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September 30, 2022 10:40 A.M.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Good morning. Today is Friday, September 30, 2022. The time is approximately 10:30 a.m. -- apologies, 10:40 a.m. My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am the administrative law judge for the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission presiding in this matter along with the Commissioners. And they will join us in a moment.

Today we are convening for the continued portion of a settlement hearing that began on September 21, 2022, in consolidated Dockets UE-220053, UG-220054, and UE-210854, which is an Avista's electronic and natural gas general rate case and its electric service reliability reporting plan.

On September 21 st we did not have enough time to finish all witness testimony prior to the end of the day. And today's date was selected in consultation with the parties and in consideration of the Commission's availability.

We are scheduled to end at 2 p.m., but I do not expect us to take nearly that long.

As before, we are using videoconferencing software so that observers can see video of witnesses, attorneys, myself, and the commissioners during the

1 hearing. No other participant or observer should appear 2 on video. Counsel.

Is there going to be anyone else appearing?
MS. SUETAKE: Yes. Thank you, Judge
O'Connell. My name is Nina Suetake on behalf of the Public Counsel unit. My pronouns are she/her. And you may address me as Ms. Suetake.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
And for the Alliance of Western Energy
Consumers.
MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your Honor. Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf of AWEC. My pronouns are she/her. And you may address me as Ms. Moser.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
For the Northwest Energy Coalition.
MS. HARDWICK: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Ellie Hardwick on behalf of the Northwest Energy Coalition. My pronouns are she/her. And Ms. Hardwick is fine. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
And for the Energy Project.
MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Yochanan Zakai. I'm with the Shute, Mihaly \&

Weinberger. Here today representing the Energy Project. My pronouns are he/him. And you may address me as Mr. Zakai.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
For Sierra Club.
MR. DENNISON: Good morning, Your Honor. Jim Dennison for Sierra Club. My pronouns are he/him. And Mr. Dennison is fine.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.
For Walmart.
MS. BALDWIN: Good morning. This is Vicki
Baldwin on behalf of Walmart. I'm with Parsons Behle \&
Latimer. You can address me as Ms. Baldwin. And my pronouns are she/her.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And good morning.

For Small Business Utility Advocates.
MS. WEBERSKI: Good morning, Your Honor.
Jennifer Weberski on behalf of Small Business Utility Advocates or SBUA. My pronouns are she/her. And you can address me as Ms. Weberski.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
Moving on regarding exhibits. Avista SC-6C
which updated pages 8 and 9 of that exhibit. And that was Avista's response to Public Counsel data request 103C supplemental. The parties have stipulated to the admission of that revision to the exhibit. / / /
(Data Request No. 103C supplemental admitted.)

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I want to turn to Public Counsel.

In the last hearing we discussed a due date for the submission of public comments. But at the end we suspended that and we're going to address it again now. The Puget Sound Energy general rate case hearing is on Monday. And with that in mind, $I$ want to ask if Public Counsel has a reasonable deadline they would like to recommend for compiling and filing the public comments exhibit with the Commission.

MS. PAISNER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
Public Counsel would like to recommend Wednesday, October 12th, as a deadline for the public comment exhibit filing.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think that's reasonable.

If there is not any objection, I'm going to make that the deadline for the public comment exhibits. They'll be set to be filed on October 12, 2022.

And I'm going to reiterate this at the end of the hearing today, but $I$ will issue a notice of bench request with -- any bench requests that have been made throughout the hearing, including this one, which I'm

1 going to designate as $B R$-- bench request No. 3 or $B R-3$.

I will add a side note that I've been in communication with the parties via e-mail and have used those communications to compile a list of appropriate persons for the confidential session.

So let me pause there.
Is there any change to that list that needs to be made?

Hearing none, we are going to move on.
When questions touching on the confidential information have finished, we are going to return to the main session of this virtual hearing and we will continue with any wrap-up questions that are not confidential, and then we will address all other matters.

At the end of our hearing on September 21st, Public Counsel and Avista waived cross-examination of the remaining witnesses Baldwin-Bonney, Earle, and Coppola. Those witnesses are excused as the Commission has no questions for any of them.

Are there any questions about how we are going to proceed today before I indicate to the Commissioners that we are ready for them to join us?

I'm seeing head shaking and not hearing anything.

