Docket Nos. UE-240006 and UG-240007 (Consolidated) - Vol. IV

WUTC v. Avista Corporation d/b/a Avista Utilities

October 1, 2024



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

Page 372		Page 374
_	1 APPEARANCES (cont.)	J
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, Complainant, DOCKETS UE-240006, Vs. DUG-240007 (Consolidated) AVISTA CORPORATION, d/b/a AVISTA UTILITIES, PAGES 372 - 479 Respondent. EVIDENTIARY HEARING - VOL. IV October 1, 2024 BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES JAMES E. BROWN II & CONNOR THOMPSON Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, Washington 98503 REPORTED BY: Stephanie C. Rhinehart, RPR, CCR No. 22013531	FOR AWEC: FOR AWEC: TYLER C. PEPPLE, SOMMER MOSER Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 Southwest Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201 (503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com sjm@dvclaw.com 7 sjm@dvclaw.com 8 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT: YOCH JAKAI Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP 10 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94102 11 (415) 552-7272 yzakai@smwlaw.com FOR NW ENERGY COALITION: MICHAEL P. GOETZ (by videoconference) NW Energy Coalition 811 First Avenue, Suite 305 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 621-0094 nike@nwenergy.org FOR THE SIERRA CLUB: GLORIA SMITH (by videoconference) The Sierra Club 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300 Oakland, CA 94612 (415) 977-5532 gloria.smith@sierraclub.org FOR WALMART, INC.: JUSTINA A. CAVIGLIA (by videoconference) Parsons Behle & Latimer 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 98501 (775) 323-1601 jcaviglia@parsonsbehle.com	Page 374
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, Washington 98503 REPORTED BY: Stephanie C. Rhinehart, RPR, CCR No. 22013531 Page 373 APPEARANCES ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES: JAMES E. BROWN II CONNOR THOMPSON WUTC COMMISSIONER: ANN RENDAHL WUTC CHAIR: DAVID W. DANNER FOR THE RESPONDENT, AVISTA CORPORATION: DAVID J. MEYER Avista Corporation P.O. Box 3727 Spokane, WA 99220 (509) 495-8620 david.meyer@avistacorp.com FOR COMMISSION STAFF: JEFF ROBERSON, JOSEPHINE STRAUSS Office of the Attorney General P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 684-1188 (360) 586-7777	20	Page 375
16	WITNESS: DAVID DISMUKES Direct Examination by Atty Robinson O'Neill 458 Cross-examination by Atty Pepple 459 Redirect Examination by Atty Robinson O'Neill 464 WITNESS: ROBERT EARLE Direct Examination by Atty Robinson O'Neill 468 Cross-examination by Atty Strauss 468 Redirect Examination by Atty Robinson O'Neill 473 ***	

Page 376 Page 378 1 REPORTED FROM THURSTON COUNTY, WASHINGTON 1 A For most of it. Not the very last witness. 2 Tuesday, October 1, 2024; 9:11 a.m. 2 Q Were you present for Mr. Bonfield's cross? 3 3 A I was not present for Mr. Bonfield's cross. 4 JUDGE BROWN: All right. So based on where 4 Q Okay. Got it. 5 5 we left off yesterday, we will now pick up with AWEC Do you agree that the CCA may cause certain 6 Witness Mullins. Is he available? 6 thermal resources to be more expensive to use to supply 7 7 ATTY MOSER: He is, Your Honor, he should be power to customers? 8 8 A As a general statement, I guess maybe, maybe not. So, on Zoom now. 9 JUDGE BROWN: Ah, I see him now. 9 you know, the CCA is designed to, I guess, reduce or 10 MR. MULLINS: Can you hear me? 10 eliminate the cost burden of purchasing allowances for 11 JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Good morning. How are 11 resources used to serve loads. And so, from that --12 12 you? that perspective, it's -- the design is that it's 13 13 MR. MULLINS: Very well. Thank you, not -- not to increase the costs. 14 14 Judge Brown. Q But hypothetically, utility could go over their no-cost 15 JUDGE BROWN: Very good. Will you raise your 15 allowances; isn't that correct? 16 16 right hand. A I guess I'm not 100 percent sure what -- what you mean 17 (Witness duly sworn.) 17 by "go over." You know, they -- there was a formula in 18 JUDGE BROWN: All right. 18 the rule and a certain number of allowances allocated 19 You may proceed. 19 to serve customers' loads. They may -- may be that 20 ATTY MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 there are more -- that there are fewer or more 21 21 emissions than those allowances, although there's 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 22 potentially a true-up process for how those get 23 23 BY ATTY MOSER: resolved. 24 Q Good morning, Mr. Mullins. Can you please state and 24 So I guess I don't have a great answer to your 25 spell your name for the record. 25 question. Page 377 Page 379 Q So I guess my question more is -- there is the 1 A My name is Bradley Mullins. Last name's spelled 1 2 M-U-L-I-N-S. 2 possibility that a utility's emissions could exceed 3 Q And how are you employed? 3 their no-cost allowances? 4 A Potentially, yeah. 4 A I am the principal of MW Analytics, a consulting firm 5 5 Q Thank you. And you agree that Avista's current method that represents large customers around the West. 6 of determining dispatch of thermal resources does not 6 Q And on whose behalf are you appearing in this case? 7 include the costs? The CCA may contribute to the use 7 A The Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. 8 of these resources; correct? 8 Q Thank you. 9 A I would not agree with that. So for Boulder Park, 9 ATTY MOSER: And given that his prefiled 10 which is located in Washington, it does include that --10 testimony and exhibits have already been admitted, I 11 that cost. 11 believe this witness is available for cross. 12 For resources located outside of Washington, those 12 JUDGE BROWN: I believe, Staff, you have 13 resources only have a compliance obligation when the 13 questions. 14 power is imported into Washington. And so, in terms of 14 ATTY STRAUSS: Good morning, Your Honor. 15 the dispatch costs, those -- those do not have a -- you 15 Josephine Strauss representing Staff. 16 know, a phantom allowance adder included on them. And 16 JUDGE BROWN: Good morning. 17 that's appropriate because if those resources are not 17 18 used to serve customers' load, then they'll have to 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 acquire power elsewhere, which will be, you know, 19 BY ATTY STRAUSS: 20 potentially unspecified power which will also carry, 20 Q Good morning, Mr. Mullins. Just a few quick questions. 21 you know, the same or similar obligation. 21 First, are you aware that the Commission's policy So I guess I would -- to your question, I don't 22 22 statement in U-230161 was rescinded on August 19, 2024? 23 agree with that general statement. 23 A I was aware of that, yes. 24 Q Okay. But for the thermal resources that do not 24 Q Just making sure. Were you listening to yesterday's 25 include the cost of the CCA in its dispatch 25 hearing?

	Page 380	Page 382
1	methodology, if those resources are dispatched and do	1 A Correct.
2	not include that cost, there is the possibility that	2 Q And you agree there is the possibility that Avista may
3	they could be uneconomically dispatched. Isn't that	not be allocated enough no-cost emission allowances to
4	true?	4 cover all emissions from its thermal resources;
5	A Well, not necessarily. So if the so, for example,	5 correct?
6	if maybe Coyote Springs is a good example. If power	6 A It's always a possibility. But the I mean, I think
7	from Coyote Springs, which is not located in	7 the way that it's designed now is it's really the
8	Washington, is sold outside of Washington, there is	8 allowance is necessary to serve Avista's load. So it's
9	no there's no compliance obligation there. So	9 not so much dependent on dispatch so that at least,
10	that it would be appropriate to dispatch it without	10 you know, my understanding is market sales aren't
11	any any compliance adder or anything	included in that; so those are kind of a separate
12	Q So I'm talking about power that's dispatched to	12 calculation.
13	Washington. If power is dispatched to Washington from	So since it's really, you know, based on the load,
14	a thermal resource and that thermal resource does not	14 it's really just what percentage of resources are being
15	include a CCA cost adder, then there is the possibility	used to serve that load whether it's, you know,
16	that that thermal resource could be uneconomically	hydro, gas, coal, or unspecified power or renewables.
17	dispatched; isn't that correct?	17 Q But you agree there is the possibility that Avista may
18	A Well, the alternative so generally, no. Because the	not be allocated enough no-cost allowances to cover its
19	alternative is market power. And market power	emissions? There is that possibility; correct?
20	unspecified power also has a compliance obligation.	20 A It's always possible, certainly. And then, you know,
21	And, in fact, it's actually slightly higher than a gas	they might have to go out and buy allowances. But I
22	plant, at least in the way that the no-cost allowances	think the design of the program was that they weren't
23	were designed.	going to have to do that. And I think the you know,
24	And so, your it is a correct comparison to	the allowances were distributed in a manner so that
25	include it without because both market purchases and	25 that wouldn't happen.
	Page 381	Page 383
1		
1 2	the power that's being generated one or the other	So that's the it may be possible, but it was
2	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended.
	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method.	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where
2	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances,
2 3 4	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method.	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances,
2 3 4 5	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch
2 3 4 5 6	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power?	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear
2 3 4 5 6 7	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made.	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct?	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process.	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances.	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington	I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there there will be a true-up and how that will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there there will be a true-up and how that will Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost allowances?	So that's the it may be possible, but it was I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there there will be a true-up and how that will Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm making it too broad.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost allowances? A I agree that they allocate the allowances based on	I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario — in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there — there will be a true-up and how that will — Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm making it too broad. So in a scenario where Avista's not allocated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost allowances? A I agree that they allocate the allowances based on information that potentially falls under this	I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario — in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I — there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there— there will be a true-up and how that will — Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm making it too broad. So in a scenario where Avista's not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of CCA
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost allowances? A I agree that they allocate the allowances based on information that potentially falls under this commission's purview as well.	I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario — in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I — there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there— there will be a true-up and how that will — Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm making it too broad. So in a scenario where Avista's not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of CCA compliance is included in the cost of dispatch, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the power that's being generated one or the other has to have an allowance. And so, you know, including it dispatching without is the correct method. Q So your opinion is that the only alternative to the dispatch of these thermal resources is unspecified market power? A That is the I mean so here we're talking about the model; right? So the model is dispatching resources against, you know, certain certain market prices, and so that's the comparison being made. Q You agree that the emission allowance allocation under the CCA is in the purview of the Department of Ecology; correct? A Maybe not entirely. So I think that there are certain inputs like the CEIP filings that inform that process. But generally, it's the it's Ecology that's that's issuing the allowances. Q Okay. So you agree that Ecology is the Washington agency that dispa assigns the allocation of no-cost allowances? A I agree that they allocate the allowances based on information that potentially falls under this	I think that would be unintended. Q So in a scenario — in a hypothetical scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, including the price of CCA compliance in the dispatch has the potential to reduce CCA costs that could appear in a true-up later; isn't that correct? A You're going to have to repeat that question. Q Okay. So in a scenario where Avista is not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of a CCA allowance is included in dispatch, then the potential for a true-up later decreases? A So I — there's kind of three pieces to that. So kind of start with the end. So the true-up; right? So, you know, there some sort of mention of a true-up in the rule. We don't know what form that's going to take or if there— there will be a true-up and how that will — Q So let me rephrase my question because I think I'm making it too broad. So in a scenario where Avista's not allocated enough emission allowances, if the price of CCA

21

22

23

24

25

page 27, line 11.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

costs of \$30 million annually; correct?

Q BY ATTY STRAUSS: So Mr. Wilson refers to a potential

bad case scenario, which you also reference in your

testimony. And this example talks about the potential

Page 386 Page 384 1 price of CCA compliance is potentially less? 1 A Yeah. I think it's just a hypothetical where -- was 2 2 A You know, not -- I guess not necessarily. So... it -- 25 percent overrun would result in annual costs 3 3 Q So you disagree that -of \$30 million. 4 4 Q Okay. And you agree that there is a possibility that A It would depend on --5 5 some or all of these costs could be determined prudent Q -- sorry. 6 A Go ahead. 6 by the Commission during review; correct? 7 7 Q Please complete your answer. A The -- so the overrun costs would, I guess, necessarily 8 A Oh, I was just going to say, you know, it would depend 8 be evaluated for prudence by the Commission. They 9 9 on a lot of factors. So I think the, you know -- as it could determine it to be prudent or not depending on 10 stands today, you know, it was designed to give them 10 their evaluation. 11 enough -- enough allowances so that they -- you know, 11 Q So you agree there's a possibility that those costs 12 12 that they wouldn't be short. I think -could be determined prudent? 13 A Certainly, it could be -- yeah. It could go -- either 13 Q So I'm not talking about design today. I'm talking 14 about the hypothetical situation where they do not have way, it would depend on the Commission's, you know, 14 15 enough allowances to cover emissions. 15 evaluation of those -- of the facts and circumstances. 16 Q And if those costs are determined prudent, you agree 16 A So as it's -- right. So as it's designed today, they 17 are supposed to have -- or will have enough allowances 17 that 30 million extra costs would significantly impact 18 18 rates? to cover their -- their emissions. You know, in the 19 hypothetical where the rule wasn't written that way and 19 A Yeah. It would -- 30 million in costs is material to 20 they were given, you know, less -- less allowances than 20 Avista. 21 21 their emissions, then, you know, I think there's going Q And you testify that the Commission should not conduct 22 to be a cost -- a cost either way. So ... 22 an annual review of the CCA costs; correct? 23 23 Q But if that cost is already included in the cost of A Correct. 24 dispatch, would that impact their dispatch of thermal 24 Q Okay. And you're more in favor of a review over the 25 resources if those resources are now more expensive to 25 four-year compliance period; correct? Page 385 Page 387 1 dispatch because of the cost of compliance with the 1 A Yeah. That's correct. You know, so in terms of 2 CCA? 2 whether there's, you know, this hypothetical where 3 A Sorry. You're going to have to repeat that one again 3 there's an overrun or not -- which, you know, I think 4 as well. 4 it would seem kind of unlikely. But in that case, you 5 Q It's okay. I'll move on. 5 know, we really won't know, you know, holistically 6 You agree that prudence is not determined through 6 until the -- you know, until we look at the full 7 a hindsight lens; correct? 7 compliance period. So it would be -- it would be hard 8 A As a general principle, yes. 8 to consider it year by year. 9 Q You agree it's determined based on analysis of what the 9 Q But we've already talked about -- that prudence is 10 utility knew or should have known at the time of the 10 determined not in hindsight but based on when the 11 decision; correct? 11 decision is made. So a decision made Year 4 is not 12 A As a general principle, yeah. going to impact decisions made Year 1; correct? 12 13 Q So I want to refer to Mr. Wilson's testimony, his 13 A So yeah. As a general principle, you know, prudence 14 response testimony, Exhibit 1TCr, starting at page 27, 14 evaluations don't consider hindsight. But, you know, 15 line 11 and going through page 28, line 3. Let me know 15 prudence evaluations inherently occur after the fact; 16 when you're there. 16 right? So the fact that we're, you know, always 17 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Would you mind 17 looking backwards isn't -- isn't, you know, contrary to 1.8 repeating that reference. 18 not considering hindsight and looking at what, you 19 ATTY STRAUSS: Absolutely. Sorry. JDW-1TCr,

know, folks should have known at the time decisions

A So in terms of the -- what the company did and what

known in Year 4; correct?

