152:10	contends 138:6	contribute 133:23	205:16 207:23,24	339:12 340:7
191:24	270:13	contributed 297:2	208:2,21 209:12	352:16 360:18
consequences	contention 143:24	contributing	209:23 210:2	correctly 195:16
203:19 230:11	144:11	349:13	211:14 217:12	283:11 284:15
244:19	contentions 117:16	control 140:1 216:9	219:7,10 220:6	315:15,16 333:9
conservation 140:6	contest 231:6 341:8	216:15 217:2	225:12 229:10	341:8,11,17
159:7 212:12,13	354:23 355:3,6	332:12	252:10,11,24,25	354:23 355:3,7
conservative	356:3,5 357:9,18	convened 210:11	253:1,2,5,14,15	356:3,5 363:22
292:24 294:19	357:25	210:19	253:18,19 254:12	corresponding
consider 144:4	contests 329:8	conventions 314:7	254:13 255:1,2,12	292:11
148:3 279:20	context 134:14	conversation	270:14,15,20	cost 92:11 96:7
283:15 299:1	137:21 309:10	333:15	272:8,14,22,23,25	104:9 118:5,12
324:19 325:25	312:17 317:20	conversations	273:1,9,10,13,19	119:2,10 120:22
326:11 345:10	332:20,23 333:16	220:25	274:17 277:15	121:1 139:18
355:18	continual 99:14	conversion 310:20	278:12 279:25	144:2 146:18
consideration	104:15 198:24	311:12,22	280:1,18,19,22,23	147:6,10 148:1
114:22 249:14	continually 150:22	convert 310:17	281:1,6,8,9,11,12	150:11,15 154:1
considered 120:21	continue 116:3	converted 344:23	283:12,18 285:16	159:22 160:25
146:6 282:8	163:21 188:1,4,17	357:21	285:17,23 286:9	168:23 169:5,11
298:24 326:25	188:25 189:5	conveyed 110:10	287:3,4,14,25	171:11 172:21,23
347:13 358:20,22	230:11 258:19	copies 323:17	290:4,5,9,15,24	172:23,25 173:6
considering 147:10	275:4 278:22	copy 185:13	291:16 293:10,11	173:10,15,15,15
148:4 151:1	316:16 357:19	core 138:10	294:20,21 296:13	173:19,19 176:1,2
171:12 186:22	continued 107:7	correct 114:6 131:6	296:14 297:10	176:5,20 178:3,22
188:5,18,18	continues 157:16	135:9 157:17,18	299:15,16 300:23	179:13,23 190:15
221:21 223:23	229:14 230:18	157:21 158:2,22	300:24 302:24	205:4,24 206:13
227:15 275:12	continuing 89:1	158:25 159:8,11	306:14,19 307:1	225:4,17 229:16
299:3	91:1,3 93:2 94:2	159:17 161:18,23	308:8,13,14,17,20	230:6,7,9,20,22
consistency 149:25	95:2 96:2 98:2	163:5,11,19,25	311:10 313:5,6	231:2 245:4

				1 age 313
246:15 248:20	counsel 88:20	322:13,14 365:1	340:10 352:20	253:4 273:14
252:12 254:2	91:23 96:9 100:12	course 137:12	367:14	278:24 293:12
255:3,19 283:8,16	100:17,19 101:1	234:13 243:21	Cross-Answering	295:2 300:19
283:17 285:13,14	101:21 102:1,6	277:17 280:2	99:4 103:11	324:21 339:14
285:20 286:6,11	103:1 108:7,9	301:7 322:13	105:19	348:23 349:2
289:9 290:3,7	115:23 118:25	court 108:19 369:1	cross-exam 118:6,7	Curriculum 100:16
291:14,19,24	119:17 120:10,15	369:16	cross-examination	curtailed 275:3
292:1,18 293:1	122:19 124:20	cover 87:20 259:8	90:16,16,17,17,22	277:10 278:23
294:15,19 295:8	127:5 129:8 132:4		90:23,23,24,24	curtailment 276:23
297:14,16 298:3,5	142:8,14,17 145:7	covers 120:10	91:6,8,10 110:1	curves 192:4 230:1
298:12 300:15,23	154:24 173:25	COVID 206:8	111:6,12 112:18	cust 245:21
301:24 302:7	178:10 199:15	270:20 296:12,25	113:9 114:13	customer 175:9
304:10,13,21	201:8 202:8 238:5	298:5	116:23 117:23	193:4 216:19
305:2 306:25	242:7 243:13	COVID-related	127:10 154:14	224:20 233:9
329:5 346:4	249:24 256:6	296:15,23	156:22 157:4	323:23 324:8,16
347:15	257:7 281:16	create 149:5 216:17	174:5 177:15	325:25 324.8,10
cost- 158:17	284:19,23 285:4,7	237:7	193:19 194:2,15	348:24 349:3
cost-competitive	286:10 316:15	created 121:23	194:21 207:13	customer-based
123:6	318:15 336:2	creates 143:25	251:22 252:3	154:7
cost-effective 140:6	343:18 344:3,7	credit 167:24 168:2	281:19 289:1	customers 116:12
159:6 180:15	351:8,13,22	168:5,8,10,14	295:21 323:3	133:19 134:12
195:20 216:23	352:22 354:4,4,15	169:2,7,9 177:22	340:15 353:1	138:22,25 139:5
248:14 343:15	354:18,22 359:15	234:21 235:4	361:1	145:1 147:2,5,6
costs 95:4 133:19	359:18 360:1	346:5	cross-examined	147:13,16,18
133:21 140:23	361:19,22 362:9	credits 292:8 334:3	115:22 128:1	148:1,22 154:10
143:14,18,23	363:5,17 365:4	Creek 162:10,16	crystal 312:5	160:12 161:15,17
144:1,5,6 150:9	366:23 369:8,9	CRITFC 94:10,12	CT-1T 105:16	162:4,13 174:15
150:18 159:20,23	counsel's 94:5	109:13 127:20	CT-2 105:18	179:20 180:11
160:1,15,20,21	115:14 117:11	151:18,19,21,22	CT-3T 105:19	189:6 192:15
173:7 174:16	118:17 127:17	152:3,10,19 207:1	curious 111:4	205:4 211:11
175:8,9 177:1,6	361:14 363:7,16	210:12,15 213:5	232:2	217:7 218:11
177:12,12,21,24	counsel-created	249:24 322:24	current 119:15	224:12,19 225:4,7
178:15 179:19	118:9,13	323:20,22	133:14,18 134:6	225:19 226:17
180:20 202:20	count 275:9	CRITFC's 148:24	135:1 145:20	227:3 230:20,22
206:19 223:1	counterfactual	149:1 218:23	146:9,13,17,19	233:11,13,22
226:15 230:17	276:20	critical 146:3	157:23 162:24	235:5 239:4 240:3
235:4 239:4,25	country 208:4	203:25	163:16 181:5	242:16 243:7,19
243:3,4,24 244:1	County 99:8	criticism 307:20	220:8 237:19	243:19 244:2,20
245:18 252:9	210:24 212:23	cross 110:7 113:2	253:7 279:17	245:9,10,13,18
255:5,21 285:25	213:4,18 369:2	113:13 120:9	285:19 290:2	246:13,17 248:4
286:4 290:10,22	couple 131:17	126:25 128:19	291:5 293:10	248:14 274:2
294:12 295:1	134:10 157:24	129:17,22 130:12	295:3,5 315:4	276:25 277:2
296:10 298:18	219:24 225:2	148:18 156:24	321:1 358:6,16	278:25 282:25
330:9 353:7	236:5 258:3	173:25 207:1	currently 161:21	283:9 286:20
council 209:11,15	270:25 271:22	251:24 288:22	162:7 163:4,4,9	309:20 310:20,24
209:22	272:2 305:16	295:14 302:14	236:13 251:14	311:25 321:10
	I	I	I	I

		1	1	1
325:3,4,17 327:19	102:4,7,9,11	deadlines 136:21	deems 145:10	depend 183:1,2
334:15 344:24	104:11,18,20	141:3,5 169:16	defer 112:25 185:6	223:21
345:21 346:19,21	112:8 113:23	196:8,13 197:8	236:16 240:22	dependent 179:15
347:9,9 348:8,14	140:9 150:10	331:20	241:15 310:12	246:10
349:6 350:4	163:16,16,20	deal 116:7 219:16	333:3	depending 224:23
357:10,13,19	205:12,13 209:7	222:3	deficiency 140:18	224:24
customers' 310:15	210:12,15 211:20	deals 131:1	defined 208:4	depends 159:19
CV 104:5 105:18	212:11,15 213:5	dealt 316:9	247:18 248:9	169:11 226:10
cycle 197:20 228:22	213:18 244:17,21	debt 168:17,19	defines 208:3	277:17
252:15 271:21,25	245:5 246:8	169:6 225:4 230:9	definitely 275:14	depicting 300:22
301:2,3 325:21	248:14 272:17	Dec 101:12 102:21	288:6 292:21	depreciable 166:18
326:3	276:19 277:3	decade 134:6,11	293:3 294:7,8	DER 149:4
cycles 274:4 364:13	284:1 285:11	decarbonize 191:12	297:3 303:1	described 252:19
	306:15,24 307:3	decarbonizing	334:19	DESCRIPTION
D	311:19 313:15	184:16	definition 171:4	91:22 92:2,23
D 88:21 92:8,21	323:8 324:9 342:6	December 221:11	324:21 332:24	94:18 95:3 96:3
93:1 94:1 103:9	347:12 350:12	deci- 197:9	definitions 171:7	97:3 98:3 99:3
103:12,13 114:5,5	353:20	decide 131:23	deflected 242:7	100:3,13 101:2,22
114:8 290:1	date 114:21 146:15	199:10 201:19	degree 242:8	102:2 103:2,10,18
353:20	220:6 247:24,24	decided 192:5	355:15,19	104:2 105:2,15
d-e 360:14	363:18 367:22,23	decides 147:2,19	delay 140:22	106:2,9
d/b/a 87:4 88:9	dated 314:18	decision 111:5	150:22 191:14	design 148:16
98:12	dates 196:19	182:12 196:7,11	243:11 282:6,8	339:4,10
daily 363:17	David 88:4 107:5	197:6 198:6	334:21	designate 215:24
damages 336:6	Davison 89:4	203:16 225:25	delayed 184:10	217:10
Dan 206:3	108:13	308:2,23 343:12	185:4 331:20	DESIGNATED
danger 121:17	day 111:11 145:9	decision-making	delays 254:18	87:20
Danner 88:4 90:19	275:6 278:9	121:19 152:10	331:11 332:3	designation 148:12
91:4 107:5 145:15	306:16 330:14	186:4 203:1	336:4	148:15 339:4
151:16 155:7	365:10 367:15	decisions 129:2	demand 153:3	designations 339:9
231:8,10 232:2,23	369:11	153:25 197:5	154:7 159:7	designed 326:18
233:5 234:10	day-to-day 193:14	203:8 223:20	274:24 277:24	despite 124:14
235:14,16,18,24	234:20	243:12 252:14	300:11	details 232:12
236:1,7 237:24	days 137:1 303:25	324:14 325:19	demanded 138:21	306:7 362:25
239:16 240:19	306:22	358:19	demonstrate	determination
241:11,18 335:25	de 91:9 101:21,24	deck 299:20 300:1	136:16,20 137:4	135:17 318:7
336:10,17 367:21	102:1 103:1 315:4	301:18	141:11,18,20,23	363:8
367:25	359:18 360:3,10	declined 363:5	142:4 149:21	determinations
data 93:3 94:5,10	360:13,14,15	DeCOTEAU 106:1	169:20 170:2	309:19
94:12,23 96:9	361:3 363:23	106:3	363:4	determine 170:19
97:6,7,9,10,12,13	364:7	DeCoteau's 214:15	demonstrated	171:24 234:25
97:15,16,18,19,21	deadline 141:1	decrease 222:20	137:14 247:5	235:10 277:7
97:22,24 98:4,6	159:14 196:16	decreased 255:8	demonstrates	determined 158:4
98:18,20,24 99:10	197:3,13 199:6	353:11	302:18	158:17 317:24
99:16,18 100:17	221:11 331:6	decreases 233:22	demonstrating	determines 333:18
100:19,21,23	365:8	dedicated 219:18	146:3 247:11	determining
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

				T ago oo i
322:16	332:8 336:15	discourse 301:6	213:2 214:2,19	291:25
develop 153:10	358:10	discovery 190:10	215:22 339:5	dollars 212:13
179:24 214:24	differential 144:7	discredits 341:24	diverging 202:15	216:19
217:16 218:13	differentiate 325:7	discretion 201:22	202:17 204:23	domestic 296:15
221:4 239:1	differently 334:1	discuss 111:24	diversity 180:3,5	dot 272:11
241:10 292:25	difficult 193:9	112:9 123:25	diverting 202:15	dots 215:16
317:12	204:15,15 222:25	163:23 177:19	divestments 116:10	double 281:3
developed 286:25	239:10 244:3	211:22 229:8	dividend 115:3	double-check
developer 183:5	difficulties 110:19	296:20 302:21	dividends 186:6	350:19,23
317:12	110:22	308:22 340:23	docket 87:6 96:17	Doumit 88:5 90:20
developers 254:19	digest 303:18	341:2 343:3	96:21 99:20,23	145:15 151:16
254:19,21 287:16	dioxide 326:23	346:14 353:9	100:4,7 101:4,6,8	241:20 242:4
297:2,6,8 328:14	direct 90:15,22	discussed 111:9	101:11,13,16	243:9 245:19
331:10 332:3,9	91:5,8,10 92:24	164:14 365:16	102:13,15,17,20	246:4,23
developing 196:2	94:19 120:25	discusses 126:9,10	102:22 103:4	downplay 332:14
198:2 214:21	156:6 177:5 195:7	177:6 200:2,16	104:22 105:4,6,9	Dr 90:21 91:3,7,25
215:6 239:7	195:10,10 199:19	201:1	107:19 121:10	93:5,6,8,9,11,12
240:18 286:24	251:8 323:25	discussing 122:9	122:25 123:24	93:18,19,21,22,24
324:21	338:6 341:5 352:7	167:15,23 207:18	124:17 125:22	94:9 95:7,9,10,12
development	360:8	discussion 90:6	126:9 166:3,4	95:13,15,16,18,19
183:20 184:13	directed 125:10	176:18 196:21	200:15 313:22	95:21,22,24 96:4
203:15 240:21	126:6 184:4	200:21 211:19,20	314:1 339:16	103:12 111:7
296:17 303:6	195:18 353:25	347:2	362:25 363:19	114:11 116:25
316:23	directing 202:3	discussions 138:13	365:6	119:2,4 120:20
developments	direction 198:11	165:13 170:23	dockets 96:15	161:10,13 162:1
139:21,25	248:15 309:4	184:12 185:24,25	118:11 198:13,13	166:15 175:17,17
develops 363:19	369:5	212:2,5 217:1	document 116:20	175:19,20,22,23
dicta 129:2	directly 180:20	220:24	118:14,18 121:12	175:25 184:5
dictate 245:16	188:16 198:7	disincentivize	121:18,20 123:24	250:15,18 251:3
difference 169:12	271:1	332:10	124:2,7 181:25	251:10 252:5
175:8 255:15,17	director 94:17 95:1	disk 307:3	187:13,25 211:14	270:12 272:20
255:23,24	96:1 251:14	disks 306:15	212:19 302:13	278:18 279:4,14
different 123:21	disagree 159:18	dispatch 192:14	315:25 316:13	281:21 283:22
136:21 159:21	320:1 355:11	205:2 222:25	documentation	284:18 285:4,15
160:3,9,10 168:9	disagreed 311:7	223:6,6 237:1	231:1	289:5 295:23
168:17,23 171:17	disagreeing 312:17	dispatchability	documents 121:23	316:3,11 319:1
179:11 183:6	disallow 230:17	236:18	124:6 128:22,25	322:20 323:5,22
188:21 190:5	disallowance	dispatchable	135:17	329:8 335:21
191:25 197:21,22	229:13	179:24 184:17,18	doing 107:21 113:8	337:1,10 341:7,11
202:18 204:5,23	disappointed	185:8 220:20	131:22 191:3	341:16,23 346:24
212:9 222:22	302:19	335:6,13	226:7 252:21	348:1 351:13,15
225:14 226:18,21	disappointment	disregard 308:1	291:19 296:11	352:1,9,13 353:3
231:25 237:10	302:5	distinction 319:4	301:8 309:12,16	353:14,15,22
239:7 241:23	discharge 275:5	355:11,12	312:9 324:23	354:8,14 358:11
292:14,14 298:7	277:23,25	distributed 148:13	342:6	359:2,9 361:10,15
298:15 305:14	disclose 222:8	148:17 153:4	dollar-per-mega	362:2,11 363:2,14
270.13 303.17	discluse 222.0	170.17 133.7	donar-per-mega	302.2,11 303.2,14

draft 182:18,22	Earle 91:7 100:12	effort 198:15	energy 87:5 89:2,8	engaging 143:14
287:22 302:21	100:15 101:1	356:22	89:13 94:17 95:1	215:13 357:4
dramatically	119:4 177:15	efforts 135:11	96:1 102:5 103:9	enhanced 148:20
118:20 149:20	351:13,15 352:1,9	140:12 215:8	103:17 104:1,8,10	enhancement 152:4
345:6	352:12,13 353:3	219:8 239:12	105:1,14 106:4	ensure 98:9 139:16
drastic 295:7	358:11 359:2,9	356:23 357:3	107:22 108:11,16	146:11 198:24
drastically 137:3	earlier 111:9 248:5	358:13	108:18,22,24	199:2
draw 159:1	257:12 273:22	eight 142:2 277:25	109:4 115:5,6	ensuring 160:14
draws 141:5	281:23 286:10	either 114:20	126:14,15 132:10	entire 143:7 217:19
drive 225:24	287:11 296:8	133:19 134:25	132:16 134:13,20	232:17 238:12
driving 183:23	315:17 319:6,9	146:21,22 220:17	136:15,17 139:8	239:5 240:17
drop 235:3	355:17 365:16	221:16 229:19	139:14 142:22	279:9 286:6
dropped 254:21	earliest 154:9	244:13,13 258:10	143:2 148:8,11,12	291:19 324:16
drops 224:14	288:12,12	293:25 328:15	148:13,17,20,25	333:18
DRs 116:6,24	early 110:8 134:6	333:24 346:4	149:4,12,17,22	entirely 254:21
120:21 125:8,9,12	150:12 163:14	366:18,22	150:6 151:7	299:5
125:14 129:7	222:9,19 309:12	electric 137:11,22	152:17,20,21	entirety 178:8
177:11 284:25	328:2	143:3 150:12	153:1,2,4,23	247:17
285:5,7 323:20	earnestly 134:19	152:15,17 153:12	154:6 162:2	entrusts 198:23
348:11 353:22,24	Earnings 102:5	225:7 329:17	169:16 176:20,25	environment
353:25 361:14	easily 246:1	364:15	185:20,24 187:8	202:12
367:12	east 222:15	electricity 327:12	191:6 193:3	environmental
due 118:21 128:13	eastern 189:10	357:19	198:15,25 202:15	89:15 109:3 152:7
129:4 136:5	202:18	eligible 318:1,2	202:16,18,19	324:17
138:11 182:18	easy 244:6,7	Elijah 89:19 109:10	203:18 204:23	epidemic 296:12
190:8 231:13	eat 250:8	151:17 323:19	205:3 208:7	321:22
287:19,21 316:17	ecetas@critfc.org	embarrass 327:6	211:22,23 212:3	equipment 300:9
350:13 366:5	89:23	emerged 316:25	212:10 213:7,8	300:11,11
duly 156:1 251:3	economic 275:21	emission 315:13	214:19 215:2,22	equity 168:17
338:1 352:2 360:3	economics 277:20	327:21	220:12,17,18	202:25 326:9
duplicated 127:7	278:7	emissions 232:4	228:1 241:7	328:5,6,6,12
duplicating 190:23	effect 126:13 282:6	326:14,23 327:11	251:14 253:8	error 131:6
duplication 127:23	302:3	emit 327:2	274:7 278:19,24	errors 354:16
128:9	effective 158:18	emitted 326:25	286:3 292:1	escalation 205:24
duties 152:7	effectively 215:8	emitting 222:21	293:16,19 296:17	298:12 300:15
dynamic 339:23,25	320:2	297:14,17,18	305:7 309:25	escalators 271:24
	effects 153:25	327:8	324:14 326:15,15	297:14,16 298:3
<u>E</u>	176:20 304:10	employee 369:8,8	326:17 334:2	301:24 302:7
E-a-r-l-e 352:12	efficiency 140:7	employing 138:7	349:10,13 350:5	304:10,14,21
e-mail 110:10	148:20 153:3	empower 145:5	363:3	306:25 307:5
111:10 120:13	154:6 159:7	empty 154:19	Energy's 150:1	especially 152:15
126:22	211:22,24 212:3	enacted 364:11	engage 211:7,11	204:15 247:7
e.e 214:18	212:10 213:8	encourages 139:13	engaged 163:4	295:7
EAG 94:12 210:4,9	215:2	ended 239:14	212:8 356:21	essence 153:6
210:20 217:20	efficient 275:23	306:18	engagement 219:8	essential 335:18
ear 110:5	289:12	endogenous 311:14	219:13 305:15	essentially 125:7
		ı	I	I

				1 ago ooo
137:16 159:16	194:12 257:3	exceed 366:12,18	115:12,14 116:23	expand 215:8,12
163:22 183:11	328:11	366:22,24	117:19 118:6,7,9	expanded 219:15
185:1,25 190:15	everyone's 342:11	Excel 118:4	118:25 119:4,5,13	expanding 202:13
191:18 203:19	346:15	Excellent 252:7	119:21 120:19,24	202:23 218:15
221:3 222:16	evidence 114:25,25	exception 112:13	123:13 124:4,25	expansion 243:2
232:18,20 234:2	141:8 142:19,23	191:8	125:17 126:11	expect 182:24
234:23,25 235:1	143:11,23 144:11	excess 274:20	129:23 130:12,15	287:17 288:10
237:6,10 238:22	150:14 200:11	277:22,23 278:8,8	130:21,23 157:11	291:12 304:7
244:14 246:20	293:12 341:24	exclude 119:12	161:8 164:7	333:23 365:5
255:24 277:12	346:10	excluded 112:24	165:21 166:10	expectation 182:25
291:4 314:10	evidentiary 87:10	117:6 118:16	175:13,16,18	276:22 277:5
establish 129:10	107:18 118:22	358:19	186:13,15 195:2	295:6
187:10	146:7	excluding 129:18	205:6 272:15	expected 158:14
established 191:19	evolved 312:11	129:22	273:6 275:25	288:6 334:2
establishing 173:1	evolving 152:17	exclusively 213:24	283:25 285:6,12	expecting 288:13
estimate 213:11	328:6	excuse 139:11	289:10 296:3	expensive 143:21
221:8 285:14	exact 169:23 199:3	excused 111:6,13	299:17,19 300:5	245:14 248:4
289:9 290:2,2	343:17	248:25 249:1	302:9,15,17	experienced 177:23
291:18,25 292:18	exactly 171:20	336:21,22 351:2,5	305:23 306:3	expert 286:11
292:23,24 293:3	278:6	359:10,13 364:23	307:15,16 308:10	288:16 296:18
294:15,20 318:19	examination 90:15	364:25	313:20 314:18	expire 198:4
365:4	90:18,22 91:3,5,6	excuses 143:19	317:4 319:6 323:6	expires 369:16
estimated 95:4	91:8,10,11 156:6	executed 161:22	324:3 338:20	explain 138:22
290:22	219:1 251:8 329:3	162:7	339:13 341:23	283:8
estimates 94:24	338:6 350:1 352:7	executing 138:2	350:11,11,23	explicitly 282:8
110:7 249:12	360:8 364:5	exemption 343:8	351:10 353:20	explore 139:13
280:21,24 292:1	examine 118:17	344:16,18 345:25	354:1,2,10 362:2	334:22 346:20
295:5	examined 156:3	346:10	362:11 363:14	explored 317:7
estimating 281:2	251:5 338:3 352:4	exemptions 204:20	365:9,13	exploring 191:24
et 302:22	360:5	exercise 356:16	exhibits 90:6	exposes 143:13
evaluate 247:5	example 124:13	Exh 99:16,18	109:18 111:1,22	exposing 174:15
evaluated 247:17	128:7 134:25	100:21,23 102:8	111:25 112:2,13	exposure 144:1
evaluating 238:15	142:25 168:13	102:10 104:17,19	112:17,22 113:2,6	expressed 302:4
330:18	186:2 191:7 254:4	exhibit 91:21,22	113:16 114:13	303:2
evaluation 152:8	276:4 278:4	92:1,2,22,23 93:2	117:6,9 118:5,10	extend 118:20
363:11	292:13 299:13	94:2,17,18 95:2,3	120:9,9 122:3,23	166:18 310:15
evaluations 314:1,3	304:9 332:18	96:2,3 97:2,3 98:2	123:1 124:25	extended 306:12
evaluator 314:13	343:14,21 344:12	98:3 99:2,3 100:2	125:7,9 126:6,24	extension 166:21
eve 140:17	344:21,22 345:18	100:3,12,13 101:1	126:25 127:6	167:3,11 253:1
evening 323:5 event 331:21	345:20 348:17	101:2,21,22 102:1 102:2 103:1,2,9	128:15 129:17,18 129:21,22 141:10	extent 128:15,22
event 331:21 events 139:22	349:12 362:6,8,19 362:21	102:2 103:1,2,9	156:16,19 251:16	129:6,12 136:2 146:21 171:3
298:5	examples 206:17	103:10,17,18	251:19 284:5	184:7 188:6 201:6
eventually 136:24	327:7 343:24	104:1,2,6,7 103:1	338:12,16 352:14	201:9,11 245:8
311:3	344:4,8,17 346:3	105.2,14,15 100.1	358.12,10 332.14	305:13 316:11
everybody 120:11	358:11,15	113:13 114:3	360:16,19 367:14	325:23 344:3
cverybouy 120.11	330.11,13	113.13 114.3	300.10,17 307.14	343.43 344.3