So we'll take just a short pause. We're not going to go off the record. And I am going to ask that

1 the Commissioners join us and turn on their video.

And, Mr. Meyer, while we're waiting for all of the Commissioners to join us, please indicate to Mr. Brandkamp that we are going to be ready for him to appear and testify.

MR. MEYER: He's positioned and ready to go. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Callaghan, let me ask one question of Staff in the interim here while we're still waiting.

I see that there's another representative for staff, Mr. Roberson. Should he also be added to the confidential session?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, I didn't anticipate that Mr. Roberson would be joining us. But he certainly can be added.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, are you on? I can see you listed but without your camera and sound. There you are.

CHAIR DANNER: I am on. Thank you.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
Let's turn now and start where we left off with Public Counsel's questions for Avista witness Brandkamp.

Mr. Brandkamp, I would like to remind you that you remain under oath having been sworn in on

September 21st.
Mr. Meyer, is there any introduction of your witness that you would like to make before we continue? MR. MEYER: No, there's not. Thank you. He's here for just a continuation of his cross.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Then I
will turn it over to Public Counsel.
Go ahead, Ms. Paisner.
MS. PAISNER: Thank you, Judge O'Connell.
CROSS-EXAMINATION (continued)
BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Brandkamp.

Would you please turn to page 7 of your rebuttal testimony, REB-1CT?
A. Okay.
Q. Beginning on line 12 and through the end of the page and on to the following page, you respond to Mr. Coppola's testimony that the Company's wildfire resiliency plan should have a mitigating impact on insurance premiums for the company in future years.

And your response in those lines, those pages, is that it will not affect it.

Is that correct?
A. So it will not have a direct impact on premium savings for the company.

But eventually as the risk of wildfires go down, we should forgo additional increases because of fires that we might have had. So it will help stabilize the rates.
Q. The Company is spending tens of million of dollars to prevent fires through the wildfire resiliency plan and vegetation management programs; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Why, then, would the company not realize any benefits through lower insurance premiums as a result of spending that much money annually?
A. Because the current marketplace does not provide credits for any type of wildfire plans. It is -- it is expected now that companies will have some type of plan, some type of baseline controls in terms of addressing risk.

But in terms of companies offering discounts because a plan exists that is not available in the marketplace today from insurers.
Q. How certain are you that those fire prevention programs will not reduce insurance premiums in coming years?
A. So as I -- as I stated at the beginning of this

1 question, it will have an indirect impact. Because if 2 you can reduce the fire ignitions and frequency of fires, 3 those that have lost energy will not have in the future which will generate additional premium increases above the risk premium increases that we're already getting now because we live in an area that is prone to increased fire risk.

MS. PAISNER: Thank you. I have no other questions for Mr. Brandkamp. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

I recall you saying at the end of our hearing last time that you were just nearly finished, and you were spot on.

Mr. Meyer, is there any redirect from questions today and questions on September 21st?

MR. MEYER: There is not. Thank you. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.

Mr. Brandkamp, I'm going to pause for a moment, look to the Commissioners. I don't believe there are any bench questions but I'll pause.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No questions. CHAIR DANNER: No questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

Mr. Brandkamp, thank you for your testimony today and on September 21st. You are excused.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So to update the commissioners on a slight change of plan with the schedule. The parties and I have discussed that we should go ahead and skip to Avista's witness Kalich. And then take Mr. Thies last as he will be -- he will have testimony that touches upon confidential information so that we can get as much testimony that is nonconfidential into the record before we then jump into a confidential session.

So let's go ahead and ask for Mr. Kalich to turn on his video. I see that his video is on.

Mr. Kalich, will you please raise your right hand.

CLINT KALICH, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

And how would you like us to address you today? THE WITNESS: Yeah. Mr. Kalich would be great. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

Mr. Meyer.
MR. MEYER: Yes. Thank you.
For the record, Mr. Kalich, please state your full name and your title and your employer.

THE WITNESS: Clint Kalich. I'm senior manager of energy analysis. And I work for Avista utilities.

MR. MEYER: Thank you.
The witness is available for cross.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Turn now to Public Counsel.
Ms. Suetake, I see your video on. So go ahead.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. SUETAKE:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Kalich. My name is Nina Suetake, and I'm here on behalf of Public Counsel unit. I will try to be very quick because I understand you are not feeling well.