Q But decisions made in Year 1 would be evaluated based

on the information known in Year 1, and decisions made

in Year 4 would be evaluated based on the information

19

20

21

22

23

24

23

24

25

day-to-day decisions should be on the utility.

you know, that is the -- that's Ecology's

And in terms of the CCA itself and the -- you

know, the actual compliance with the CCA, that's the --

Page 388 Page 390 1 they -- you know, the actions that they took, it would 1 responsibility versus -- you know, certainly the 2 be based on, you know, information they had at the --2 Commission should focus on the costs and the recovery 3 3 of those costs and whether they're prudent. But at the at the time. 4 Q Okay. So a review that was happening every four years 4 end of the day, if there's -- if a utility, you know, 5 5 would then contemplate potential prudence in costs that doesn't meet its obligations under the CCA in terms of 6 accumulated over those four years; correct? 6 allowances, that's the -- that's Ecology's area to 7 7 enforce. So it's -- that's what that paragraph is A Correct. And, you know, it would have to evaluate, you 8 know, kind of the -- that period of time. 8 9 9 Q Yeah. So if they have a bad case one, maybe two years, Q BY ATTY STRAUSS: Okay. But you agree it is the 10 you're looking at potentially \$60 million at the end of 10 Commission's job to regulate rates; correct? 11 that four years, assuming just one or two bad years. 11 A Correct. 12 12 A I wouldn't -- I mean, I wouldn't necessarily agree with Q And if prudently incurred, CCA costs are costs that can 13 that. I mean, so this is just, like, a hypothetical 13 be recovered through rates; correct? 14 situation --14 A Generally, yes. 15 Q So I'm talking about this hypothetical in this 15 Q And you agree that it's the Commission's job to ensure 16 hypothetical world. 16 that utilities are properly considering costs that may 17 A Oh -- well, so I wouldn't -- yeah. So I don't agree 17 be associated with compliance with Washington state 18 18 with the hypothetical. So I think the way it's laws; correct? 19 designed today, it's designed to give, you know, all --19 A As a general principle, yes. Q Thank you. That's all my questions. 20 20 you know, cover all the costs and eliminate the cost 21 burden of the program. That's -- that's the purpose. 21 JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect? 22 And, you know, to the extent that there are, you 22 ATTY MOSER: Okay. I always have trouble 23 know, issues with allowances, we really won't know 23 with this mic. Yes, thank you, Your Honor. I do have 24 that. You really can't say there's an issue until the 24 a few questions. 25 end of the compliance period. I mean, it may be that 25 JUDGE BROWN: All right. Proceed. Page 389 Page 391 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 1 one year's high, one year's low, and you won't really 1 2 know until the end because it's -- you know, they 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 comply with the compliance period as -- as a whole. 3 Q Mr. Mullins, kind of earlier in your discussion -- or 4 4 in your cross, there was a question about -- if Avista And so, that's really where that recommendation is 5 coming from, you know. And granted that, you know, you 5 includes allowances in dispatch, the impacts of that. 6 do have to consider, you know, facts and circumstances 6 And I want to follow up on that line of guestioning. 7 at the time decisions are made. 7 So if Avista includes allowances in power costs 8 Q Fair enough. 8 dispatch, so in modeling, that has an upward -- that 9 In your cross-answering testimony -- and I'm just 9 puts upward rate pressure on power costs; right? 10 going to paraphrase this, but it's at BGM-18 -- -8T --10 Because it's changing the resource dispatch? 11 sorry -- page 12, lines 3 through 9. You say, "It's 11 A Well, so they already do include CCA costs for 12 12 not the Commission's place to enforce compliance with Boulder Park. So just to make that clear. But if they 13 the CCA"; is that correct? 13 were to expand that and include the dispatch costs and 14 ATTY MOSER: Sorry. What page? 14 out-of-state resources, that would -- yeah, that would 15 ATTY STRAUSS: Page 12, line 3 to 9. 15 certainly increase costs, you know, relative to how 16 THE WITNESS: No. So in terms of -- yeah. 16 those resources will dispatch in the -- in markets. 17 So this says that, just kind of as a general principle, 17 Q Okay. So from a -- from just a power cost modeling 18 you know, it's usually not good for the Commission to perspective, power costs would go up, and emissions 18 19 be, you know, micromanaging dispatch decisions for 19 would go down; is that correct? 20 20 the -- for the utilities. You know, prudence reviews A Power costs will go up. I'm not sure that emissions 21 21 are appropriate, but that -- you know, those just will go down. Because, you know, if you reduce a

generation from a -- you know, an out-of-state thermal

still -- you know, it goes somewhere. So, you know, it

plant, you still have to buy or -- or net power's

may be that, instead of getting power from

2.2

23

24

Page 392 Page 394 policy statement and then referenced that it had been 1 Coyote Springs, that power comes from an unspecified 1 2 source which, you know, potentially has a higher 2 rescinded. Do you remember that? 3 3 emission value than Coyote Springs. So it will 4 4 Q Okay. And as part of that docket, is it your certainly increase costs. Emissions equation, I think, 5 5 understanding that the Commission is looking -- or the is somewhat -- somewhat more murky. 6 Q Okay. So there's emissions that we consider for 6 intention of that is for the Commission to develop a 7 7 purposes of dispatch, and then there's emissions that uniform approach to CCA implementation across all 8 actually result from actual operations. And there's a 8 utilities? 9 9 distinction there; is that right? A Yeah. Yeah. And I think it's -- it's a pretty 10 A Yes. Yeah. Absolutely. So -- and, you know, in this 10 complicated issue, especially, you know, when you deal 11 11 case, we're really concerned with, you know, setting with the out-of-state resources and how -- how they 12 12 the baseline for net powers costs, not -- you know, impact, you know, free allowances. So I think 13 really setting any principles for how -- or at least, 13 that's -- would probably be a good thing, to have some 14 you know, my testimony's focused on -- more on the more kind of robust discussion and also to get more 14 15 baseline, not necessarily, you know, setting any 15 certainty from Ecology as to how some of those aspects 16 16 principles about how they should or should not manage of the rule will work. 17 those out-of-state resources. 17 Q Thank you. I have no further questions. 18 18 JUDGE BROWN: Any questions? No? All right. And I think there's, you know, a big difference 19 between sort of the -- you know, the practice --19 And you are excused. Thank you. 20 20 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you. dispatch and practice versus, you know, what we're JUDGE BROWN: Next I believe we have 21 modeling here today. Because it's -- the model today 21 witnesses from Staff. 22 is more of a theoretical exercise to get a baseline as 22 23 opposed to, you know, what actually happens and the 23 ATTY ROBERSON: I believe there are no bench 24 actual obligations that occur under the CCA. 24 questions for Ms. Atitsogbe. So Ms. Erdahl would be 25 Q And so, if the Commission sets that baseline higher 25 next. Page 393 Page 395 1 than actual emissions that materialize from operations, 1 JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Exactly. Thank you. 2 2 does that mean that customers have then overpaid for MS. ERDAHL: Good morning. 3 power costs? 3 JUDGE BROWN: Good morning. Will you raise 4 4 A I mean, potentially. So, I mean, I guess there's, you your right hand. 5 5 know, kind of the questions from -- Staff, I think, (Witness duly sworn.) 6 6 JUDGE BROWN: You may proceed. seem to think that there's sort of a -- you know, sort 7 7 of an offsetting benefit to applying dispatch to 8 8 out-of-state resources that would, you know, **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 9 potentially offset that -- that higher cost. So I 9 BY ATTY ROBERSON: 10 think that's kind of an implicit in Staff -- kind of 10 Q Good morning. Would you please state your name and 11 11 spell your last name for the record. what Staff's recommendation is. 12 12 If you increase power costs today by 20 million or A Good morning. Betty Erdahl, on behalf of Staff. 13 70 million, depending on how it's done, you know, later 13 E-R-D-A-H-L. 14 14 Q And are you the same Betty Erdahl who submitted we're going to save, you know, more than \$70 million or 15 15 Exhibits BAE-1T through BAE-10? \$20 million. And, you know, I'm not -- I'm not so sure 16 it, you know, will really work that -- work that way. 16 17 Q Okay. And then, are you aware whether Ecology has 17 ATTY ROBERSON: I believe there are no cross 18 issued any formal or public guidance on how the true-up 18 questions; so Ms. Erdahl's available for questions from 19 19 will function at this time? the bench. 20 A I -- yeah. I am not. There's sort of a vague mention 20 CHAIR DANNER: Well, good morning. 21 21 THE WITNESS: Good morning. to it in -- in a rule. But at this point, it's really 22 unclear as to, you know, how that process will -- will 22 CHAIR DANNER: So you were in the room 23 23 yesterday when we had some discussions with Ms. Andrews 24 Q Okay. And at the very beginning of your questioning 24 about provisional plant? 25 with Ms. Strauss, she asked you about the Commission's 25 THE WITNESS: Correct.

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

1.8

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Page 396

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

CHAIR DANNER: And I wanted to get your sense -- are you comfortable that each project is provided adequate scrutiny and that you understand the purpose and the timing and the necessity for each project?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Staff analyzes what's filed in the case, and we take a look at what's been approved in a prior case as far as what they're filing in the next GRC, their multi-year rate plan. And the provisional plant's looked at on a threshold prudence level. And once the company files its annual review at the end of the year, a few months following the end of the rate year, then we would do a final review of the provisional plant.

CHAIR DANNER: She couldn't come up with a sa- -- an example yesterday. Do you have an example of provisional plant and how you would scrutinize that? I mean, she was talking about -- we have thousands of pages. And so, assuming that you have the time to look through those thousands of pages -- I mean, I'm trying to get a sense of a case where the forecasts are lower and the actual costs come in higher. That concerns me. And I'm just trying to get a sense of your ability to scrutinize the filings to make sure that we're treating these provisional plant numbers correctly.

Page 398 the multi-year rate plan rejected partly for that

reason as there is a resource constraint issue. Some time was definitely spent on it, but we would like more

time and resources. CHAIR DANNER: Okay.

Do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.

So following along the same line of questioning to Ms. Andrews yesterday, was Staff concerned with the introduction of new business cases at the time of the provisional plant review filing?

THE WITNESS: So during the GRC? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. The provisional plant review process --

THE WITNESS: Oh, the retrospective --COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- for 2022 and 2023. So is that a concern that Staff has?

THE WITNESS: We have seen some projects overestimated in the plant reviews. And that's caused us to be a little concerned about -- we support a provisional portfolio basis review; so there's some flexibility for the company to switch gears if they need to depending on their business needs.

But on the other hand, we have seen some projects in the past, I believe both for PSE and Avista, where

Page 397

THE WITNESS: That's understandable, and that's something Staff has looked at and been concerned about in the annual plant review. I did not review plant in this case. I'm sorry. I did not go back and look at that after yesterday's questioning.

I want to use AMI as an example. I don't know. I mean, provisional plant is put in during the rate case. When we look at the review, the annual review, Staff actually goes back and looks at what was filed in the rate case as provisional. And the company does provide a lot of support in the general rate case and in the plant review so we can see what was provided and looked at in the rate case. And then we can also look at --"Here's what you actually did during this year. Here's what you spent of the provisional plant."

Now, if they overestimate, we're recommending refunds on a portfolio basis. So money that wasn't spent on something like AMI, if we use that as an example, they might have spent the money somewhere else, which raises a different concern. We don't want companies overestimating provisional plant.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And then, the question about whether your team has the time and resources to review these projects, you're confident that you do? THE WITNESS: Well, actually, we would like

what was estimated in the provisional review -- or the provisional filing -- what was actually spent wasn't the same amount, and it was off by quite a bit. So then they use that money. They -- you know, they were

Page 399

afforded the flexibility to spend that money somewhere else

So Staff feels like we're kind of learning how to work through these multi-year rate plans. And while we're not recommending a project-by-project review or -- like, in the Northwest Natural case, I think eight projects were approved provisionally. That was really nice. It was easy for Staff to go back and look at just those eight projects.

But then, fast-forward to 2022, rate cases and the provisional reviews following that for both PSE and Avista, there's a lot of projects. And some of them were pretty far off from the estimates that were originally filed. However, they spent the money somewhere else, and they did support that. It's just -- we're unsure about a blanket approval of provisional plant. We don't want -- I think the question is -- how do we not overestimate plant?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So would you accept, subject to check, that in the company's 2023 provisional plant filing, Avista reported 123 total

	Page 400		Page 402
1	projects with 21 of those being new business cases that	1	guess just one more question.
2	weren't included in the 2022 GRC?	2	So the company's 2022 general rate case was a
3	THE WITNESS: Subject to check.	3	two-year rate plan with this case being filed shortly
4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And so, is this	4	after the end of the first rate year and a test year
5	a significant deviation from the first year of the	5	that reflects capital additions through June of 2023,
6	two-year rate plan?	6	which is only six months into the rate into
7			Rate Year 1.
8			
9	more projects, yes. I'm not sure what the dollar	8 9	Do you have any concerns that a portion of that
10	amounts are	10	plant is effectively being picked up in the test year
11	(Reporter requests clarification.) THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what the dollar	11	without commissioners reviewing testimony and evidence
		12	to support the business cases and level of investment
12	amounts are that the dollar impact of those	13	that overlap?
13	projects.		THE WITNESS: No. I mean, in the we would
14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	14	be looking at the business cases in each case, each
15	So do you think these alternative projects merit	15	opportunity that we get, whether it's in a GRC or a
16	the same level of scrutiny from Staff and other parties	16	plant review or in the next GRC.
17	as would be performed during a full adjudicative	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
18	proceeding rather than the compliance process?	18	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Well, thank you
19	THE WITNESS: The intent is to look at	19	very much. I also wanted to ask you about wildfire
20	prudence in their review, which is one of the reasons	20	expense balancing account.
21	we're asking for six months instead of four months. So	21	You identify certain costs that you believe are
22	yes, it's important that we look at all those projects.	22	strictly and exclusively related to the mitigation of
23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	23	wildfire risk. And I just want to clarify. Do you
24	So do you find any merit in AWEC's claim that the	24	are you proposing that these types of costs be the only
25	utility's spending to its approved budget? Which	25	costs included in any future wildfire balancing
	Page 401		Page 403
1	your review of the 2022 and 2023 provisional plant does	1	account? Or that the balancing account should be
2	indicate the company's exceeded the level of rate base	2	phased out completely?
3	approved in the 2022 settlement.	3	THE WITNESS: Well, we're recommending
4	THE WITNESS: I don't know. I mean, again, I	4	phasing out the balancing account. But so far, just
5	think it's valuable to review plant on a portfolio	5	starting with costs that overlap with other efforts,
6	basis because there needs to be some flexibility. And	6	which would be the storm damage and grid hardening.
7	if we have multi-year rate plans in effect, it gets	7	And then, maybe in the next rate case, we could look at
8	more difficult as you go further out to know what the	8	whether or not the amounts that are related to
9	plant needs are. Things change. Sometimes a company	9	wildfire only, whether or not that's prudent to roll
10	can't actually invest where they plan to. Maybe	10	into base rates or not.
11	there's a delay.	11	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. That's what I was going
12	So I guess, to me, that weighs on the side of	12	to ask you was if if you're proposing to phase it
13	the costs that are being recovered are reasonable even	13	out, when would that be? And so, you don't really have
14	if they spend the money on other projects. Although I	14	a hard date? You just say, "Let's look at it in the
15	guess it does cause some concern if certain plants	15	future GRC"
16	overestimated by 30 or 50 percent and they're large	16	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not sure how
17	projects. That seem it feels like it's this	17	material it would be.
18	blanket, you know, windfall of money to spend somewhere	18	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. That's
19	else. If it's not spent on plant, it would be	19	all I have. Thank you very much.
20	redundant, though; so it is being spent on plant that's	20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21	used and useful.	21	JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?
22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So your concern	22	You may be excused. Thank you.
23	is with the overestimation and then the result of that?	23	Will you present your next witness, Staff.
24	THE WITNESS: Mm-hmm. Yeah.	25	ATTY ROBERSON: Staff calls Kristen Hillstead.
25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I		Mister i i ilisteau.

	Page 404	Page 406
1	JUDGE BROWN: Good morning.	1 Q When you shifted the operating and maintenance
2	MS. HILLSTEAD: Good morning.	2 expenses, did you I mean, you didn't shift their
3	JUDGE BROWN: Ah, thank you.	3 capital expenditures from their test year, did you?
4	(Witness duly sworn.)	4 A No, I did not.
5	JUDGE BROWN: You may proceed.	5 Q Are you concerned that shifting the op I mean,
6	ATTY ROBERSON: Thank you.	6 those expenses are linked operations and maintenance
7		7 and capital projects. Are you concerned that shifting
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION	8 part of the rate case would result in a distortion?
9	BY ATTY ROBERSON:	9 A No.
10	Q Good morning. Would you state your name and spell your	10 Q It resulted in a \$6 million addition to the operation
11	last name for the record.	and maintenance cost to shift the costs forward one
12	A Kristen Hillstead, H-I-L-S-T-E-A-D.	12 year or six months, rather.
13	Q And are you the same Kristen Hillstead that submitted	13 What was do you know the source of that initial
14	Exhibits KMH-1T through Exhibit KMH-16C?	14 \$6 million?
15	A Yes.	15 A It was the data request for Public Counsel's data
16	ATTY ROBERSON: And I believe there's cross	16 request through 97. It was the actual.
17	from Public Counsel.	17 Q But do you know what was the why was there
18		\$6 million more in that addition when you shifted
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION	19 forward 6 months? Do you know?
20	BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL:	20 A Because it was the actual there were actual
21	Q Good morning, Ms. Hillstead.	21 expenses.
22	A Good morning.	22 Q You didn't track down what was the source of that
23	Q We had a chance to talk briefly yesterday. I want to	23 additional \$6 million from operations in the last part
24	ask you about the operations and maintenance budget.	24 of '23?
25	A Okay.	25 A It was basically, they had taken their 6 months.
	Page 405	Page 407
1	Q Initially in the filing, Avista asked to inflate their	1 And I compared the what they filed initially and
2	costs by a percentage. I think it was over 6 percent	2 then when they rolled it forward to the end of
3	that they calculated based on prior looking at prior	3 December. And it was the 6 million on the electric
4	years; is that right?	4 side.
5	A Yes.	5 Q Right. You didn't go line by line and figure out what
6	Q And Staff's recommendation was to deny that that	6 the changes were?
7	inflation or percentage; correct?	7 A No.
8	A Correct.	8 Q Okay. Public Counsel's proposal was to reduce the rate
9	Q And why is that?	9 of inflation to what we expect inflation to be. Do you
10	A Because it's an unknown and didn't think it was a	have a position on that? On Public Counsel's proposal?
11	reasonable escalation considering some of the trends of	11 A No.
12	the O&M where some of them were going up and some were	12 Q You don't have a position? Or you don't like it?
13	going down. So Staff thought it would be best to just	13 A Don't have a position. Sorry.
14	not include an escalation factor.	14 Q What on rebuttal of this, to change their proposal
15	Q So is the objection that the data that they presented	where they both shift the year six months forward and
16	was conflicting? Or is it that you just opposed	then apply an inflation rate when you proposed the
17 18	inflation an inflation measure at all?	17 six-month shifting forward, was that intended to be 18 alternative like, an exclusive alternative to adding
19	A We just yeah. We didn't accept the inflationary component.	18 alternative like, an exclusive alternative to adding 19 an inflation rate?
20	Q Okay. What and your counter-proposal was to move	
21	the test year from the year ending June of '23 to	20 A Can you restate that, please. 21 Q Well, they're doing both. They're both shifting and
22	the year ending December of '23?	they're inflating. That seems like a worse scenario
23	A Correct.	than either just inflating or shifting.
24	Q And the advantage of that is what?	24 A We just shift we just took the end of the year. We
25	A They're actually known and measurable expenses.	25 did not include any escalation or don't support an
	-yy	and the second s