	I	1	1	1
extra 250:13	familiar 158:22	287:7,9 303:12,14	276:1 294:23	162:3 221:24
290:23 335:10	175:5,6 176:15	303:20 304:22	306:24 367:15	flexible 151:8
extraordinary	189:23 281:25	305:9 306:10	finding 178:16	flow 144:8 160:12
296:11	286:12,16 287:14	308:15 313:21,25	179:13 283:23	176:12 215:22
extreme 173:6	308:9 331:24	315:25 350:14	findings 152:25	218:2 231:14
eyesight 291:1	far 162:13 169:6	365:6 367:10	fine 164:18 194:1	flowed 225:18
	173:20 184:13	files 307:11	213:16 319:20	flowing 233:21
F	186:4 191:25	filing 114:21	365:24	flown 225:18
face 324:14	214:3 215:10	138:19 141:12	finer 214:1	focus 289:7 326:22
faced 146:20	282:18 320:9	151:4 167:5 170:6	finished 121:24	341:3 353:10
206:14 243:12	336:5,13	185:2 196:20	firm 274:6 276:11	focused 133:13
Faces 98:16	feasible 140:6	203:2 221:11	322:1,10	136:6 232:25
facilitate 219:8	159:7	231:1 235:23	firmly 322:17	322:5 325:1
276:9	Feb 101:9 102:18	303:6,10,24	first 109:17 113:21	326:13
facilitating 219:12	federal 98:9 182:9	304:16 305:6,7,10	116:5 118:24	focuses 149:15
facilities 157:25	231:16,20 235:19	305:17,18 306:6	120:18 133:11	follow 139:15 142:2
167:3 357:14	feedback 92:9	362:14 367:14	134:10,11 136:1	241:22 356:14
facility 344:23	271:20 302:1,3,11	filings 205:16	136:23 137:25	follow-up 211:16
facing 182:11,15	302:25,25 303:9	304:24	138:6 151:19	follow-ups 211:15
185:11 243:10	303:20 304:1,18	fill 252:22 334:22	154:15 156:1	following 107:6
274:15	304:19,23 305:12	final 96:16 99:21	164:20 198:15	110:2 151:5
fact 119:3 149:19	305:20 326:20	101:4 102:13	200:17 203:17	218:22 287:2
160:19 195:9	feel 110:20 123:21	104:22 176:19	204:13,14,14	follows 156:4 251:6
316:5 330:4	228:5 256:6	297:19 303:20	215:10 228:1,6	270:9 338:4,23
348:22 356:2,12	312:15	308:11,21 316:4	233:4 249:11	352:5 360:6
362:5 363:4,8	feels 304:12	321:7 346:3	250:13 251:3	Footnote 290:13
facto 315:4	felt 322:7	finalized 124:2	255:13 290:17	299:13
factor 180:10	fewer 150:18	finalizing 303:6	315:23 316:10	force 183:23
factors 233:25	fifth 88:22 221:20	finally 129:6	325:21 329:5	forced 349:6,11
236:19 275:13	fight 147:17	139:19 349:9	333:22 338:1	forecast 164:22,24
327:13	figure 191:1 204:21	finance 169:4	340:22 342:23	254:1 272:3,9,12
facts 114:20,24	206:10 215:7,13	190:14	351:13 352:2	291:5,6 311:17
117:21 122:15	216:22 240:9	financed 314:9	360:3 362:14,21	333:17
163:22 184:22	328:8,13	financial 99:7	366:5	forecasted 282:25
200:11 203:4	file 130:12 184:25	115:17 121:2	fish 89:18,20 106:1	334:14
factual 171:24	223:11 343:7	143:22 144:9	106:8 109:8,11	forego 115:1
factually 126:16,18	345:25 362:22	148:20 162:25	132:21 151:13,18	foregoing 369:4
failed 141:9	365:23 367:16	175:2 176:6,13	152:8,11	foreshadow 240:16
fails 140:20	filed 114:18 116:15	182:10 186:18	fish-friendly 153:5	forest 329:7
failure 142:15,25	116:15,20 121:18	224:25 225:3	five 112:21 204:10	forget 242:11
145:2,6 153:16	121:23 122:12	231:15 246:22	281:3 318:22	form 133:20 146:16
fair 188:3 228:4	124:3,6 130:3,9	274:14 317:15	five-year 149:6	300:22 302:11,25
318:14 358:4	130:13 131:1,3,13	346:5	215:12	303:10 317:15
fairly 182:16 276:4	136:23 137:2	financially 369:9	flat 242:1,2	formal 365:24
fall 145:25 146:24	142:11 167:8	find 133:22 178:14	fleet 184:17 275:13	forms 252:23
falling 315:13	188:1 192:6 255:2	204:20 230:10	flexibility 161:17	forthcoming
	100.11/2.0233.2	2020 230.10	101.17	-51,011,011,115

365:14	244:25 282:10,16	G	137:12,23 138:20	335:21 337:1,10
fortunate 311:2	349:15 361:16	G-h-o-s-h 251:12	140:11,14 141:14	Ghosh's 279:4
forum 200:25	fruition 237:25	gap 305:17 331:3	154:8 157:25	gigawatts 329:11
forward 129:5	238:10 239:17	gaps 228:3	158:20 160:24	330:1
136:9 192:4	fuel 178:21 232:4	garner 301:6	162:8,23 179:2,7	give 109:25 122:4
196:14 197:2,7,23	286:4 328:16	garner 301.0 gas 136:22 140:8	179:10 180:7,8	127:1,11 129:4
212:11 220:13	fuel-dependent	225:17 241:3	183:24 184:4,16	130:3 132:1,9,18
221:9 230:1 232:9	179:25	277:14,16,18	191:12 214:21	132:23 161:8
234:7 238:9	fuel-type-specific	278:2,3,4 310:18	226:16 233:21	207:7 245:12
244:23 245:3,15	255:20	310:20 311:12	236:20 237:16,22	246:20 257:3
316:18 367:1	fueling 183:20	315:11 326:23	274:20 275:7,17	283:20 303:25
fossil 232:4	full 116:14 122:13	357:21	277:14 279:19	312:16 316:17
found 150:9 275:22	188:10 221:16		280:17 286:18	332:11 351:18
314:11 317:5	242:16 249:20	gasification 239:12 gathered 211:3	335:7 344:23	355:8 366:14
334:20	252:6,17 285:17	\cup	345:20	given 110:7 132:7
foundation 119:1	285:20 287:14	gears 180:16 general 88:16,22	generator 282:23	132:12 135:25
125:11 283:24	307:9 311:17	150:11 176:16	327:12	147:23 150:19
founded 152:6	329:18 356:19	177:3,13,19 180:1	generators 277:16	182:10 203:25
four 137:24 152:4	369:6	206:5,22 210:1	277:18	274:13 277:1
152:11 153:18	fully 311:13,15	228:6 308:3,18,21	geographical 180:3	287:15 291:12
182:20 184:25	321:14	309:5 329:16	180:5	292:10 304:6
213:10,14 214:15	function 110:21,21	341:14 354:20	getting 161:5	318:19 322:2
220:2 277:25	fundamental 115:8	355:8	191:23 200:8	gives 322:17
358:11	203:5 236:17	generally 160:20	203:22 204:14	giving 131:21
four-million-meg	fundamentally	168:16,19 169:18	220:14 226:3	276:14 299:24
334:9	165:12 217:12	169:19 170:5,22	243:25 280:21	global 296:15
four-year 133:14	232:14	173:14 175:6,7	298:11 304:4	321:22 326:22,24
137:13,20	funding 98:9	176:14 178:18	325:21,22 331:15	327:2
fourth-largest	208:12	182:23 186:2	334:14	go 107:23 109:15
242:18	funny 303:24	188:9 239:3 242:3	GHG 98:16	111:2,21,23 113:4
frame 241:23 304:6	further 124:20	253:19 273:5,10	GHG-neutral	113:15,18 115:25
305:4	127:12 140:22	275:22 286:20	333:23	116:3 123:1
framework 164:23	184:10 185:4	299:2,4	Ghosh 90:21 91:3	127:18 128:20
165:15 191:19,20	195:12 219:22	generate 159:3	94:17 95:1 96:1	131:20 132:24
220:24 221:2	246:24 248:22	178:23 183:25	117:9 119:2	133:6 146:21
222:8,12	295:10 322:21	275:4 277:1	120:20 163:23	147:2 154:13
Francisco 89:10	335:21 349:18	282:24 334:2	182:2 184:5 185:6	166:14 168:11
frankly 310:7	359:2 363:24	generated 277:9	229:4 236:16	172:15 178:4
free 110:20 256:6	364:18	278:11 327:7	242:20 250:15,18	180:22 184:22
312:15	future 128:3	generating 140:25	251:3,10,12 252:5	191:11 192:1,5
frequent 184:12	154:10 164:22	158:25 163:10	270:12 278:18	193:8 197:15
Friday 111:10	193:2 246:13	178:21 273:19	279:14 281:21	198:1,14 201:6,13
120:14 130:3,14	311:1 312:3	277:19 278:3,10	283:22 289:3,5	204:19 207:3,8
131:1,3	317:13,17 342:22	335:2	295:23 316:3,11	209:7 214:10
front 114:3 161:11	345:17	generation 137:8	319:1 322:20	217:3,5 220:1,13
170:8 205:7		Scheration 157.0	323:5 329:8	224:16 227:5,25
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

229:20 232:9	221:5 222:3	governed 152:10	211:24 212:9	hardening 188:25
235:6 238:3 240:3	223:10 224:4,11	governing 170:25	217:14 221:2	235:9
240:4 243:16,24	224:13 227:21	governor 116:21	222:8 224:1,8	harder 230:9
244:14,20 245:25	232:25 233:18	governor's 116:8	240:25 326:9	hardworking
249:12,15,20,25	234:11 235:4,5	117:3	groups 215:24	143:13
249:25 250:8	236:20 237:6	grab 250:8	217:10 219:5	Harness 98:7
251:25 256:13	238:6,19,25 239:6	grandiose 142:20	grow 328:12	harvest 152:8
272:4 277:4,12	240:7,14,16	granted 131:14	growing 182:23	hate 249:17
279:2,9,11,22	242:25 243:1,2,3	Granting 101:9	growth 233:14,17	Hathaway 94:3
281:16 288:21	243:4,7,22 244:10	102:18	329:23	102:5 114:15
291:21 292:19	244:12 245:10,12	grants 151:7	guarantee 147:17	115:5,6,6,18
295:15 310:7,7	245:14 246:15	granularity 179:1	guaranteed 152:5	185:20,20,22,24
318:23 319:9	248:3,19 252:21	214:8	guess 203:23	186:8 187:8,9,12
330:11 334:21	258:5 271:10,21	graphic 315:1	241:11 290:1,17	Hathaway's 128:17
337:1,8,24 340:12	273:4 278:16	graphical 300:22	298:2 302:17,23	Hayes 89:10
344:2 345:9	281:2 289:7,10	graphs 272:10	307:10 309:12	HB 99:13 104:15
350:20 351:2,22	291:8 294:12,13	GRC 96:15 166:3	312:3 316:21	HC 97:4 99:4
352:22 356:15	296:7 297:4 298:2	308:23 358:17	320:11 321:16	head 122:6 184:1
360:1,24 365:12	324:7 330:18	great 157:9 166:13	333:3	208:24 242:14
365:15,25 366:10	333:10 343:16	195:5 205:9,11	guesses 311:1	303:8 304:19
366:16 367:3,8,9	344:25 351:9	242:15 253:10	guidance 247:8	heads 130:20 259:5
367:9	366:18	274:6 296:5 300:3	guys 163:17	heads-up 127:11
goal 134:4 218:3	good 107:11,25	300:7 301:14		hear 117:11 125:4
245:24 246:3,6	108:4,8,12,17	302:16 306:2,9,20	<u>H</u>	157:7 178:7 271:2
320:17 335:4	109:1,10 133:8	307:13,18 312:9	half 116:17 122:12	343:22
goals 126:15	136:14 142:9	313:24 314:21	hand 155:8,15	heard 129:15
goes 120:24 188:7	145:14 147:1,17	319:20 335:20	187:1 250:19	131:25 238:5
231:24 240:12	148:9 149:10	363:1	256:25 329:25	243:20 281:23
247:22 278:6	151:15 156:8	greater 233:17	337:17 351:15	320:8
315:7 319:7	157:6,8 174:7,8	greatly 202:13,23	359:20 369:10	hearing 87:10 90:5
365:24	186:19,22 194:23	green 143:2 191:6	handle 256:4	107:19 109:16
going 110:13	194:24 207:15,16	191:11 275:24	handled 127:10	110:18 111:25
115:19 159:1	223:15,16,17	276:2	handling 125:5	112:4,23 113:11
160:3,5,9,23	231:8,9 247:1	greenhouse 136:22	happen 176:1	115:15 118:2,20
162:12 163:13,14	250:6 252:5,6,6	140:8 225:17	277:7	136:9 187:3
167:22 168:22	258:22,23 281:21	326:23	happened 329:9	237:19 245:20
169:8 172:15	281:22 289:3,4	greenhouse-gas-	happens 196:18	288:17 310:23
173:2 174:24	293:13 295:23,25	147:11	happy 112:12	heavily 314:24
177:18 179:23	323:5 338:8	greenhouse-gas	136:10 345:14	height 270:19
180:18 185:19	340:18 351:14	145:25	hard 124:6 238:25	Helena 89:16
193:8,10 196:14	352:9 353:4	grid 152:17 153:7	249:10 271:12	help 189:3 235:13
196:23 197:2,23	360:10	153:12	304:11 305:4	256:6 276:11
197:23,25 198:3,6	Gorge 180:8	ground 246:16	325:12 333:10	293:16 326:1
201:6 202:2 203:2	gosh 366:9	group 163:7 165:15	335:1 337:4	helped 301:6
203:9 213:17	Gotcha 319:20	169:4 172:20	hard-to-reach	helpful 170:22
217:5,8 220:18,19	gotten 178:9 304:3	210:11,17,19	211:11	184:2,7 203:9
			<u> </u>	1

	•	•	•	1 ago oo7
249:21 257:10	honest 318:9	250:7	197:17 209:6	228:2 305:8
289:16 312:19	honestly 286:14	hopeful 237:25	221:17 244:21	implementing
332:23	297:20 301:17	hopefully 224:25	258:11 276:3	150:5
helps 176:9 332:10	Honor 108:1,5,9,13	276:23 326:8	326:1	implications 283:8
hereunto 369:10	108:18 109:2	332:10,11	identifying 162:15	346:21 348:7,13
Hermiston 358:1	111:3 112:5,20	hoping 272:4	188:23 190:17	349:5,9
358:14	113:20 114:10	hour 110:11 249:20	195:20 274:18	important 116:19
hesitate 223:25	115:13 116:4	277:20,24,24	IEs 314:12	135:5 145:17
hesitation 224:22	117:14 118:3	278:1,2	ignitions 189:2	152:25 217:3
Hey 244:4 310:8	119:18 120:17	hour-by-hour	ignore 144:10	275:16 304:1
Hi 296:1 361:4	121:7 122:5,21	179:2	ignores 143:8,12	320:24 322:7
hierarchy 224:17	123:19 124:23	hours 220:21 237:1	iii 209:5	355:10
high 139:8 206:22	125:6,19 126:3	274:7 276:13	IIJA 339:1	importantly 126:11
276:8 294:22	127:3 130:18	277:10,25	illustrative 120:19	134:4,20 145:24
300:12 325:14	131:4 132:2,5,7	house 217:6	imagine 124:7	187:6
high-energy-cost	132:12,17,22	housekeeping	197:4	impose 145:10
274:7	133:2,9 136:15	91:12 365:2 367:5	impact 138:22	imposed 173:8
high-value 277:24	142:9 149:11	367:11	153:12 168:5,8,22	impossible 148:2
high-valued 278:1	154:20 155:4,13	hundred 168:20	169:1,7,9,10	impression 200:18
higher 143:13,20	155:19,22 156:21	191:11 199:7	177:6 248:8 280:8	improper 120:18
143:21 146:13,16	157:1 170:17	220:14 240:3,4	283:17 325:10	345:1
146:23 147:19,25	171:23 172:4,7	242:6 309:24	326:21 327:13	improve 144:8,8
150:9,10 180:9	174:2 177:2,9,11	hurdles 274:14	328:1,18 346:5	176:6,12 246:21
225:4 254:11	177:20 180:24	hydro 99:6 334:6	347:8	246:21
277:3 290:3 291:6	186:23 187:15,18	hydroelectric	impacted 154:3	improvements
291:8,12 293:9	193:16,20 194:19	214:21	208:1,3,8 271:17	324:18
294:11 295:3	199:24 200:7,10	hydrogen 237:6,6,7	296:18 297:11	improving 228:12
298:18 315:5	207:4 209:3	241:3,6	300:9 324:20	326:4
327:9 329:19	218:21 219:21	hypothetical	impacts 139:14,25	imprudent 146:14
330:1	241:21 250:12,23	175:25 331:22	140:2 152:14,20	357:4
highlighted 291:15	251:21 252:1	345:1,6,10	153:22 161:17	imputation 168:16
292:4	256:1 257:11,18	I	162:3 177:22	inadequate 142:24
highlights 138:5	258:3,14 279:1	Idaho 96:20 189:16	185:7 190:24	inappropriate
highly 104:3	281:14 288:23	316:25	214:20 230:20,22	118:8 200:4
179:15 208:1,3,8	295:17 315:21	idea 190:1	234:22 324:13,17	incentive 145:3
256:10 271:13	316:20 322:25	ideally 151:4	325:12 326:12	216:15,20
275:6 324:20	328:25 333:4	identified 111:6	328:14 347:2,9,13	incentives 148:20
hip 143:19	337:6 340:9	112:14 162:17,19	350:4	216:17
hired 219:7	343:16 344:9,25	163:18 203:20	implement 151:8	include 125:9 152:7
history 331:9	345:4 349:23	232:15 252:19	201:23 202:14	208:4,25 219:5
hold 149:17 305:16	350:6 351:12	272:21 354:16	215:8	272:2 310:19
holding 134:25	352:19 359:6,11	identifies 208:25	implementation	330:2
holistic 152:14	359:17,24 360:21	288:1	87:5 107:22	included 212:5
248:8 363:11	364:2,24 365:7,17	identify 113:16	136:15 149:17	293:17 329:16
holistically 234:17	366:9 367:6,21	172:12 182:20	199:9 201:18	350:16
home 213:7	hope 134:14 165:1	1/2.12 102.20	203:18,24 204:6	includes 118:4

	_	_	_	
120:7 207:21	290:9	300:10	inputs 150:16	145:20,22 146:4
314:7 350:12	incurring 245:4	inflations 271:24	252:10,11 253:13	146:10,16,19,23
353:21,22	independent 98:21	inform 196:7,13,15	281:5 298:5	146:24 147:20,25
including 136:22	314:13	196:23 197:2,3,23	320:25	148:5 149:18,20
225:16 271:23	INDEX 90:1 91:1	197:25 198:7	inquired 209:14	150:2 166:23
inclusion 296:21	91:21 92:1,22	205:16 308:5	inroads 141:11	170:2,9,12 191:16
inclusive 292:7	93:2 94:2,17 95:2	325:18	install 236:21	196:16 198:9
Income 99:8	96:2 97:2 98:2	information 121:22	Institute 98:7	203:3,17 244:10
income-qualified	99:2 100:2,12	163:15 186:5	instrumental	245:11 246:14
148:23	101:1,21 102:1	189:8 196:24	219:12	247:6 253:1,3,7,8
incorporate 202:22	103:1,9,17 104:1	197:17 198:10	insufficient 142:21	253:8 283:10
202:24 204:22,24	105:1,14 106:1,8	205:14,19,25	insulation 332:12	285:19 290:4
221:22 227:23	Indian 151:24,25	206:13,19 211:8	integrated 98:12	291:3 295:2 308:6
incorporated	208:4,22 209:6	253:17,22 254:2,5	252:16 253:9	309:17 333:13,19
138:14 185:23	indicate 109:20	256:3,10 271:8,13	254:8 321:8	335:4 339:8
217:18 272:24	123:5 131:22	271:14,23 272:3	intend 132:1	340:23 341:4,25
341:9,12	140:18 307:24	293:1,1 299:1	188:17 320:5	353:11 363:3,10
incorporating	indicated 111:13	300:17 301:23	321:14 366:12	interlocking 135:3
164:19	112:1 123:10	302:6 307:4,9	intended 136:16	intermittent 275:17
incorrect 124:12	126:25 131:16,18	311:17 314:14	137:4 181:4	internally 343:3
126:16 313:4	145:24 156:24	315:8 318:8	intends 188:4	interpretation
315:18 316:6	173:25 181:23	319:13 323:10	intent 142:4 187:5	170:20,25 171:5
317:2 338:21	193:19 194:14	324:12 325:9,23	247:15 320:12	201:2
increase 143:23	198:18 205:18	informational	Inter-Tribal 89:18	interrupting
159:23 230:9	207:1 211:20	228:18	89:20 106:1,8	318:16
235:4 243:3,4	251:24 257:20	informed 121:14,20	109:8,11 132:21	Intertribal 151:13
275:12 278:18,23	288:22 294:1	125:23 150:7	151:18	intervenor 135:4
279:15 300:23	295:14 344:5	300:14 356:22	interaction 172:20	257:16
315:11 346:18	indicates 134:7	informs 252:14	interchangeable	intervenors 134:19
increased 135:9	indication 224:22	initial 118:21 123:3	173:20	135:6 136:7
154:6 174:15	293:25	128:6 181:22	interconnect	intervenors' 136:3
176:12 226:11	indications 224:7	254:17 313:3	159:25 160:11	intimate 362:24
315:4,9	indicator 214:22	318:4 342:16	interconnected	introduce 112:18
increases 140:23	324:9	366:8 367:14	160:24	128:4 151:21
233:15 255:4,7,10	indicators 323:23	initially 183:18	interested 165:13	202:19 229:3
353:6	325:9	187:25 254:10,12	211:10 218:15	invest 115:20
increasing 226:18	individual 113:10	300:15	328:10 369:9	188:25 189:5,8
278:13	217:7 222:1	initiate 181:23	interesting 303:12	invested 213:17
incremental 92:11	industry 238:12	182:6 339:17	interests 151:21	investigate 116:9
144:2 147:4	239:5 240:17	362:15,22	interfere 110:9	200:6
226:15 233:23	244:8 253:21	initiated 180:25	interim 92:10,12,14	investigation
285:14 289:9	inevitably 150:17	254:15 287:9	92:16,17 94:24	339:17
290:3 291:18	inflated 133:21	initiation 319:14	133:13,24 134:2	investing 188:4,18
294:15	150:15 206:18	initiatives 191:6	134:22 135:1,8,13	188:24 189:2
increments 221:17	296:10 329:12	input 222:11 300:1	135:20 136:20	investment 153:1
incurred 286:6	inflation 98:8	301:11,18 324:24	137:3,4 142:12,18	154:6,8 186:21
	I	I	I	I