Do you have a copy of your testimony in front of you, your direct testimony?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Okay. And could you please turn to page 4?
A. I'm there.
Q. On lines 10 through 16 -- I'll give you a second.

Is it correct that the power supply methodology

1 uses a three-month historical average of actual
electricity and national gas prices for the forward rate period?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Do you have a copy of the cross-examination Exhibit EGK-7X?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And are you familiar with this data request response?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. And it -- is it correct that you are -sorry. Never mind.

Is it correct that Avista states in this response that the proposed level of power supply expense is based on a forward look of resource and load requirements for the pro forma period?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you can give me one second. I need to pull up your -- apologies. I am missing your rebuttal testimony in front of me.

MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, I'm sorry. If I can get a moment. I failed to open all of the documents. BY MS. SUETAKE:
Q. Never mind.

Looking at this data request response, is it

1 correct that you state that there is typically no estimate or forecast that uses data more recent than four years old?
A. That is what is stated in the response, yes.
Q. I would like to discuss this with you a little bit.

Are you saying that there is no forecast that uses anything more recent than four years ago, 2018?
A. Yeah. Ms. Suetake, I think -- I believe I see where you're going here with this question.

The -- the response here had some information on some of the larger-cost components. We struggle a little bit -- or I personally struggle a little bit -- with the intent of the response and was trying to be responsive.

So I think in that statement, I was thinking more of the assumptions around, say, the outage rates or the maintenance rates for our power plants or some of the market revenue.

So -- and the last paragraph, I did mention because $I$ was thinking of things that may not have been otherwise documented where I talk about the work papers, revised the additional information. And I think you're clearly pointing out here that the price is based on a more recent set of forecasts. It is three months. It's stated in testimony and the data provided in working
papers.
Q. Okay.
A. So that would run counter to that specific sentence. I was hoping, I guess, in looking at this last paragraph that would have differentiated that.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I was going to walk you through your work papers, but I think you've answered.

Just to make sure, national -- for instance, natural gas prices would be more recent than four years old -- the four years; is that correct?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. And that -- do those include -- do the power prices and natural gas prices include data from 2021 even?
A. They would be based upon, as the testimony identifies later, it was a three-month average up through August of last year. So they would have been 2021, all of the data.

MS. SUETAKE: Okay. Thank you.
I believe that is all my questions for you. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Meyer, any
cross-examination -- sorry, redirect?
MR. MEYER: Here I am. There is none. Thank
you.
Thank you, Mr. Kalich. Take care of yourself. THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm going to look to the Commissioners.

Again, I don't believe there are any bench questions. But did that bring any? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no questions. CHAIR DANNER: No questions. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No questions, Your Honor. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. Mr. Kalich, thank you for your testimony today. You are excused. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Judge O'Connell. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Now let's have Avista witness Thies appear on video and testify.

The plan is that -- well, let me ask Ms. Paisner for Public Counsel. Are there -- I'm assuming that there are some preliminary questions at the beginning of your examination that are not confidential; is that correct? MS. PAISNER: Yes, that is correct. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. When you're done with those, please indicate to us when your questions will start to necessarily require that we get into confidential information, and we will take a pause before

1 asking those questions, and we will move to confidential 2 session.

MS. PAISNER: Okay. Thank you. That was my plan.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I see we have Mr. Thies on video.

Mr. Thies, I want to remind you that you remain under oath having been sworn in during the hearing on September 21st.

Mr. Meyer, is there any introduction of your witness again that you would like to make before we continue?

MR. MEYER: Just full name and position with the company, please.

THE WITNESS: Mark Thies. I'm the executive vice president, chief financial officer, and treasurer of Avista.

MR. MEYER: Thank you. That's all I have. He's ready for cross.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Ms. Paisner, please go ahead.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Thies.
A. Good morning.
Q. I think $I$ would first like to make a clarification in Exhibit MTT-12CX where there is a reference to -- the Company's response to Public Counsel data request 328C. Where this reference appears in that exhibit on the right-hand column for sources, I will refer to it as Exhibit MTT-9CX, which is how it has been renamed. So I just wanted to make that clear clarification before beginning.

MR. MEYER: Excuse me. This is Mr. Meyer.
I'm finally to that page and the source column. Could you direct us to the line number in the source column?