	Page 408	Page 410
1	escalation.	1 ATTY STRAUSS: Sorry about that.
2	Q Okay. That's all the questions I have for you.	2 Q BY ATTY STRAUSS: Mr. Wilson, could you please state
3	A Oh, thank you.	3 your name and spell your last for the record.
4	JUDGE BROWN: Is there any redirect?	4 A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N.
5	ATTY ROBERSON: There is not.	5 Q And where are you currently employed?
6	JUDGE BROWN: Questions from the bench?	6 A I am currently employed at Grid Strategies where I'm
7	CHAIR DANNER: I do have a question for you.	7 vice president.
8	Good morning.	8 Q Do you have any changes or corrections you need to make
9	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	9 to your testimony or any exhibits?
10	CHAIR DANNER: Referring to your response	10 A Yes, I do. There was a the version of exit
11	testimony, you state that Staff would support an	11 excuse me let me pull that exhibit number up.
12	inclusion of the union wage increase in Year 1 once the	12 Exhibit 28C that was filed was not the final exhibit
13	contract is ratified. And since your testimony was	prepared, and so I need to correct that for the record.
14	filed, the company has provided a revised adjustment on	14 It did not have any the error in the filing did not
15	ratification of the union contract.	15 have any material impact on the testimony. But it
16	Do you agree with the company's revised proposal	16 would be confusing for someone who was trying to
17	for Rate Year 1?	17 cross-reference Table 1 back to Exhibit 28C.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.	18 And the correction is in cell is in the
19	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And if the Commission	19 Tab DR230COMPREV. And it is cell K33. And that
20	were to grant a multi-year rate plan, what are your	20 number that cell should be filled in with a zero.
21	thoughts on the post-adjustment to union and nonunion	21 And once that's done, then the exhibit is corrected and
22	wages for Rate Year 2 using the board-approved minimum	the results match up with my testimony.
23	pay increases for 2026?	23 Q Thank you.
24	THE WITNESS: I would support what would be	24 ATTY STRAUSS: The witness is ready for
25	known, as long as that union contract would or the	25 cross-examination.
	Page 409	Page 411
	5	1490 111
1	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION
1 2		1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER:
	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you?
2	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you.
2	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on
2 3 4 5 6	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it.	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change
2 3 4 5 6 7	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 6 Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff?	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet 11 was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet 11 was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet 10 was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused.	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 BY ATTY MOSER: 3 Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? 4 A Fine, thank you. 5 Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? 8 A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. 9 Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet 10 was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS:	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record.	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N.	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the comparison tab matches up with Table 1 of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. Q And where are you currently employed?	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the comparison tab matches up with Table 1 of my testimony. And that's the version that should have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. Q And where are you currently employed? JUDGE BROWN: Before you proceed, I have to	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the comparison tab matches up with Table 1 of my testimony. And that's the version that should have been filed. So there's nothing substantive about it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. Q And where are you currently employed? JUDGE BROWN: Before you proceed, I have to swear you in. So would you raise your right hand.	Decrease that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the company. And that's the version that should have been filed. So there's nothing substantive about it. It just somehow that papened. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Okay. So it sounds like we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. Q And where are you currently employed? JUDGE BROWN: Before you proceed, I have to swear you in. So would you raise your right hand. (Witness duly sworn.)	BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Q Okay. And just because I'm catching up a little bit on your correction, can you just explain what that change does to this table? A Well, it doesn't change anything in my testimony. Again, it was just a I don't actually know how this particular the misfiled version of the spreadsheet was created. But that cell referenced should be a zero because that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the comparison tab matches up with Table 1 of my testimony. And that's the version that should have been filed. So there's nothing substantive about it. It just somehow that error crept in there, and I'm not sure where or how that happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	board had approved the increases for the nonunion and any contract that would be signed. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. THE WITNESS: With approved wage increases. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted some clarification on that. Appreciate it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no questions. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: Is there anything from Staff? ATTY ROBERSON: I believe Staff's next witness is Mr. Wilson; so we can call him now. JUDGE BROWN: All right. Thank you. And you're excused. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. Could you please state your name and spell your last for the record. A John D. Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N. Q And where are you currently employed? JUDGE BROWN: Before you proceed, I have to swear you in. So would you raise your right hand.	Decrease that's part of just calculating up the non-itemized costs associated with the company's model run. And for some reason, there was a formula there that was similar to one in another row, and so it must have gotten copied in inadvertently somehow. But I did not use that. And so, when that correction is made, then the table in the company. And that's the version that should have been filed. So there's nothing substantive about it. It just somehow that papened. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ATTY MOSER: Q Good morning, Mr. Wilson. How are you? A Fine, thank you. Okay. So it sounds like we're

Page 412 Page 414 1 Can I please have you turn to your cross-answering 1 that sentence just for -- to clarify things for the 2 2 testimony on page -- well, Table 1. Commission. 3 3 A 1. I have that in front of me. Go ahead. So this is based on the company's model run using 4 4 Q Great. And if I look at the bottom of this table, I'm the price that was just quoted, about \$38 per ton. And 5 5 seeing two adjustments related to the CCA. And the the model run produces an emission estimate. And based 6 first one is "include CCA allowance price and dispatch 6 on that, relative to the -- Avista's proposal filed in 7 7 market purchases." And that's a 21.6, roughly, its direct case, the emissions are reduced by 8 million-dollar increase to Avista's net power costs; 8 18 percent using that market price. 9 9 Q BY ATTY MOSER: Okay. And now if I can have you turn correct? 10 A Correct. 10 to your direct testimony, page 28. 11 Q Okay. And I just want to make sure that I understand 11 A Okay. I'm there. Q And then, starting on line 2, you describe how 12 12 how that number is calculated and what it means. So 13 PacifiCorp includes CCA costs and rates: is that 13 I'm going to describe it to you, and if you can correct 14 my understanding if it's incorrect, that'd be great. correct? It actually goes on to the next page as well. 14 15 15 Oh, I'm sorry. 16 16 Q So my understanding is that this adjustment applies a A Yes. 17 \$38.09 allowance price for all unit dispatch and power 17 Q Okay. And is it your understanding that PacifiCorp 1.8 purchase decisions without distinguishing between 18 does not include CCA costs for all unit dispatch and 19 retail load and wholesale load. Do I have that 19 power purchase decisions without distinguishing between 20 correct? 20 retail load and wholesale load? 21 21 A (No audible response.) A I'm sorry. You -- was your question about PacifiCorp 22 Q So we're not talking about direct CCA compliance costs 22 or Avista? I've lost that part of the question. 23 Q I'm sorry. It's about PacifiCorp. I'm trying to 23 here. We're just considering those in the dispatch 24 of -- any economic dispatch for power costs forecast 24 understand your understanding of how PacifiCorp 25 purposes? 25 forecasts CCA costs and its power costs. Page 413 Page 415 1 A That's correct. 1 A I have not done a full review of PacifiCorp's CCA 2 2 Q Okay. And then, this also -- if we turn a couple of allowance costs. I know that Mr. Mullins's testimony 3 pages, if you need to -- would result in an 18 percent 3 discusses that, and I don't have any disagreements with 4 reduction in emissions for power cost run, as you've 4 his interpretation of that. My point here was that CCA 5 5 proposed here; is that correct? allowance costs are included in Chehalis dispatch 6 6 A Can you direct me to that. costs, and Avista is not doing so. 7 7 Q Well, would you agree that Avista includes CCA dispatch Q Yeah. It's on your page 13, lines 4 and 5. 8 8 A Okay. costs as a shadow price for its Boulder Park facility? 9 ATTY MEYER: Of which exhibit? 9 A Yes. That's dated on line 5 of my testimony, right 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. That's correct. 10 there where you're quoting. 11 ATTY MOSER: I'm sorry. I'm still on his 11 Q Okay. But your proposal goes beyond just including CCA 12 12 costs for -- CCA costs for dispatch on plants that are cross exhib- -- yeah. 13 Q BY ATTY MOSER: Although now I'm going to move us to 13 located within the state of Washington; correct? We're 14 your direct testimony, please. 14 talking about all dispatch and market purchases? 15 15 A That's correct. A Okay. 16 Q And at page 20- --16 Q Okay. 17 CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry. Just a moment. 17 A That's correct -- I think, the CCA law, yes. 18 18 The last citation you said was page 13? Q Okay. So if your proposal is adopted in this case, it 19 19 ATTY MOSER: Well, let's see if I read that would result in a discrepancy between the way that 20 too fast. Yes. Page 13. 20 PacifiCorp forecasts its CCA compliance obligations and 21 21 CHAIR DANNER: Of his cross-answering -the way that Avista does; is that right? 22 ATTY MOSER: Of his cross-answering 22 A It would update the Avista costs. It would update the 23 23 testimony, the corrected cross-answering testimony, Avista dispatch to be compliant with what I understand 24 pages -- I'm sorry -- lines 4 and 5. 24 to be the intent of Ecology on implementation of the 25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So I can elaborate on 25 CCA. And it would be my expectation that other

23

24

25

Page 416 Page 418 Q BY ATTY MOSER: Great. And can I direct you to page --1 utilities would need to act accordingly. And I don't 1 2 it's 22 of your testimony and, I think, 25 of the 2 believe any of the utilities are 100 percent fully 3 3 exhibit. compliant with the interpretation of the CCA that I 4 4 understand Ecology has. A Okay. 5 5 Q And can -- are you aware that PacifiCorp had a general Q And starting on line 13, you -- there's a section 6 rate case last year? 6 related to realtime dispatch and the Commission -- oh, 7 7 Oh, I think I -- we lost your audio. sorry. I'm in the wrong place in my question. 8 A Is my audio back? 8 In this Q&A, you confirm that PSE does not include 9 9 Q Yes. Sorry. Maybe there just a little bit of a delay. emission -- an emissions costs adder in dispatch 10 A And I did -- I did participate in that proceeding, I 10 decisions for natural gas and coal generation resources 11 11 when serving retail electric demand; is that correct? believe. 12 12 Q And did you propose -- or are you aware that Staff A That's correct. Q Okay. And then you go on to the next Q&A -- and that's proposed an adjustment or -- similar to your 13 13 14 14 \$21.6 million adjustment proposed for Avista here? starting on page 23 of your testimony -- and you 15 A No. We didn't engage this issue in that case. 15 discuss the uncertainty in Ecology's true-up process; Q Okay. And now I'm going to direct you to -- AWEC 16 is that correct? 16 17 Cross Exhibit -- I believe it's JDW-36X. But that's 17 A That's correct. 18 your direct testimony in PSE's rate case. 18 Q And then, if we skip over to page 25, there's a Q&A 19 A Actually, if you give me just a moment to pull that 19 starting on line 1. And there you conclude that, given 20 20 an inconsistency in Ecology's positions, it is not up --21 clear-cut that PSE should include CCA cost in retail 21 Q Of course. 22 22 A -- cross examination exhibits; so I'll have to go to dispatch; is that correct? 23 23 that --A I'm sorry. Where does it say it is not clear? Were 24 24 (Reporter requests clarification.) you quoting me there? Or were you summarizing? 25 25 Q Let's see. Well, I think you say, "Given the JUDGE THOMPSON: Mr. Wilson, when you're Page 419 Page 417 1 speaking, could you attempt to speak into the 1 inconsistency in Ecology's position, it is important to 2 2 microphone as much as possible. I think the audio is obtain clarification." And then I believe you conclude 3 cutting in and out a little bit on our end. I don't 3 that you cannot advise the Commission that Ecology's 4 know if there's anything that you can do on your end. 4 position is clear or that the recent federal court 5 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you. I'll take decision constrains Ecology from expecting 6 6 some steps if you just give me a moment. allowances -- allowance costs to be considered in 7 7 And before I do that, could you repeat -- the dispatch decisions. 8 request was for my direct testimony in the PSE case? 8 A Yes. That's my testimony. And for a little bit of 9 Q BY ATTY MOSER: It is. And that was marked -- it's an 9 context for the Commissioners, this testimony would 10 10 AWEC cross exhibit, and it was marked as JDW-36X. have been included in my testimony file -- this 11 A Thank you. And I'm switching my audio to a different 11 material -- excuse me -- would have been included in my 12 12 microphone. Avista cross-answer testimony. But the Commission 13 13 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. Please take your issued the policy statement on the CCA, and so we 14 time. 14 removed this portion of the testimony from the draft 15 THE WITNESS: Is that any better? Are you 15 that I was going to file and substituted in what was 16 hearing me? Is that any better? 16 filed, which was a discussion of the Commission's 17 (Reporter requests clarification.) 17 policy statement. 1.8 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. I'm just getting 18 Later, the Commission issue -- rescinded the 19 feedback from the court reporter, and it sounds like 19 policy statement, and so we removed all of the 20 this is -- this is better. 20 testimony related to the policy statement from the 21 21 (Reporter clarification.) testimony. So I'm -- certainly, the general line of

reasoning that is in the PSE testimony, I do agree

further, your conclusion is that -- and I believe your

Q And so, I guess, just to understand that a little

would apply to the Avista case as well.

22

23

24

25

JUDGE THOMPSON: Just as good. Okay. So we

can go ahead and proceed, and I'll jump in if we need.

have the testimony up, and I'm ready to proceed.

THE WITNESS: Great. Thank you. Okay. I

Page 420 1 recommendation for PSE is that there should be a CCA --1 2 you don't have an equivalent adjustment that you're 2 3 recommending -- an equivalent adjustment to the 3 4 \$21.6 million adjustment you are recommending for 4 5 Avista in PSE? 5 6 A No. That's not correct. If you go to page 26 of that 6 7 7 same testimony, lines 6 through 8, there is a conducted. 8 recommended adjustment there for emissions. 8 9 9 Q So your testimony is that the Commission doesn't have 10 enough information and you don't have enough 10 11 information from Ecology to make a recommendation on 11 12 whether this is prudent, but you nevertheless 12 13 recommended that the Commission include this 13 adjustment? 14 14 15 A That's correct. Yes. I think that the -- you know, it 15 16 is a complicated situation, and it's unfortunate. But, 16 17 you know, there's -- let me back up and explain the 17 18 18 lack of clarity for the Commission since this testimony 19 is -- while it was probably riveting to read at the 19 20 time that it was submitted, it may not be in the 20 21 Commissioners' minds. 21 22 So there's two sets of facts here. One is that I 22 23 conducted an interview with Ecology staff and asked 23 24 them to explain this confusing situation to me. And if 24 25 they walked it through, they made it very clear in that 25 Page 421 1 interview that they expected the utilities to include 1 made against this. 2 CCA allowance costs in dispatch decisions, among other 2 3 facts. And I can go through those, if asked. 3 4 4 The other statement is -- let me find that in the 5 5 PSE -- in 2022. And this begins back on page 18 of my 6 6

Ecology's position has evolved since 2022 and they are now feeling that it is time for this activity to take place, or whether there was some misunderstanding -and I can't explain what that misunderstanding might have been because I felt very certain about what Ecology staff were saying to me in the interview I

Page 422

Page 423

So, you know, we've got a set of -- a written statement kind of buried in the back of a large -- of a large document that is suggesting it's not time yet to do this. And then, later, staff saying, "This is how we think" -- Ecology staff saying, "This is how we think things ought to operate."

And then the third factor I considered is sort of the overall economic efficiency gains from a prudency point of view. And that factor is that, when Avista is dispatching its plants, it has the option to dispatch a plant that is going to incur an emissions cost. It has the option to purchase power on the market that does not require it to impose an emission cost.

And -- or -- and if it chooses not to impose that emissions cost, then it has the opportunity to sell allowances and, of course, buy allowances and take on that emissions costs. So from an economic efficiency point of view, there's really hardly any argument to be

PSE testimony. I don't remember the cross-examination exhibit number, but it's the one you've been referring to. It's a statement of the -- concise explanatory statement.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And this statement, it says, "Ecology believes that, in the short term, the importance of not creating a disincentive to the creation or submission of an accurate emissions forecast outweighs the valid ideal here" -- "suggested" -- "the valid ideal suggested here of creating an economics incentive to reduce more than is required by CETA," C-E-T-A.

So what I interpret here is that, in 2022, for the emissions forecast purpose, Ecology said, "We don't want to add in the emissions costs in the dispatch decision for right now." But the ideal -- the economic incentive to reduce more than is required by CETA is the ideal.

And so, this is somewhat consistent with the interview I had with Ecology staff, which took place later than this. So what I'm unclear about is whether

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so, I really still think that, in spite of the confusion and certainly understandable lack of clarity on the part of various parties in this position as to when and how Ecology is going to proceed, I do think that the prudent activity, given the tac- -- or the emissions -- the requirement is for that fee to be included in dispatch costs just as the costs of SO2 compliance -- just as the cost of NOx compliance, et cetera -- is included in dispatch costs.