317:15	315:24 316:1,1	119:15 121:15	JNS-12 97:20	Josephine 88:15
investments 139:16	320:23 321:6,18	135:12 136:4	JNS-13C 97:22	108:5 121:9
153:2 168:18	322:15 325:8,13	139:2,24 150:24	JNS-14 97:23	josephine.strauss
investor 94:3 186:8	325:21 326:3	164:23 165:15	JNS-15 98:4	88:18
investor-owned	327:15 330:8,22	182:8 183:20	JNS-16C 98:5	JT-1T 106:10
364:15	342:14 344:11	190:17 192:22	JNS-17 98:7	judge 87:16 88:6
invite 217:5	345:17 358:21	193:8 201:9,25	JNS-18 98:10	107:6,15 145:15
involve 218:6	IRP/CEIP 330:3	204:16 206:6,9,12	JNS-19 98:14	148:10 236:8
321:16	343:2	221:2 222:8 223:5	338:20	judgment 136:4
involved 152:13	IRPs 184:23 206:21	224:25 225:3,3	JNS-1HCT 97:4	330:21
286:23,23	286:24 287:1	227:25 229:23	JNS-1HCT(R)	judicial 152:9
IRA 339:1	322:14	231:14,14,15,16	339:13	judicious 163:1
IRP 96:11,12,14,23	Irrigation 92:4	236:17 238:16,18	JNS-2 97:5	July 98:22
98:11 114:18	isolated 203:9	243:10 246:21	JNS-20 98:15	jump 367:1
116:18 121:14,24	298:13	248:13 270:20,23	JNS-21 98:18	jumping 280:24
121:25 124:1,5	isolation 197:6	279:21 296:16,24	JNS-22 98:19	281:7
144:21,23 150:11	issuance 200:5	297:4 300:10	JNS-23 98:21	June 116:16
150:16 151:4	319:12	342:4,4 353:10	JNS-24HC 98:23	jurisdiction 138:24
163:13,17 181:22	issue 115:18 116:19	issuing 116:21	JNS-25HCT 99:4	347:10
181:22 182:3,18	117:23 120:24	144:24 168:21	JNS-26C 99:5	jurisdictions
182:22 184:25	121:15 125:11,23	320:12	JNS-27 99:7	228:21 347:15
185:2 187:14	126:13,18 127:23	it'd 217:17	JNS-28X 99:9	justification 296:21
196:2 197:19	128:9 144:22	it'll 118:19 182:20	346:23 350:15	justifications 135:7
205:16,24 206:18	171:23 177:12,13	182:25 196:15	JNS-29X 99:11	135:9 341:25
223:24 224:23	177:24 178:22	247:20 280:16	JNS-3 97:7	353:11
225:10,12 226:2,4	180:21 182:13	item 188:22 367:12	JNS-30X 99:13	justified 296:10
228:8,15,17,19,19	188:20 189:6	items 91:12 365:2	125:20 126:8	311:15,23 344:1
228:22,22,23,25	195:7,11,19	367:5	128:7,9	justify 226:6
229:1,1,2 252:10	198:20 199:15	$oxed{J}$	JNS-31X 99:16	239:10
252:17,23 253:5	200:17 225:8	$\frac{\mathbf{J}}{\mathbf{J}}$ 89:3	125:7 341:5	justifying 139:23
253:11,18 255:1,2	229:21 230:11	Jaclynn 91:5 97:1,4	JNS-32X 99:18	K
255:3,11,13 271:4	233:9 234:18,19	l	JNS-33X 99:20	$\left \frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{K}} 106:3 \right $
271:7,21 272:20	239:5 240:2	98:1 99:1,4 100:1 126:7,8 131:5	JNS-34X 99:22	K 100.3 Katie 104:1,4,5
272:25 273:1,2	246:11 247:15	337:14 338:1,11	JNS-35X 100:4	105:1
276:20 285:17	288:2,7 289:7	January 182:18	JNS-36X 100:6	Kaufman 103:9,12
286:25 287:2,7,19	296:7 299:8,12	287:20,24 302:20	JNS-4 97:8 272:15	103:14 111:7
287:21 288:1,7,9	320:5,10 321:19	303:3	JNS-5 97:10	keep 110:15 122:14
292:2 294:1 299:2	339:18,18	jeopardize 142:5	JNS-6 97:11	133:4 202:20
299:21 301:2,3,13	issued 114:17 167:3	jeopardizes 140:19	JNS-7 97:13	223:1 238:15
301:18 302:11,21	177:12 183:21	Jeremy 106:8,10	JNS-8 97:14	239:3 344:7
303:5,7,11,12,13 303:21 305:4,7,18	187:13 206:7 224:9 287:3 288:5	Jim 166:18 310:17	JNS-9 97:16 John 87:25 369:1	keeping 317:9,19
306:6,10,24 309:4	293:14 294:2	311:11,12 357:11	369:15	key 301:13
309:13,13,15	308:19 313:10	357:19 358:13	join 207:7	kick 244:5
310:19 311:9,14	362:5,13,20	JNS-10 97:17	join 207:7 joined 143:18	kind 115:10 117:2
311:23 312:7,9,13	, ,	JNS-11 97:19	257:13	117:3,4 118:21
311.23 312.7,3,13	135005 117.4 117.14		231.13	,
DUELL DEALTIME DEPORTING LLC				

		l		I
164:10 196:18	196:17,24 197:1,1	305:1,6,11,13,19	L	LDK-1T 103:11
197:7 199:7	197:7,8,12,19,24	307:21 309:7,14	L 100:15	LDK-2 103:13
203:14 204:5,22	198:11,12 201:24	309:16,25 310:22	labeled 211:6	lead 195:19 223:5
204:23 206:21,22	202:1,2,11,17	311:1,16,18 312:2	257:24 354:10	276:23
209:1 218:2	203:7,10,18,22,23	312:8,14 314:6	Laboratory's 104:8	leading 302:6
221:17 222:8,17	204:7,10,12,13,14	317:8,10 318:8	Lacey 87:12 107:3	leads 238:23
224:14 225:15	204:15,21 206:5,7	320:18 321:4,12	lack 150:4,19 188:7	learn 198:15 332:1
232:12 233:12,15	206:7 213:15	321:14,16,18,25	302:5	learned 190:13
233:15 238:17,17	215:7,14 216:17	322:13 324:18	laid 142:2 171:10	332:5
238:22 239:21	216:21 218:3	325:2,11 326:7,14	Lance 103:9,12,13	least-cost 171:15
240:15 244:19	219:12,14,15,15	327:19 328:6,13	land 213:25 240:7	171:20 173:3
249:20 252:21	220:13,13 222:6	329:15 330:7,14	lands 213:20	205:2 226:23
271:2 274:4	222:11,22,24	330:15,17,21	landscape 199:11	leave 125:1 131:23
277:19 285:20	224:3,10,24 225:6	331:10,14,15	201:20	231:6 258:11
298:12 300:21	226:5,14 227:22	332:7,8 333:8,22	language 126:17	331:3
302:5,18,18	228:2,5 230:2,23	333:24 334:8,15	169:23 170:7,14	leaves 141:9 147:15
303:17,23 304:6	234:8,9,16 236:4	335:1,5,8,9 336:5	172:1,16,24	286:17
304:12 306:5,21	236:17,19,25	336:11,14 343:14	172.1,10,24	led 135:12 139:9
307:8 309:19	237:2,14,17	350:19,20	large 242:19,25	235:15
310:12 312:17	238:21,24 239:11	knowing 310:21	254:14	left 154:17 257:5,20
313:18 315:7	239:22,22,23,24	knowingly 186:18	Largely 297:10	306:21 318:18
319:12,16 326:25	239:24 240:2,5,6	knowledge 121:22	larger 222:19	legal 170:20 171:2
327:22 334:11	240:6,23,24 241:4	122:17 125:11	276:15	171:5,7 172:3
358:9	241:5,15 242:8,16	128:18,20 160:2		199:21 201:9
kinds 271:15	242:17,25 243:9	177:4 187:4 188:7	late 111:10 120:13 130:9 222:9	339:17 347:21
knew 234:10 304:3	243:11,12,14,14	189:19,21 212:4		348:2
310:3	243:18,19,21,22	213:23 254:4	latest 254:8 271:8	legislation 191:9,10
know 110:20,22,24	243:23,23,24	300:13 356:18	272:12	legislature 239:20
111:9,25 112:3	244:3,4,5,6	357:1	law 87:16 88:6	legislature's 189:23
115:2 116:9 120:7	245:20 246:1,7,9	known 167:12	89:15 107:6,15	length 118:20
123:9,13 128:3,8	247:17 248:15	303:13	109:3 126:19	lengthy 147:16
128:11 131:15	254:13 257:25	KW-10X 104:19	135:20 139:12,15	279:5
155:12 157:12	258:7 271:2,4,8	KW-10X 104:17 KW-11X 104:21	140:4,13,20	lesson 239:15
161:2 165:1	271:21 272:4	KW-11X 104.21 KW-12X 105:3	141:15,19 200:22	lessons 332:2,5
167:22 168:22	274:4,11 275:5,11	KW-12X 105.5 KW-13X 105.6	200:23 201:3,10	let's 107:23 109:15
169:7,8 170:8	278:5 286:3,19,21	KW-14X 105:8	257:12 364:12	111:21 133:6
173:5,7,8,10,12	291:2,6,10,12,19	KW-17X 103.8 KW-1THC 104:3	Lawmakers 94:7	154:13 166:14
			laws 141:4,5	
178:21,25 179:1	292:8,15,21	KW-2 104:5	lawsuits 182:17	181:14 194:5,13
180:7 182:12,22	293:13,19,20,22	KW-3 104:6	layering 228:7	202:19 205:6
183:19,22,23,24	294:4,7 296:21	KW-4 104:7	lays 169:15	209:7 210:9
184:3,12,14,20	297:1,1,5 298:11	KW-5 104:9	Lazard 104:9	249:13 285:3,3
185:4,7,7,23,25	298:25 299:2,3,9	KW-6X 104:11	LC 96:21 98:12	286:15 312:21
187:13 188:20,23	299:9,11 302:17	KW-7X 104:13	99:12 104:13	319:25 332:17,17
189:1,6 190:18	302:18,19,23	KW-8X 104:15	123:24 124:4	332:19 340:20
192:4,4 195:3,22	303:9 304:3,9,11	KW-9X 104:17	126:9	354:7 365:12
195:25 196:3,17	304:13,15,17,18			letter 94:3 114:15
		•	•	

186:9 187:6,20,22	331:12,17,21	281:4 286:18	290:19 292:3,12	lot 159:21 170:18	
313:21	332:19 339:14	354:16	293:19 304:20	193:6,14 198:5,16	
letting 110:22	340:5 342:20	loads 191:13	306:22 309:17	201:25 203:1	
111:9	345:5 346:13	loan 168:20	310:9 315:23	220:17 236:22	
level 168:23 178:19	356:7	local 211:23,25	319:9 327:16,16	238:20 239:15	
185:21 206:22	linear- 255:8	326:21 327:4,7,9	327:20 350:3	240:8 242:24	
216:21 217:7	linearly 255:8	327:14,21	351:9 355:20	243:20 258:5	
270:24 274:9	lines 157:11 164:9	localized 325:10	367:13	271:20 277:9	
325:14,16 327:14	165:21 174:11	326:11	looked 179:1	294:5 301:6,17	
levelized 104:9	195:8 232:4 235:8	located 159:19,22	292:15 298:1	330:10 331:14	
292:1	283:6,13 339:22	327:18	307:6 367:18	louder 138:1	
levels 315:5	340:21	location 160:10	looking 113:25	140:16 142:3	
liabilities 182:11,14	link 235:23 350:12	173:11 328:16	114:1 121:10	low 223:2 233:14	
182:17 186:24	350:22	locations 180:15	158:19 161:8	239:4 271:10	
liability 150:24	list 98:14 119:21	237:10 292:14	162:14 164:4,8	295:6 330:9	
185:10,11 187:19	124:14 158:10	lodge 283:23	165:20,21 166:10	low-income 148:21	
187:21 188:5,19	235:22 256:23	long 154:25 254:16	173:7,17 174:11	213:7 324:20	
231:14,16	257:4,8 297:19,25	294:7 304:12	183:5 186:15	low-range 292:18	
liaison 219:8,11	313:3,16,16 316:4	308:25 327:22	190:12 191:3,12	low-value 277:10	
lieu 272:3	316:22 317:24	long-term 146:22	191:18 192:18	277:19	
light 87:5 88:9	318:4 319:16,17	147:7,9 180:20	197:18,21,24	lower 135:19 144:4	
107:21 240:12	338:18,21 350:12	230:10 234:22	205:3 212:7	145:22 168:19	
limit 139:14 190:1	350:23 353:23	244:19 245:12,13	220:12 222:16	176:25 191:16	
190:4 366:6 367:7	361:18 362:3,12	292:20,22 293:4,7	223:4 224:5	211:15 226:13,15	
limited 109:25	listed 116:23	294:12 299:3	226:18,21 227:20	291:2 356:10	
203:8 206:14	211:13 361:20	353:6	228:5 229:25	lowered 134:2	
273:24,24 274:13	listened 301:17	long-winded	232:18,24 233:3,3	135:8,16 176:1,6	
296:16 344:8	lists 122:11 298:25	312:14	233:10 234:17,24	178:15 179:14,19	
345:5	little 118:1 144:16	longer 207:5 234:5	235:10 234:17,24	247:6	
limiting 115:16	163:24 167:24	254:22 344:19	240:23 248:8,19	lowering 134:22	
limits 232:4 366:7	169:14 188:15	longer-term 215:14	254:9 256:5,22	142:12 144:6	
line 144:20,23	192:21 207:18	237:5	272:15 273:5	lowest 139:18	
164:9 174:23,24	214:8 229:4	look 136:9 159:9,22	283:6 284:12	147:10 171:11	
177:7 178:2,5	246:20 249:13	160:19,20 170:14	290:25 304:12	294:22	
180:22 181:5	273:4 279:22	174:18 175:17	311:8 314:5 317:9	lowest-cost 293:3	
183:14,18 200:2	290:20 299:18	174:18 173:17	318:18 330:16,17	330:19	
200:12 204:11	304:4 309:9 321:4	188:22 190:12,20	350:11 354:1,5	lunch 110:6 249:5	
216:3,4 218:22	326:17 335:10	190:22,23 203:24	355:24 361:10,14	250:14	
242:1,2 246:2	live 240:8	225:15 227:22	361:15 367:1	250.14	
247:3,21 257:15	lives 166:18,22,22	228:8 232:16	looks 205:23	M	
279:18 287:12,18	167:3 311:11,22	233:1,7 234:1,21	249:15 286:20	M-a-t-t-h-e-w	
288:11 292:23	load 135:9 137:7,11	236:1 237:18	306:5,10,16,21	156:11	
296:6 307:19,24	137:22 173:4	243:13,17 245:20	319:8 322:12	M-c-V-e-e 156:12	
312:24 316:16	182:23 226:22	248:2,12 256:21	Loop 107:2	M.S 87:25 369:1,15	
319:22,25 329:13	233:13,17 273:8	257:4,7 276:21	lost 134:15 329:6	ma'am 338:17	
330:24 331:2,2,5	277:17 280:17	280:14 282:15,16	356:24	340:8	
330.27 331.2,2,3	277.17 200.17	200.17 202.13,10	330.27		

				. 1 ago 002
MacNeil 206:3	mark 128:4 365:13	92:21 93:1 94:1	157:11 164:5,8	meant 325:6,16
main 138:5 183:23	365:15,25	154:16 155:4	174:9 195:2	measure 170:12
232:10,11	marked 91:22	156:1,11 353:20	214:11 229:7	326:16
maintain 227:4	120:3 123:17	maximum 363:16	MDM-3 93:3 99:16	measured 215:21
235:2	129:18 130:13	McVEE 90:15	100:21 102:8	measures 187:7
maintaining 143:5	289:11 305:24	92:21 93:1 94:1	104:17 353:21	measuring 324:22
146:12	market 139:9	115:21 117:22	354:1	mechanisms 151:9
maintains 146:19	143:25 147:3	154:16 155:4,11	MDM-4X 93:4	medium 129:14
making 115:15	151:3 192:4,16	156:1,8,11 157:6	MDM-5X 93:6	meet 120:22 123:1
141:11,24 169:21	195:11 204:25	170:19,24 171:6	MDM-6X 93:7	126:14 140:13
170:13 171:4	225:24 226:5,7,10	171:24 172:2,7,8	113:23 114:11	142:6 143:5
199:12 201:21	226:11,13,15,18	174:7 177:4	MDM-7X 93:9	144:15 146:3,23
203:8,16 225:3	226:24,25 227:5,5	180:25 184:8	MDM-8X 93:10	147:11 157:17
248:18 311:9	229:25 243:24	187:4 194:3,15,23	MDM-9X 93:12	161:14 162:2
312:8,10 335:18	244:15 245:24,25	199:16 200:1	MDX-4X 161:8	173:4 185:5
manage 162:24	271:8,17 272:5	201:7,17 206:24	mean 114:5 119:20	194:25 196:8
188:21 189:7	276:12 311:8,19	207:15 219:3	129:25 160:1	197:8 199:6 204:1
225:2 245:17	314:14 315:5,10	223:16 249:12	161:24 164:18,25	205:2 216:13
248:12 320:22	317:21 318:10	252:17 273:21	166:9 167:19	220:5,20 229:16
management 99:8	319:2,3,6,12,15	274:15 287:5,10	169:3 172:19,21	232:14 233:24
238:23	319:17 330:14	310:13 323:7	176:21 179:15,19	236:9,12 238:6
manager 210:1	markets 190:24	353:20 355:16	182:16 183:1	242:10,23 243:5
mandate 136:22	223:1 296:19	356:14	190:12 195:22	243:16 245:5
151:6 200:18	marking 128:6	McVee's 200:8,16	198:8 204:4,7,7	293:9,16,23 295:2
220:5 236:10	365:12	201:11	204:13 206:13	320:15 321:11
mandated 195:12	massive 242:9	MDM-10X 93:13	214:3 218:9,10,13	333:20 336:3
mandates 141:16	massively 320:18	MDM-11X 93:16	220:11 222:2	meeting 94:12
184:16 198:25	material 127:25	MDM-12X 93:17	224:2 226:11	146:12 170:3
204:2 208:7,12	128:18 342:24	MDM-13X 93:19	227:17 228:1	197:15 198:25
324:19 347:21	343:21 344:12	MDM-14X 93:20	236:12 238:1	199:2 207:6
mange 234:20	materially 346:4	MDM-15X 93:22	241:14,15 242:13	209:23 210:9,16
manner 189:8	materials 96:8	166:10	243:3 244:8,11	211:3,5,21 218:3
223:11 227:10	331:14	MDM-16X 93:23	252:11 277:16,17	245:11 246:8,14
229:15 231:3	math 160:14	MDM-17X 94:3	298:21 319:3,10	246:18 248:18
manual 255:7,10	Matrix 91:23	114:14 185:13	330:16 332:21	290:3 299:14,21
manually 296:10	Matt's 200:12,25	MDM-18x 94:4	340:25 358:7	300:1,14,18 301:1
map 152:21	matter 87:4 98:11	116:5 175:13	Meaning 226:2	301:15,19,22
Mar 100:5,8	107:17,20 116:8	MDM-19X 94:6	meaningful 150:5	302:6 305:25
101:14,17 102:23	122:15 125:25	MDM-1T 92:24	meaningfully	306:17 334:8
103:5 105:7,10	126:19 154:25	MDM-20X 94:9	133:23	meetings 210:25
March 96:18,20	173:11 245:11	205:6	means 153:21	301:4,6,11,18
124:2 167:4	327:2 342:16	MDM-21X 94:10	171:5 173:17	305:16 326:9
287:21 303:14	356:12	209:8 212:15	192:19 230:12	megawatt 242:24
304:16,23 306:10	matters 128:20	MDM-22X 94:12	240:12 246:18	megawatt-hour
308:11,19 313:21	368:2	210:10,17 324:4	247:13 248:16	292:10,11
313:25 317:22	Matthew 90:15	MDM-2T 92:25	317:25 334:22	megawatt-hours
	•	•	•	•