MS. PAISNER: Yes, that's correct.
MR. MEYER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. Paisner, I think I can clarify the question for us all.

In that source column, there -- there is an exhibit indicated PC cross exhibit X -- big X little X, indicated Public Counsel data request 328C with various attachments.

Is that -- I see several lines that are indicated with that.

MS. PAISNER: Yes.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Is that supposed -- is that big X a placeholder for -- I'm sorry, is it 6X that you

1 said?
Q. Please turn to page 32 . JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you for pausing so we can all get there. THE WITNESS: EMA-7T, is that what you said, I'm sorry, Ms. Paisner, just to make sure. BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Yes. It's Exhibit EMA-7T, this is Elizabeth Andrews' rebuttal testimony.
A. Page 32.
Q. Starting on page 32, line 9.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay.
A. Or I have it in front of me, I guess I should say. I have it in front of me.
Q. Okay. So beginning on line 9 of this page and through the next five pages, Ms. Andrews discusses her objection, or the Company's objection, to the adjustments to pension and OPEB proposed by Public Counsel.

It appears on these pages that the main objection that the Company has is that Mr. Coppola's analysis of pension and OPEB expenses, that in his analysis, he used information from a December 2020 actuarial run instead of more recent information.

Is that your understanding?
A. That is my general understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. For my next few questions I'll be referring to Exhibits MTT-8X through 11X, so far no confidential material. But these are the exhibits and these are data requests 327 through 30 .

I noticed that on these DR responses that the Company submitted, you are identified as the witness; is that correct?
A. Yes. I don't -- on all of them, I haven't looked at every single one of them, but $I$ assume that $I$ am, yes. I see 8X. I can look at the others just to make sure if that is helpful.
Q. Are you able to answer questions about this subject matter as it is discussed in these data requests and in Ms. Andrews' rebuttal testimony?

MR. MEYER: Your Honor -- let me go on with video here.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: For the record, this is Mr. Meyer.

MR. MEYER: Okay. Good. We're all set. Just -- I'm not sure where this is going. But in advance of last week's hearing, I communicated with Ms. Paisner anticipating that there might be some overlap between Ms. Andrews and Mr. Thies. And I tried to make quite clear in advance of the hearings that Ms. Andrews is the appropriate witness to speak to how the pension

1 expense was built into the case. But Mr. Thies is the

Page 399
1 Mr. Meyer indicated, if it's how it got incorporated into
2 the revenue requirement, I may need to defer to
3 Ms. Andrews.
But we can go forward and I can answer to the best of my ability. And if I need to refer to Ms. Andrews, I will -- I will attempt to do that as well. If that works for everyone.
Q. Okay. The reason I ask these questions is that you did not file any testimony on pension or OPEB expenses; is that correct?
A. Yes. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. Would you please look at Exhibit MTT-10CX in attachment $A$. This is the Company's response to Public Counsel data request 329C.

MR. MEYER: This is a confidential exhibit. MS. PAISNER: I understand.

THE WITNESS: And I see in MTT-10CX, I see five pages. I'm looking for what was a -- an attachment, but maybe I'm missing it. I see. Okay. Attachment A, is that what it is? I'm sorry.

BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. That's the full exhibit, yes.
A. Attachment $A$ is the -- that's the page I'm supposed to be on?
Q. Subpart B, which I don't believe is on that

1 attachment. I just wanted you to have the full exhibit 2 in front of you.

MR. MEYER: I'm going to at this point lodge an objection because this really tips over the line. This goes to a table of before various pension evaluation results, the timing. And ultimately how they were built into the case. And that's really the province of Ms. Andrews.

MS. PAISNER: I can rephrase my question.
BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Mr. Thies, can you please look at subpart B to

1 the question on Public Counsel data request 329 which is MTT-10CX. Let me know when you're there, please.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see --
A. I believe I'm in the right spot.
Q. Do you see that there's a sample table there with years across the top and it starts with discount rate, expected return rate, employer contributions, et cetera?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Okay. And the Company's response to this portion of the data request, the Company provided an Attachment A. And in that attachment, there's a schedule that provides a December 31 st run with no year specified in connection with the December 31st, correct?