And I think it would be a mistake for a utility to operate as if no such cost exists and then come back several years later and find out that, well, such a cost did exist, and then bring that cost to customers much later after the fact and say, "Hey, look, it was very confusing. We didn't know at the time. We weren't certain at the time. And now we have to pay that cost; so please" -- you know, "we're going to ask for that in rates."

And that creates all kinds of prudence review issues that I think can be avoided. So I hope that that extensive background there clarifies my statement that you were asking about.

Q It was very extensive. Thank you. But at the heart of it, it's based on an informal interview that you had

13 (Pages 420 to 423)

		Page 424		Page 426
1		with Ecology staff; correct?	1	A I see it.
2	Α	It's based I would say at the heart of it is	2	Q Okay. So isn't it more appropriate for the Commission
3		based on all three factors that I just went over.	3	to address this policy issue in a policy statement? Or
4	Q	Okay.	4	rules that would be broadly applicable to all
5	Α	And I'm sure you don't want me to review those again.	5	utilities?
6		We're so lucky to have a transcript in this proceeding;	6	A I think which is more appropriate is a decision for the
7		so I don't think you have to. Thank you, though.	7	Commission. It's my job in this proceeding to provide
8		But you're not aware of any formal guidance that	8	the Staff's review of the power costs and to ensure
9		Ecology has issued on this point; is that correct?	9	that the forecast is as accurate as possible and is
10	Α	Much to all of our regret, no.	10	I with my recommendation, the Staff has adopted the
11	Q	Yeah. That would make everyone's job a lot easier,	11	position that including dispatch costs in the forecast
12		wouldn't it?	12	is the most prudent action that could be taken in order
13		So now I'm going to have you refer to AWEC	13	to reasonably reflect the actual power costs that are
14		Cross Exhibit 37X and 38X. And that's the Commission's	14	likely to be incurred in the rate year. And that is
15		policy statement and then the letter rescinding that	15	not a matter that can wait for another proceeding since
16		policy statement, just to orient you.	16	the power cost forecast is before us today.
17	Α	Okay. Do I need to pull those up? I didn't have the	17	Q Okay. I'm going to have you now turn back to your
18		cross-examination exhibits in the	18	cross-answering testimony.
19	Q	I don't think so. I are you familiar with the	19	A Okay.
20		documents?	20	Q And then, again, page 7, Table 1, I want to spend a few
21		Generally speaking.	21	minutes just talking about this second adjustment, the
22	Q	Okay. Well, I'm happy to give you a moment if that	22	CCA allowance costs for market sales.
23		would be helpful.	23	A Okay.
24		I think I can find them pretty quick here.	24	Q And here, this is just a CCA allowance adder for the
25	Q	Okay.	25	anticipated allowance costs that Staff believes Avista
		Page 425		Page 427
1	А	Okay. I've got the notice, and I've got the order.	1	would need to acquire for wholesale sales; correct?
2	, ,	Okay.	2	A Based on Avista's calculations of those emissions, yes.
3	Q	Okay. And then, on page 6 of the policy statement,	3	Q Right.
4		there's just a section that's and starting in	4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And what page are we
5		paragraph 19, it talks about realtime dispatch.	5	on? Excuse me.
6	Α	Okay.	6	ATTY MOSER: Excuse me. I was referring to
7	Q	And it's just here, the Commission discusses the use	7	page 7, just that same Table 1. It's the last
8		of social cost of greenhouse gases and CCA costs and	8	adjustment in that table.
9		realtime utility dispatch operations; is that correct?	9	CHAIR DANNER: And that's on page 11?
10	Α		10	ATTY MOSER: I'm sorry. I
11	Q	Okay. But then, if we turn to the cross exhibit the	11	CHAIR DANNER: The document that I have so
12		next cross exhibit, the recision letter which is	12	I'm just trying to
13	_	just one page	13	ATTY MOSER: Oh, okay. Yeah.
14	Α	So I have two documents. I have a notice rescinding	14	CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead.
15	-	the policy statement and then an order.	15	ATTY MOSER: I think this is the up maybe
16	Q	I'm just talking about the notice rescinding the policy	16	we have a page discrepancy. This is the revised
17 18		statement.	17	cross-answering. Is that what you guys have?
1 ×		Okay.	18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm just trying to
	Q	And just in that bottom paragraph, it says, "Notice is	19	find it.
19		given that the Commission withdraws the August 15th,	20	ATTY MOSER: Okay. Sorry. Table 1 might be
19 20		-		
19 20 21		2024 policy statement for further consideration. The	21	more helpful than a page number.
19 20 21 22		2024 policy statement for further consideration. The Commission will continue to consider input from	22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which exhibit is
19 20 21 22 23		2024 policy statement for further consideration. The Commission will continue to consider input from interested parties and will issue further notices,	22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which exhibit is this? Sorry.
19 20 21 22 23 24		2024 policy statement for further consideration. The Commission will continue to consider input from interested parties and will issue further notices, policy statements, or draft rules in this docket as	22 23 24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which exhibit is
19 20 21 22 23		2024 policy statement for further consideration. The Commission will continue to consider input from interested parties and will issue further notices,	22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And which exhibit is this? Sorry.

Page 428 Page 430 1 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And page 11 or 7... 1 A Yes. That's correct. 2 ATTY MOSER: Oh. I think that the Table that 2 Q All right. Got you. Thank you. 3 3 A Yeah. I'm not testifying that 43 million is small. I'm looking at is only in the revised version of 4 4 testimony. That's a large cost. 5 5 CHAIR DANNER: All right. So we have that And that's kind of the issue here, if I can 6 electronically. We also have paper binders. And I 6 elaborate. You know. Avista has not included this 7 7 think we're dealing with the discrepancy. \$43 million in here, but I do believe that it will be 8 ATTY MOSER: Sure. Yeah. 8 incurred. And right now it's my understanding that 9 9 CHAIR DANNER: Would you tell us -- give us these costs are being deferred and -- as part of a 10 the number of the exhibit, and we will --10 deferral mechanism in a prior rate case. And Avista 11 ATTY MOSER: Yes. It's JDW-24CTr. 11 assumes that that will continue. 12 12 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. We And it's our opinion that it is more in the customer's interest, if those costs are incurred, that 13 have that. 13 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I'm there. 14 they be recovered closer to the time at which they're 15 ATTY MOSER: Okay. 15 incurred as opposed to deferred and then a large amount Q BY ATTY MOSER: And so, the adjustment that I'm 16 16 added up and added to customers' bills in the future 17 referring to is that last adjustment, the CCA allowance 17 for several years of cumulated -- of accumulated costs. 18 cost for market sales. It's a \$43.1 million adjustment 18 Q So I want to -- you actually led me to my next 19 and increase to Avista's net power costs. 19 question, which -- it's always nice when that works 20 20 out. I want to go back to a statement that you just A That's correct. And just given the conversation we 21 just had, perhaps I should take just a brief moment to 21 made, which is that -- you believe that Avista will 22 orient everyone to the table. 22 incur CCA compliance cost obligation for all of its 23 wholesale sales; is that correct? Did I just hear that 23 These are the system cost adjustments. And the 24 first one is to exclude the portfolio error adjustment, 24 correctly? 25 25 A I don't believe it's all of its wholesale sales. So which has been subject of a lot of testimony. Page 429 Page 431 1 Following that are a number of corrections, most of 1 let me see if I can very quickly direct you to where I 2 which the company has accepted. And then, the last two 2 calculate that and walk you through that. Give me just 3 are the ones we've been talking about. So the first 3 a moment here to follow -- to trace my formulas here. 4 4 Q And, Mr. Wilson, I just want to say you don't need one is the -- including the CCA allowance price in the 5 dispatch. And that's the 21.6 million you referenced 5 to -- I can ask my question without the specific 6 earlier. And then, the next one is the actually CCA 6 number. I'm asking on more of a general policy basis. 7 allowance cost for market sales, which is 43.1 million. 7 A I understand. And that's where I'm coming to, yeah. 8 And what was not included are any CCA allowance 8 So the emissions calculation is performed in 9 9 Exhibit 28C. And it's a -- this is a confidential costs for retail sales because those are offset by the 10 10 no-cost allowances. And I'm assuming but not portion of the exhibit. It's conducted on an hourly 11 guaranteeing that Ecology would -- its true-up process 11 basis; so the emissions are totaled up on an hourly 12 12 would grant sufficient no-cost allowances to cover the basis. And the emissions include -- for -- they're 13 retail sales. So that is the underlying structure to 13 distinguished first by serving load and then by serving 14 this table. And the result is a very small increase in 14 the market. And there are zero emissions resources 15 net power costs -- or net power expenses for --15 that conserve the market -- Colstrip, market purchases, 16 relative to the company's original proposal. 16 and then gas. And that totals up for the emissions. 17 Q Is it your testimony that a \$44 million increase is a 17 So there is a distinction made by the company in 18 small increase to net power costs? 18 its calculation of emissions depending on the 19 A No. It's the \$360,000 number --19 classification of the emissions. It's not down to the 20 Q Oh. 20 individual plant level, but it is at the -- sort of the 21 A -- that I was referring to as small. 21 emissions -- well, actually, I take that back. I think 22 Q That's net of all of your adjustments, which also 22 all of those can then be traced back -- yeah. They can 23 includes removal of the portfolio --23 each be traced back to the individual plant. 24 A That's correct. 24 So does that answer your question? Or are you 25 Q -- error forecast adjustment? 25 looking for something more specific than that?

Page 434

Page 435

There is no prohibition on it and no specific cap. Q Okay. And do you have witness -- Avista Witness Kinney's testimony in front of you? His rebuttal testimony? And that's Exhibit SJK-17T. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. And then, let's see. I neglected to include a line number for myself; so... A Well, what's the page number so we can get there? Q Sorry. I'm looking. There's a -- do you have it electronically? A I do. Q Maybe you can help me with a control find. A All right. I'm always happy to help out a

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wheel-through transactions. And so, I did not adjust for that 16 percent figure in my calculations that were submitted as part of my cross-answer testimony because, of course, I did not have the availability of Mr. Kinney's testimony at that time, as you can So that would be a reasonable adjustment to make, that -- that 16 percent could reduce the wholesale sales obligation. But I don't think I see anything else here that allows it to get to a zero point. And I do think that those costs will be incurred overall. Q Even if it can't get to a zero point, it could be mitigated? A Well, I think that word "mitigated" sounds like there's some sort of, you know, Wizard of Oz behind the curtain trick that can reduce things. And I think what -- it's not really mitigation to say -- and so, I don't think that's a good choice of words by Mr. Kinney, with due respect. I think that what he's saying is --16 percent of the wholesale transactions are exempt

from CCA obligations, and so those should not be

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1.8

Page 436

included in an estimate.

And if I had the opportunity to submit additional evidence, I would take that 16 percent and apply it -- I guess I would -- what I would like to do is do a DR request and see if I can get that on an hourly basis. But even if it's on an annual basis, you could go through and just simply take 16 percent of those emissions and, in some fashion -- so you might -- you might just reduce that cost by 16 percent or you might reduce classes of emissions by 16 percent and see how that worked out the cost. It might work out to the same number. I haven't performed that calculation.

But that would be a -- I wouldn't call that a mitigation as much as a correction to reflect a reasonable historical standard that there are going to be wholesale transactions that are exempt from CCA costs

And that's kind of my point here, also -- is that by not including the CCA allowance cost in these dispatch decisions, essentially, you're creating a sale to an exempt customer the same as you are to a customer for whom that cost is incurred.

So if, for example, Avista received an offer from an exempt customer to pay \$42 for the power and it also received an offer from a Washington customer to buy Page 438

if the company is making sales that are uneconomic to customers, the Commission would have the ability to review that as part of power cost proceedings, for example; isn't that right?

A I agree with that statement, but I think the distinction you're making between operational and forecast is missing the point I'm making.

So the point I'm making here is that, in the forecasts, the -- we're trying to get the most accurate baseline forecast possible. That is the scope of the work that Staff assigned to me, and that's the work I've performed, and so my goal is not the make the costs too high or too low. And so, you know, it's important that these dispatch costs be included in the -- in this -- wholesale sales, which are going to be affected by this.

So, for example, if Avista is selling power to Idaho or selling power to California from its plants, then, ideally, its dispatch price would not include a CCA allowance cost. But conversely, when it is selling to a Washington customer, then it should. And if its Aurora model can't handle that distinction, then it's going to need to make approximations to estimate the likely share of system sales to those different jurisdictions and then include the appropriate forecast

Page 439

Page 437

that power for \$38 but -- let me flip that around. So received the \$38 offer from the exempt customer -- say, in California -- and a nonexempt customer in Washington -- and that offer was from 42 -- then I might say, well, 42's more than 38. Let's sell this

power to this wholesale customer for \$42.

But in doing so, because they have not considered the CCA allowance cost in the dispatch price, they have incurred on customer's behalf that CCA allowance cost of, say, \$38. And so now, instead of a \$42 revenue to the customers, they get \$4 in revenue to the customers because they have to pay that \$38. And you could change the dispatch costs however you like.

- Q Well -- okay. I think for forecast purposes, it's my understanding -- and you can correct me if this is not your understanding -- that the model is going -- once you include the CCA cost that the company will incur as a shadow price for its dispatch for Boulder Park, that the model will not choose to make uneconomic wholesale sales as part of the power cost run. And that's on a forecast basis; is that your understanding?
- A Yes. That's correct. So the -- go ahead with your question, yeah.
- Q Well, and so then I think your response was really speaking to an operational basis, which -- in realtime,

for CCA allowance costs that would be incurred for its sales to CCA jurisdictional customers.

- Q Now, are you aware at this time whether the company's Aurora model has that functionality?
- A I don't recall asking that question on discovery.
- Q Okay. Thank you.

But to your sort of broader point, I'm really trying to understand where there are a lot of unknowns — there are a lot of unknowns still in CCA implementation; right? I mean, as you testified, we don't know how the true-up is going to function. We don't know how Avista may or may not be able to mitigate its no-cost allowance — its CCA obligations through other means. We don't even know if the CCA is going to be here because there's a valid initiative that would repeal it currently before Washington voters November 1st; right?

- A Well, those were three different things. Could you walk me through those separately?
- Q Well, I'm just trying to understand if you agree that there is considerable unknown and, therefore, risk to the Commission making decisions in this case -- because we don't know, like, large aspects of CCA implementation, including whether the CCA is going to be here. Would you agree?

Page 442

Page 440

- A Again, there was a lot there. Are you asking me if the Commission should or shouldn't make decisions?
- Q I'm asking you if you view these unknowns as risks.
- 4 A Okay. Well, why don't you walk me through them individually.
 - Q Okay. If the Commission sets rates right now, with your recommendation, there's going to be about a \$65 million increase to power costs. But the CCA, if it's repealed, then those costs would not actually be cost-incurred, potentially, by Avista, and so customers would be overpaying \$65 million. Would you agree?
 - A Yes. I would agree that, if those facts occur, then the rates would be set too high. And, in fact, if that were the case, I would hope that the Commission would immediately reopen rates and try to make adjustments. I've seen -- I don't know whether that is something that can be done in Washington, but I've seen commissions in other jurisdictions respond to major policy changes, you know, with targeted action.
 - Q And then, we've also heard you testify that Avista may be able to use no-cost allowances to cover some or all of its wholesale sales with -- you've already made a correction or accepted a 16 percent change to your recommendation. That number could be different; it could be higher -- that they wouldn't be able to

- lower than forecasts, then customers will have paid more than the costs. And if that was your question, the answer is yes.
- Q And they could be lower because the true-up could function well, we don't know how the true-up is going to function, but it could function in a way that's more favorable than you're anticipating; is that right?
- A Well, I think the true-up is an interesting question because -- so from an economic point of view, in a way, the true-up is irrelevant from the point of view of operational and, therefore, forecast operations thinking.

So if Ecology is granting one no-cost allowance or, you know, all the allowances that Avista needs minus one, they still have to transact in the market, you know, anywhere in that range. And if -- you know, transacting in the market, even transacting in the market by simply holding pad and keeping the allowances and deciding that they are not worth selling at the prices that are being offered, they are making an economic decision to dispatch plants or not dispatch plants versus sell or not sell or buy or not buy. Those are all economic decisions that the utility makes on an ongoing basis.

Page 441

mitigate -- it's possible; right?

A That's correct that there's uncertainty around that number. Again, I'm not going to accept the word "mitigate." I think that the ratio of jurisdictional to non-jurisdictional sales is an uncertainty. That's part of the entire net power expense process -- is that there is uncertainty around any number of variables and costs in this. And I think we heard extensive testimony from the company's witnesses as to how perilous they view the uncertainty.

My view is that there's a lot of it that can be managed from their end, but I think there's also a lot that is simply a degree of uncertainty that results in power cost variability that has to be addressed through the ERM. And that certainly forms the basis of my recommendations as to revisions to the ERM. But I know that's not the subject of your question.

Q Thank you.

But you fundamentally agree that, if the
Commission adopts your recommendation, your recommended
adjustments in this case, and then Avista's actual
compliance obligations under the CCA are either
mitigated or lower, customers will have paid more in
rates than Avista's obligations; right?