			1	
183:24 233:16	microphone 118:1	325:13 327:15	mortgage 190:25	291:4
291:9 332:22	127:4 155:1,8	modeling 121:25	191:1	multistate 202:3
334:13,16,23	microphones	122:13 124:2,8	Moser 89:3 90:11	225:14 344:19
335:2	110:16	140:17 150:7,17	90:23 108:12,13	345:18
megawatts 181:10	mid-morning 110:4	150:20,20 197:21	111:3,19 132:7	Multnomah 88:11
274:10,10 283:1	middle 274:22,23	214:20 229:4	145:14 249:17	89:21
291:22 329:14	Mihaly 89:9	230:25 231:6	250:13 288:23	muted 110:16
334:8	miles 327:18	252:10,14 253:18	289:2 295:9	
megawatts' 275:11	million 144:2	255:1,11 281:5	366:17	
282:24	212:25 213:3,3,9	298:4,7 303:4,18	motion 101:9	N 99:4 103:17,19
member 152:4,12	213:17,19 285:14	305:21 307:1	102:18 120:14	N-W-E-C 109:5
152:16,23 153:18	290:7,20,21	311:9,14 320:4	130:12 131:1,5,7	name 107:14
210:3	294:14 295:4	321:1 342:2,5,8	131:11,13,14	151:17 156:9,11
members 152:11	334:25 335:1	models 330:22	366:11,18 367:10	189:13 228:20
258:3,7	millions 240:6	modest 136:2	motions 90:7 110:4	251:10,12 295:23
memory 358:12	Milt 88:5	modifications	131:2	324:15 338:9
mentioned 197:20	mind 193:23 293:6	198:9	Mountain 98:7	352:10,12 360:11
220:24 221:21	356:25	modular 282:4	116:10 189:11,15	360:13
231:18 236:8	mine 284:9,14	moment 109:24	189:19	named 148:12,17
merely 172:11	354:3	114:4 129:19	move 119:1 129:5	148:21
met 158:5 209:10	minimize 159:25	178:7 185:10	131:19 171:8	nameplate 181:11
209:21 210:6	161:17 162:3	242:11 256:21	234:7 245:15	naming 314:6
methodologies	minimum 148:12	351:8	312:21 358:10	narrow 318:4 345:8
220:25 346:17	148:15 200:19	moments 187:19	moved 119:5 186:3	narrower 355:25
methodology	339:4,9	Monday 107:1,12	moving 114:14	nation 149:3 152:2
117:17,20 138:8,9	minute 161:9 257:3	money 121:2	116:5 118:4 121:7	153:13 154:3
138:13,16,19	minutes 109:25	147:14 186:19,22	189:10 197:7	207:22 209:11
141:13 164:13,19	133:5 194:2,5	243:8	198:5 212:11	211:21 212:6
164:20 165:5,9,19	249:6,19,25	monitoring 152:8	238:3 240:17	213:20 214:18,23
191:15 192:1,7,10	250:14 318:22	Montana 89:16	244:22 245:3	215:5,11 218:7,14
193:11 198:3	misinterpret	months 114:17,18	272:11 316:17	218:16
221:9,13,16,24	239:23	131:6 167:5,6	330:24 342:10	National 104:7
244:25 324:22	misleading 124:11	190:19 287:9	347:19 356:7	nations 219:6,19
338:25 344:19	missed 131:3 339:7	288:5 304:15	363:2	Natrium 183:9,25
345:18,22 356:1	mistake 287:25	morning 107:11,25	MSP 138:7 165:14	184:3,10 185:4
methods 326:4	misunderstanding	108:4,8,12,17	165:15 339:24	281:25 282:6,14
metric 328:18	313:19	109:1,10,17	much-needed	282:23 330:25
metrics 115:17	mitigation 235:9	118:21 133:8	320:24	331:1,7,21,24
121:2 143:22	mixed 226:3 299:18	136:14 142:9	multi-jurisdictio	332:15,19 334:14
144:9 167:25	Mm-hmm 158:12	145:14 148:9	139:4	natural 152:5
168:2,5,11,15	206:16 216:24	149:7,10 151:15	multiple 109:20	277:14,16,18
169:7,9 175:2	218:1 233:5	156:8 157:6,8	150:6 222:14	278:4 310:18,20
176:7,13 230:8	235:14 313:17	174:7,8 194:23,24	232:21 299:12	311:12 357:21
234:21,22 235:2	model 121:24	207:15,16,17	multiplied 291:8	natural-gas-fired
324:16,25 325:2,7	150:22 304:8	223:15,16,18	292:10	358:2
326:1 346:5	311:23 321:14	231:12	multiply 161:1	navigate 204:16
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	Ī	Ī	1	ı
near 134:10 141:5	158:6 169:25	326:9,19 328:4	normally 278:23	282:4,5 334:5,10
197:8 255:4 274:1	172:10 188:10	331:16 339:15	Northeast 88:11	number 143:19
294:10 330:10	209:16 216:25	346:17	89:21	145:21 213:3
344:20	218:8 221:25	news 94:6 116:6	Northwest 89:13	216:3 236:21
near-term 134:2	224:6 226:22	129:7 185:22	89:13 104:1,6	243:18 254:14
252:18 271:6,18	243:23 247:5	NewsData 96:20	105:1,14 108:24	255:17 277:3
291:3 293:24	293:17 321:9,18	98:15 122:8	108:24 109:4,4	290:17 291:9
322:6 330:8	350:16	Nez 151:25	124:4 132:16,16	294:22 299:22
nearly 288:7	negotiate 133:22	nice 140:17 194:25	149:12,12 152:22	318:17 324:1
necessarily 161:2	negotiation 138:9	252:6	193:18 194:15	327:18 334:11,13
203:24 214:13	222:6	night 119:21	195:9 205:13	344:8 366:8
279:8 319:10	negotiations 163:8	120:13 237:11	231:5 257:19	numbered 284:15
325:6	167:22 221:2	274:20,23,24	295:13 307:22	numbering 121:8
necessary 147:14	222:7 223:10	284:24	311:5,21	302:10 338:21,23
195:13 270:14	273:14,16 357:5	night's 299:23	Northwest's 195:6	numbering's 354:6
276:9	net 118:12 144:11	nighttime 278:22	200:23 342:18	numbers 137:10
necessitate 145:22	176:19 177:1,6,12	nine 114:17	Nos 99:10 100:20	242:20 253:12
need 110:13 141:2	177:24 178:3,15	No(s) 94:5 96:10	102:7 104:12	255:16 272:13
149:24 151:2	179:13,19,22	100:18	notably 291:6	299:18,22 333:1
179:24 182:20	199:7 246:9	Non-confidential	note 113:18 123:9	333:11 334:25
184:17,18 185:8	275:14 283:16	270:8	129:6 130:11	numerically 168:7
191:3 200:18	353:7 358:23	non-dispatchable	180:18 201:8	NW 104:1 105:1,14
209:2 214:13	neutral 147:12	178:24	249:8,10 258:17	NWEC 104:11
220:16 226:2,4	neutrality 136:22	non-emitting 137:8	367:11	105:14 109:5
230:5 232:15	140:8	137:12,23 138:12	noted 115:25	193:18 194:16
233:16,23 234:11	never 124:14	138:20 139:17	176:25 184:6	205:13 217:8
234:14,16 237:3	135:24 278:6	140:11,14 141:14	187:3 211:9 316:9	231:5 295:13
237:14 238:20	309:3 319:19	159:17 163:10	316:14	311:5 312:18
246:19 247:23	348:3	165:6 184:18	notes 94:13 210:16	315:24 342:17
249:7 252:18,22	new 94:21 95:5	189:4 199:8	211:5	NWEC's 215:17
258:14 274:6	138:13,16,19	222:17 232:6	notice 93:13 127:25	307:20 311:21
276:11,13 283:2	141:12 163:20	233:21 234:11,14	128:2 145:4	
288:1 309:20	164:12 165:4,9	236:24 237:22	231:24 235:22,23	0
316:7 321:15	184:21,22 191:15	273:7,15 276:16	303:16 365:24	object 114:16 130:9
323:9 324:6	197:18 200:14	280:17 281:3	noticed 207:5	164:18 170:18
329:22 333:18,21	202:14,19 204:8	299:4 333:25	November 116:15	177:3,7 199:14
334:9 335:9	220:20 221:12,23	334:5,10 335:17	124:3 137:1 190:8	278:17 315:22
337:11 338:15	222:16 229:3	346:18 348:18	305:9 308:16	316:3 343:17
340:7 345:19	230:1 233:21	non-price 328:14	344:14 366:5	345:1
367:16	236:24 238:15,18	328:17	367:24 369:11	objected 170:21
needed 110:5,6	239:1,7,10,17	nonbinding 216:11	NOx 327:4	347:25
163:17 228:9,10	240:18,21,23,24	221:8	NREL 253:12,17	objecting 113:6
233:8 304:2	240:25 246:10	nonconforming	253:21,24 254:5	184:5
needing 293:23	276:1 281:24	317:25	255:16,17,20	objection 112:12
297:6 312:6	282:3,4 305:2	nonexistent 316:22	271:11 272:3,9,13	113:5,5,14,17,18
needs 126:13 145:3	320:3 325:20	nonlocal 249:18	nuclear 183:3,6,13	113:24 115:8,24
	1			<u> </u>

	i i		1	I
116:14 117:11	offered 148:17	189:23 190:1,10	310:1,4 312:23	operate 173:2
118:22 122:2,6,10	offerings 148:14	193:11 194:5,11	316:8 318:14,22	192:15 202:13
123:17 125:16,18	offers 143:19	194:12 195:24	318:23,25 319:20	204:24
125:21 126:4,6	office 88:16,21 99:7	196:5 197:4,4	321:24 323:11,14	operated 232:21
128:15 130:15,17	257:12	203:21 205:11	323:16,18,24	operating 301:7
171:22 180:18	official 184:25	207:8,10 208:15	328:19 333:10	307:9
200:13 283:24	offset 237:10 286:2	208:19 209:7,10	336:10,17,19	operation 192:12
284:10 344:3	286:6	209:25 210:3,6,9	337:13,13,16	203:5 331:6,20
objections 110:23	offsetting 120:21	210:19 211:2,5,13	338:18 341:6	operational 190:17
112:2,2,9,17	121:3 144:4	211:16,19 212:4	342:10 350:24	operations 92:22
114:10 117:8	283:16 285:13	212:11 213:2,10	351:1 354:11,14	93:2 94:2 152:15
118:6,23 122:20	286:4 327:20,20	213:13,16,23	359:9 364:13,22	156:14 185:17,18
124:24 125:4,5,7	oh 119:22 159:18	214:6,9,10,24	365:11,21 366:2	189:19,21 193:14
125:8 126:22,24	167:14 175:21	215:3,9,15 216:7	366:20,25 367:19	198:1 202:10
127:6,9,12,21	216:4 284:7,21	217:8 218:4,17	368:1	232:21 276:18
128:10,19,22,24	285:1 337:7	219:25 220:9,22	Olympia 88:17	277:4
129:7,16 130:10	361:13	221:14,19 223:12	once 116:1 128:4,4	Operator 98:21
131:12 203:14	okay 112:15 113:3	225:9,21 227:8,13	155:10 192:12	opine 199:16
316:7,9 340:24	114:7 115:24	229:6 230:16	238:24 326:20,24	opined 200:4
objectives 190:5	117:7 120:1 121:6	235:24 241:18,24	336:25	opinion 172:17
objects 164:17	122:1,6,18 124:18	242:4,5 244:4	one's 299:24	188:11,14 200:3
obligation 199:5	125:3,15 126:1,20	245:19 248:23	ones 117:8 162:16	201:7,11 216:16
obligations 145:4	127:5,13,18,22	249:22,25 252:13	236:4 241:1	329:25
147:12 153:16,17	130:4,19,20,25	252:23 253:1,3,10	285:19	opinions 188:8
207:20 324:9	131:8 132:3,6,10	253:16,20 254:3,9	ongoing 212:2	344:7
347:21 348:2	132:15,20,24	254:24 255:14	301:3	opportunities
observed 298:18	133:3 154:12,18	256:1,11 257:2,22	online 249:24	130:6 149:5 211:7
obvious 297:3,4	154:19,22,22	258:1,20,25 259:2	256:21 257:4	opportunity 111:24
obviously 294:5	155:14 157:19	270:22 272:10,15	258:7 259:3	112:3 118:17
335:6	158:19 159:5,11	273:3,4 276:14	onset 154:9	119:5 124:21
occasion 210:7	159:13 160:5	277:13 278:9	onwards 318:3	127:1 130:8
occur 282:9	161:5,13 163:3,9	279:14,22 280:10	OPCU 339:14,16	149:13 153:9
occurred 270:19	164:4,17 166:10	280:13,20 281:2	OPEC 125:21	201:8 211:10
Oct 99:15,21,23	166:13,14,21	283:3 284:16	open 200:19 227:4	221:4 274:19
101:5,7 102:14,16	167:2,11,24 168:4	285:3,8,11,22	317:19 342:23	293:13 303:16
104:16,23 105:4	168:7,13,25	286:8,10,15,23	opening 90:3,8,9	304:8 305:20
October 87:11	169:20 170:1,2	287:2,5,10,19,23	90:10,11,12,13,14	366:14
107:2,12 130:14	171:14 173:22	288:10,15,18	109:19,21,22,23	opposed 138:18
136:25 299:14,21	174:18 175:1,7,12	289:6,17,19,20,20	131:15,17,18,19	341:19
300:2,25 304:14	175:22,25 176:5	289:22,25 290:16	131:21,24 132:1,9	opposite 115:2
369:5	176:10,15,18,23	292:23 293:4,8,25	132:14,18,23	339:25
off-ramp 239:21	179:12 180:5	294:12,24,24	133:1 148:21	opt 147:25
offer 144:14,16	181:4,10,15,18	295:9 296:20	149:14 154:12	opted 272:2
148:19 153:21	182:1 183:9	298:16 300:1,7,20	220:3	optimal 325:25
271:19 272:1	185:13 186:13,15	301:21 302:16	Openings 109:24	Optimize 98:9
293:14 332:1	186:17,21 189:17	305:22 307:8	opens 203:19	optimized 311:14
			- F	

	100 - 7 - 100 -		07.00.00.00.00	
option 222:16	190:6,7 193:2	overbuild 236:22	95:22,23 96:1,4,9	207:25 209:10,14
292:5 294:18	228:10 234:15	321:10	96:11,12,14,15,19	209:21 210:6,23
311:24 330:19	313:7 316:6	overbuilding	96:23 97:5,7,8,10	211:3,7,9 212:13
options 139:14	Oregon's 349:13	241:17 321:4	97:11,13,14,16,17	212:24 213:13,18
184:22 191:25	organization	overlap 228:11	97:19,20,22,23	215:4 217:15
204:18 222:22	151:22	overprocure	98:4,5,11,16,18	219:7 221:3,8
223:5 230:15	organizations	233:23	98:19,23 99:16,18	223:23 225:10
240:24 293:12,18	211:25 217:5	overrule 129:16	100:17,21,23	226:6 247:4
299:4 315:3	219:16	172:16 188:13	102:9,11 104:18	251:15 252:9
317:19 319:9	original 191:21	201:6 344:3	104:20 107:20	253:11,16 254:10
330:15,16	297:6 309:22	345:10	108:1 112:9,16	254:25 257:24
OPUC 96:17,21	originally 254:23	overruled 180:19	115:1,15 116:9,10	270:13 272:6
98:15 121:10	317:11	overview 90:5	117:16 118:10	273:7,14 279:24
123:3,3,23 128:25	originate 342:14	owned 151:23	120:25 122:2,9,11	280:16,21 281:2
129:3 313:4 314:1	Oshie 89:20 109:12	ozone 139:21	122:24 126:13	281:10 282:6,19
315:17 318:8	154:18,20 155:7	231:19	128:2,10,25	284:18 285:15
order 93:16 96:16	OTR 232:1,3,7,20		134:25 135:21,22	293:5 295:1 296:9
98:13 99:12,21,21	236:4	<u>P</u>	136:23 137:2,16	299:11 302:11
100:5 101:4,5,9	out-of-state 141:3	p.m 249:4,6,10	137:18,21 138:5	303:4 308:15
101:14 102:13,14	outcome 134:14	250:2,4,4,8 275:6	138:16,17,18	309:4 313:21,25
102:18,23 104:13	147:1 197:9 298:6	335:1 368:7	139:4,8,12,15,19	315:2 316:23
104:22,23 105:7	298:14,15 309:5	Pac 123:5 189:14	140:2,5,11,21	317:13,16 319:7
110:2,14 125:21	326:2 339:19	321:25	141:8,11,20	320:2,5 322:2
126:10,11 135:22	369:9	PAC-192:3	142:11,15,22	324:8,12 332:21
142:1 147:22	outcomes 307:7	PAC-10C 92:15	143:6,17,18,19	341:7,8,11,17
149:25 151:2	325:10	PAC-11 92:17	144:12,14,17	342:12,25 343:5,7
163:15 164:12	outdated 135:2	PAC-2 92:4	145:2,6,8,9,21	343:11 344:21
167:2 176:19,24	196:25	PAC-3 92:6	146:3,11,14 147:2	345:16 346:16
177:3,14 179:13	outflow 244:18	PAC-492:7	147:8,13,19,25	347:12,19 348:17
196:21 200:5	outline 113:5	PAC-5 92:8	149:3 150:8,14,22	348:22 349:7
291:14,24 308:11	outlined 164:23	PAC-6 92:10	151:3 153:11,20	353:19 355:18
308:18,21,25	222:12	PAC-7 92:11	154:9,15 156:13	356:13 358:24
334:3 342:19	outreach 202:24	PAC-8C 92:12	156:15 157:20	363:19
343:9 344:16	208:19 213:13	PAC-9 92:14	160:5,11,14,16	PacifiCorp's 93:14
346:1,7 363:18	215:12 216:25	pace 134:19	161:14,21 162:7	96:17 98:11 99:10
ordered 190:7	217:13 218:6,15	Pacifi- 118:9	163:9 164:12,17	99:11,13,20,22
339:15,16	219:5	Pacific 87:4 88:9	165:13,16,18	100:4,6,19 101:3
ordering 151:9	outside 139:25	98:12 107:21	166:23 167:14	101:6,13,15 102:3
198:19	157:19 161:20	PacifiCorp 87:4	168:13,25 172:9	102:7,12,15,22
orders 139:3	162:5,21 200:5	88:9,11 91:24	172:12 177:14	103:3 104:11,13
Oregon 88:12 89:5	212:2 347:10,21	92:1,21 93:1,3,4,6	180:2 184:9 185:5	104:15,21 105:3,6
89:22 93:16 98:10	outstanding 90:7	93:7,9,10,12,17	186:21 187:7,23	105:8 112:6
124:17 126:9,14	110:3 113:13	93:19,20,22,23	188:2,17 189:13	113:23 116:5
128:23 139:1,3	131:2,7 162:22	94:1,4,8,9,16,23	190:2 191:14	117:4 121:11
151:24 153:20	overall 181:13,14	95:1,7,8,10,11,13	192:8,22 195:7,10	124:1 127:6
160:12 189:14	275:14 327:1	95:14,16,17,19,20	195:18 205:13	133:10,11 134:15
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

134:20 135:13	315:7,24 319:23	particularly 185:11	pay 160:25 179:9	309:24 331:3
138:2 140:18	339:14,21 340:3,4	294:10 327:4	185:19 240:4	332:17,20 333:24
141:5,22 142:4,24	366:6,7 367:7	parties 109:20,22	336:6	334:17 335:3,16
142:25 143:9,11	pages 87:14 212:19	110:15 111:23	payers 143:13,23	percentage 168:19
143:25 144:10	229:8 258:19	112:3,19 113:6	154:2	242:23 255:23
145:2,18 146:2,6	366:10,12,18,22	120:6 126:12,23	paying 160:23	279:15 339:24,25
146:10,12 147:7	366:24	127:15,24 130:9	PČAM 119:15	percentages 279:24
148:5,13 149:16	pancake 160:22	131:17,21 132:8	144:7 175:5 284:3	332:21 355:21
149:20 150:7	paper 168:21	132:13 133:4	286:12	Perfect 114:9 285:8
151:1 153:13	290:13,14 294:13	134:16 135:14	PDF 212:21 314:23	361:17 363:12
154:4 157:15	332:25 333:5	153:14 165:14	peak 274:4 276:13	perfectly 318:9
159:24 166:14	papers 129:8	167:15,23 177:17	277:24 293:16	358:24
168:1 177:18	paragraph 186:17	191:23 194:3	peakers 334:5,10	performed 285:13
187:12 189:10,21	paraphrasing	200:20 222:7,11	335:14,15,17	performs 276:6
207:21 210:3,16	356:15	223:8 239:22	peaking 277:18	period 133:14
216:15 217:1	pardon 286:17	248:6 249:7,9	penalize 142:15	142:13,13,20,21
247:6 253:3 255:3	parent 115:7 186:1	328:10 337:3	145:6,8	144:21,23 145:20
270:22 272:16	part 130:16 164:18	366:7,11,14 367:4	penalties 134:1	146:5,9,17 150:3
286:12,17 290:2	164:21 165:2,4,8	368:3	135:19 147:22	179:22 181:5
297:18 298:4	166:25 184:11,21	parties' 110:2	361:19,23 362:5	196:22 213:2
306:24 307:20	191:16 197:19	131:24 132:25	362:13,18 363:17	235:20 287:13
308:3,4 341:14	206:2 209:1	partly 335:6	364:8	293:10 295:3
346:18 348:8,14	210:10,25 217:1	partnered 211:23	penalty 145:10	306:12,18 322:19
349:10 353:6,11	217:12 231:13	parts 198:5 217:6	361:7 362:9,15,20	periods 237:14
358:16 363:9	232:1,11,11	233:18 278:14	362:22 363:16	permit 141:22,25
pacing 146:13	233:19 257:15	296:18	people 240:8 294:4	183:21
page 90:2 91:2,22	273:11 282:11,12	party 93:3 94:22	307:2 317:8	permits 331:15
92:2,23 94:18	299:5 303:5 324:9	99:16,18 100:21	Perce 151:25	persisting 270:24
95:3 96:3 97:3	336:5 352:14	100:23 102:8,10	perceived 311:20	person 249:18
98:3 99:3 100:3	partial 112:2 125:8	104:17,19 112:25	percent 134:7,12	257:20 301:9,16
100:13 101:2,22	partials 125:17	129:12 130:15	137:7,9,9,9,11,18	305:10
102:2 103:2,10,18	participant 257:7	194:14 257:13,24	137:19,19,19,20	personal 99:8
104:2 105:2,15	participants 257:4	259:3 353:19	137:22 148:14	128:18 187:4
106:2,9 157:11	participate 192:16	356:19 357:1	150:10 168:20	320:16
164:5,9,9 165:21	223:1	362:14,21 369:8	169:3,5,9 191:11	personally 169:12
174:11,18,19,24	participating	passage 209:11	199:8 215:21,23	297:23
175:18 186:15	310:17	path 136:17 137:5	216:14 217:11,15	perspective 112:6
195:2 200:2,11	participation	140:7 322:11	217:21,24 218:5	126:18 133:10
201:12 211:8,15	204:25 216:9,12	patience 270:11	220:14 233:12,20	145:17 147:5
212:17,20 215:18	216:13,18,22	patri50931@aol	236:20 240:3,4	172:20 173:21
215:19 247:2,3	217:4 310:15	89:24	241:25,25 242:5,6	247:16 332:16
283:6 285:12	338:24	Patrick 89:20	242:10 245:21	334:11,23
289:23 296:3	particular 175:18	109:12	247:23,24 248:10	persuasive 129:1
299:7 300:4 306:3	187:20 188:22	pause 194:7 250:3	280:17,21,24,25	pertains 128:16
307:16 312:22	222:20 224:13,14	320:20	281:7,8 282:19	phased 99:14
314:22,23,24	247:22 279:12	paused 318:5	283:2 291:7	104:16 255:8
	I	I	I	l

phases 328:2	121:16,18 133:14	337:17 338:9,18	326:22 327:4,7,9	possible 190:18
phone 256:16	135:17 140:11,19	345:11 351:15	pollution 327:14,21	223:2 239:4
257:14	142:23,24 143:3,4	352:10 353:13,14	pool 159:16 349:1	240:21 241:12
phrasing 309:9	142.23,24 143.3,4	354:22 355:2	pools 160:3,4	277:16 292:17
physical 180:12	145.12,13,23	356:8,25 357:8,17	popular 240:8	293:8 294:9,25
1 0		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1 1	300:19 355:16
physically 180:6	163:12,21 172:1	357:24 359:20	populations 324:23 325:1	
picked 294:22	172:20 180:20	360:11 361:8		358:24
Pierce 369:2	183:2 184:11,21	362:3 363:2,15	portfolio 92:12,14	possibly 150:23
PIM 96:11,14	187:24 197:16,18	plotted 242:1	92:15,17 150:17	196:3 321:17
299:14,21 302:20	197:23 198:16	plug 312:9	192:14 272:22	post-COVID 301:7
305:25	199:12 201:20	plus 193:4 275:24	282:10,15 285:20	post-hearing 366:4
pivot 223:7	202:24,25 224:8	282:23	298:4 302:21	post-modeling
place 155:1 204:5	225:20 227:4,9	PO 88:17	303:4 307:6,11	309:18
230:3 235:1	228:12 229:20	point 119:19	309:14 321:8	post-MSP 355:25
277:12	237:13,19 238:14	164:14 165:16	325:5,6,8,14,15	potential 116:9
placed 275:1	246:21 251:14	170:22,23 177:3	325:18,25 326:1,5	127:25 160:10
plainly 140:20	293:10 295:3	178:10 179:23	326:12,13,15,19	182:10 189:1
142:24	312:4 326:19	180:19 182:14	327:25	192:23 193:6
plan 87:5 98:12	341:12 350:5	200:7 209:4	portfolios 304:22	197:2,24 226:14
107:22 110:4	353:6	211:17 232:23	305:3,14 325:24	227:15 332:24
114:8 119:8,9	plans 98:9 109:15	233:2 234:6,23	326:17	potentiality 355:24
131:21,22 132:18	115:1 136:19	239:18 256:4	portion 87:20	potentially 123:6
132:22 134:7,11	143:7 197:7 254:8	293:2,25 294:17	168:23 187:20	193:2 223:3 244:1
136:16 137:13,20	plant 275:19	300:22 303:11	258:15 259:7	256:2 305:3
138:2 141:6,20	276:25 277:15	305:10 308:1	339:12	power 87:4 88:9
142:15 143:1,5,7	327:8,10 334:14	312:10 317:17	portions 110:17	96:7 98:12 107:21
144:24 145:2,9	plants 241:2 274:21	329:24 335:8	190:23	116:10 118:5,12
149:6,17 181:25	275:3 315:11,12	345:3,7 349:1	Portland 88:12	119:2,10 120:22
184:9 189:7	327:17,17 358:2	355:6	89:5,22 150:11	139:2 144:1,4,6
203:18 204:9	play 110:5	pointed 201:24	pose 153:17	159:1,3 161:5
214:24 215:12	pleading 362:14,22	pointing 248:7	poses 175:25	168:18 175:8,9
217:16,18,19	please 110:19,23	points 203:14	position 134:17	176:1,2,5,19
218:13 228:2	111:2 127:18	policies 202:18,20	160:5 165:8	177:1,6,12,24
230:6 233:6	155:11,15 156:9	203:7 204:23	185:15 198:8	178:3,15 179:13
240:13 243:5	156:10 171:9	205:3 312:6	216:1,2,7 217:9	179:19,22 189:11
245:15 252:16,19	174:9 175:12	349:11,13	219:20 224:3	189:14,15 209:24
253:9 305:8 320:2	186:13 188:12	policy 92:21 93:1	227:4 239:9	210:1 212:8
320:15 321:15	194:13 195:1	94:1 151:22	240:20 241:8	274:21,23 275:3
322:11,17 331:2	250:18 251:10,11	156:14 172:8	246:19,22 251:13	275:17 277:12,21
338:24 345:17	251:13 256:6	173:9 185:17,18	270:22 286:22	278:10,11 279:24
planned 181:23	257:3 279:2 283:5	190:5 198:13	312:18 331:4	283:16 285:13,25
183:18,25 317:12	283:19 296:2	202:15,16 222:18	342:17,18 347:20	286:11 315:5
341:19 356:11	298:9 299:17	238:18 239:2	358:24	335:19 336:4
planners 241:15	300:4 302:9	328:7 344:12	positive 328:18	353.19 330.4
planning 94:17	305:23 307:14		positive 328.18 possibilities 195:23	Power's 189:19
95:1 96:1 98:7		pollutant 326:24	-	
95.1 90:1 98:7	313:20 314:17,22	pollutants 326:21	possibility 241:5	power- 158:24