MR. MEYER: Again, just let me get the witness
to the right page. I'm going to hand him my copy.
MS. PAISNER: Attachment A.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Are you looking at Attachment A?
A. Yes, I'm sorry. I'm trying to find where it says Attachment A. But okay.
Q. Right. So now there's a spreadsheet, right?
A. Yes. That has years across the top and a number

1 of different items --
Q. Right.
A. -- down the side.
Q. The upper -- so on the left column at the top, it states obligation at December 31st. But there's no year stated in that cell. Is that correct?
A. Yes. But I believe the -- the intent of that is the obligation across each of those years in the -- that are identified at the top of each of the columns.

So it says December 31st. And then if you go to the different columns, it would be as of December 31st of 2021, for example, or 2019 , or 2020.

So the December 31 st was a reference to that line but then the years are different --
Q. Okay. Would --
A. -- because of the table. How the table is set up.
Q. Would you please read those years across the top going from left to right?
A. So it says -- it says 20 -- the furthest year to the left, is 2023 estimated, 2022 estimated, and then 2021, 2020 through 2017 is the furthest to the right.
Q. Okay. And Public Counsel's data request for data request 329 sub $B$, they requested information for 2021 through 2026.

Is that correct?
MR. MEYER: You'll need to go back to another page. The question itself, okay. Was that 9C?

THE WITNESS: So 2021 through 2026, is that what you're saying, referring to Ms. Paisner? BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Yes. Is that my -- yes, that was a request.

MR. MEYER: I think he's completed his answer.
I don't know what other question is there. Okay. Sorry. BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. That was the question. Thank you.
A. Sorry. And I'm not even ill like Mr. Kalich.
Q. In your data request response to data request 329 C that was MTT-10CX, you also stated that other information could be found in Public Counsel data request 328C, and that one is MTT-9CX, and other documents referenced on page 2 of the response to data request 329C, subpart D?

MR. MEYER: May I approach the witness?
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes.
MR. MEYER: Would you please restate your
question?
BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. In response --
A. Yes. I see where you're -- yes.
Q. Okay. So I'm looking at data request 328C and 329C.
A. Okay.
Q. And these are exhibits MTT-9CX and MTT-10CX. And specifically in response to 329, you also state that other information can be found in Public Counsel data request 328 C and other documents referenced on page 2 of that data request response. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So there are various pieces of information is what we're getting at. In order for you to answer these questions, there are a lot of pieces, would you say? Is that correct?
A. Yes. And there's a lot of data associated with all of the different calculations and requested amounts.
Q. Thank you.

Would you please refer now to Exhibit MTT-12CX?
A. Yes.
Q. So this is a schedule put together by Public Counsel -- -- putting together all of these pieces, it shows a summary of the key assumptions and data used in the calculation of pension and OPEB costs. And in the right-hand column providing a source for each line of the

1 lines shown in this schedule.

Page 1 of this exhibit pertains to the pension plan, and page 2 pertains to the OPEB plan.

Have you reviewed this exhibit?
A. Yes.

MR. MEYER: I'm sorry. Let's be sure that I
have -- I do not have page 2.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: Ms. -- let me step in here.
Ms. Paisner, we only have one page as well.
MS. PAISNER: I believe this exhibit was
updated. So perhaps this is -- one moment, please. Let me just confirm.

MR. MEYER: All right. At least on our end, we do have a page 2 that didn't appear in my book. It is on the -- the medical piece of this, not the pension.

And I think that has been provided to the Commission by Public Counsel as part of a cross exhibit. But I'm not sure if the Commissioners themselves actually have a page 2. I know I did not in my book.

MS. PAISNER: There was a -COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I do not.

MS. PAISNER: Okay. There was a confidential refiled exhibit that had a second page. JUDGE O'CONNELL: One moment. I believe we may have that. Okay. One moment, please.

MS. PAISNER: If it helps, it was filed on September 14th.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: So I have in the docket a document marked as being filed or marked with a date of September 14, 2022, Avista pension plan key assumptions and costs comparison intended for Thies.

And it appears to be what you are referring to. In the docket, it is noted as having been filed on September 15th.

We have it. I want to give a moment for the Commissioners to be able to get to that exhibit.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have it now.
CHAIR DANNER: Thank you, Judge. I have the exhibit.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
Now that we're all on the same page, please go ahead, Ms. Paisner.