A I think what you're asking me is -- if the costs are

Page 443

So I don't agree that the true-up itself affects that. What it does affect is the net cost of allowances for retail sales. And in this case, as I mentioned earlier in summarizing Table 1, I have assumed that the no-cost allowances will be exactly sufficient to supply the needs of Avista for its retail sales.

I think that assumption itself is probably wrong. It will probably end up being somewhat more or somewhat less. That's what Ecology has said. I think they've said that in writing, that they're not likely to match it up exactly. But certainly, that's what they said to me in the interview that I did. And the point there wasn't that they were going to be tweaking the -- the point was they were not going to be tweaking those numbers down to the tenth of a ton to match it up exactly. They were going to be issuing the allowances, and they expected that they would be -- whatever the target that they were setting was, they would probably be a little bit higher or a little bit low of whatever they meant to hit. Hopefully that makes sense.

So I don't view the true-up as material a risk for the factors that are in our net power cost forecast, even though the quantity of no-cost allowances is certainly going to affect net power expenses in the

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 444

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 446

Page 447

Q But you are recommending that the Commission increase Avista's net power costs by about \$65 million, an increase that Avista has not asked for but they are saying they can mitigate or they believe can mitigate -- we don't -- I understand you're -- don't like the term "mitigate." But that is a certain cost and power cost that you're asking the Commission to approve now while, at the same time, recognizing the level of uncertainty and risk that is associated with this program.

And I'm trying to understand why Staff is asking the Commission to increase rates over the risks that we're seeing. I'm genuinely trying to understand why Staff is falling on that side of the line.

A So I will break it down into the two components. First, the 21.6 million in Table 1 on page 7 of Exhibit JDW-24CTR. So that 21 million is including the CCA allowance price. And I've explained the reasons why I think that that is a prudent action to do. And if the Commission accepts the recommendation and includes -- directs that the power forecast and also the operations include a CCA allowance price, then that is going to require Avista to operate its plants in accordance with what I view as economic principles

included in our PacifiCorp case. I can't remember that

And that amount is already -- cost that is being sort of built up and deferred, presumably with carrying cost. And so that, again, is not a new cost that is being invented here by Staff and being added to customer's bills. It's a cost that exists and will be collected from customers. It is not a question of if it will be collected; it is a question of when it will be collected and how much will be collected.

And based on the information I had at the time that I filed this testimony, I came up with the best estimate I could as to what that cost would be. I've acknowledged that this 16 percent from Mr. Kinney would be a reasonable adjustment to that. But other than that, I think that that is the cost that will be incurred and will be eventually collected from customers.

And whether the Commission decides that it should be collected through rates now in this case or whether it should be deferred and collected in the future with carrying costs is kind of the decision that is before it. And I don't think the Commission can avoid that decision, unfortunately.

Q Okay. I have just a few more questions for you, and

Page 445

around the CCA allowance price.

The main risk with that is the initiative that you mentioned. And if the Commission wants to defer that decision and allow dispatch without an allowance price -- until that is decided or until some other date, then the result is going to be potential dispatch that results in a requirement for more allowances and even higher costs. So instead of 21 million -- and I'll just speculate here -- it might be 30 million or 40 million in allowance prices that eventually have to be recovered from customers.

So yes, it is an additional cost now, but it's because Avista omitted it from their filing, not because it is a cost that we are sort of adding to customers. It is a cost that results from the regulations that have been -- or the laws that have been adopted by Washington and the regulations so far as they've been detailed. They're in place. And that cost should be allotted to customers.

The second one -- the CCA allowance cost, the 43 million, which is the one that might be reduced to 16 percent or thereabouts -- that cost is a cost that is currently being deferred due to a rate case settlement that is no longer in effect. And that may be the reason that it -- incidentally, that it wasn't

it's going to require us to shift gears a little bit to a slightly different CCA topic.

Can I take you to your direct testimony at page 32.

A I am there.

Q Okay. And then, starting on line 1 -- so this section is just a summary of your recommendations for the Commission on CCA costs. And then, starting on line 1, page 32, you said, "Avista should buy and sell" --"should sell and buy allowances in a prudent manner to minimize NPE. This will require new risk management policies and practices and potentially additional staff to manage the carbon allowance portfolio"; correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay. So I'm just trying to understand kind of the timing and the procedural expectations that Staff has around this recommendation. Is this something that Avista should do now?

A Yes. It's something that it should do now. Go ahead with your question.

Q Well, and is it your understanding that the CCA allows a utility to deposit no-cost allowances for compliance?

A I'm not sure what you mean by that. There's specific rules that Ecology has set out on when allowances need to be deposited -- maybe, the legal term, I've

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the -- the fact that its renewable energy resources

would not come online in a timely manner early in the

process, it could have bought more allowances at the

lower price. It could have dispatched its fleet based

on a marginal price that was at the higher end of the

range earlier, and it would have ended up costing the

customers less in the long run than the eventual

Page 448 Page 450 1 forgotten -- but, you know, sort of presented for 1 outcome of that. 2 compliance. And I don't have those rules at the front 2 So making sort of the wrong call on the 3 3 availability of resources is a risk management of my mind. Happy to review them with you, if you'd 4 like to open them. 4 decision -- and one can evaluate the prudence of 5 5 Q No. That's okay. Just -- would you -- I guess, is it whether that -- they had the right information or the 6 your understanding that -- for the first compliance 6 wrong information at the time. But those were the kind 7 7 period, a utility has the option to sell no-cost of decisions that I've seen actually play out in 8 allowances or deposit them for compliance? Both of 8 reality. And so, there's a lot packed into these two 9 9 those options exist for the first compliance period. sentences here that are very important for the 10 A Subject to check, I'll accept your representation of 10 Commission to consider. So I'm glad you've drawn 11 the rules. That sounds -- that sounds like what I 11 attention to that. 12 12 recall. But I don't have it in front of me; so I can't Q I'm always happy to help. Just one last question. confirm it exactly. 13 13 For these new risk management policies and 14 14 Q Okay. Well, subject to check, assuming that I'm practices, is that something that Staff is looking for 15 correct, wouldn't it also be prudent, then, for Avista 15 the company to file with the Commission? Or is there a 16 16 to deposit for compliance its no-cost allowances rather particular process that Staff had contemplated with 17 than buying and selling them? It's possible that that 17 respect to that recommendation? 18 could be a prudent action? 18 A Well, I think -- not in this case -- in at least one 19 A Yes. It's possible that that -- there's lots of 19 proceeding that I've worked for the Staff on, we've 20 20 possibilities here. So I can give an example from recommended that the Commission review that utility's 21 experience. 21 hedging practices on an annual basis -- or -- excuse 22 One of my other clients is a Canadian province, 22 me -- not on an annual basis but -- in requiring annual 23 23 Nova Scotia. And the utility there was -- participated filing, I think, is the way we put it. And that would 24 in a cap-and-trade program very similar to 24 include updates to the risk management policies and 25 25 practices of the utilities. Washington's. And I can't disclose the details of this Page 449 Page 451 1 because they're confidential, but there was a price 1 So I think this would be part of the same 2 2 range over which those carbon allowances could trade. oversight that the Commission would have over fuel 3 And the -- let's just say the price range was, say, \$20 3 costs hedging, over just all the different kinds of 4 a ton to \$60 a ton and that there was sort of 4 risk management concerns. 5 guardrails on both sides of that. 5 Q Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. 6 And what happened was -- the utility, early in the 6 JUDGE BROWN: Any redirect? 7 trading period, based on its expectation that certain 7 ATTY STRAUSS: No redirect, Your Honor. 8 renewable energy resources would come online, was 8 JUDGE BROWN: Anything from the bench? 9 trading emission allowances towards the lower end of 9 All right. You are excused. Thank you. 10 the range. And then later, when it realized that 10 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 11 certain renewable energy resources were not going to 11 JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this time I want 12 come online, it started trading at the very high end of 12 to get an idea where everyone is because we have a few 13 13 witnesses, actually, left. And so, I wanted to know if And so, that's the kind of risk management in 14 14 anyone wants to take a break now or push through. And 15 policy and practice that has to be put in place. 15 if that's the case, then the next witness will be NWEC 16 That's what I mean by buying and selling in a prudent 16 Witness Charlee Thompson. 17 manner and making risk management decisions. And, you 17 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think we should take 1.8 know, if that utility had, for example, anticipated 18 a break.

JUDGE BROWN: All right. So we'll take a

ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: After -- I'm

presuming after Ms. Thompson we would do Public

Counsel's two -- and there's no time from the parties

for Ms. Thompson. Does the Commission anticipate

ten-minute break and reconvene at 11:16.

having more than 45 minutes for Charlee --

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Page 452		Page 454
1	JUDGE BROWN: Oh, no.	1	Burden Assessment, or EBA, was completed in 2022, both
2	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: so that I should	2	done by Empower Dataworks. And I referred to them in
3	have my witnesses available after lunch? Or should I	3	testimony as LINA/EBA. And I did this because, while I
4	have them ready at 11:30, 11:45?	4	know that they are two separate assessments, I see them
5	CHAIR DANNER: Our questions for Charlee	5	both as similar analyses because they're both intended
6	Thompson will be very brief.	6	to shed light on the number of low income households in
7			the utility service area, the number of energy burden
8	them available after the break.	8	households, other relevant customer information like
9	JUDGE BROWN: Yeah.	9	demographics and geography, et cetera.
10	ATTY PEPPLE: Judge, just one more point of	10	And NWEC sees EBAs and LINAs as very much
11	order	11	complementary to each other, and we see them both as
12	JUDGE BROWN: Yeah.	12	necessary to understand the need of Avista's low income
13	ATTY PEPPLE: I think we noted there may	13	and energy burdened households. Customer needs and
14	have been some bench questions for Dr. Kaufman. Is	14	utility system the utility system that they're a
15	there I just wanted to check in on that.	15	part of, obviously, are dynamic. And that is why we
16	JUDGE BROWN: No.	16	advocate for the most recent data in LINAs and EBAs and
17	ATTY PEPPLE: Okay.	17	updated customer income and usage data in LINAs and
18	JUDGE BROWN: There are none.	18	EBAs.
19	ATTY PEPPLE: Okay. Thank you.	19	And I think I guess one distinction that I
20	JUDGE BROWN: All right. So we'll reconvene	20	would make between the two, from my understanding, is
21	in ten minutes, and we are off the record.	21	that EBAs seem broader than LINAs in that, when an EBA
22	(Break in proceedings at 11:06 a.m.)	22	looks at energy burden or assesses energy burden, it's
23	JUDGE BROWN: At this time, we would like to	23	looking at the energy burden for an entire utility
24	call NWEC Witness Charlee Thompson.	24	service area. Whereas when a LINA looks at energy
25	Good morning.	25	burden, it's looking at a subset of that. So the
23	Cood Morning.		but don't, it o looking at a babbot of that. Do the
	Page 453		Page 455
1	MS. THOMPSON: Good morning.	1	energy burden of specifically low income customers in a
2	JUDGE BROWN: All right. Can you raise your	2	utility service area.
3	right hand.	3	My testimony offers four recommendations for
4	(Witness duly sworn.)	4	future iterations of EBAs and LINAs because I wanted my
5	JUDGE BROWN: All right. You may proceed.	5	recommendations to be considered for both, depending on
6	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. Good morning,	6	what data's being captured in each of those assessments
7	Charlee Thompson. This is going to be very quick.	7	currently and also in future iterations of them. But I
8	Just I wanted to follow up. There were some	8	will say, if my recommendations are more pertinent to
9	conversations that I had yesterday about the energy	9	either the LINA or the EBA as they are right now, I
10	burden analysis and the low income needs assessment	10	welcome that clarification.
11	that you may have heard. And I wanted to just get	11	CHAIR DANNER: All right. And so, I'm
12	your your views on this.	12	getting a sense that you you are not using these
13	Throughout the testimony, both NWEC and The Energy	13	reports differently? They are different reports, but
14	Project witnesses both refer to the energy burden	14	they're using you're using them together?
15	analysis and the low income needs assessment. And	15	THE WITNESS: Correct. Yeah. And I think
16	they they referenced different years for the most	16	oh, well, I won't speak for other advocate
17	recent low income needs assessment. And I just wanted	17	organizations, but we when we're looking for similar
18	to ask you how you define or how you would	18	information like I said, like, just the general
19	characterize the difference between an EBA and a low	19	assessment of who's low income, who's energy burden,
20	income needs assessment.	20	how does that break down
21	THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you,	21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Can you slow down a
22	Commissioner Danner.	22	bit
23	In my initial testimony, I recognized that the	23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
24	most recent LINA was completed in 2021. And I didn't	24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: thank you. Sorry.
25	state this, but I know that the most recent Energy	25	The court reporter's having

	Page 456		Page 458
1	CHAIR DANNER: Asking us to slow down.	1	all hear me?
2	THE WITNESS: Yeah, Yeah,	2	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: You're a little bit
3	And I was saying that I won't speak for other	3	soft. Can you either get closer to the microphone or
4	advocate organizations, but when NWEC when we look	4	speak more speak up more.
5	for information on low income customers, on energy	5	DR. DISMUKES: How about now?
6	burden customers, how that breaks down by the different	6	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Much better. Thank
7	utility service types, electric and gas, we our	7	you.
8	minds immediately go to let's look at the low income	8	Is that good?
9	needs assessments and energy burden assessments. And	9	THE REPORTER: Yes.
10	we don't necessarily make the distinction like, if	10	JUDGE BROWN: Will you raise your right hand.
11	we have this one piece of information, we're going to	11	(Witness duly sworn.)
12	look specifically and exclusively at one of these	12	JUDGE BROWN: All right. Proceed.
13	resources and not the other.	13	
14	So I guess the short answer to your question there	14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	was was yes.	15	BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL:
16	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.	16	Q Mr. Dismukes, could you please spell your name for the
17	And then, I also want to just ask you about the	17	record and indicate where you're employed.
18	multi-language strategy and so forth that again, you	18	A Yep. My last name is Dismukes D, as in "David,"
19	heard the discussion that I had yesterday.	19	-I-S, as in "Sam," -M, as in "Mary," -U-K-E-S, as in
20	How many times have you met with the advisory	20	"Sam." And I am employed as a consulting economist
21	groups with the company in the last year on the	21	with the Acadian Consulting Group in
22	multi-language strategy?	22	Q Did you
23	THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you.	23	(Reporter requests clarification.)
24	I honestly can't really speak to the	24	Q BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Could you repeat that last
25	multi-language strategy because, from my understanding,	25	answer. The court reporter didn't hear you.
	Page 457		Page 459
1	it's been in conversation more in depth in the Equity	1	A Oh, I'm sorry. I'm a consulting economist with the
2	Advisory Group, or EAG, whereas I'm a member of the	2	Acadian Consulting Group in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
3	Energy Assistance Advisory Group, EAAG. So I know that	3	Q Did you prepare testimony and rebuttal testimony that
4	the work has been happening. And I think, as	4	was filed in this case?
5	Mr. Bonfield had mentioned yesterday, not I assume	5	A Yes, sir, I did.
6	not all advisory group members across the EAAG and EAG	6	Q And did you prepare exhibits that were also filed in
7	necessarily knew, like, all these all the	7	this case?
8	behind-the-scenes work that Avista is advancing and	8	A Yes, sir, I did.
9	committing to on a multi-language strategy. So yeah.	9	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: And those have been
10	I don't have a specific number of	10	admitted, and so I tender the witness for
11	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. That's fine. That's	11	cross-examination.
12	all I need to know. I don't have any further questions	12	JUDGE BROWN: AWEC.
13	for you.	13	ATTY PEPPLE: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And thank you. I	14	
15	don't have any further questions.	15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16 17	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you so much.	16	BY ATTY PEPPLE:
17 18	THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: I think that's all and we	17	Q Good morning, Dr. Dismukes.
19	will proceed to Public Counsel's witnesses at this	18	A Good morning.
20	time. And I'm showing that the first witness will be	19	Q Just a couple questions on rate spread for you.
21	David Dismukes.	20	You oppose AWEC's recommended rate spread; is that
22	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: And I believe he's on	21	right?
23	the screen. Can you say something, Mr. Dismukes, to	22	A Yes, sir.
24	make sure we can hear you.	23	Q And my understanding of the primary reason that you
25	DR. DISMUKES: Sure. Good morning. Can you	24	oppose it is that it is not known what the class parity
	•	25	ratios would be following the rate increase from the
		1	