				. 1
PPA 168:22,24	289:7 326:16	335:7,16	90:2 91:2	346:3 356:9,22,23
169:5 276:3	345:5	problem 154:21	process 118:22	357:3 358:12
291:21 292:20	prevent 134:22	192:11 216:10	157:22 170:6	procurements
334:21	189:1 192:7	330:7 331:6,7,9	184:11,21 187:24	274:1
PPAs 169:11	193:12 342:12	358:18 361:9	197:16 200:6,19	procures 144:5,12
330:17	343:13	problematic 112:24	205:25 206:3,20	procuring 143:15
practice 253:20	previewed 217:19	223:4	222:6 228:2,15	157:23 174:13
317:19 331:19	previously 111:5	problems 356:13	229:21 235:10	230:2,12,13
pre-existing 278:19	112:14 133:16	procedural 118:15	238:14 247:23	244:15 245:6
precedent 135:15	214:4	118:21	254:16 286:24	246:22
precedential	price 192:4 230:1	proceed 113:19	301:3,13 303:6	produced 125:12
203:11,12	253:13,18 271:11	117:25 120:15	305:12,15 317:6	product 117:2
predetermined	271:24 272:5	126:23 133:6	318:3 332:5	293:18
146:8	292:11 294:17,22	136:13 154:13	processes 197:18	production 292:8
predicted 321:23	330:11 342:7	155:21 156:25	228:12	productive 274:22
prefer 154:24	prices 139:9 160:8	180:22 194:17	procrastinate	products 293:21
preference 112:21	164:22 226:15	195:21 207:3	142:5	profile 177:22
112:25 113:1	227:6 254:23	250:25 251:25	procrastination	346:5
preferred 272:21	255:21,25 294:10	281:16 288:21	141:7	program 92:5,6,7
302:21 307:6	315:11 329:12,20	295:15 318:24	procure 126:14	148:14,16,22
326:2	330:1,2	337:24 340:12	135:22 144:2,15	339:4,9
prefiled 90:6	pricing 253:17,22	351:22 352:23	146:21 147:3	programs 154:6
109:18 111:22,24	254:6 255:1 294:2	360:1,24 367:3	148:2 158:5,13	193:5 208:8,12,17
126:24 129:17,21	primarily 118:7	proceeding 117:17	163:16 192:17	213:10,14 216:15
prejudicial 117:5	133:13 136:7	119:10 122:24	231:2 248:3	216:20 217:17,22
124:11 187:2	149:15 255:6	124:9 125:1	271:10 295:1	217:25 218:2
prepare 306:25	primary 229:9	128:12 129:13	322:1,18 342:19	233:9
prepared 132:8	240:10 305:10	143:4 153:9	procured 123:6	progress 99:14
206:3 289:14	printout 289:18	156:17 177:13,25	158:15 273:7,11	104:15 135:18
presence 369:5	prior 114:20	187:23 188:2	330:4	136:20 137:14
present 169:24	116:20 118:11	196:6,12 197:10	procurement	138:1 140:21
182:3 258:7	124:24 206:7	203:13 251:17	120:22 123:11	141:10,16,18,21
270:23 273:2	226:12 253:16	257:16 258:9	135:11 140:19	141:24 146:11
301:19 303:2	300:18 301:2	313:8,9 316:10	143:21 150:23,25	149:21 150:5,16
presentation 110:3	303:6 307:7	352:14 356:2	151:6 157:16	169:21,25 170:3
presented 304:14	358:11,15 361:5	358:17 360:16	163:7 175:1	170:13 171:5
presents 152:20	prioritize 222:17	361:19 362:4,13	192:23 195:13	185:1 198:25
president 92:21	priority 223:6,6	362:15,23 365:16	199:12 201:20	199:13,17 201:21
93:1 94:1 156:14	224:21 320:16	proceedings 90:1	202:1,2,4,5 206:2	228:19 229:1
172:8 185:15	privy 185:23	91:1 107:7 121:16	223:7,21 224:1	234:15 247:5,11
presiding 87:16	proactive 258:10	165:25 166:2,6	227:10 228:4	247:16,19,20,21
107:17	probably 236:22	178:4 194:7 250:3	229:23 240:25	248:10,16,17
presumably 189:18	240:7 254:19	270:8 347:22	245:8 246:6 248:4	282:12 303:13
217:16 218:6	283:2 313:15	348:3 361:21	248:7 252:14	341:1 363:4,9
pretty 242:2,9	318:22 323:17	368:6 369:4,6	271:2,18 320:13	progress' 247:9
249:19 274:5	331:15 334:21	PROCEEDINGS	321:6,17 341:17	project 89:8 96:19
	l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	ı	ı	ı

				<u> </u>
103:17 108:16,18	172:17 201:9	100:12,17,19	365:12	330:24 343:4,17
132:11 148:8,11	205:19 225:5	101:1,21 102:1,6	pursue 140:5	345:11,13 348:1
149:1 183:9	240:11 245:12	103:1 108:7,9	144:17 159:6	348:10,25 349:23
275:25 276:5	250:21 254:22	115:14 117:11	276:2 315:4	351:10 354:25
281:25 287:16	270:25 274:8,19	118:9,13,17,25	pursuing 183:3	355:25 356:7,24
316:24,25 317:3	275:16 278:20	119:17 120:9,15	273:16 275:24	357:7 358:9,10
317:13 323:16	292:8 303:4,19	127:5,17 128:23	purview 320:15	363:13
projected 137:10	312:17 332:20	129:8 132:3 139:1	push 230:18	questionable
183:14	335:13,18 337:19	142:8,14,17 145:7	pushing 243:8	307:22
projecting 334:24	346:6 347:2	173:25 182:16	put 127:24 129:8	questioning 177:7
projections 280:20	359:22 363:5	202:8 249:23	145:3 148:25	178:5 180:23
projects 153:4	provided 213:19	258:18 281:16	212:19 221:9	218:22 279:18
158:23 162:16	214:8 228:17	284:19 285:4,7	235:1,23 237:9	316:16 319:22
204:11 213:8	247:8 300:18	300:1 301:6,11,12	241:11,23 309:15	345:5 346:13
239:13 252:22	303:9 305:20	301:18 303:16	312:8 329:24	questionnaire
254:22 297:9,10	306:16 313:6	306:12,15 307:4	350:21,22	328:5,12
314:5,11 317:9	361:22	326:8 338:24	putting 153:22	questions 90:18,19
319:8 330:17	provider 225:6	347:20 351:8,12	157:24 162:10	90:19,20,20 91:4
331:16	provides 126:10,17	351:22 354:15,17	240:5 246:16	110:25 111:16
proper 121:5	148:19 159:2	354:22 359:15,17		113:9 115:11
122:14	204:25 225:23	361:14,19,22	Q	128:8,19 136:10
property 173:11	362:19	362:9 363:5,7,16	Q3 293:16	155:10 170:19
proposal 93:14	providing 126:21	363:16 365:4,5,8	Qualification	173:23 180:19
150:2 198:2 310:3	128:13 153:23	366:23	103:13	184:3 194:3
311:2 312:2	246:12	publicize 318:6	quantify 306:24	218:18 219:3,22
proposals 252:22	proving 142:22	published 152:19	quantity 327:1	219:24 220:2,23
310:14	provision 208:11	292:2	question 94:13	236:9 238:20
propose 165:19	provisions 331:19	PUC 93:16 98:10	111:4 113:21,21	241:19,22 248:22
249:4	332:8 336:3	150:12	121:19 145:18	248:24 252:8
proposed 135:2	proxy 292:7,13	Puget 150:1	146:13 162:5	256:2 281:14,23
145:19 167:20,20	293:4,7 299:3,4	pull 114:2 161:9	171:9 178:2,7,12	295:10 318:17
310:16 326:5	322:14	256:25 284:8	179:12 188:3,7,10	322:21 323:6,9,22
proposing 167:14	prudence 147:17	289:14 302:9	188:14 196:9	324:7 328:13,20
proprietary 271:13	227:14,16,18	332:4	199:20 200:11,13	335:21,24 336:18
protection 152:3	234:7	purchase 122:9,11	200:22,23,24,25	336:20 340:21,22
187:7	prudency 311:15	168:18 229:15	201:2,11,13,15	342:20 347:12,16
protections 115:4	prudent 139:16	234:24	203:22 204:7	349:18 350:7
protocol 138:15	158:5 189:8 203:5	purchased 329:11	216:19 218:23	351:1 354:20
164:23 191:20	227:10 238:22	purchases 99:6	221:20 222:4	359:2,7 361:6,7
198:3 221:4	248:12	133:20 276:12	238:1,21 243:13	363:24 364:19,21
222:13 280:2	PS1 92:12,14,15,17	315:6,10 329:16	243:15 247:1	364:22 367:4
proven 238:23	PSE 161:2 254:5	pure 294:19	279:10,11,13	quick 113:21
provide 109:21	PTC 292:15 294:14	purpose 240:11	294:24 298:8,16	119:18 177:21
128:2 131:18,24	PTCs 292:7 294:17	305:14	302:23 309:8	182:14 220:2
133:1 149:13	public 88:20 91:23	purposes 173:9	312:15 316:12,15	quickly 125:5
155:17 170:25	91:23 94:4 96:9	228:18 363:5	316:21 326:10	294:11 308:9
155.11 110.25	71.23 77.7 70.7	220.10 303.3		271.11 300.7
L				

		I		I
318:15 336:1	356:19 357:2	realize 191:22	235:22 247:6	recognizes 139:24
337:3 340:20	ratemaking 203:7	330:11	296:23,25 297:2	recognizing 218:13
366:15	rates 138:25 139:2	realized 165:17	reassigning 190:22	recollection 282:22
quite 254:16	143:6 147:23	221:5 223:9	rebuttal 92:25	recommend 151:2
274:11 279:5	160:22 173:1	really 118:7 125:13	94:20 119:3,9	recommendation
310:7 312:12	283:17 348:24	154:25 196:16	120:20 121:1	142:18 149:15,19
quote 115:1 200:13	349:3	204:3 218:14	138:17 157:14	149:24 165:2,7,9
200:16 211:9	rating 168:12	239:13,25 244:2	164:4 165:20	195:6 229:9
302:19 363:18,21	ratings 168:10,11	246:19 248:7	174:9,21 177:5	342:21 347:3
quote/unquote	Ray 209:25 211:9	275:12,16 276:6	195:1 200:12	348:8,14
322:3	RCW 208:10	276:10,10 286:19	229:7 247:2 283:5	recommendations
	347:11	286:21 291:20	289:8,22 296:2	148:19,25 149:2
R	re- 312:15	292:18 298:11	299:7 307:15,15	152:21 214:15,17
R-21X 284:20	re-analyzing	304:1 305:5 312:6	312:22 319:23	215:11 307:1
R-o-b-e-r-t 352:12	206:10	312:11 314:3	REC 133:20	338:20 361:7
R-o-h-i-n-i 251:12	re-ask 316:15	317:14 318:12	REC-bundled	recommended
rain 340:19	reaching 141:16	322:5,8 325:14,14	293:19	98:14 290:4
raise 110:23 150:24	191:14	326:2,13 329:6,21	REC-generating	361:23
155:15 203:14	reactors 282:4	330:15 331:13	333:20	recommends
250:18 337:17	read 176:24 185:22	334:23 335:17	recall 176:18,21	142:14 145:7
351:15 359:20	186:10 187:21	reason 113:5 121:4	181:25 199:1	148:11
raised 150:6,21	195:16 254:7	124:9 138:10	208:24 220:3,23	reconductoring
222:14 301:23	308:7,25 315:15	reasonable 139:18	236:3,6 297:20	235:8
356:20,20	315:16 323:16	146:11,18 147:10	301:17 303:8	reconvene 250:1
raises 144:1 201:25	347:5 348:11	148:15 154:1	304:23 305:12	record 107:12,24
raising 112:16	363:22	171:11 172:22	309:21	109:13 113:7
ramifications	readily 134:8	173:1,13,19	recast 282:15	115:11 124:16
188:23	reading 283:11	199:17 230:6	312:15 322:8	129:10,20 130:16
ran 206:12 234:3	342:5	231:2,5 247:5,9	recasting 322:6	130:21 131:11
range 287:14	ready 155:11,13	247:11,16,19,19	receive 277:2 283:1	140:9 146:7 149:1
325:24	207:3 250:19	247:21 248:10,16	288:5,8 318:1	156:10 180:18
rapidly 152:17	288:8 295:16	248:17,20 282:21	343:15 357:10,13	194:6,13 208:10
rare 134:16	real 121:16 246:11	308:5 310:22	357:19	209:4 250:1,9
rate 94:7 100:4,6	335:8,12,14	329:25 330:6,12	received 139:20	251:11 279:4,7
101:13,15 102:22	real-world 298:5	330:20 341:1	140:9 162:6	300:19 301:4
103:3 105:6,8	realign 309:23	342:17 344:10,15	205:25 206:19	338:10,22 350:17
119:10 139:14	310:3	344:18 345:15,24	224:8 254:10,12	350:21 352:11
143:13,23 154:2	realignment 344:21	346:6 363:4	254:14,15 271:20	360:12 367:15,16
160:23 167:21	349:6,11,12	reasonably 153:21	293:20 307:2	368:5
176:16 177:3,14	358:14	287:18 288:13	317:21 350:13,20	recording 300:25
177:19 180:1	realities 133:18	291:11,21	365:5	301:5,10
187:7 308:3,12,18	148:4 358:5,8	reasoning 307:23	receives 278:14	recourse 147:15
308:22 309:6	reality 136:2	reasons 118:16	receiving 305:12	331:22
310:12 329:17,18	147:24 226:19	129:16 138:5,21	recess 194:13	recovered 147:23
341:14 346:17	270:14 310:6	139:23 154:5	recognize 223:3	recovery 238:24
349:5 350:4	320:21 330:20	202:7 231:25	259:3	329:19 356:19
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

RECs 244:15 277:1	refiled 282:13	98:1 99:1 100:1	reliable 140:6	256:18 257:6
277:3	309:21	136:18 139:3	154:1 159:6 206:9	258:4,13,21,25
redacted 92:14,18	reflect 133:17	147:21 151:8	225:6 240:11	324:2,5 340:2
314:18,24 315:8	136:2 214:22	156:14 172:8	274:6 335:7	350:9,24
redeem 190:25	255:3 324:12	185:16,17,18	reliably 275:16	renewable 89:13
redirect 90:18 91:3	330:20 341:18	189:18 199:11	335:18	94:21 104:1,6,7
91:6,11 218:20	342:4	201:20 239:2	reliance 225:24	105:1,14 108:24
219:1 328:23	reflected 255:5	reiterating 312:4	226:6,7 227:1	109:3 124:4
329:3 349:21	358:15	reject 134:24	276:12 315:5,9,12	132:15 134:8,13
	reflects 206:18	142:14 149:16	relied 129:9 205:20	137:8,12,22
364:5	363:8	229:9	relies 129:12	138:12,20 139:17
redo 305:1	reframe 279:11	rejected 165:10	rely 115:22 236:25	140:11,14 141:14
reduce 144:7 150:2	refresh 271:5	rejection 98:10	293:8	149:12 150:8,15
276:12 283:16,17	318:11 358:12	rejects 150:2 283:9	relying 135:11	150:18 158:20
reduced 143:20	refreshed 271:4	related 128:20,25	226:14	159:17 162:8,22
149:20	refreshes 205:20	211:16 324:16	remain 111:14,14	163:10 165:5
reducing 179:22	refreshment 320:25	347:13	280:11	176:20,25 178:14
C	refute 356:9,12	relates 201:12	remains 117:1	178:18,19 193:18
138:6,10 139:23	regard 200:3	282:5	276:17	194:15 195:6,9
145:19 285:25	301:24 320:12	relative 191:6	remarks 90:3	200:23 205:12,23
315:14	regarding 124:19	233:13 274:11	149:14	206:18 220:12,17
reductions 135:12	126:8 128:10	286:18,22 369:8,8	remedy 145:1	220:18 231:5
redundant 241:21	150:1 165:14	release 151:3	146:15	232:5 233:21
Reeder's 89:15	176:19 188:8	released 186:11	remember 126:25	236:20 252:9
refer 128:6 171:16	195:6 196:22	187:22 195:11	178:16 199:3	253:22 254:2,6
171:18 212:12	223:6 252:11	relevance 116:13	227:11 297:25	255:5 257:19
215:15 228:20	315:18 316:12	125:20 128:14	301:20 304:18	271:23 273:5,6,15
235:22 289:10	318:17 320:8	308:23 316:1	REMEMBERED	274:8 276:15,24
290:12 314:4	339:5 342:21	347:25	107:1	278:14 280:17
325:5	367:4	relevant 114:17,19	remind 110:15	281:3 295:13
reference 159:9,10	regardless 134:14	114:21 115:18	133:4 337:3	296:10,17,22
164:7 212:17	203:10 225:22	116:19 117:21	remote 301:8	297:8,10 298:3,14
350:12	297:5	119:7 121:4,13,21	remotely 352:1	298:17 299:10
references 309:1	regards 177:22	122:10,23 123:2,5	remove 178:21	300:16 301:25
referencing 307:21	region 233:1	123:25 124:8,10	removed 345:19	304:13,20 305:2
referred 167:25	regression 141:19	124:25 152:25	Rendahl 88:4 90:19	307:22 311:5,20
171:17 291:25	regulated 238:16	177:21 187:9	90:20 117:10	326:14 329:5,22
319:2,5	238:21	188:1 215:24	129:25 130:4,7	330:8 333:25
_	regulates 347:7	219:4 341:12	145:15 151:16	334:2 335:2,10
210:12 213:5	regulation 231:17	343:22 347:4,16	164:6 193:20,23	342:18 346:19
231:21 280:1	231:20 310:7	347:22 348:3	212:16 223:15,19	348:18 363:3
	regulations 170:21	reliability 158:6	225:9,21 226:25	renewables 179:17
317:3 318:9,12	182:9	189:3 235:13	227:8,13 228:14	179:18,21 222:21
319:17	Regulators 98:8	239:21,25 240:1	229:6,12 230:16	253:13,18 255:1
refers 212:13	regulatory 92:21	274:9 276:8	231:4 246:25	304:10 306:25
refile 285:20	93:1 94:1 97:1	326:16 335:13	248:21 256:12,15	renumbered
		<u>I</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>I</u>