BY MS. PAISNER:
Q. Mr. Thies, do you have that exhibit in front of you with the second page included? We can reforward that to you as well.
A. I do have it, Ms. Paisner. Thank you.
Q. Please look at page 1 of that exhibit.
A. Just for clarity, that's the pension?
Q. Right. Page 1 is pension. Page 2 is OPEB.

And I -- at this point, I think I should say that the subsequent questions will touch upon confidential information.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Then we are going to pause for just a moment. We are going to create a confidential breakout session, and we have a list of authorized individuals who will be placed into that confidential session.

I'm sorry. Can I have everyone mute their microphones? We have a -- apologies for whoever is feeling unwell, but we can hear you quite loudly.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Judge O'Connell, I think there is a question in the chat about who is "NLMC" in order to figure out who can be in a confidential breakout session.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be off the record for a moment.
(A break was taken from 11:29 a.m. to 11:33 a.m.)
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CHAIR DANNER: Judge, I have a question for Mr. Thies, if I may. This is Dave Danner.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you for jumping before we left. Please.

CHAIR DANNER: Thank you.
Good afternoon. The question I have, Mr. Garrett said in his testimony that a utility like Avista has an incentive to keep less equity than is reflected in its authorized capital structure because equity gets a bigger return than debt but debt costs less. And this is in his Exhibit $D--$ DJG-1T at page 56, line 16 to 60. There's the discussion.

How does Avista -- how does the Company's level of equity fluctuate throughout the year? Does it go up or down? Does it stay relatively constant? Is there a range in which it normally stays during normal expected business operations?

THE WITNESS: So, generally, Chair Danner, when we -- when we look at it, we go out annually and say to the market what we are expecting to issue in equity to -- to try to maintain what I'll call -- my attorneys get mad at me sometimes -- a prudent balance sheet, because I believe it's prudent. And also to maintain an equity layer that is similar on a commission basis to get there.

There are times during the year -- and we've seen a little bit of that recently -- is because we've had positions where certain -- certain costs, like the energy recovery mechanism to the extent that is, out of the money we incur costs but are not able to recover

We also had in our last case and our current case before this Commission, energy that the -- the tax -- the customer tax credit in which we're not recovering cash, those are interim and very short-term items that when we look at funding our capital structure -- I don't want to necessarily -- I want to make sure we have an equity layer similar to our authorized -- but when we have higher cap structure or higher costs, we don't just issue equity right away on that. We do that over time so as to spread a little bit of the -- you know, the expectation of getting to our authorized return in a rate effective period, that is always our target. And we will try to do that.

In fact, we had to raise our equity layer in this year and in next year in our expectations from a historical 60 to 90 to 135 and 120 million, which we did. And we would expect to continue that.

So our target as we're trying to raise equity for the Company is to get to that authorized. Not to

1 underequitize the Company, but also not to overequitize
2 the Company. To have an appropriate equity layer.
3
4

Again, we've had a couple of combinations in two years in a row of negative -- I'll call it negative. I shouldn't just -- the ERM has been in an expense position. So we've incurred higher costs and were allowed recovery. So we're paying for those costs, deferring it for recovery, but cash is going out. As

1 well as the customer tax credit from our prior case -2 and I apologize, I don't know the docket numbers. But 3 our prior case was the first one. And then our current 4 case, we have an expectation as well. If the Commission 5 approves -- again, I'm not assuming anything -- you know, 6 those are -- and we've also had some increase in capital. 7 Some of that is due to inflation. And we try to be very 8 prudent with managing our capital and make sure that they 9 pencil out as benefitting to the customers, that it's 10 still an appropriate -- a prudent capital expenditure. 11 But our capital costs have gone up. Some of that we fund 12 even higher than what we requested.
THE WITNESS: I don't think -- well, I don't

1 look at it that way.

The way $I$ look at it is we are trying to make sure that -- assuming there aren't any of these short-term items that if we raised equity -- what $I$ don't want -- what I don't want to do, or I prefer not to do, is raise equity and have buyback shares later because I overequitized in a period when I know the cash would come back in a later period, i.e., that customer tax credit. When those credits roll off, presumably our cash flows will increase to the stated amounts that have been approved by this Commission.