Page 460 Page 462 second year of Avista's last multi-year rate plan; is 1 1 A Yes, sir. 2 that correct? 2 Q Okay. And when you were asked in discovery whether 3 A Yeah. I think that is correct, in part. I think there 3 this portion of your testimony was intended to indicate 4 4 are other public policy reasons that go along with that this transition would increase or decrease costs 5 5 that. That's not the sole reason, but that is one of for residential customers relative to other classes, 6 the reasons that I enumerated in my cross-answering 6 you responded that you were not taking a position on 7 7 that issue. Do you recall that? testimony. 8 Q Okay. Thank you. And did you do any analysis to 8 A Yes, sir, I do. 9 9 determine what the parity ratios would be if we did Q Okay. So I guess -- could you just kind of explain 10 account for that second year rate increase? 10 what you are trying to convey with this portion of your 11 A No. sir. 11 testimony. 12 Q Okay. And you are aware that Avista has not done that 12 A There's just still a number of unknowns about where 13 analysis either; is that right? 13 utility costs, not just for Avista but for a lot of 14 14 A Yes, sir. I'm aware of that. regulated utilities around the country, are going on a 15 Q Okay. Could you turn to your cross-answering testimony 15 forward-going basis. on page 4, starting on line 15. 16 16 I think -- uniformly, I think the experience to 17 A Okay. I'm there. 17 date has been that they are going up for all customer 18 Q Okay. And in this Q&A, it -- my understanding of what 18 classes. And in some respects, is it becoming 19 you were saying is that the parity ratio for the 19 burdensome for -- within the residential classes for 20 residential class would be closer to 1 if the second 20 some categories of customers as well? So the point I'm 21 year of Avista's last multi-year rate plan were 21 trying to make for the Commission here is to keep that 22 considered. Is that your position? 22 in mind when it's thinking about the rate spread 23 23 A Well, I don't know. I mean, generally, I would argue 24 I -- think the way I would characterize it is that --24 Q Okay. So essentially, just -- the costs are going up 25 25 for all customers in order to -what that ratio is, is not entirely clear or known. Page 461 Page 463 Whether -- how much it would move closer to 1 and how 1 1 A Correct. 2 much, I can't say. I can't -- it's not my testimony 2 Q -- yeah. Okay. 3 that it would be 1 or it would entirely make up its 3 And did you review Avista's cost-of-service study 4 difference. It's just that it's not an accurate 4 and rate spread when it was -- that was included in its 5 reflection right now because of that second year rate 5 initial case? 6 increase not being fully embedded in those numbers. 6 A I did at one time, yes, sir. I did include -- and 7 Q Okay. 7 clearly looked at the rate spread. 8 A And you would hope -- if I can expand upon this, you 8 (Reporter requests clarification.) 9 would hope that, given the size of the increases to 9 Q BY ATTY PEPPLE: Sorry. Would you mind repeating that 10 base rates that were agreed upon last time, that you 10 answer one more time for the court reporter. 11 would have seen some improvement. And we haven't seen 11 A Yes. I did look at the cost of service and the rate 12 that at this point, and it may be that -- the fact that 12 spread that was provided by the company. 13 there are improvements that are unobservable at this 13 Q And are you aware that, in their initial testimony, 14 point because we just didn't have that data -- or I 14 Avista recommended that residential customers receive a 15 didn't have that data to do that. 15 higher rate increase than other classes in the event 16 Q Okay. So it's also possible that, if we looked at the 16 that the company's full rate request was not approved? 17 second year and did a cost-of-service study including 17 A I do remember that. Yes, sir. 1.8 that information, that the parity ratios would not 18 Q Okay. And Public Counsel is, of course, recommending 19 include? Is that possible? 19 that Avista not receive its full rate request. Is that 20 A Yeah. It's possible. Anything could happen in those 20 your understanding? 21 numbers, yes. 21 A Yes, sir. 22 Q Okay. Then, if you look at the bottom of page 5 of 22 Q Okay. And did you -- you did not file any response 23 your cross-answering testimony, you have a couple of 23 testimony challenging Avista's proposed rate spread or 24 Q&As that talk about the transition to renewable 24 any aspect of its cost-of-service study; is that true? 25 generation. Do you see that? 25 A That is correct. Yes, sir.

Page 464 Page 466 1 1 Q Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions. think about affordability -- I think, in the 2 JUDGE BROWN: Any redirect? 2 affordability studies that have been done, there's 3 3 something like 250,000 households in Washington that 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 4 are struggling right now with energy affordability 5 5 BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: issues. I think, if you look at the company's own 6 Q When you were being questioned about the -- why you 6 information relative to affordability -- I think in 7 7 oppose the rate spread, one of the issues was the fact their own assistance program there's been as much as a 8 that we don't know what the impact of the second rate 8 29 1/2 percent increase in the participation of 9 9 year was. And then you said there were other policy households and those numbers. 10 reasons that you -- that inform your recommendation. 10 You take all those policy issues into 11 Could you explain what those were -- or are. 11 consideration. I think that's an important factor for 12 12 A Yeah. I think -- two things I would argue that are thinking about what the ultimate rate spread should be. 13 13 somewhat related that would need to be considered in Q This was -- you recall when you were asked about the 14 14 initial recommendation from Avista of an equal rate thinking about these rate spread issues from a 15 residential customer perspective is -- one, what were 15 spread if their full award was given? Do you recall 16 that testimony? 16 relatively large increases last time on a relative 17 basis for those customers in the settlement agreement. 17 A Yes, sir. 18 18 Q If there's a large increase over -- I mean they're And the fact that, as I noted in my testimony, we're 19 still not sure kind of how that is really flowing 19 currently requesting 132 million total this -- in their 20 20 rebuttal case. Is the concern -- or is your concern through in terms of the achieved returns. 21 And the fact that -- you know, because they're 21 greater or lesser than if a smaller amount were 22 large -- and you take that into the context of 22 awarded? 23 23 affordability issues right now for a number of A These concerns would be there regardless of -- I don't 24 residential customers that are issues in Washington as 24 know where -- if there's an inflection point or a 25 25 well as other places -- the fact that, you know, big number that I would say, "Oh, it would be okay to Page 465 Page 467 1 picture, from a macro perspective, we've gone through a 1 deviate from that" -- from. It just depends on the 2 2 period of relatively high prices and inflation. order and the magnitude. I would say that these 3 When you start thinking about how those roll 3 concerns, particularly this unique point, given what 4 4 through energy affordability numbers and statistics, I happened in the last rate case and the fact that 5 5 think it's important to kind of keep those in mind when there's still ongoing issues and transitions going on, 6 6 you think about rate increases for utilities. You see I would be hesitant to go further beyond, you know, a 7 7 this not just as an issue being raised in Washington, uniform increase in this particular instance. 8 8 Q Thank you. That's all the questions I have. but in other states as well. 9 It is a challenging time for a lot of lower income 9 JUDGE BROWN: Any questions from the bench? 10 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor. 10 households, and I think some of the statistics really 11 11 mask how serious that can be for some. There was a JUDGE BROWN: At this time... 12 12 great article, I think, this last week in the Or, rather, you are excused. Thank you. 13 13 Wall Street Journal that was looking at how some of the THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 JUDGE BROWN: Will Public Counsel call his data indicates low income -- the lower 15th, 20th 14 15 percentiles have seen relatively larger increases or 15 next witness. 16 percent increases in their income over the last couple 16 ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Public Counsel calls 17 of years. 17 Robert Earle, and I see he's on the screen. 18 But when you think about that, a lot of it -- and 18 Can you just verify our audio works, Mr. Earle. 19 19 MR. EARLE: I can hear you. you break those numbers down -- a lot of it has to do 20 20 JUDGE BROWN: All right. Raise your right with transfer payments that have come in. So it really 21 21 hand, Mr. Earle. doesn't get at the true, systemic issues of energy 22 22 affordability for many of those customers. (Witness duly sworn.) 23 23 So when you take into context what happened in the JUDGE BROWN: You may proceed. 24 24 last rate case, the size of what we're looking at, as 25 25 had been proposed by the company in this case, you ////

Page 468 Page 470 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 1 that they need or dispose of allowances that they don't 2 2 BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: need. 3 3 Q Can you please state your name for the record and Q Would you agree that prudency is determined by 4 4 evaluating what the utility knew or should have known indicate where you're employed. 5 5 at the time it made its decision? Correct? A My name is Robert Earle. Last name is spelled 6 E-A-R-L-E. I'm employed by Alea IE, LLC, as the owner. 6 A No, I don't. I don't agree that that's necessary in Q And did you prepare testimony in this matter? 7 7 this case. I don't agree that it is necessary to go 8 8 back and do a traditional type of prudency analysis in 9 Q And exhibits that were filed with that testimony? 9 terms of what the utility knew at the time, whether the 10 A I did. 10 plans are put into place at the time -- is necessary. 11 Q And did you prepare cross-answering testimony that was 11 What I suggest in another docket -- which we may filed in this matter? 12 12 be discussing together next week, which is the 13 13 A I did. Puget Sound Energy risk-sharing mechanism docket -- I 14 14 Q Along with exhibits? think that it is possible to construct an incentive 15 A There were no exhibits attached to the cross-answering. 15 mechanism that would provide the protection for Q In any case, your testimony and your exhibits have been 16 16 consumers, would provide incentives for a utility to be 17 admitted; so I tender you for cross-examination. 17 prudent in this acquisition of allowances to meet its 18 18 compliance requirements without requiring, frankly, a JUDGE BROWN: And, Staff, you may proceed. 19 ATTY STRAUSS: Thank you. 19 very burdensome annual review of what the utility knew at the time and how it knew it and whether its 20 20 21 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION decisions based on that knowledge were prudent. 22 22 BY ATTY STRAUSS: Q So just so I'm clear, your testimony is that -- in Q Good morning, Mr. Earle. I just want to talk to you 23 reviewing costs accumulated for CCA compliance, your 23 24 24 very briefly about the annual review of CCA compliance testimony is that the Commission should not be applying 25 costs posed by Staff. 25 the normal prudence standard? Page 469 Page 471 1 A yearly compliance review comports more directly 1 A Well, I'm not sure what you mean by "normal prudence 2 with the concepts of gradualism and the goal of 2 standard." I think that in the case -- in cases where 3 avoiding rate shock; correct? 3 vou can construct an incentive mechanism against some 4 A I'm not sure I can agree with that. 4 benchmark, then both Staff, interveners, and the 5 Q Well, in your words, an annual review would be a useful 5 utility are all better off by -- rather than having the 6 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- tool to -- would be useful to provide guardrails; isn't that correct?
- A I believe I said that, yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- Q So for situations where potential costs could be high, annual reviews allow for a more even spread of those -those costs each year versus over a four-year period?
- A So it could, depending on how that annual review is structured. My real concern here has been that the compliance process la- -- for compliance period, last almost five years. In fact, before compliance period begins, the utility may start to acquire allowances or it may start to figure out how to -- how to decrease its emissions.

But in any event, you know, we don't really know the score until the game -- we don't know the winner until the game is over. And so, we don't really know what the cost for any given year of the compliance period is until -- until we've run through the four years of the compliance period plus the ten months where they have some opportunity to acquire allowances burden of collecting -- collecting data, going through and figuring out, well, what they knew and when did they know it and whether the decisions made on that basis were prudent or not can be avoided.

And I think that everybody is better -- better off under such a situation than saying, "Well" -- like we do, for instance, with power costs, with the annual review, saying, "Well, okay. What did they trade? How did they dispatch their system?" and so on. I think, in the case of CCA allowance cost, we can make the process much simpler and much cleaner.

- Q So just so I'm clear, you're proposing a mechanism for dealing with these costs, but you do not think that they need to undergo the same prudency review, what looks at what the company knew or should have known at the time it made decision to incur those costs?
- A Sure. We have a market. Now, like I said, annual guardrails may be needed so that we can, you know, make sure things are going along. But I sort of -- I view that as mostly a check-in process. And -- but final

	Davis 470		Page 474
	Page 472		Page 474
1	prudency can be determined after the compliance period	1	from the bench, you are excused, Witness Earle.
2	is over when the performance over the cost over the	2	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	period is known and it can be compared to market	3	JUDGE BROWN: So at this time, I think we
4	performance.	4	have called all of the witnesses at this point. And
5	Q Fair enough. Okay. So just one last question, then.	5	are there any housekeeping matters before I move
6	And this has to do with the CCA policy statement.	6	forward?
7	You're aware that the CCA policy statement that	7	ATTY ZAKAI: Your Honor, did the
8	was issued on August 15th, 2024, was rescinded on	8	Commissioners have questions for Witness Stokes?
9	August 19th, 2024; correct?	9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No questions.
10	A I'm aware that it was rescinded. The exact date, I	10	JUDGE BROWN: All right. And I believe
11	don't remember, but I do recall it was rescinded.	11	yesterday we covered the issue of public comments;
12	Q Okay. So looking at your testimony, then, on page	12	correct?
13	your cross-answering testimony so RLE-17T at	13	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Yeah. Public Counsel
14	page 6, lines 6 through 15, you agree this portion of	14	is in the process of preparing those and should be able
15	your testimony is no longer relevant; correct?	15	to file them certainly by Tuesday next week, if that's
16	A I'm sorry. Can you give that page number	16	acceptable to the Commissioners and to Your Honor. And
17	Q Yeah. Absolutely.	17	I'll be filing a motion, but relevant to the excerpt
18	A please.	18	that I presented to everybody yesterday so that you
19	Q Sorry. Page 6	19	have those specific comments.
20	A Yes.	20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we decided
21	Q lines 6 through 15.	21	what for next Tuesday during the comment hearing; is
22	A Right. Obviously, because the we no longer have	22	that correct? I'm trying to remember. It's usually
23	that policy statement. It was rescinded.	23	one week after the hearing.
24	Q Okay. Great.	24	ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Yeah. I it's
25	ATTY STRAUSS: That's those are my only	25	unclear to me whether I wrote "Thursday" or
	Page 473		Page 475
1			
	questions for the witness.	1	"Tuesday"
2	questions for the witness. JUDGE BROWN: Redirect?	1 2	"Tuesday" COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay.
	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2	-	2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay.
2	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect?	2 3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just
2 3 4	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the
2 3 4 5	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL:	2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure.
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE BROWN: Redirect? REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review with the you know, after the compliance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to be used in a future year. And a utility should take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up from 50 to 60, anticipating that you would ask for an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to be used in a future year. And a utility should take into account the fact that it has this connection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up from 50 to 60, anticipating that you would ask for an additional 10 pages.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to be used in a future year. And a utility should take into account the fact that it has this connection between years in the compliance period in thinking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up from 50 to 60, anticipating that you would ask for an additional 10 pages. ATTY MEYER: You're always a step ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to be used in a future year. And a utility should take into account the fact that it has this connection between years in the compliance period in thinking about what it does. And simply looking at a single	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up from 50 to 60, anticipating that you would ask for an additional 10 pages. ATTY MEYER: You're always a step ahead. Okay. Fair enough.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: Q Just to be clear, Mr. Earle, the recommendation you had about the potential alternative for an incentive system, that's not proposed in this case; correct? A It's not it's not proposed in this case. Q Okay. A And I'm sorry if I misstated. It's not proposed in this case. What's proposed in this case is a review a review with the you know, after the compliance period is over. Because we don't know you know, whatever the review consists of, we won't know, until the compliance period is over, what happened. Because allowances can be banked from one year to be used in a future year. And a utility should take into account the fact that it has this connection between years in the compliance period in thinking about what it does. And simply looking at a single year and what they've done, I think, is a wrong-headed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Oh, okay. ATTY ROBINSON O'NEILL: but I just conferred with my staff. We're going to meet the Tuesday deadline for sure. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excellent. Okay. Thank you. JUDGE BROWN: All right. At this point, we are ATTY MEYER: May I JUDGE BROWN: Yes. Please. ATTY MEYER: As I more often than not do, may I have an extra may all the parties have an extra 10 pages instead of the 60-page limits on briefs, given the breadth of the issues? CHAIR DANNER: You're asking for 60 pages? ATTY MEYER: 70 instead of 60. I have had mixed success in this request. CHAIR DANNER: We've actually already gone up from 50 to 60, anticipating that you would ask for an additional 10 pages. ATTY MEYER: You're always a step ahead.