119:21 120:8	reprice 254:11,20	342:6 353:20	168:8,9,14 169:1	163:5,11,18 165:6
130:1 284:8	297:6 332:4	require 117:18	173:10,18 178:20	165:10 166:22
repairs 235:7	repriced 255:16	127:24 241:16	178:24 180:6	167:11 168:5,21
repealed 344:13	repricing 139:19	243:1 285:17	182:20 183:3,6	169:13 174:14,14
repeat 164:7	158:5,11 177:23	required 138:16	205:24 206:18	178:15,18,19
178:12 196:9	206:6,11 254:9,25	140:3,5,14 159:6	223:21 224:6,14	179:24 180:15
201:15 345:12	270:19 297:3,11	172:1 199:13	227:1,2,9,20	181:2,4,6 184:17
348:10,25 354:25	329:8 330:13	201:21 291:22	230:19 237:21	184:18 192:9,11
repeatedly 168:1	357:5	296:16 311:16	244:12 252:12,16	192:13,25 193:7
repeating 134:6	repricings 270:16	requirement 134:8	253:9 254:8 255:5	195:20 197:25
356:25	request 93:14 97:6	136:19 137:15	271:1,24 273:1,19	204:20,22 215:22
rephrase 298:10	97:7,9,10,12,13	140:8 178:1	273:25 279:20	221:22,25 222:17
replace 222:21	97:15,16,18,19,21	208:20 224:15	280:7,8 283:17	222:20,21,24
replacement 336:4	97:22,24 98:4,6	248:17 310:8	286:1,7 292:5,7,7	224:5,11,18,20,21
replacing 335:7	98:18,20,24 99:10	358:5,6,7,16	292:17,20,25	224:25 227:7,19
replies 367:7	100:17,19 102:4,7	requirements	293:12 294:9,18	229:15,16 230:2
reply 129:13	104:11 111:18	120:23 139:3	297:8,10 298:3,23	230:14 232:6,16
215:23 367:22,23	113:24 116:8,14	142:2,6 146:12	299:4 307:11,21	233:3,8,9,10
report 92:3,9 96:22	116:16 117:3	153:11 161:15	308:4 315:2,9	234:11,14 236:23
98:22 104:10	133:12 134:24	170:6 173:5	317:11 322:12,14	237:9 242:22
123:24 124:4,13	140:10 189:24	197:22 230:13	325:18 328:15	243:1 245:2,4,7,9
124:15,16 150:16	205:12,14 210:13	235:19 247:12	330:8 331:5 339:2	245:13 246:12,16
189:24 190:18	210:15 212:15	328:7 329:18	339:3,6,11 341:17	252:10 271:10
228:20 229:2	213:5,18 252:21	requires 141:15	354:24 355:4	272:21 273:5,7,8
282:12 303:13	272:17 284:1	153:24 161:16	357:2	273:11,15,17
313:10 314:18,23	285:11 304:8	162:3 171:15	resource-intensive	274:8 276:1,16,22
325:2,4,23 326:1	342:3 343:8,12	216:18 247:9	147:16	276:24 278:14,20
reported 137:21	344:16,18 345:25	309:18 344:20	resources 94:21	278:21 279:16,20
325:8	346:6,9 347:12	res- 245:12	95:5 115:20	287:11,12 288:1
reporter 87:25	362:22 365:14,18	reservation 151:24	117:18 121:1,4	288:10 292:9,13
108:19 369:1,16	367:9	151:25 207:22	122:25 123:7	292:22 293:4,5,7
reports 185:22	requested 225:11	209:16 213:20	126:14 135:22	293:9 294:6 295:1
represent 151:17	254:20 361:19	218:7	138:12,20 139:17	296:16,22 297:12
270:14 320:24	362:9 363:16	reservations 153:19	140:7,23,24,25	297:14,15,17,18
325:17	365:8	reserve 136:4	143:16 144:3,3,5	297:23 298:14
representation	requesting 196:20	reside 208:1	144:12,15,18,20	299:5,11 300:16
115:23 271:16	293:18 319:13	Residential 92:7	144:22 146:21,23	301:25 315:19
representative	362:14	resilient 153:6,7,8	147:3,3,6,9,9,10	316:12 320:3
209:25 211:21	requests 93:3 94:5	resolved 136:24	148:2 150:18	322:1,18 329:12
310:6	94:11,12,23 96:9	resource 98:9,12	152:5 154:8	329:19 330:1,4
representatives	99:17,19 100:22	115:1,16 133:21	157:16,19 158:4	331:8,10 333:20
209:24 212:5	100:24 102:9,11	133:23 135:10	158:11,13,15	333:25 335:10
368:3	104:18,20 112:8	141:12 146:14	159:7,17,22,25	339:5,23 341:19
represented 144:21	209:7,19 211:20	147:15 148:14,17	160:4,6,11 161:14	342:19 344:20,21
271:6	212:11 304:19	150:8,15,24	161:20,22,25	345:19 346:19
represents 142:25	313:15 323:8	158:25 160:24	162:1,5,8,11,14	348:18,23 349:2,7

349:12 355:12,13	363:7 365:25	return 194:1,6	223:24 224:4,9,10	123:13
355:16,19,19,22	responses 93:3	revenue 176:8	224:11,16 225:8	RG-21X 118:4
355:24 356:6,17	94:22 99:9,16,18	177:25 310:8	225:25 226:1,2,4	119:20
356:19	100:19,21,23	329:17 358:5,6,7	226:7 231:13	RG-21XC 96:5
Resp 94:9	102:6,9,11 104:11	358:16	232:5,9,14,24	120:3,7 129:18,23
respectfully 107:20	104:18,20 125:13	review 120:14	234:3 244:20	130:13,23
respond 122:4	125:14 129:7	131:11,12 190:14	245:16,17 254:11	RG-22X 96:7
124:20 126:2	131:24 132:25	311:15 347:11	254:15 270:17	119:24 120:8
172:5 177:8	140:9 211:2 279:5	reviewed 186:8	271:5 273:9,12	283:19
187:16,17 199:24	279:5 284:19,25	302:13,14 314:12	281:10 287:3,8,10	RG-23X 96:9
215:19 366:15	344:4 348:5,11	346:11	288:2,4,7,11	RG-24X 96:11
responded 116:25	353:19 361:14	reviewing 330:16	293:15 294:2	299:17
125:10 129:9	362:18	revise 131:5 139:9	297:19,21,22,25	RG-25X 96:12
213:18 214:12,14	responsibility	141:25	298:24 312:25	302:9
343:18	139:5 198:24	revised 87:5 99:20	313:3 314:2 316:5	RG-26X 96:14
responding 138:18	199:4 348:16	99:23 101:4,6	317:1,6,21,23	305:24
202:8 307:19	rest 113:1 134:18	102:13,15 104:22	318:5,6 319:11,14	RG-27X 96:15
response 91:24	275:2 297:25	105:4 107:22	319:17,19 320:5	308:10
93:4,6,7,9,10,12	356:16	123:11 136:24	320:10,12,20	RG-28X 96:17
93:17,19,20,22,23	restate 188:13	137:3,3 138:7,14	321:19 328:3,4,8	121:8 313:20
94:4 95:7,8,10,11	298:9	149:18 191:21	329:9 332:2,6	RG-29X 96:19
95:13,14,16,17,19	restated 188:11	253:4 290:25	339:15,18,19	122:8
95:20,22,23 96:4	restoration 152:8	313:10,18 342:23	341:18 342:14,22	RG-2T 94:20 283:5
96:9 97:5,7,8,10	restructure 94:7	356:1,11	343:2,13,15,25	296:3 299:8
97:11,13,14,16,17	restructuring	revising 321:7	344:11 345:17	307:16
97:19,20,22,23	189:24 190:13	revisions 304:9	356:10,17,23	RG-3 94:21 275:25
98:4,5,18,19,23	result 133:18,25	RF- 205:15	357:3	RG-30X 96:21
100:14,17 101:23	147:18 158:1	RFP 121:11,13	RFPs 123:12 160:2	123:18,23 124:20
102:3 104:3	223:10,24 244:13	123:7,9 124:14	163:9 192:24	314:18
105:16 113:23	291:8 324:14	126:13 139:20	193:6 206:15	RG-31X 96:23
116:2,6 117:11,13	329:11 341:1	140:13 144:18,19	229:14 230:11	120:8
120:16 122:19	348:7,13 349:11	144:22,25 151:3		RG-4 94:22 99:18
123:14 124:19,23	358:19	151:10 157:20	RG 354:10	100:23 102:10
124:24 150:23	resulted 191:15	158:2,3,7,16	RG-10X 95:10	104:19 354:5,7,9
153:3 154:7 159:8	resulting 270:20 results 298:20	161:21 162:6,14	RG-11X 95:11	354:10 361:11 PC 5 04:24
161:13 166:14,17 177:21 200:16	302:21 303:2,5	162:17,21 163:19 163:25 177:24	RG-12X 95:13 RG-13X 95:14	RG-5 94:24 RG-6 95:4 289:11
201:5 205:18	358:18	180:25 181:6,13	RG-13X 95:14 RG-14X 95:16	RG-7 95:5
214:10,11 215:15	resume 270:9	181:19,23 182:6	RG-14X 95:10 RG-15X 95:17	RG-8X 95:7
214:10,11 213:13	retail 137:7,11,22	181:19,23 182:0	RG-16X 95:17 RG-16X 95:19	RG-9X 95:8
236:8 249:16	281:4 291:5	195:8,11,19,19	RG-10X 95:19 RG-17X 95:20	right 121:8 155:15
272:16 279:9	333:17,24 334:17	195.8,11,19,19	RG-18X 95:22 96:6	157:7 162:18,21
341:7 345:11	354:16	190.4,4,23 198.20	119:25	166:2 175:10
346:24 347:1,5,24	retain 358:3	204:17,19 205:15	RG-19X 95:23	176:13 181:11
350:13 353:13,22	retained 186:7	205:15,19,21,25	RG-1T 94:19	182:18 183:4,15
354:14 362:1,17	retains 358:1	206:7,20 223:22	RG-20X 96:4	190:3,8,11 192:13
00		200.7,20 223.22		1,0.5,0,11 1,2.13

	1		1	
194:10 197:14	RLE-1T 100:14	184:2,7 186:23,25	198:14	scenario 282:9
202:13 203:25	RLE-2 100:16	199:14 200:10	rules 127:24 128:2	291:20 292:22
204:14 205:21	RLE-3 100:17	218:20,21 219:2	145:5 169:15,20	294:8
206:1 214:15	RLE-4X 100:19	219:21 250:10,12	169:24 171:8	SCGHG 101:8,11
215:25 230:7	361:8,12	251:1,9,21 257:11	364:8	102:17,20
234:20 235:16	RLE-5X 100:21	278:16 283:22	ruling 99:14 104:16	schedule 90:5
236:7 237:2 242:2	353:13	284:2,5,7,10,12	115:25 126:17	99:15 104:16
244:9,17 245:6,20	RLE-6X 100:23	284:20 285:1,3,8	178:7	118:15 151:5
246:23 248:7	354:10	315:21 323:19	run 118:14 160:2	304:4
250:19 256:17	RLE-7X 101:3	328:25 329:4	225:16 226:5	scheduled 129:13
272:19 273:23	RLE-8X 101:6	335:20 337:6,9,10	228:8 245:15	scheduling 125:21
274:14 282:20	RLE-9X 101:8	337:13 340:13,16	252:16 276:20	Schrier 206:4
287:20 288:3	RMP 94:7	342:11,16 343:20	285:17 291:19	scope 122:14
290:11 297:9,15	RNW 104:1,11	344:9,10 345:4,14	304:8 305:2,13	219:20 345:2
297:19 306:6	105:1 109:5	345:15 346:15,20	330:7 335:15	score 328:14,17
308:7,16,19	307:20 312:18	349:17 353:2	357:21	screen 289:15
314:25 316:25	320:1	354:6,8,12,14	runaround 354:13	295:19 333:5
322:11 324:7,10	RNW-NWEC	359:1 360:24,25	running 330:8	SDV-10X 102:20
333:18 336:13,14	104:1 105:1,14	361:2 363:23	Ryan 256:23	SDV-10X 102:20 SDV-11X 102:22
337:17 341:3	RNW/NWEC 94:9	366:9 367:18	Kyan 230.23	SDV-11X 102:22 SDV-12X 103:3
350:23 351:15	120:10 122:3,19	Rogala's 220:3	$\overline{\mathbf{S}}$	SDV-12X 103.3 SDV-1T 101:23
354:1 359:20	149:9 353:25	Rohini 90:21 91:3	S-i-m-m-o-n-s	SDV-11 101.23 SDV-2 102:3
rights 152:4,16	road 152:21	94:17 95:1 96:1	338:11	SDV-2 102.5 SDV-3 102.5
214:23 316:24	Rob 108:9	117:9 250:15	S-t-e-f-a-n 360:14	SDV-3 102.3 SDV-4X 102:6
317:12,17	Robert 88:21 91:7	251:3,12	sake 113:7	SDV-4X 102.0 SDV-5X 102:8
ring-fencing 115:4	100:12,14 101:1	role 110:18 139:22	sales 291:5 333:17	SDV-3X 102.8 SDV-6X 102:10
risk 147:10,13,21	177:15 351:13	156:13 172:2,3,11	333:24 334:18	SDV-0X 102.10 SDV-7X 102:12
171:12 173:16	352:1,12	roll 326:20	salmon 152:23	SDV-7X 102.12 SDV-8X 102:15
174:15 203:19	robert.sykes@at	Ron 206:4	salt 183:11	SDV-8X 102.13 SDV-9X 102:17
224:12,13 229:13	88:24	room 111:14	San 89:10	SEALED 87:20
229:19,20 230:8,8	Rock 162:10,10,16	131:20 256:6,7	Sanger 257:12	seat 154:19
230:23 239:20	Rocky 98:7 116:10	257:7,20 258:11	satisfy 334:3	Seattle 88:23
321:4 330:7	•	,	save 171:2	second 116:6,22
331:16 335:12,14	189:11,15,19 Rogala 88:10 90:8	roughly 281:3 round 366:8	saving 243:7	134:18 164:18
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	O	rounds 129:11	saw 131:10 272:10	
risk-adjusted 173:15	90:15,18,22 91:3 91:6,8,10 107:25	366:4	297:5,8 330:4	165:2,4,8 207:7 283:20 365:18
risk-averse 239:3	108:1 112:5,20	routine 331:18	saying 138:3	section 208:5 209:4
risks 153:16 335:9	113:20 114:6,9		160:17 236:14	209:5 211:6
		Row 291:1,1,2,15	238:4 240:15	
River 89:18,20	116:3,4 117:25	333:17 334:4,5	298:17 319:9	258:18,20 289:25
106:1,8 109:8,11	118:3 121:7 122:5	RPR 87:25 369:1	350:12	290:1
132:21 151:13,18	123:19 126:3	369:15	says 187:11 200:13	see 116:11 128:24
153:8 162:10	130:17 133:2,8	rule 169:18 231:19	201:10 242:7	174:25 176:4
275:24 276:2	155:3,22 156:7,21	366:6	247:23 249:18	186:20 194:11
RLE-10X 101:11	170:17 171:22	rulemaking 200:6	278:21 300:8	211:12,18 213:1,7
RLE-11X 101:13	175:19,21 177:2	200:19	315:2,8	213:21,22 225:7
RLE-12X 101:15	177:20 181:12,15	rulemakings	313.2,0	256:18 257:8

				1 age 100
259:5 271:9,14	224:12 240:2	358:1,3	322:13,14	97:4 98:1 99:1,4
275:25 276:2,6	245:9 246:17	shared 301:23	shows 121:2 141:18	100:1 126:7,8
289:20 306:19	273:8 274:2	322:2 355:12,20	141:20 142:19,23	215:17 337:15
312:20 314:14	333:23 334:15	355:21 356:6	144:11 211:2	338:1,8,11,12
318:19 319:25	344:23 345:21	shareholders	231:1 272:4	340:6,17 343:18
333:10 334:11	346:19	114:16	shuffle 355:9	344:10 345:15
347:11 353:24,24	served 199:21	shares 136:3	shuffe 333.3 shut 232:20	346:23 349:18
353:25 354:8,8	serves 190:2	Shaylee 103:17,19	Shute 89:9	350:3
seeing 130:19 255:4	service 153:14,19	shifts 147:13	shutting 337:11	Simmons' 131:5
255:22 330:13	157:24 162:10	shine 179:4	shy 290:20	345:2
seek 342:25	188:24 207:19,21	shining 340:19	sic 274:16 283:23	simply 119:13
seeking 230:12	219:19 225:6,7	shocked 321:21	287:21	146:13 173:5
seen 182:22 271:11	226:23 237:23	short 107:23	side 182:14 222:15	291:10 292:4,9
276:17 331:10	238:24 240:11	124:14 145:25	259:3	311:18 317:16
segment 207:22	357:10,13	146:24 158:10	sight 329:6	319:7
select 93:3 94:22	services 186:1	190:19 218:22	sign 163:2 168:22	simultaneous
99:16,18 100:21	serving 137:7,10,21	246:14 286:18,21	291:21 292:19	129:11 366:4
100:23 102:8,10	242:15 278:25,25	294:6 297:19	332:9 334:21	single 192:14
104:17,19 150:17	280:16 281:4	298:25 313:3,15	signed 256:8,22	206:19 270:17
330:10	set 134:24 135:15	313:16 315:13	257:9,17 258:8	362:6,16
selected 311:24	148:12 198:14	316:4 318:4	259:4 364:12	singular 289:7
353:19	199:6 217:17	319:16,17 358:23	significance 327:8	sit 154:17,24 155:1
selection 322:15	220:5 239:2	short- 146:22	significant 179:21	site 180:14
selections 280:7	323:25 330:22	short-term 133:20	200:17 225:23	sited 180:6
self-build 330:17	339:24,25 363:10	147:3 244:14	226:7 229:16	siting 180:12
self-built 314:6,12	369:10	293:9,12,15,16,23	230:20 232:19	sitting 154:18
319:8	sets 143:2 170:5	295:8	233:19 236:21	310:23 334:20
sense 112:19 146:2	247:23	shorter 133:5	241:16 273:17	situated 239:1
225:16 258:20	settled 137:6	249:13	275:10 276:5,18	situation 113:12
313:13 328:11	settlement 100:8	shortfall 98:16	309:25 310:24	162:25 179:15,17
sensitivities 304:2	101:11,17 102:20	290:23 291:11	317:15 329:22	182:10 203:2,9
sent 120:12 126:22	103:5 105:10	292:10	330:13 331:11	226:20 234:3,17
sentence 186:17	136:25 167:15,22	shortfalls 293:23	significantly	244:3 248:2
285:24	setup 161:3	293:24	159:23 160:9	331:23
separate 87:20	seven 137:1 290:20	Shortly 244:24	192:11	situs 95:4 121:3
124:8 225:16	severe 140:18 243:2	show 140:21 141:9	signing 254:18	143:21 144:3,12
258:14,19 259:8	shaking 130:20	141:16 143:11	332:3	174:14 192:8,10
279:21 305:15	259:5	150:14 157:16	similar 116:13	192:13,19,24,25
separately 358:20	share 138:11 155:9	226:4 227:18	119:14 121:12,15	193:1,1,2,4,8,12
358:22	162:12 211:7	234:7 333:1 354:3	121:25 122:9	197:25 202:6,7
September 287:8	222:19,19 233:18	showed 163:17,21	123:14 141:4,4	204:22 221:22,25
318:5	276:15 277:1,2	showing 140:21	190:7 356:7 361:5	226:16 227:23
series 315:7	278:19,24 289:15	197:15 220:8	362:17	228:7 291:23
serve 134:12 147:7	295:19 332:25	226:5 228:2 243:7	similarly 314:9	321:5 355:13,15
161:15 173:4	333:5,9 334:16	246:7,8	357:2	355:19,24
196:12 220:19	346:18 353:8	shown 247:20	Simmons 91:5 97:1	six 112:21 160:13
	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 ago 107
189:22 190:2	sorry 114:3 118:9	163:6 179:16	spike 242:9	313:4,7,9 314:18
221:6 252:20	121:24 127:3	183:22 188:10	split 94:8 190:16,20	314:23 315:2
303:22	158:7 161:24	217:22 253:23	237:7	318:8 337:14
six-state 143:8	164:6 178:11	304:11 318:12	splitting 190:22	338:20 340:24
159:24 233:1	196:9 197:11	320:13 344:6	spoke 227:9	341:8,11,16,23
286:17	201:14 202:5	speaking 110:16,18	spoken 321:3,3	342:3,7,23 343:3
sjm@dvclaw.com	209:20 210:12,14	175:7 253:6	sponsor 352:13	344:6 345:23
89:6	213:24 216:3	306:12 342:1	360:16	346:14 347:1,11
slashed 137:16	217:24 253:6	345:22	sponsored 323:7,8	347:13,25 348:1,6
slide 299:20 300:1	283:20 287:6	speaks 123:8 138:1	spreads 224:12	348:12,17 349:4,5
300:4,20,20 306:3	291:1 293:24	177:4,16,16	spreadsheet 96:7	349:9,15,20 350:3
slides 96:11,14	298:18 299:18,24	Special 98:22	118:5	350:20 353:24
305:25	312:14 319:21	specific 127:5	spring 151:4 255:2	366:21
slightly 334:1	321:23 324:4	128:20 142:17	309:11 317:22	staff's 98:14 112:11
slope 242:14	327:22 333:10	143:15 169:1,16	Springs 151:23	119:24 120:14
243:16,25 244:1	334:25 337:8	170:7 178:16	Square 107:2	124:15 125:6
247:22	338:22 341:21	183:1 184:3 203:3	squinted 199:18	126:4 140:9 142:2
slows 134:9	353:15 354:25	255:19,21,22	ss 369:1	164:11 215:17,19
small 243:18 282:4	356:24 357:12	273:6 280:2 293:5	stable 143:6	220:23 229:9
334:11	365:17	322:3 324:1,19	staff 88:14 91:24	258:24 315:17
smaller 138:11	sort 112:4 118:12	325:1,11 343:20	93:4,6,7,9,10,12	336:25 341:3
204:19 230:13	134:24 187:10	344:4 347:25	93:17,19,20,22,23	342:10 347:1,3,20
297:11	203:15 214:1	363:6,10	95:7,8,10,11,13	348:13,16 350:3
SMITH 256:25	216:4 243:11,11	specifically 111:7	95:14,16,17,19,20	staffing 219:18
SNS-1T 103:19	243:12,20 321:3	112:1 113:10	95:22,23 96:4,12	stakeholder 219:12
social 225:17	328:2 331:22	115:20 149:2	96:21 97:1,6,7,9	301:3,13 302:11
solar 96:19 179:4,9	344:22 356:21	196:17 198:7	97:10,12,13,15,16	324:24 326:20
211:10,17 237:11	sorts 222:23	208:11,25 211:6	97:18,19,21,22,24	stakeholders
237:16 240:7	sound 150:1 181:11	214:22 237:21	98:1,4,6,18,20,24	210:23 221:6
275:13,24 276:3,5	249:6 282:20	253:24 293:17	99:1,5,9 100:1	222:14 300:14,18
277:23 278:8	288:3	305:12 309:1	102:4 108:3,5	301:22 303:5,15
286:4 297:23	sounded 311:7	321:9 323:22	112:1,9,16 113:22	303:19 304:7,21
298:23 300:9,11	sounds 118:2 204:2	325:7 342:1	123:3,24 124:4,13	306:23
316:24 334:6	280:19 282:21	361:15	124:16 125:4,10	stale 133:17,25
sold 317:12	source 96:7 150:10	specifics 332:7	125:10,10,12,12	stand 154:16
soliciting 293:15	sources 241:6	specter 117:3	127:16 128:11,24	250:16 359:18
solution 133:21	327:11	speculation 115:9	129:3 130:13	standalone 275:15
solutions 153:5,6	sourcing 331:14	187:1	131:4 132:1	275:23
solvent 225:5	Southeast 89:4	speculative 192:3	136:13 138:18,22	standard 134:5
somebody 367:1	107:3	315:12	139:13,23 140:10	146:1,4 171:10
something's 238:24	sovereign 218:14	spell 156:9 251:10	156:24 166:15	229:17 234:15
somewhat 127:23	SOx 327:4	338:9 352:10	171:23 217:9	238:6 253:20
276:17 326:11	space 360:14	360:11	249:23 251:24	317:18 334:7
Sommer 89:3	speak 115:9,21	spend 163:1	258:3,5,6 278:18	standards 149:23
108:13 250:13	118:1 128:16	spent 147:14	285:4 290:4 296:8	150:6 169:21
soon 133:23 287:19	140:16 142:3	sphere 326:8	302:4,18,19,24	170:4 172:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