And so if $I$ raised equity on that, then in the future I would -- you know, I could get to a point where I would have to buy back shares to again maintain that capital structure. Or I could run overequitize. I don't believe we're incented to underequitize because I don't think that's the right way to look at things. And I don't believe we're incented to overequitize either. I believe we should target -- and this is what we do, our blended authorized return. And from time to time we may be off that. But that is -- I don't look at it as an incentive to try to underequitize or necessarily a detraction to say, well, let's raise more equity and then I'm covered. From a financial perspective, as I look at it, that's inefficient on -- on both sides. We shouldn't

1 underequitize because we are getting an authorized layer.
2 We should try to achieve that.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Mr. Thies, before you go -- Mr. Meyer, go ahead.

MR. MEYER: May I just have one following question based on the colloquy?

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead, Mr. Meyer.
MR. MEYER: Thank you.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MEYER:
Q. Mr. Thies, does the Company expect to be at or near a 48-and-a-half percent equity component during the 2023 rate period?
A. No. I think we're slightly behind in '23 by the end of -- end of '23 and '24, yes. For the '23 rate period, there will be a period in our current forecast -now if required, we could issue the additional equity to get there. Because, again, I'm not trying to under or

1 over. We're trying to balance the timing of that equity 2 to make sure that we have appropriate equity based on the items that $I$ talked about. We'll be slightly under at the start of '23, my understanding of our current forecast, and then get there towards the end and into ' 24.
Q. So by the end of '23 and into '24?
A. We should be in '24 to be there. Absolutely. MR. MEYER: That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Did that bring up any questions from the Commissioners?

And I see -- I believe, Ms. Paisner, you would like to be heard.

MS. PAISNER: Yes. I just noticed we are still in closed session. I wasn't sure if the material --

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I am planning to address that right now.

MS. PAISNER: Okay.
JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Thies, the questions you were just asked by the bench, my understanding is that that comes -- all of that information is available in nonconfidential testimony that you provided, as well as Mr. Coppola, for Public Counsel.

Am I correct in that? Mr. Thies, stay with us on camera for just a moment. THE WITNESS: Okay.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm going to send everyone back to the main room, and then we will conclude this testimony.

Okay. We should all be back in the main session now which is not confidential.

At the end of what was our confidential session, Chair Danner posed a question for Avista witness Thies. That question and answer did not touch upon confidential information and it will be indicated in the transcript that will be available, that that question and the response and the follow-up by Avista's counsel, Mr. Meyer, is not confidential.

The topic of that question concerned the level of equity that Avista maintains throughout the year and whether it stays steady or varies, up or down. And the answer addressed that question. And $I$ will just leave the answer that will be in the transcript to speak for itself.

Okay. Now there are no more questions, I believe, for Mr. Thies.

So, Mr. Thies, you are excused. Thank you for your testimony this afternoon.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor, and Commissioners.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. So we've reached that point of the hearing where there is no more testimony intended for the day. And I would like to address a few brief matters before we conclude the hearing.

First $I$ will issue a notice of bench requests by the end of the day Wednesday of next week, that is Wednesday October 5th. And that notice will include any and all bench requests that were asked during this hearing. And I'm going to issue it next Wednesday in consideration of the Puget Sound energy general rate case happening on Monday and Tuesday and not wanting to get either of the cases confused by issuing those bench requests while that hearing is going on.

Second, to address briefs -- and counsel can turn on their cameras if they want to.

Legal briefs in this case are due on October 21, 2022. I see no reason to change that at this time. And considering that the settlement addresses every disputed issue, we intend to place -- or we are going to place a limit of 50 pages on the briefs instead of the typical 60 that we allow. But we encourage the parties to be forthright and use only the number of pages necessary to make its arguments.

About the matter of limiting it to 50 pages, is there -- would any counsel like to be heard on that?

MR. MEYER: Avista does not -- that seems reasonable to us.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Is there -- my apologies.

Is there anything else that we need to address today before we adjourn?

MR. MEYER: No, Your Honor. Not from Avista. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Hearing nothing, I want to thank all the parties, all the witnesses, representatives. Thank you for your efforts both on September 21 st and today. And thank you to the parties and the Commissioners for finding a time so close to September 21 st when we could have this reconvened hearing. It's much appreciated, and thank you.

With that, we are adjourned and off the record. Thank you.
(The hearing adjourned at 12:31 p.m.)
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