			· · · · ·
	Page 476		Page 478
1	at 60. There's a lot of reading to be done over the	1	ATTY MEYER: Thank you. Appreciate it.
2	next few months; so	2	JUDGE BROWN: And thank you for reminding me
3	ATTY MEYER: Understood. Thank you.	3	that we didn't have reply briefs on the proceed on
4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: let's keep it	4	the prehearing conference order establishing the
5	there.	5	procedural schedule.
6	JUDGE BROWN: Well, that was going to be the	6	So we'll look at 70 as the absolute limit.
7	next issue I was going to address. So we have a we	7	Are there any other questions from the parties?
8	have the briefs set at 60 and reply briefs	8	And is there anything else we need to address before we
9	ATTY MEYER: I don't believe, Your Honor,	9	adjourn?
10	there were, in the procedural schedule, any reply	10	Okay. Thank you to all of the parties,
11	briefs.	11	representatives, and witnesses. We are adjourned and
12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. I guess we	12	off the record.
13	were anticipating there were reply briefs. So we were	13	(Proceedings adjourned at 11:53 a.m.)
14	thinking 30 for reply briefs, but if there are no reply	14	* * *
15	briefs anticipated let's be off the record for a	15	
16	minute.	16	
17	(Discussion off the record.)	17	
18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So could you repeat	18	
19	what you just said.	19	
20	JUDGE BROWN: Yes. If there are reply	20	
21	briefs, a 30-page limit with regard to those.	21	
22	Are there any further questions from the parties?	22	
23	Yeah. I knew it.	23	
24	ATTY MEYER: I understand the Commissioners	24	
25	are conferring about the need for reply briefs. None	25	
	are comorning about the ricourter rophy briefe. There		
	Page 477		Page 479
1	were scheduled in the as we laid out the procedural	1	CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER
2	schedule through the end.	2	STATE OF OREGON)
3	JUDGE BROWN: That's right. So if there) ss.
4	are yeah. I expect the motion will be filed	3	COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH)
5	requesting such at that point with regard to replies.	4	TI
6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I guess, do the	5 6	This is to certify that I, Stephanie C. Rhinehart, a
7	parties want to have reply briefs in this proceeding?	7	Washington Certified Court Reporter, Oregon Certified Shorthand Reporter, and Registered Professional Reporter
8	It wasn't initially anticipated.	8	reported the within and foregoing proceedings; said
9	JUDGE BROWN: Yeah.	9	proceedings taken before me on the date herein set forth;
10	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Again, we have a lot	10	and that I was authorized to and did report said
11	going on.	11	proceedings.
12	ATTY MEYER: Avista was not.	12	I further certify that the foregoing transcript is a
13	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	13 14	true and correct record of the proceedings; that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter
14	•	15	reduced to typewriting under my supervision: and that I am
14 15	JUDGE BROWN: Okay.	15 16	reduced to typewriting under my supervision; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
15	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no	16 17	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or
15 16	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was	16 17 18	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.
15 16 17	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm	16 17 18 19	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
15 16 17 18	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I	16 17 18 19 20	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.
15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply	16 17 18 19	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply briefs then, yeah, go for it.	16 17 18 19 20 21	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply briefs then, yeah, go for it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But that does mean you	16 17 18 19 20 21	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2024.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply briefs then, yeah, go for it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But that does mean you have to file 70.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2024. /s/Stephanie C. Rhinehart, RPR Washington CCR No. 22013531 Expires 05/26/2025
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply briefs then, yeah, go for it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But that does mean you have to file 70. ATTY MEYER: I'm going to limit it to 69, if	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2024. /s/Stephanie C. Rhinehart, RPR Washington CCR No. 22013531 Expires 05/26/2025 Oregon CSR No. 22-0014
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BROWN: Okay. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if there are no reply briefs, I'm okay with increasing to 70. I was under the impression we had reply briefs; so I'm CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I'm fine with 70. I was thinking 60 and 30. But if we're not having reply briefs then, yeah, go for it. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But that does mean you have to file 70.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2024. /s/Stephanie C. Rhinehart, RPR Washington CCR No. 22013531 Expires 05/26/2025

	116.6	. 66 1 . 1 . 114	442 14 444 10 22	126 6 150 21 22
A	446:6	affordability	442:14 444:19,23	436:6 450:21,22
a.m 376:2 452:22	adder 379:16	464:23 465:4,22	445:1,4,10,20	450:22 468:24
478:13	380:11,15 418:9	466:1,2,4,6	447:13 471:15	469:5,10,12
ability 396:23	426:24	afforded 399:5	allowances 378:10	470:19 471:12,22
438:2	adding 407:18	agency 381:19	378:15,18,21	annually 385:25
able 434:20 439:12	445:14	agree 378:5 379:5,9	379:3 380:22	answer 378:24
440:21,25 474:14	addition 406:10,18	379:23 381:11,18	381:17,20,21,25	384:7 431:24
absolute 478:6	additional 406:23	381:21,24 382:2	382:3,18,21,24	442:3 456:14
Absolutely 385:19	436:2 445:12	382:17 385:6,9	383:4,10,22	458:25 463:10
392:10 472:17	447:12 475:21	386:4,11,16	384:11,15,17,20	anticipate 451:24
Acadian 458:21	additions 402:5	388:12,17 390:9	388:23 390:6	anticipated 426:25
459:2	address 426:3	390:15 408:16	391:5,7 394:12	432:6 449:18
accept 399:23	476:7 478:8	415:7 419:22	419:6 422:23,23	476:15 477:8
405:18 441:3	addressed 441:14	433:11 434:17	429:10,12 432:6	anticipating 442:7
448:10	adequate 396:3	438:5 439:20,25	432:19,20,23,24	475:20 476:13
acceptable 474:16	adjourn 478:9	440:11,12 441:19	433:3,6,10 434:12	appear 383:6
accepted 429:2	adjourned 478:11	443:1 469:4 470:3	440:21 442:15,19	APPEARANCES
440:23	478:13	470:6,7 472:14	443:3,5,17,24	373:1 374:1
accepts 444:21	adjudicative	agreed 461:10	445:7 447:10,22	appearing 377:6
account 402:20	400:17	agreement 464:17	447:24 448:8,16	applicable 426:4
403:1,1,4 460:10	adjust 435:5	Ah 376:9 404:3	449:2,9,21 469:16	applies 412:16
473:19	adjustment 408:14	ahead 384:6 412:3	469:25 470:1,17	apply 407:16
accumulated 388:6	412:16 416:13,14	417:23 427:14	473:17	419:23 436:3
430:17 470:23	420:2,3,4,8,14	437:22 447:19	allows 435:14	applying 393:7
accurate 421:13	426:21 427:8	475:22	447:21	470:24
426:9 438:9 461:4	428:16,17,18,24	Alea 468:6	alternative 380:18	Appreciate 409:6
achieved 464:20	429:25 432:4,10	Alliance 377:7	380:19 381:4	478:1
acknowledged	435:11 446:15	allocate 381:21	400:15 407:18,18	approach 394:7
446:14	adjustments 412:5	433:3	473:7	433:1 473:23
acquire 379:19	428:23 429:22	allocated 378:18	AMI 397:6,18	appropriate 379:17
427:1 469:16,25	440:15 441:21	382:3,18 383:4,9	amount 399:3	380:10 389:21
acquisition 470:17	ADMINISTRAT	383:21 432:25	430:15 446:3	425:25 426:2,6
act 416:1	372:15 373:2	allocation 381:11	466:21	438:25
action 426:12	admitted 377:10	381:19 432:18	amounts 400:9,12	approval 399:20
440:19 444:20	459:10 468:17	allotted 445:19	403:8	approve 444:9
448:18	adopted 415:18	allow 445:4 469:10	analyses 454:5	approved 396:8
actions 388:1	426:10 445:17	allowance 379:16	analysis 385:9	399:11 400:25
activity 422:2	adopts 441:20	381:2,11 382:8	453:10,15 460:8	401:3 409:1,4
423:6	advancing 457:8	383:11 412:6,17	460:13 470:8	463:16
actual 389:24 392:8	advantage 405:24	415:2,5 419:6	Analytics 377:4	approximations
392:24 393:1	advise 419:3	421:2 426:22,24	analyzes 396:6	438:23
396:22 406:16,20	advisory 456:20	426:25 428:17	Andrews 395:23	area 390:6 454:7,24
406:20 426:13	457:2,3,6	429:4,7,8 434:13	398:9	455:2
441:21	advocate 454:16	434:18,21,23	ANN 373:4	argue 460:23
add 421:19	455:16 456:4	436:19 437:8,9	annual 386:2,22	464:12
added 430:16,16	affect 443:2,25	438:20 439:1,13	396:11 397:3,8	argument 422:25
,				

4.1.465.10	200 14 15 200 0	410 12 22 420 5	1, 1, 1,422,22	460 0 474 10
article 465:12	389:14,15 390:9	419:12,23 420:5	background 423:22	469:8 474:10
asked 393:25 405:1	390:22 391:2	422:16 426:25	backwards 387:17	476:9
420:23 421:3	394:23 395:9,17	430:6,10,21	bad 385:23 388:9	believes 421:10
444:4 462:2	403:24 404:6,9,16	432:19,22 433:14	388:11	426:25
466:13	404:20 408:5	434:6,20 436:23	BAE-10 395:15	bench 394:23
asking 400:21	409:11,17 410:1,2	438:17 439:12	BAE-1T 395:15	395:19 408:6
423:23 431:6	410:24 411:2	440:10,20 442:15	balancing 402:20	451:8 452:14
439:5 440:1,3	413:9,11,13,19,22	443:6 444:4,24	402:25 403:1,4	467:9 474:1
441:25 444:8,12	414:9 417:9 418:1	445:13 447:9,18	banked 473:17	benchmark 471:4
456:1 475:16	427:6,10,13,15,20	448:15 457:8	base 401:2 403:10	benefit 393:7
aspect 463:24	427:24 428:2,8,11	460:12 462:13	461:10	best 405:13 446:12
aspects 394:15	428:15,16 451:7	463:14,19 466:14	based 376:4 381:21	better 417:15,16,20
439:23	451:21 452:2,7,10	477:12	382:13 385:9	458:6 471:5,10,10
assesses 454:22	452:13,17,19	Avista's 379:5	387:10,21,23	Betty 375:5 395:12
assessment 453:10	457:22 458:2,6,15	382:8 383:21	388:2 405:3 414:3	395:14
453:15,17,20	458:24 459:9,13	412:8 414:6 427:2	414:5 423:25	beyond 415:11
454:1 455:19	459:16 463:9	428:19 432:5	424:2,3 427:2	467:6
assessments 454:4	464:5 467:16	434:11 441:21,24	432:24 446:11	BGM-18 389:10
455:6 456:9,9	468:2,19,22	444:3 454:12	449:7,22 470:21	big 392:18 464:25
assigned 438:11	472:25 473:5	460:1,21 463:3,23	baseline 392:12,15	bills 430:16 446:7
assigns 381:19	474:7,13,24 475:3	avoid 446:23	392:22,25 438:10	binders 428:6
assistance 457:3	475:10,12,17,22	avoided 423:21	basically 406:25	bit 399:3 411:5
466:7	476:3,9,24 477:12	471:9	basis 397:17 398:21	416:9 417:3 419:8
associated 390:17	477:23 478:1	avoiding 469:3	401:6 431:6,11,12	443:20,20 447:1
411:13 432:5	audible 412:21	award 466:15	436:5,6 437:21,25	455:22 458:2
433:4,6 434:14	audio 416:7,8	awarded 466:22	441:15 442:25	blanket 399:20
444:10	417:2,11 467:18	aware 377:21,23	450:21,22 462:15	401:18
assume 457:5	August 377:22	393:17 416:5,12	464:17 471:9	board 409:1
assumed 443:5	425:20 472:8,9	424:8 439:3	Baton 459:2	board-approved
assumes 430:11	Aurora 438:22	460:12,14 463:13	becoming 462:18	408:22
assuming 388:11	439:4	472:7,10	beginning 393:24	Bonfield 457:5
396:19 429:10	authorized 479:10	AWEC 374:2 376:5	begins 421:5	Bonfield's 378:2,3
448:14	availability 435:8	416:16 417:10	469:16	bottom 412:4
assumption 443:8	450:3	424:13 459:12	behalf 377:6	425:19 461:22
Atitsogbe 394:24	available 376:6	AWEC's 400:24	395:12 437:9	bought 449:21
attached 468:15	377:11 395:18	459:20	behind-the-scenes	Boulder 379:9
attempt 417:1	452:3,8		457:8	391:12 415:8
attention 450:11	Avenue 373:19	B	Behle 374:23	437:18
attorney 373:13,19	374:14	back 383:25 397:4	believe 377:11,12	Box 373:9,14
434:1	Avista 372:10,10	397:9 399:12	394:21,23 395:17	Bradley 375:2
Atty 375:3,4,4,6,10	373:7,8 382:2,17	410:17 416:8	398:25 402:21	377:1
375:10,13,13,17	383:4,9 386:20	420:17 421:5	404:16 409:11	breadth 475:15
375:18,18,20,21	391:4,7 398:25	422:9 423:12	416:2,11,17 419:2	break 444:16
375:21 376:7,20	399:16,25 405:1	426:17 430:20	419:25 430:7,21	451:14,18,20
376:23 377:9,14	414:22 415:6,7,21	431:21,22,23	430:25 432:5,17	452:8,22 455:20
377:19 385:19,22	415:22,23 416:14	432:12 470:8	444:5 457:22	465:19
	,== ,==			

	•	ı	İ	
breaks 456:6	buy 382:21 391:23	419:23 430:10	479:23	characterize
brief 428:21 452:6	422:23 436:25	439:22 440:14	CEIP 381:15	453:19 460:24
briefly 404:23	442:23,23 447:9	441:21 443:3	cell 410:18,19,20	Charlee 375:14
468:24	447:10	445:23 446:1,20	411:11	451:16,25 452:5
briefs 475:14 476:8	buying 448:17	450:18 451:15	certain 378:5,18	452:24 453:7
476:8,11,13,14,15	449:16	459:4,7 463:5	381:9,9,14 401:15	check 399:24 400:3
476:21,25 477:7		465:24,25 466:20	402:21 422:5	448:10,14 452:15
477:16,17,20	C	467:4 468:16	423:17 444:7	check-in 471:25
478:3	C 372:25 374:3	470:7 471:2,15	449:7,11	Chehalis 415:5
bring 423:14	479:5,22	473:8,9,12,12	certainly 382:20	choice 435:22
broad 383:20	C-E-T-A 421:16	479:17	386:13 390:1	choose 437:19
broader 439:7	CA 374:10,19	cases 398:10	391:15 392:4	chooses 422:21
454:21	calculate 431:2	399:14 400:1	419:21 423:3	circumstances
broadly 426:4	calculated 405:3	402:11,14 471:2	441:15 443:12,25	386:15 389:6
Brown 372:16	412:12	catching 411:5	474:15	citation 413:18
373:2 376:4,9,11	calculating 411:12	categories 462:20	certainty 394:15	claim 400:24
376:14,15,18	calculation 382:12	cause 378:5 401:15	CERTIFICATE	clarification 400:10
377:12,16 390:21	431:8,18 436:12	caused 398:19	479:1	409:6 416:24
390:25 394:18,21	calculations 427:2	CAVIGLIA 374:22	Certified 479:6,6	417:17,21 419:2
395:1,3,6 403:21	435:6	CCA 378:5,9 379:7	certify 479:5,12	455:10 458:23
404:1,3,5 408:4,6	California 437:3	379:25 380:15	CETA 421:16,21	463:8
409:10,13,22,25	438:18	381:12 383:5,6,10	cetera 423:10 454:9	clarifies 423:22
451:6,8,11,19	call 409:12 436:13	383:22 384:1	Chair 373:5 375:7	clarify 402:23
452:1,9,12,16,18	450:2 452:24	385:2 386:22	375:8,11,15	414:1
452:20,23 453:2,5	467:14	389:13,23,24	395:20,22 396:1	clarity 420:18
457:18 458:10,12	called 474:4	390:5,12 391:11	396:15 397:22	423:3
459:12 464:2	calls 403:24 467:16	392:24 394:7	398:5 402:18	class 459:24 460:20
467:9,11,14,20,23	Canadian 448:22	412:5,6,22 414:13	403:11,18 408:7	classes 436:10
468:18 473:2,25	cap 433:13	414:18,25 415:1,4	408:10,19 409:3,5	462:5,18,19
474:3,10 475:8,11	cap-and-trade	415:7,11,12,17,20	413:17,21 427:9	463:15
476:6,20 477:3,9	448:24	415:25 416:3	427:11,14 428:5,9	classification
477:14 478:2	capital 402:5 406:3	418:21 419:13	428:12 452:5	431:19
budget 400:25	406:7	420:1 421:2 425:8	453:6 455:11	cleaner 471:16
404:24	captured 455:6	426:22,24 428:17	456:1,16 457:11	clear 391:12 418:23
built 446:4	carbon 447:13	429:4,6,8 430:22	457:16 475:16,19	419:4 420:25
burden 378:10	449:2	434:19 435:25	477:18,25	460:25 470:22
388:21 453:10,14	carry 379:20	436:16,19 437:8,9	challenging 463:23	471:17 473:6
454:1,7,22,22,23	carrying 446:4,22	437:17 438:20	465:9	clear-cut 418:21
454:25 455:1,19	case 377:6 385:23	439:1,2,9,13,14	chance 404:23	clearly 463:7
456:6,9 471:6	387:4 388:9	439:23,24 440:8	change 381:25	Cleve 374:4
burdened 454:13	392:11 396:7,8,21	441:22 444:19,23	401:9 407:14	clients 448:22
burdensome	397:4,7,10,11,13	445:1,20 447:2,8	411:6,8 437:13	closer 430:14 458:3
462:19 470:19	399:10 402:2,3,14	447:21 468:24	440:23	460:20 461:1
buried 422:9	403:7 406:8 414:7	470:23 471:15	changes 407:6	Club 374:17,18
business 398:10,23	415:18 416:6,15	472:6,7	410:8 440:19	coal 382:16 418:10
400:1 402:11,14	416:18 417:8	CCR 372:25	changing 391:10	Coalition 374:12