		•		
198:14 245:11	state's 143:3	Statewide 227:15	298:24 300:9	334:7 335:2,13
stands 143:20	state-by-state	static 142:19	315:6,10	subgroups 325:3
start 112:23 113:15	227:24	status 184:22	store 179:7,10	subject 116:8
140:24 157:10	state-specific	222:10 306:6	220:17,19 241:6	117:22 159:11,12
162:14 190:16	225:12 312:6	342:3	storing 278:11	159:15 162:18
191:3 192:12,18	321:5,9,17	statute 143:4	story 140:17	169:4 170:15
192:19,25 207:18	stated 119:7 129:17	172:14 197:13	strain 121:2 175:2	181:7,8,16 182:19
220:1 226:21	137:18 140:20	199:6 201:10	strategy 252:15	208:14,15,17,22
228:7,12 230:1	171:14 202:8	362:19	315:4	212:1 216:8 236:5
235:11 238:12,19	209:21 223:20	statutes 170:20	Strauss 88:15 90:9	239:24,25 258:9
239:7 240:17	254:23 286:10	202:14 238:18	90:16,22 91:5,6	305:11 333:14
244:14 245:3,6	363:17	statutorily 208:3	108:4,5 112:11	347:11 355:13
246:22 249:15	statement 90:8,9	statutory 143:5	114:2,7 119:18	364:16
288:8 329:5	90:10,11,12,13,14	150:5 171:25	120:1,4 125:6,19	subjecting 225:4
339:15	103:13 109:21,22	185:5 199:16	127:16 131:4	submit 117:21
started 190:17	109:23 115:17	200:14	132:2 136:14	136:19 138:16
191:22 219:17	116:21 127:17	stay 327:9	157:1,5 164:8,10	141:15 164:12
222:16 228:8,8	131:17,19,21	steel 246:16	171:10 172:4,7	208:16 306:25
229:3,22 255:10	132:1,9,14,18,23	Stefan 91:9 101:21	173:22 252:1,4	332:9 338:12
255:11 301:10	133:1 149:15	101:23 102:1	256:1,9 258:2,23	341:23 344:15
starting 107:24	166:7,8,9 171:24	103:1 359:18	270:11 279:1,3,14	346:9,10,16
133:6 200:2,12	172:12 182:4	360:3,13,13	281:13 337:12,14	352:13 360:15
208:13 227:22	184:13 220:4	step 195:15 198:20	338:7 340:6,9	366:11
229:21 247:2	298:22 313:19	199:19 211:13	343:16 344:25	submits 145:9
289:23,25 296:6	320:1	242:19 258:10	349:22 350:2,6	submitted 91:23
301:10 307:19,24	statements 109:19	stepped 272:1	351:11 365:17,21	123:3,4 131:5,13
310:1 312:24	118:11 131:15,19	stepping 271:22	366:2,21 367:6	141:8 156:16
319:25	154:13 187:4,5	steps 204:1	Street 88:11 89:4	167:12,18 177:14
state 88:16,21	239:23 273:21	stipulate 112:7	89:10,21	251:16 282:11
113:17 126:15	states 94:6 116:7	Stipulation 100:8	stress 143:22 276:7	302:14 313:12
140:3 141:2 156:9	138:23 139:1,6,7	101:17 103:5	strides 312:8,10	333:13 350:16
159:16 160:6	141:4 144:24	105:10	strike 358:9	364:16 367:13
161:13 168:25	160:13 161:5	Stokes 103:17,20	string 138:21	submitting 165:4,9
173:4 184:15	165:19,23 171:18	148:19	strong 115:4	Subpart 347:24
197:22 202:21	173:8 180:9	stop 110:12 115:12	276:11 340:24	subsequent 128:5,7
205:2 221:9	189:20,22 190:2,5		353:5	320:23 356:21
222:18 224:13,19	191:5 198:4	249:10 337:4	stronger 191:6	subsequently
226:10,11 232:4	202:16,18 221:6	stopped 340:19	structure 185:21	303:20
233:7,8,24 234:2	222:1,14,18 223:4	storage 98:22	191:2 210:16	subsets 160:4
242:18 247:4	227:19,21 237:22	157:21,23 158:19	struggling 197:11	subsidiary 189:10
251:10,13 252:17	279:25 286:22	158:24 159:4	studies 153:22	subsidy 292:9
272:20 338:9	339:14,22 346:22	169:10,13 183:11	183:2 243:6 246:7	substance 200:24
344:12 347:8,22	347:3,10,14 348:2	237:5 273:17	study 190:7,8 202:6	substantial 151:1
348:16 349:10,16	348:9,15,19 349:6	275:10,15,23,24	234:8 246:20	187:6
352:10 360:11	350:4	276:11,22 277:11	355:18	substantially
369:1,2	states' 204:23	282:24 297:11,24	stuff 330:10 331:12	142:12 150:9
	1	1	1	'

227.4	1	1	l. • • • •	1
235:4	198:6 199:1,4	174:6 175:20,23	tabs 317:9	139:10,23 142:1
substantiate 168:7	201:16 225:3	175:25 177:8,11	Takala 106:8,10	142:12,18,19,20
substantive 125:22	227:20 248:18	178:13,14 180:24	take 107:23 110:6	143:2,5,20,20,21
125:22	257:13,14 275:20	180:25 181:14,18	110:13 179:9	144:16 145:20,23
successful 310:2	279:4,6 290:16	184:6,9 186:24	180:10 193:24	146:4,10,13,16,20
sufficiency 149:4	293:22 298:8	187:15,18 188:15	199:18 205:1	146:23,24 147:20
sufficient 139:17	309:8 313:18	188:17 193:15	207:9 237:12	147:25 148:5
140:22 144:15	314:7 322:5	281:17,20 284:4,6	240:14,17 241:24	149:18,20 150:3
148:2 157:16	328:10 335:18	284:17 285:6,11	249:4,13 256:21	166:23 170:2,10
194:5 249:6	350:21 355:1	288:18 351:12	258:10 277:1	170:12 171:11
suggest 115:21	358:7	352:8,19 354:4	281:2 315:9	191:16 196:17
suggested 223:8	surprise 329:15,22	359:6,17 360:9,21	takeaways 211:3,5	198:9 203:3,17
suite 88:23 89:5,22	surprises 186:18	364:2,6,18 365:7	taken 204:1 221:4	214:25 244:10
305:2 307:9	surrebuttal 118:8	366:23	222:11 369:4	246:14 247:7
311:17	119:8	sympathetic 139:24	takes 147:20	253:1,3,8 282:15
summarize 164:10	surreply 120:19	system 94:8 98:21	204:10 287:15,17	283:4,10 285:19
summary 306:5	121:5	138:11,19 141:13	288:5	290:4,25 291:3,13
333:12	surrounding	143:8,9 152:15	talk 109:15 164:10	293:9 295:2 308:6
summer 232:21	138:13 182:9	153:11 154:1	167:24 210:9	309:17 315:14
274:5 317:23	296:12	159:19,21,24,25	212:3,12 229:4	320:16 321:11
sun 179:4 340:19	suspect 182:20	160:23,25 162:11	326:7 332:17	322:6 333:13,19
super 278:1	suspend 342:22	162:12 179:7	talked 240:24	335:16 339:8
supplement 96:5	343:1 345:16	189:1,3 191:5	294:4 296:8 313:1	340:23,25 341:4
119:24 124:5	suspended 115:3	193:1 196:4 202:6	talking 135:6	341:25 353:12
supplemental	suspending 342:13	212:25 222:15,24	231:17 279:19	363:9,10
130:12	343:13	222:25 224:6,11	280:7 284:2 290:1	tariffs 300:11
supply 139:21	suspension 123:9	224:18 226:1,4	293:22 306:8	tax 173:11 292:8
270:19,22 291:22	186:6 343:25	227:19,20 228:5,9	319:16 336:2	team 255:3 286:25
296:15,23 297:4	sustain 171:8	232:15,16,17	355:15	312:9 317:23
300:10 309:10,25	186:18	233:3,7,10,14,18	talks 362:18	318:6 320:14,17
333:20	swayed 326:2	234:1 235:9	tangible 137:13	team's 321:6
supply-side 123:11	swear 155:15,16	242:17 245:2	target 98:17 185:5	technical 110:19,22
support 143:24	250:20 337:17,18	275:1,2,10,14	216:10 218:3,13	151:22
147:7 338:13	351:16,17 359:20	276:16,23 277:11	241:24 245:5	technically 298:21
supported 202:4,6	359:21	278:15 286:17	253:7 282:7,18,19	techniques 197:21
244:17 245:5	switch 240:12	321:17 334:16	320:3 335:4 363:3	technological
320:4 321:18	241:3,7 273:4	358:1	363:6	275:21
supporting 118:5	switched 222:12	systems 160:22	targeted 248:11	technologies
149:1 231:1 322:3	sworn 156:1 251:3	161:1 212:14	targets 92:10,12,14	150:19 153:3
supports 148:14,16	338:1 352:2 360:3	275:15	92:16,17 94:24	236:13 238:13,15
supposed 202:1	Sykes 88:21 90:10	systemwide 143:12	123:1 133:13,17	239:17 240:21,23
sure 113:25 118:25	90:16,23 91:8,10	225:11 227:14	133:24,25 134:3	241:1,10,13
120:5 123:20	91:11 108:8,9		134:22 135:1,2,8	281:24
162:20 163:7,15	115:13 117:14	T	135:13,16,20	technology 104:8
169:23 170:11	120:17 127:3	T-E-P 108:20	136:20 137:4,4,13	220:20 236:24
179:16 196:10	132:5 142:9 174:2	table 154:17 276:1	137:17 138:6,11	237:4 238:2,8,23
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 490 110
239:1,7,10 240:18	territory 153:14,19	319:23 320:8	281:15,17 285:8	thing 109:17
243:22 245:22	207:19,21,25	337:18 338:12,13	288:20,23 295:9	123:23 235:11
246:10 253:24	tested 274:15	338:16 339:21	295:12,18 312:19	243:20 313:14
255:22 275:18	testified 119:3	342:4,6 345:2	316:8,18,19	319:1 322:8 332:1
282:3,5 292:14	122:24 145:21	351:17 352:13,17	319:21 322:20,23	332:22
298:6,19 315:13	156:3 185:10	354:21 355:2,6,9	322:25 324:5	things 115:17 158:1
331:11	187:19,21 190:10	356:8,14 357:8,17	327:24 328:19,22	198:16 203:1
technology-depe	195:8 251:5	357:24 359:9,21	330:23 335:21,21	204:6,8 219:14
220:16 236:11	287:10 296:6,9	360:15,18	335:23 336:17,19	222:4 237:13
technology-type-	299:8,11 316:4	thank 108:2,6,10	337:23 340:11,13	239:6 272:5 321:5
255:20	319:25 338:3	108:15,21 109:6,7	342:9 344:9 346:2	324:17 325:15
tell 278:7 327:5	352:4 360:5	109:14 111:3,19	346:12 347:18	332:4
367:22	testify 170:7 195:14	111:20 113:20	348:4 349:18,19	think 112:21,22,23
telling 313:16	283:15 313:2	116:1,4 117:7,14	350:6,24 351:3,4	113:3,4 114:17,19
tells 140:17 247:13	testifying 171:7	117:24 118:3	351:11,21 352:21	114:24 115:8,10
temporary 133:21	174:13 175:1	119:16,22 120:4	354:12 359:2,3,4	116:19,22 117:5
ten 109:25 133:4	315:17	121:6,9 122:1,18	359:9,11,12,25	118:16 119:1,7,12
167:5 306:22	testimony 87:20	122:22 123:15,16	360:23,25 363:23	121:12,16,21
tender 156:22	92:24,25 94:19,20	124:18,22 125:1,3	363:25 364:18,20	122:10 124:9,11
251:22 340:9	97:4 99:4 100:14	125:15 126:1,20	364:23,24 365:11	124:19 125:17
352:19 360:21	101:23 103:11,19	127:13 132:19	366:2,3,25 367:25	126:16 127:22
TEP 108:20 148:14	104:4 105:16,19	136:10,12 142:6,7	368:2,5	128:1,11,12 133:5
148:16 149:2	106:3,10 109:18	145:10,12 148:6,7	thanks 196:5	133:10 134:5,16
TEP's 148:24	118:8 119:3,4,6,8	149:7,8,13 151:10	198:17 203:21	135:5,23 159:18
term 134:10 172:11	119:9 120:20,25	151:12 154:10,11	205:5 246:24	170:18,22,23
197:8 246:14	123:2 126:11	154:12,23 155:3,5	250:13 295:11,18	171:1 172:2,3
255:4 274:1 294:6	131:5 138:17	155:20,22 156:21	299:6 305:22	173:14 175:21
294:7,10 330:10	141:10 142:3	156:23 157:2,9	314:16 321:24	177:2 178:2,4,9
344:20	148:18,24 150:21	159:13 161:7	322:22 328:21	179:15 181:2
terminate 320:20	155:16 157:15	172:18 173:23,24	That'd 174:20	182:12,16 184:14
343:1	164:4,15 165:20	174:3 175:22	the 334:6	184:20 187:1
terminated 138:15	165:23 171:14,25	180:24 193:17	then-current	188:3,20 190:6
163:25 165:14,16	172:17 174:9,21	194:17,18 201:4	114:20 122:15	195:22,25 196:15
182:8 221:1 328:4	177:5,6 192:21	206:24,25 207:4,8	164:19 281:5	196:16 197:3
terminating 342:13	195:2 198:18	207:11 209:20	then-future 309:22	199:14,21 200:21
termination 231:25	200:2,8,12 201:12	210:18 212:22	then-relevant	200:25 201:23
terminology 173:14	201:24 204:2	218:18,19 219:21	320:4	203:8,22 204:9,12
terms 173:16,20	214:11,12,14	219:23 220:22	theories 135:25	204:13,17 214:13
242:9 245:17	215:16 223:20	223:12,17 241:19	thereof 188:8 369:9	215:6 217:3 218:9
283:4 290:9 312:1	229:7 231:18	241:21 246:24	thermal 135:10	218:14 219:11
324:17 325:11	247:2,10 250:20	248:21,23,25	139:9,11 166:22	220:2,11,13 226:9
331:24	283:5 289:8,22	250:12,17,19,24	167:11 232:21	226:13 230:15,21
TerraPower 183:7	290:6 296:2,20	251:1,21,23 252:1	241:2 307:20	230:24 231:4,18
183:22 184:13	299:8 307:15,22	254:3,24 255:14	308:4 309:25	236:4 237:17
237:20 282:1	308:13 311:6,21	257:22 258:4,25	310:5 327:8	238:11,16 239:5
terrible 291:1	312:21,22 313:2	270:11 280:13	thermals 311:9	239:19,21 240:13
	1		·	1

241:8,16 242:22	130:8,19,25 131:8	thorough 190:19	364:23	total 326:14,14,14
244:8 248:1,24	132:3,6,10,15,20	thought 223:8	time-sensitive	334:17
249:19,20 253:6	132:24 133:3	294:17 301:5	204:1,9	totality 173:17
254:19 257:5	136:12 142:7	309:23 310:1,4	timed 248:5,5	touching 256:3
258:23 275:18,19	145:12,16 148:7	thoughts 128:17,17	timeline 306:7	tough 239:15
276:9,19 278:3,16	148:10 149:8	249:23 366:7	timely 223:11	track 206:21 278:6
279:18 282:18,18	151:12 154:11,22	three 138:3,5	229:15 231:3	324:15 325:13,15
283:24 287:6,15	155:5,9,14,20	153:18 191:9	times 159:21 179:3	tracking 214:3,4
287:19 288:4,4,6	156:2,23 171:3	226:12 230:2	179:8,11 188:3	tract 214:7
288:12,13,21	172:6,15 173:24	334:25 335:1	305:16	tracts 213:20,24,25
289:11,11,17	174:3 177:10	338:17 340:21	timing 161:16	traditional 199:11
294:6,8 295:6	178:6 180:17	364:15	237:10 248:18	201:19
296:25 298:21	187:17 188:6	throw 186:19	287:6 303:12,24	trajectory 134:10
299:18,21 305:19	193:17,21,25	throwing 186:22	317:20 331:12	153:15 244:11
306:7,11 310:5	194:10 199:25	tight 249:19 304:6	tissue 187:10	333:18
312:3 313:14	201:4 206:25	time 107:13 110:7	today 107:18	transactions 163:3
317:3 320:9,23	207:8 212:20	110:9 111:10	123:25 133:11	163:6
322:5,16 326:3	215:17 218:19	112:8 116:25	134:22 136:9	transcribed 369:5,6
327:16 328:2,5	219:23 220:9,22	117:1 127:11	148:25 153:1	transcript 258:14
329:6 330:6,7,19	221:7,14,19	129:20 131:14	155:17 223:20	258:17 259:6
331:9,16 332:22	223:12 248:23	136:6 149:7 151:4	241:13 243:11	300:25 369:6,6
335:8,11,12 339:7	249:3,22 250:6,17	151:19 157:22	246:8 249:10	transform 135:16
342:16 343:5,11	250:24 251:4,23	163:12,20 164:21	250:21 252:8	153:11
343:22,25 344:17	256:5,11,14,17,20	167:12,17 176:9	270:24 292:20	transformation
345:7 351:1	257:2,22 258:6,16	179:3,4,22 182:13	294:5 310:9 313:1	136:18 149:22
355:10 356:12	259:2 279:2,8	189:9 190:14	320:8 321:4	151:7
358:18 364:22	281:15 284:1,22	196:2 204:12,14	337:19 338:13	transforming
366:10,17,18	288:20 295:12	207:9 221:18	351:18 353:10	153:25
367:2	316:8 318:15,23	222:20 225:8	359:22 365:3,9	transition 134:20
thinking 233:20	322:23 328:22	229:24 233:17	368:2,4	139:15 152:18,22
326:10 327:23	333:6 335:23	235:7 237:14	today's 111:25	162:2 169:17
third 186:17 300:8	336:13,19,24	239:9 240:14	112:4 113:11	205:4 276:10
Thompson 87:16	337:8,16,23 338:2	241:6 243:5	243:13 333:14	transmission
88:7 90:3,18	340:11 344:2	244:24 246:20	365:16	160:19,25 275:2
105:14,17,18,19	345:9 349:20	249:3,5,7,10,12	told 241:2	transparency
107:6,11,14 108:2	350:7,18 351:4,7	250:7 253:13	Tom 206:4	150:20 219:17
108:6,10,15,21	351:14,21 352:3	258:12 287:15,16	tomorrow 291:21	transport 139:22
109:7,14 111:8,20	352:21 359:4,7,12	288:8 303:9,18	ton 324:24	231:19
112:15 113:3	359:15,19,25	304:3,5,6,25	tool 150:17 214:1	Transportation
115:24 117:7,12	360:4,23 363:25	305:4,6 307:2	298:4 312:11	87:2 88:2 107:4
117:24 119:17,22	364:20 365:1,11	308:25 310:3,11	321:7	107:16
120:2,6 121:6	365:20,22 366:3	310:14,21,22	Toolkit 98:8	treated 150:18
122:1,18 123:16	366:13,20,25	317:17 318:18,18	top 184:1 208:24	treaties 152:6
124:18 125:3,15	367:8,23 368:1	322:9,18 330:21	247:3 255:24	treatment 138:25
126:1,20 127:13	Thompson's 90:5	336:21 342:3	303:8 304:18	treaty 152:4,16
127:18,22 130:2,5	236:8	351:2 359:10	315:23	214:23
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	157 10 174 0	226.22	051.16.051.10	100 10 147 00
treaty-protective	157:10 174:9	326:22	251:16 271:12	133:18 147:20
153:5	175:12 186:13	U	286:11 290:14,16	148:1 172:25
trend 242:1,2	195:1 205:6	UE 362:25	298:8 304:9	230:18 357:4
247:21	240:12 283:5,13	UE-210829 87:6	306:23 331:1	unscathed 332:11
tribal 149:5 152:19	283:19 289:22		340:24 353:5,8,9	unserved 326:15,18
209:1,11,21 219:6	296:2 299:17	99:21,23 101:4,7	355:23	unsupported
219:8,11,19	300:4 305:23	102:13,16 104:22	understanding	307:25
Tribe 152:1	306:3 307:14	105:4 107:19	114:11 153:10	unsure 349:4
tribes 151:23,24	308:10 313:20	UE-210852 100:5,7	159:1 171:6 208:6	up-ramp 244:1
152:1,5,12,16,23	314:17,22 346:23	101:14,16 102:23	214:1,5 215:1	update 96:23
208:22	351:8 353:13	103:4 105:7,9	232:11 236:18	114:19,22 116:15
tribes' 152:4	361:8	166:4	240:18 245:1	117:5 121:14,24
153:18	turning 169:14	UE-210979 93:15	254:13 255:19	122:12 124:1,3,5
tried 303:25	198:18 299:7	UE-220376 101:9	271:3 298:16	133:17 134:4,9
trigger 346:4	322:24	101:11 102:18,20	313:11 364:7,10	137:2,17,17
troubles 118:2	twice 315:22	UE-230172 100:4,7	understood 185:9	140:20 141:17,23
true 115:3 178:18	two 114:18 122:20	101:13,16 102:22	189:17 214:17	142:11,15 144:24
183:19 198:21	123:22 124:24	103:4 105:6,9	309:9	145:19 148:5
270:18,21 275:7	125:17 129:11	166:3	unfair 165:12	149:17,21 150:1,8
286:2 296:24	133:11 135:5,25	UE-230172/210852	unfortunate 320:21	157:15 165:25
298:21 307:3,12	160:22 161:1	96:16	331:13	167:8,13,18
369:6	168:17 184:23	ultimate 115:7	unfortunately	184:24 187:12
truly 148:1	191:9 192:24	303:10	274:8 282:16	192:5 196:19,19
truth 155:17,17,18	203:17,17 206:14	ultimately 133:22	331:16 355:18	197:19 220:8
250:21,21,22	213:19 215:10	243:23 277:10	unique 140:2 143:1	228:17,24 229:1,2
337:19,19,20	228:22 230:2	309:18 320:20	143:9 331:7	229:3,10 252:17
351:18,18,19	252:17,20 257:5	328:3	unit 139:9 166:18	272:20 273:2
359:22,22,23	279:21 293:17	UM 96:17 99:14	166:19 277:18	280:14,15,16,20
try 116:11 187:10	299:24 303:24	104:15 121:10	282:24 357:11	283:10 284:23
216:12 219:17	316:7 329:11	126:17 313:22	units 139:11 232:21	291:3 292:2 305:8
244:16 284:17	330:1 344:17	Umatilla 151:25	310:16 311:11,22	305:8 308:6,15,24
305:16 321:10	348:5 361:5,20,25	unable 125:13	357:11,20,20	309:2,5 315:25
333:11 354:7	362:1 364:3 366:4	unallocated 349:1	358:13,13	316:2 322:4,7
trying 127:4 173:7	two-year 150:16	unapproved 138:8	universe 124:8	330:3 333:14
178:10 191:12	185:1 303:13	uncertainty 243:20	unknown 315:11	341:9,20 342:15
199:1,15 202:14	type 148:16 183:6	243:21	unmute 110:23	347:17 354:17,23
202:20,24 204:16	255:22 328:15,16	uncontested 135:13	unnecessarily	355:3 357:9,18,22
204:21 206:10	types 292:14	unconvinced	143:12	357:25 358:4,21
215:7,13 227:25	298:19,23 328:13	140:10	unnecessary	updated 94:24
230:6 238:25	331:11	underlying 232:13	143:25	133:13 135:10
240:15 241:9	typical 171:16	232:19 234:4	unobjected-to	148:5 197:16
242:13 248:12	252:15	underneath 315:1	112:8,12	299:22 340:25
279:3,6 328:8,11	typically 154:16	underscores 149:24	unprecedented	341:17,25
332:14	274:21 275:3	understand 116:18	195:14 198:20	updates 135:16
turn 109:17 110:1	277:19,21,22	153:24 156:16	199:19	136:2 170:9 185:2
111:21 131:15	314:13 319:15	164:24 243:10	unreasonable	updating 203:3
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l ⁻

272:12	150.5 160.15 20	94:1 156:14 172:8	120.2 11 121.15	142.7 0 10 12
	159:5 169:15,20 169:24 170:3,13	185:15	130:3,11 131:15 131:20 135:16,18	143:7,9,10,13 144:6,12 145:1
upstream 115:3	/		· /	*
urge 135:25	173:3 184:15 188:21 199:12	video 110:17 207:6	135:21 141:9	151:20 153:14,20 159:15 160:6
urges 148:3		videoconference	167:24 180:16	
USC 208:5	201:21 202:3	89:8,13	202:17 207:18	161:15 162:13
use 108:20,23	203:5 225:15	view 153:9 227:14	212:11 214:10	165:6 171:25
109:5,13 110:17	238:17,22 239:23	285:20	215:11,15 217:5	184:24 186:21
113:25 114:1,11	240:11 245:16	viewed 168:19	235:3 239:3 240:3	188:5,18 189:6,15
139:11 172:16,23	248:2,12 253:20	186:21	240:4 241:24	192:9 193:1
179:10 197:16	317:18 320:22	views 147:24	243:11 248:7	197:20 201:2,10
232:19 238:23	347:7 361:20	Villiers 91:9 101:21	249:19 257:14	207:19 210:4
253:21,24 254:5	362:6 364:9	101:24 102:1	273:20 276:7	225:11,13,19,23
274:16 298:2	utility's 140:10	103:1 359:18	279:9 280:14	225:24 226:5,8
301:24 302:6	150:2 173:21	360:3,10,13,14,15	290:16 294:15,21	228:10,18,18
355:7,25 356:2,5	206:18 347:20	361:3 363:24	297:24 311:4	232:25 233:11,13
uses 354:23 355:3	V	364:7	317:14 323:5	233:15,22 234:14
usual 203:25		virtually 194:25	325:10,24 327:6	242:15 245:9,10
usually 252:18,20	V-i-l-i-e-r-s	301:16	327:16 331:17	245:13 272:17
252:20 319:17	360:14	vision 106:4 152:20	333:15 341:3	273:8 276:15,25
326:13	vague 358:9	166:23	342:20 343:24	277:2 278:13,20
Utah 116:8,12	valid 203:14 234:5	Vitae 100:16	346:20 347:5	278:25 279:16
117:3 160:11	234:8	vital 322:16	356:4,4,15 365:23	280:3 281:4
189:16,23 190:8	valuable 273:17	VOLUME 87:10	367:7 368:2	282:25 283:9
191:7,8,10 193:4	274:23 275:6	VP 189:18	wanted 123:20	286:18,20 290:7
UTC 96:12 97:5,7,8	value 116:22	vulnerable 153:17	127:11 231:12	290:23 291:23
97:10,11,13,14,16	118:12 147:4	209:2 324:13,23	292:15 312:16	303:14 309:20
97:17,19,20,22,23	170:24	vying 159:16	318:16,19 332:15	310:15,20,24
98:4,5,18,19,23	Van 89:4 108:13		Ware 104:1,4,5	311:25 321:9
151:20 272:17	variable 286:3	W	105:1	325:17 327:19
347:7,10,14 362:9	variant 325:24	W 88:4 107:5	Ware's 320:1 342:6	328:7 334:15
utilities 87:2 88:2	various 139:20,22	WAC 159:5	Warm 151:23	339:23 344:24
107:4,16 128:23	182:17	wait 163:14 230:18	Warren 114:15	345:19,21 346:19
136:19 139:13	vehemently 138:18	284:21 287:6	128:17 187:11	347:7,8,9,10,14
140:24 141:2,3,15	vein 356:7	wait-and-see 141:6	washed 226:1	347:22 348:16,19
143:3,4 145:3	venues 299:12	waiting 163:12	Washington 87:1	349:16 353:7
159:15 160:7,16	verifiable 135:12	295:18	87:12 88:2,16,17	355:13,21 357:10
160:18 171:11	verify 256:7 271:12	waive 109:22,23	88:21,23 89:4	357:13,18,25
199:5,5 202:12	version 303:21	112:7,12 131:16	95:4 96:7 107:3,4	358:3,20,22
203:12 208:12	336:16	waived 132:8,13	107:15 115:20	361:20 362:6
239:1,6,9,14,15	versus 169:13	waivers 230:12	117:19 120:22	369:1,2
253:23,25 330:15	272:7	walk 332:11 343:24	121:1 129:1	Washington's
364:15	vetting 311:2	want 94:7 110:15	133:19 134:11	138:11 143:1
utilities' 206:21	VI 87:10	112:3 113:11,16	135:20 138:21	149:22 286:21
utility 121:18	viable 293:21	117:2,10 119:15	139:2,4,10,12	Washington-
134:12 135:23	321:15	120:4,12,15,18	140:4,13 141:2,14	143:14
139:1,5 140:1,3	vice 92:21 93:1	124:15 127:1	141:15 142:16	Washington-loca
		l		

		<u> </u>	1	1
327:17	201:7 202:3,14,24	209:16 211:22	168:14 169:13	242:3,13,20 244:7
Washington-spec	203:3 204:5,16	213:7 214:18	179:3 180:7,8	246:3,5 247:14
143:15	205:3 215:6,6,13	web 135:3	237:11 240:7	249:1,11 250:11
wasn't 123:20	218:14 220:12	website 228:21	274:20,21 275:3	250:23 251:22,25
317:22 329:21	221:3 222:3,23	week 112:14	275:13,19 276:25	252:16 257:25
water 237:7	223:4 224:2 225:4	weighing 128:14	277:9,22 278:8,21	273:21 274:15
Wattsmart 213:8	225:5,5,14 226:18	weight 128:14	286:3 292:6	283:23 284:9,11
way 128:9 154:1	227:19,22,25	129:4 316:17	294:13,17 297:23	284:14,21 285:2
171:16 189:4	228:11 229:21,25	328:17	298:23 300:8	285:10 295:11,14
190:18 215:14	230:5,12 233:10	Weinberger 89:9	316:24 334:6	310:13 320:1
226:21 228:6	234:6,16,24	weird 301:7 324:22	wind's 237:15	322:22 323:24
229:19 230:14	238:22,25 239:3	welcome 111:15	winter 237:15	328:21,24 333:3,4
235:2 239:7	241:9 242:15	124:21 194:12	274:5	333:8 336:8,11,15
241:12,23 242:6	243:7,12 244:11	250:7	Wiseman 209:25	336:22,25,25
244:13 246:11	245:21,23 246:15	well-known 316:5	210:3,6 211:19	337:2,21 340:4,10
248:20 286:15	246:16 248:11,18	went 180:19 195:14	wit 107:7	344:5 345:12
310:21 311:4	248:19,19 258:2	204:3 210:23	Withdraw 101:9	349:19 351:3,5,9
312:7 317:19	258:23 271:22	271:3	102:18	351:13,20 352:20
324:22 326:18	273:4 293:22	weren't 297:23	withhold 178:6	359:3,11,13,16,24
ways 171:17 205:3	302:17 318:20	299:22 316:12	witness 103:13	360:22 364:24,25
221:21 222:23	319:12,16,17	west 222:15	115:9 119:2 127:9	369:10
243:17	323:21 324:23	Western 89:2,15	128:5,5,8,21	witness's 128:16
we'll 109:17,24	325:21,21 326:3	103:9 108:11,22	135:7 148:18	188:7,11,14 201:2
110:5 122:4 171:8	327:23 328:2	109:3 191:5	154:16,17,18	344:6
178:8 188:13	329:13 330:17	whatever's 244:15	155:4,8,13,19	witnesses 110:2,10
197:16 204:24	334:24 355:15	244:16	156:22,25 163:23	110:14 111:5,12
236:1 242:5,6	366:17	wheel 160:10	170:19 171:1,24	111:13,17 112:18
244:4,4,21,21,24	we've 113:12 115:3	wheeling 159:20,23	172:19 175:24	118:18 127:7,24
245:6,23,25,25	121:15 131:25	160:1,20,21,23	177:4 178:11	361:5 368:3
246:1,5 323:1	150:6 152:13	WHEREOF	181:16 182:2	witnesses' 110:12
351:7 365:15	162:25 173:16	369:10	185:6 193:16,21	Wonderful 154:23
366:10 367:3,9	178:9,9 179:18,20	wholly 151:23	199:16 201:14	wondering 126:4
we're 118:24	180:7 204:17	WIJAM 135:11	207:2 214:14	Woodland 107:2
121:10 123:25	211:23 214:7	138:10 280:2	215:17,17 220:7	words 138:1 140:16
125:5,5 133:13,16	219:15 222:5	286:19 339:24	220:11 221:1,10	142:3 203:23
136:9 157:22	229:24 235:8	341:9 354:24	221:15 222:2	217:23 331:3
162:9,9,9,25	237:19 272:1	355:4,7,13,16	223:17,25 225:13	work 117:1 127:4
163:12,14 169:8	276:20 282:8	356:2,3,5	226:9 227:2,12,17	129:8 149:3
170:23 171:4	313:1,6 320:8	wildfire 150:23	228:16 229:4,11	165:15 192:22
173:17 174:24	322:13 326:7	182:17 185:11	229:18 230:21	214:17 215:5,11
180:10 181:2	328:9 329:6	186:24 187:19,20	231:9,22 232:10	215:23 216:10
184:15 188:25	331:10 345:4	188:5,19 189:2	233:2,6 234:13	217:10,13 219:4
189:2,12 190:12	350:20	231:15 235:8	235:15,17,21,25	221:2 222:8
191:18 193:10	weatherization	Wildlife 152:11	236:3,15,16	227:21 229:22
194:11 196:20,20	148:22 149:4	willing 109:23	238:11 239:19	255:18 271:1
197:15,15,21,24	153:2 154:7	wind 96:19 157:24	240:22 241:14	273:25 290:13,13
177.13,13,21,27	100.2 10 1.7	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	210.22 211.17	273.23 270.13,13
•				

212 0 222 25		127.04.120.2	00 100 5 101 14	220 22 240 5
312:9 332:25	Y	137:24 138:3	08 100:5 101:14	339:22 340:5
333:5 350:3	Yakama 149:3	145:23 152:13	102:23 105:7	12-hour 237:3
worked 239:13	152:1 153:13	154:10 179:19	1	12:25 249:4
working 163:8	154:3 207:22	182:21 184:23,25	194:9 96:20,22,23	12:26 250:4
183:5 191:19	209:11 211:21	191:9,9 203:17	99:15 101:12	1200 89:22
211:24,25 215:5	212:5 213:20	204:11 225:2	102:21 104:16	129 92:3,4,6,7,8,10
219:18 221:3	214:18,23 215:5	226:12 230:3		92:11,12,14,15,17
222:5,23 238:12	215:11 218:7,15	238:12 239:11	164:9 174:11	92:24,25 93:3,4,6
241:9 310:14	Yakima 209:24	246:13 252:18,20	195:8 205:12	93:7,9,10,12,13
321:6 324:21	210:1,23 212:7,23	271:22 272:2	249:6 276:3	93:16,17,19,20,22
326:3,5	213:4,18	281:3 291:12	310:17 311:13	93:23 94:3,4,6,9
Workpaper 92:10	yeah 112:25 114:7	335:17	323:20 335:16	94:10,12,19,20,21
92:11	166:8 167:7 181:9	yep 216:5 272:18	338:24 341:7	94:22,24 95:4,5,7
Workpapers 99:5	181:16 182:7	357:23	357:20 358:13	95:8,10,11,13,14
104:6	185:12 186:12	YOCHANAN 89:9	1-20 94:11	95:16,17,19,20,22
works 212:9 286:13	193:25 206:13	Yochi 89:9 108:18	1-3 100:18	95:23 96:4,7,9,11
world 139:22 301:8	208:24 209:5	you-all 250:7	1,000 145:8	96:12,14,15,17,19
worldwide 300:10	210:14,21 215:3	yzakai@smwlaw	1.10 323:23	96:21,23 97:4,5,7
worry 243:19	215:18 217:3,17	89:11	1.3 210:13,15	97:8,10,11,13,14
worst 133:25	241:20 246:3		1.5 212:15	97:16,17,19,20,22
worth 275:11	284:9 287:9	Z	1.6 213:5	97:23 98:4,5,7,10
282:24 312:3	289:21 295:18	Zachary 88:10	1.7 213:17	98:14,15,18,19,21
wouldn't 172:25	298:10 299:20	108:1	1.8 323:22	98:23 99:4,5,7,9
203:13 242:9	301:21 313:14	zachary.rogala@	1:15 250:2	99:11,13,16,18,20
341:1	314:3,25 318:21	88:13	1:18 250:4,8	99:22 100:4,6,14
Wow 335:20	319:4 320:13	Zakai 89:9 90:12	10 97:10 101:9	100:16,17,19,21
wrap 242:14	336:8,16 357:15	108:17,18 132:12	102:18 165:21	100:23 101:3,6,8
wrapped 116:18	year 116:14,16,17	148:9	246:13 291:2	101:11,13,15,23
122:13	116:17,20 122:12	zero 199:7 246:10	314:22,23 315:24	102:3,5,6,8,10,12
write-off 239:14	122:13 124:6	zero-carbon 153:12	347:12 348:1	102:15,17,20,22
writing 302:2	137:25 157:25	zero-cost 286:3	10-K 116:13	103:3,11,13,19
313:11,14	162:11 163:14	zero-fuel-cost	10-Ks 114:17	104:3,5,6,7,9,11
writings 129:3	179:9 184:24	178:20	10.13.22 96:11	104:13,15,17,19
written 302:2	187:14 198:4	ZIP 214:4	10:55 194:8	104:21 105:3,6,8
304:17	221:12 222:9,9	Zoom 110:20,21	100 134:7,12	105:16,18,19
wrong 284:13,18	228:22,25 248:10	111:15 207:5	103 89:15	106:3,4,10
327:5 350:22	277:2 292:11	257:8,20	107 89:4 90:3,4	12th 366:5
WUTC 102:3	293:17 301:10		109 90:5	13 95:9 164:5,9
Wyoming 160:11		0	11 165:22 167:6	186:15 194:2
180:8,9 189:16	305:16 308:19	01 365:13	174:11 283:6	238:12 283:6
191:6 274:22	311:18 315:25	031942 362:25	339:22 340:5	289:23 299:21
276:25 292:6	326:9 333:22	04.13.23 96:14	11:10 194:6,8	302:20 339:21
294:13,17	335:15	06 99:21 100:5	111 90:6	340:4 361:14
2) 1. 13,17	year's 136:6	101:4,9,14 102:13	1151 208:5	13-28 100:20 102:7
X	years 133:15,24	102:18,23 104:22	12 95:7 149:25	130 90:7 96:5
	134:10,21 136:7,8	105:7 177:14	215:19 216:6	130,000 243:19
				130,000 443.17

	Ī	101 0 - 10- 1-		
245:21	2	101:3,6 102:12,15	114:15 116:18	245:21 271:21,25
133 90:8	2 95:16 157:11,11	104:15,21 105:3	121:24 124:3,3,5	272:6,11 280:21
1345 181:10	276:3 310:17	136:23 138:6	137:1,1,8 144:21	280:24 287:19,21
136 90:9	311:13 338:25	149:18 150:16	145:18,23 150:11	288:1,4,5 293:16
13th 300:2 301:1	341:11 346:14	163:17 208:13	166:3 176:15	301:2,13 310:16
305:25 313:21,25	357:20 365:15	210:7 212:24	181:22 182:3	320:5,10,12,23
14 164:9 283:13	366:1	228:19,19,25	183:14 186:9	322:15 339:3
307:24	2- 98:16 237:3	253:4,5,9,11	197:19 205:16,24	344:11 345:17
140,000 242:15	20 93:5 161:10	270:23 287:1,2,8	228:15,17 229:1,2	357:11
142 90:10	162:1 174:18,23	290:25 291:7	255:2,3,13 271:4	2026 146:5 287:18
145 90:11	174:24 176:15	303:13 309:22	272:20,25 273:1	288:2
148 90:12	179:18,19 182:7	310:19 364:17	287:1,21 299:2	2027 287:12 288:13
149 90:13	190:13 213:3	2022 93:14 94:13	302:11,20,21	2028 183:18 238:3
14th 306:15 307:8	218:5 236:19	96:17 101:12	303:5,12,15,21,21	255:6,6 272:11
15 150:10 194:5	238:2 239:11	102:21 106:4	305:9,25 306:6,11	287:13 288:13
250:14 361:10,15	242:10 246:13	121:11 123:12	308:3,11,16 309:5	334:20 335:9
151 90:14	247:3 319:25	124:14 133:15	309:12,13,16	2029 136:8 146:5
156 90:15	323:20 346:24	137:8,18,21	310:1,23 313:21	224:5 280:18,25
157 90:16	348:11 367:2,9,10	139:19 144:19	313:25 317:22	281:8 288:14
16 98:22 174:18,19	367:12	145:20 150:3	318:5 329:16	357:20
362:2	20- 302:9 309:11	152:19 158:9	330:3 357:1	2030 98:16 123:1
17 97:12 174:24	313:20	163:18,25 164:1	358:17	134:4,21,23
362:11	20-21 99:10	181:1,19 182:8	2024 87:11 93:15	136:22 137:2,14
174 90:16	2000 88:23	205:15,19,20	93:16 94:7 96:20	140:7,15,17
18 97:13 190:19	2016 190:7	206:12 210:11,19	96:22,23 98:22	144:16 145:25
208:5	2016/2017 190:13	211:19 224:17	99:12,15 100:5,8	146:4 147:11
1855 152:6	2019 254:15 364:12	231:13 232:9	101:14,17 102:23	151:2,6 157:17
186,000 334:8,16	2020 123:12 138:15	253:16 254:9,18	103:5 104:14,16	159:14 185:5,7
334:22	139:20 140:12	255:11,16 270:23	105:7,10 107:2,13	195:13 196:16
18th 130:14	144:18 157:19	271:5 273:12	130:14 133:24	197:3,9,13 199:7
19 97:15 100:5,8	158:1,3,7,10,11	281:10 287:3,8,10	137:9 144:22	224:5 229:16
101:14,17 102:23	158:15 161:20	297:7 299:14,21	145:23 167:4	230:3 234:16
103:5 105:7,10	162:6,17,21	300:2 301:1	181:24 182:6,8	238:3 242:6,12,23
363:2	164:23 177:23	304:14 312:25	210:7 212:24	243:2 244:4
19.405.120 208:10	191:20 198:3	313:3 314:1 317:1	282:11 292:21	245:24 246:3,9
19.405.120(4)(A)	205:14,20 206:6	317:6,20 318:11	308:11 314:19	281:8 282:7,19
209:5	222:13 234:3	318:11 319:19	366:5 369:5,11	283:2 320:3,15
1900-plus 329:14	254:10,14 271:5	320:20 328:3	2025 133:15,24	321:15 322:2,12
194 90:17	273:8,9 276:4	2023 92:3 96:11,12	134:3 137:9	331:4,21 333:22
1977 152:6	280:1 297:18,21	96:14,15,18,23	145:21,23 146:2,6	334:9,14
19th 167:4 308:11	298:24 318:11	98:12,21 99:11,21	150:3 151:4	2030s 150:13
308:19	329:9 332:2	99:24 100:4,6	166:19 169:9	2032 134:8 220:5
19X 116:5	341:18 356:9,17	101:5,7,10,13,15	182:18,24 195:12	236:10 238:7
1st 137:1 306:13	356:23 357:3	102:14,16,19,22	199:20 221:11	242:7,11 255:7,9
308:16 314:19	2021 99:13,20,22	103:3 104:8,9,13	241:25 242:10	272:7
369:11	2021 77.13,20,22	104:23 105:5,6,8	243:14 244:5,12	2045 134:5 185:8
	<u> </u>			1

				1 ago 117
199:7 220:5	24-297 93:16 99:12	166:19 175:18	37 144:2 285:14	334:17 339:3
236:10 238:6	104:13	211:8 247:2	290:7 294:14	342:10
239:16	24/7/365 237:23	282:19 283:2,13	295:4	5/26/2025 369:16
206.521.3211 88:24	241 90:20	311:11 331:3	38 93:18	50 150:10 247:23
207 90:17	246 90:20	332:17,20 333:17	39 97:24	282:24
21 87:11 93:6 94:7	25 99:21,24 101:5,7	334:25 335:1	396 89:10	500 275:11
107:2,19 228:22	102:14,16 104:23	339:1,14 357:11		503.238.0667 89:23
228:25 287:7	105:5 134:21	3:00 110:11	4	503.241.7242 89:6
348:12 356:11	136:8 137:19,20	3:56 368:7	4 166:18,19 175:19	52 95:13
367:12 369:5	169:3,5 196:18	30 148:14 229:22	190:15 195:8	53 93:9
219 90:18	215:23 244:10	236:19 246:13	200:2,12 247:3	54 91:25 365:19
2193 96:17 121:10	245:6 246:17	300-megawatt	249:10,10 285:5,7	55 95:15
313:22	248:10 290:19	316:24	300:4,4 306:3,3	57 93:11
21C 347:19	307:16 342:14	300-MW 96:19	311:11 339:2	58 93:12
21st 107:12	343:2	30th 306:18	341:16,16 357:11	59 95:22
21X 284:17	251 90:22	30X 123:14 124:25	357:11 358:13,14	59601 89:16
21XC 130:2	252 90:22	31 137:7,18,22	4- 237:3	5C 175:17,23
22 121:13 181:13	25th 136:25	221:11 241:25	4-8 94:5 96:10	5X 353:17,18,19
316:5 363:14	26 137:19 312:22	290:13,21	4-GW' 98:16	361:9
220 90:18	319:23	31st 287:21 303:15	4:00 337:5	
223 90:19	27 93:8 113:24	303:21 306:11	40 98:4 137:8	6
22X 119:20 209:8	181:2 215:21	31X 126:5	212:25 236:20	6 97:6 212:20 216:4
284:24	216:13 217:11,15	323 90:24	283:1 291:7	296:6 339:4,8,8
22XC 130:1	217:21,24 218:5	329 91:3	40128 88:17	339:14 341:23
23 97:16 121:14	27A 114:1,12	32X 125:7 126:5	406.443.3501 89:16	6- 237:3
124:1 137:19	27D 113:25 114:11	33 137:19 241:25	41 98:6 137:11	60 95:24 137:9,9
187:14 195:2	27th 367:24	241:25 242:10	415.552.7272 89:11	280:17 303:25
200:2 201:12	28 93:16 97:19	245:21 280:21,24	43 152:21	366:6,8,10,12,18
228:23 273:2	99:12 104:14	335 91:4	430 89:5	366:22,24
292:2 296:3 299:7	181:3 361:15	338 91:5	435.319.5010 88:12	61 93:19
303:3,11 309:13	281 90:23	34 95:19	45 249:20,25	62 93:21 280:25
312:12 315:3,24	289 90:23	34-37 104:12	46 98:18	281:7
316:1 341:14	28th 365:9	340 91:6	47 95:12 299:13	621 107:2
23-25 94:13	28X 350:15	35 95:10 249:6,19	48 95:21	63 93:22 166:15
23.8 213:3,9,17	29 97:21 137:20	294:13	480-100-610	64 96:4 285:4
231 90:19	204:10 229:22	350 91:6	169:15	65 93:24
2345 99:14 104:15	230:3 291:15	352 91:8	480-100-610(4)(a)	7
126:17	295 90:24	353 91:8	159:5	
23X 284:24	2976 369:16	36 97:22 98:24	49 98:20	7 95:18 164:9
24 97:18 137:19	29X 123:13	360 91:10	4A 116:6,24 209:4	174:24 215:20,23
190:19 196:18	2A 353:14,16,22	360.709.4850 88:18	5	229:8 233:11,20
200:11 244:10	354:8,11,14	361 91:10		334:4 339:6,9
245:6 246:17	2T 201:12	364 91:11	5 165:21 175:17,19	700 89:21
290:19 315:3		365 91:12,23,24	175:20 275:6	75 247:24
24-073 98:13	3	368 91:13	283:2,13 300:20	77 335:3
126:10	3 93:15 157:11	369 87:14	331:3 332:17,20	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı	ı

				Page 410
	1		1	ı 7
8				
8 97:7 174:11 216:4				
233:12,20 285:5,7				
285:11 291:1				
312:24 334:5				
339:11				
8- 237:3				
80 242:5				
80.01.040 347:11				
800 88:22				
82 96:21 98:13				
99:12 104:13				
123:24 124:4				
126:9 281:8				
333:23				
825 88:11				
87 87:14				
8C 285:24				
9				
9 97:9 102:4 107:13				
229:8 272:17				
283:6 291:1				
307:19				
9:00 107:3				
94102 89:10				
97214 89:5				
97232 88:12 89:22				
98104 88:23				
98504 88:17				
7000100.17				
	l .	l	<u> </u>	I