25444	1.55 14 455 10	200.15.400.40	120 24 422 45	l .
374:14	457:14 467:10	390:17 400:18	420:24 423:16	conversations
collected 446:8,9	474:9,20 475:2,6	412:22 415:20	confusion 423:3	453:9
446:10,10,17,20	475:24 476:4,12	423:9,9 430:22	connection 473:19	conversely 438:20
446:21	476:18 477:6,10	434:19 441:22	CONNOR 372:16	convey 462:10
collecting 471:6,6	477:13,15,21	447:22 448:2,6,8	373:3	copied 411:16
Colstrip 431:15	commissioners	448:9,16 468:24	conserve 431:15	Corporation
come 396:15,22	402:10 419:9	469:1,14,14,15,22	consider 387:8,14	372:10 373:7,8
423:12 449:8,12	474:8,16 476:24	469:24 470:18,23	389:6 392:6	correct 378:15
449:20 465:20	Commissioners'	472:1 473:13,16	425:22 450:10	379:8 380:17,24
comes 392:1	420:21	473:20	considerable	381:3,13,25 382:1
comfortable 396:2	commissions	compliant 415:23	439:21	382:5,19 383:7
coming 383:25	440:18	416:3	consideration	385:7,11,25 386:6
389:5 431:7	committing 457:9	complicated 394:10	425:21 466:11	386:22,23,25
comment 474:21	companies 397:21	420:16	considered 419:6	387:1,12,24 388:6
comments 474:11	company 387:25	comply 389:3	422:14 437:7	388:7 389:13
474:19	396:11 397:10	component 405:19	455:5 460:22	390:10,11,13,18
Commission 372:4	398:22 401:9	components 444:16	464:13	391:19 395:25
372:7,19 373:11	408:14 429:2	comports 469:1	considering 387:18	405:7,8,23 410:13
383:25 386:6,8,21	431:17 434:13,20	concede 432:22	390:16 405:11	412:9,10,13,20
389:18 390:2	437:17 438:1	concepts 469:2	412:23	413:1,5,10 414:14
392:25 394:5,6	450:15 456:21	concern 397:20	consistent 421:23	415:13,15,17
408:19 414:2	463:12 465:25	398:17 401:15,22	consists 473:15	418:11,12,16,17
418:6 419:3,12,18	471:20	466:20,20 469:13	Consolidated 372:9	418:22 420:6,15
420:9,13,18 425:7	company's 399:24	concerned 392:11	constrains 419:5	424:1,9 425:9
425:20,22 426:2,7	401:2 402:2	397:2 398:9,20	constraint 398:2	427:1 428:20
438:2 439:22	408:16 411:13	406:5,7	construct 470:14	429:24 430:1,23
440:2,6,14 441:20	414:3 429:16	concerns 396:22	471:3	432:9,20,21
444:2,8,13,21	439:3 441:9	402:8 451:4	consulting 377:4	434:15 437:15,22
445:3 446:19,23	463:16 466:5	466:23 467:3	458:20,21 459:1,2	441:2 447:13,14
447:8 450:10,15	compared 407:1	concise 421:8	consumers 377:7	448:15 455:15
450:20 451:2,24	472:3	conclude 418:19	470:16	460:2,3 463:1,25
462:21 470:24	comparison 380:24	419:2 432:17	cont 374:1	469:3,7 470:5
commission's	381:10 411:19	conclusion 419:25	contemplate 388:5	472:9,15 473:8
377:21 381:23	Complainant 372:8	conduct 386:21	contemplated	474:12,22 479:13
386:14 389:12	complementary	conducted 420:23	450:16	corrected 410:21
390:10,15 393:25	454:11	422:7 431:10	context 419:9	413:23
419:16 424:14	complete 384:7	conference 478:4	464:22 465:23	correction 410:18
Commissioner	completed 453:24	conferred 475:4	continue 425:22	411:6,18 436:14
373:4 375:7	454:1	conferring 476:25	430:11 434:11	440:23
385:17 398:7,13	completely 403:2	confident 397:24	contract 408:13,15	corrections 410:8
398:16 399:23	compliance 379:13	confidential 431:9	408:25 409:2	429:1
400:4,14,23	380:9,11,20 383:5	449:1	contrary 387:17	correctly 396:25
401:22,25 402:17	383:23 384:1	confirm 418:8	contribute 379:7	430:24
409:7 427:4,18,22	385:1 386:25	434:25 448:13	control 433:24	cost 378:10 379:11
428:1,14 451:17	387:7 388:25	conflicting 405:16	conversation	379:25 380:2,15
453:22 455:21,24	389:3,12,24	confusing 410:16	428:20 457:1	383:23 384:22,22
	l		l	l

	_	_	_	
384:23,23 385:1	434:18,20 435:15	395:17 404:16	456:5,6 462:5,20	dealing 428:7
388:20 391:17	436:17 437:13	413:12 416:17,22	462:25 463:14	471:18
393:9 406:11	438:13,14 439:1	417:10 424:14	464:17,24 465:22	December 405:22
413:4 418:21	440:8,9 441:8,25	425:11,12	customers' 378:19	407:3
422:18,20,22	442:2 444:3 445:8	cross-answer	379:18 430:16	decided 445:5
423:9,12,14,14,18	446:22 447:8	419:12 435:7	cutting 417:3	474:20
425:8 426:16	451:3 462:4,13,24	cross-answering		decides 446:19
428:18,23 429:7	468:25 469:9,11	389:9 412:1	<u> </u>	deciding 442:20
430:4,22 436:9,11	470:23 471:12,18	413:21,22,23	D 409:20 410:4	decision 385:11
436:19,22 437:8,9	471:21	426:18 427:17,24	458:18	387:11,11 419:5
437:17,20 438:3	counsel 373:17	460:6,15 461:23	d/b/a 372:10	421:20 426:6
438:20 441:14	404:17 463:18	468:11,15 472:13	damage 403:6	442:22 445:4
443:2,23 444:7,8	467:14,16 474:13	cross-examination	Danner 373:5	446:22,24 450:4
445:12,14,15,19	479:16	375:4,10,13,18,21	375:7,8,11,15	470:5 471:21
445:20,22,22	Counsel's 406:15	377:18 404:19	395:20,22 396:1	decisions 387:12,19
446:3,5,5,7,13,16	407:8,10 451:23	410:25 411:1	396:15 397:22	387:21,22 389:7
463:11 469:22	457:19	421:6 424:18	398:5 402:18	389:19,22 412:18
471:15 472:2	counter-proposal	459:11,15 468:17	403:11,18 408:7	414:19 418:10
cost-incurred	405:20	468:21	408:10,19 409:3,5	419:7 421:2
440:10	country 462:14	cross-examining	413:17,21 427:9	436:20 439:22
cost-of-service	COUNTY 376:1	434:1	427:11,14 428:5,9	440:2 442:24
461:17 463:3,24	479:3	cross-reference	428:12 452:5	449:17 450:7
costing 449:24	couple 413:2	410:17	453:6,22 455:11	470:21 471:8
costs 378:13 379:7	459:19 461:23	CSR 479:24	456:1,16 457:11	decrease 462:4
379:15 383:6,25	465:16	cumulated 430:17	457:16 475:16,19	469:17
385:25 386:2,5,7	course 416:21	current 379:5	477:18,25	decreases 383:12
386:11,16,17,19	422:23 435:8	currently 409:21	data 405:15 406:15	defer 445:3
386:22 388:5,20	463:18	410:5,6 433:9	406:15 454:16,17	deferral 430:10
390:2,3,12,12,16	court 417:19 419:4	439:16 445:23	461:14,15 465:14 471:6	deferred 430:9,15
391:7,9,11,13,15	455:25 458:25	455:7 466:19	data's 455:6	445:23 446:4,21
391:18,20 392:4	463:10 479:6	curtain 435:19	Dataworks 454:2	define 453:18
392:12 393:3,12	cover 382:4,18	customer 436:21,21	date 403:14 445:6	definitely 398:3
396:22 401:13	384:15,18 388:20	436:24,25 437:2,3	462:17 472:10	degree 441:13
402:21,24,25	429:12 432:23	437:6 438:21	479:9	delay 401:11 416:9
403:5 405:2	433:3,6,10 440:21 covered 474:11	454:8,13,17	dated 415:9	demand 418:11
406:11 411:13		462:17 464:15	David 373:5,8	demographics
412:8,22,24	Coyote 380:6,7 392:1,3	customer's 430:13	375:16 457:21	454:9
414:13,18,25,25	392:1,3 created 411:11	437:9 446:7	458:18	deny 405:6 Department 381:12
415:2,5,6,8,12,12 415:22 418:9	creates 423:20	customers 377:5 378:7 393:2	david.meyer@av	depend 384:4,8
			373:10	386:14
419:6 421:2,19 422:24 423:8,8,10	creating 421:11,15 436:20	423:14 437:11,11 438:2 439:2	Davison 374:4	dependent 382:9
425:8 426:8,11,13	430:20 creation 421:12	438:2 439:2 440:10 441:23	day 390:4 479:20	dependent 382:9 depending 386:9
426:22,25 428:19	crept 411:22	440:10 441:23	day-to-day 389:22	393:13 398:23
420.22,23 428.19	cross 377:11 378:2	442.1 443.11,13	deadline 475:5	431:18 455:5
430:13,17 432:5	378:3 391:4	449:25 455:1	deal 394:10	469:12
+50.15,17 452.5	370.3 371. 4	++ <i>J.43 +33.</i> 1		707.12
		•		•

	I	ı	ı	1
depends 467:1	458:14 468:1	449:22	467:17,18,19,21	electric 407:3
deposit 447:22	directly 469:1	dispatching 381:3	468:5,23 473:6	418:11 456:7
448:8,16	directs 444:22	381:8 422:17	474:1	electronically 428:6
deposited 447:25	disagree 384:3	dispose 470:1	earlier 391:3 429:6	433:22
depth 457:1	disagreements	distinction 392:9	443:4 449:24	eliminate 378:10
describe 412:13	415:3	431:17 438:6,22	early 449:6,20	388:20
414:12	disclose 448:25	454:19 456:10	easier 424:11	embedded 461:6
design 378:12	discovery 439:5	distinguished	easy 399:12	emission 381:11
382:22 384:13	462:2	431:13	EBA 453:19 454:1	382:3 383:4,10,22
designed 378:9	discrepancy 415:19	distinguishing	454:21 455:9	392:3 414:5 418:9
380:23 382:7	427:16 428:7	412:18 414:19	EBAs 454:10,16,18	422:20 449:9
384:10,16 388:19	discuss 418:15	distortion 406:8	454:21 455:4	emissions 378:21
388:19	discusses 415:3	distributed 382:24	Ecology 381:12,16	379:2 382:4,19
detailed 445:18	425:7	docket 394:4	381:18 393:17	384:15,18,21
details 448:25	discussing 470:12	425:24 470:11,13	394:15 415:24	391:18,20 392:4,6
determine 386:9	discussion 391:3	DOCKETS 372:8	416:4 419:5	392:7 393:1 413:4
460:9	394:14 419:16	document 422:10	420:11,23 421:10	414:7 418:9 420:8
determined 385:6,9	456:19 476:17	427:11	421:18,24 422:6	421:13,18,19
386:5,12,16	discussions 395:23	documents 424:20	422:12 423:5	422:18,22,24
387:10 470:3	disincentive 421:12	425:14	424:1,9 429:11	423:7 427:2 431:8
472:1	Dismukes 375:16	doing 407:21 415:6	432:25 433:2	431:11,12,14,16
determining 379:6	457:21,23,25	437:7	442:14 443:10	431:18,19,21
381:25	458:5,16,18	dollar 400:8,11,12	447:24	433:4,6 436:8,10
develop 394:6	459:17	Dr 436:4 452:14	Ecology's 381:24	469:18
deviate 467:1	dispa- 381:19	457:25 458:5	389:25 390:6	employed 377:3
deviation 400:5	dispatch 379:6,15	459:17	418:15,20 419:1,3	409:21 410:5,6
difference 392:18	379:25 380:10	DR230COMPREV	422:1 432:18	458:17,20 468:4,6
432:18 453:19	381:5 382:9 383:5	410:19	economic 412:24	479:16
461:4	383:11,23 384:24	draft 419:14	421:20 422:15,24	Empower 454:2
different 397:20	384:24 385:1	425:24	442:10,22,24	ended 449:24
417:11 432:1	389:19 391:5,8,10	drawn 450:10	444:25	energy 374:8,12,14
438:24 439:18	391:13,16 392:7	due 435:22 445:23	economics 421:15	377:7 449:8,11,19
440:24 447:2	392:20 393:7	duly 376:17 395:5	economist 458:20	453:9,13,14,25
451:3 453:16	412:6,17,23,24	404:4 409:24	459:1	454:7,13,22,22,23
455:13 456:6	414:18 415:5,7,12	453:4 458:11	effect 401:7 445:24	454:24 455:1,19
differently 455:13	415:14,23 418:6,9	467:22	effectively 402:9	456:5,9 457:3
difficult 401:8	418:22 419:7	dynamic 454:15	efficiency 422:15	465:4,21 466:4
direct 375:3,6,10	421:2,19 422:17		422:24	470:13
375:13,17,20	423:8,10 425:5,9	E 372:16 373:2	efforts 403:5	enforce 389:12
376:22 395:8	426:11 429:5	E-A-R-L-E 468:6	eight 399:11,13	390:7
404:8 409:16	436:20 437:8,13	E-R-D-A-H-L	either 384:22	engage 416:15
412:22 413:6,14	437:18 438:14,19	207.12	386:13 407:23	ensure 390:15
414:7,10 416:16	442:22,22 445:4,6 471:14	EAAG 457:3,6	441:22 455:9	426:8
416:18 417:8 418:1 431:1 432:5	dispatched 380:1,3	EAG 457:2,6	458:3 460:13 elaborate 413:25	entire 441:6 454:23
	380:12,13,17	Earle 375:19	430:6	entirely 381:14 433:2 460:25
432:12 447:3	300.14,13,17		430.0	433.4 400.23
1	1	1	1	1

Page 486

461:3	EVIDENTIARY	425:11,12 427:22	fact 380:21 387:15	446:12 459:4,6
enumerated 460:6	372:13	428:10 431:9,10	387:16 423:15	468:9,12 477:4
equal 466:14	evolved 422:1	433:16 444:18	440:13 449:19	files 396:11
equation 392:4	exact 472:10	exhibits 377:10	461:12 464:7,18	filing 396:8 398:11
Equity 457:1	exactly 395:1	395:15 404:14	464:21,25 467:4	399:2,25 405:1
equivalent 420:2,3	433:12 443:5,12	410:9 416:22	469:15 473:19	410:14 445:13
Erdahl 375:5	443:17 448:13	424:18 459:6	factor 405:14	450:23 474:17
394:24 395:2,12	examination 375:3	468:9,14,15,16	422:14,16 466:11	filings 381:15
395:14	375:4,6,10,13,17	exist 423:14 448:9	factors 384:9 424:3	396:24
Erdahl's 395:18	375:18,20,21	exists 423:12 446:7	443:23	filled 410:20
ERM 441:15,16	376:22 391:1	exit 410:10	facts 386:15 389:6	final 396:13 410:12
error 410:14	395:8 404:8	expand 391:13	420:22 421:3	471:25
411:22 428:24	409:16 416:22	461:8	440:12	financial 479:17
429:25	458:14 464:4	expect 407:9 477:4	Fair 389:8 472:5	find 400:24 421:4
escalation 405:11	468:1 473:4	expectation 415:25	475:23	423:13 424:24
405:14 407:25	example 380:5,6	449:7	falling 444:15	427:19 433:24
408:1	385:24 396:16,16	expectations	falls 381:22	fine 411:4 457:11
especially 394:10	397:6,19 436:23	447:16	familiar 424:19	477:18
essentially 436:20	438:4,17 448:20	expected 421:1	far 396:8 399:17	firm 377:4
462:24	449:18	443:18	400:7 403:4	first 374:14 377:21
establishing 478:4	exceed 379:2	expecting 419:5	445:17	400:5 402:4 412:6
estimate 414:5	exceeded 401:2	expenditures 406:3	fashion 436:8	428:24 429:3
436:1 438:23	Excellent 475:6	expense 402:20	fast 413:20	431:13 444:17
446:13	excerpt 474:17	441:6	fast-forward	448:6,9 457:20
estimated 399:1	exclude 428:24	expenses 405:25	399:14	five 469:15
estimates 399:17	exclusive 407:18	406:2,6,21 429:15	favor 386:24	fleet 449:22
et 423:10 454:9	exclusively 402:22	443:25	favorable 442:7	flexibility 398:22
evaluate 388:7	456:12	expensive 378:6	federal 419:4	399:5 401:6
450:4	excuse 410:11	384:25	fee 423:7	flip 437:1
evaluated 386:8	419:11 427:5,6	experience 448:21	feedback 417:19	flowing 464:19
387:21,23	450:21	462:16	feeling 422:2	focus 390:2
evaluating 470:4	excused 394:19	Expires 479:23,24	feels 399:7 401:17	focused 392:14
evaluation 386:10	403:22 409:14	explain 411:6	felt 422:5	folks 387:19
386:15	451:9 467:12	420:17,24 422:4	fewer 378:20	follow 391:6 431:3
evaluations 387:14	474:1	462:9 464:11	Fifth 373:19	453:8
387:15	exempt 435:24	explained 444:19	figure 407:5 435:6	following 396:12
event 463:15	436:16,21,24	explains 434:22	469:17	398:8 399:15
469:19	437:2	explanatory 421:8	figuring 471:7	429:1 433:1
eventual 449:25	exercise 392:22	extensive 423:22,24	file 419:10,15	459:25
eventually 445:10	exhib- 413:12	441:8	450:15 463:22	forecast 412:24
446:17	exhibit 385:14	extent 388:22	474:15 477:22	421:13,18 426:9
everybody 471:10	404:14 410:11,12	extra 386:17	filed 396:7 397:9	426:11,16 429:25
474:18	410:12,17,21	475:13,13	399:18 402:3	437:14,21 438:7
everyone's 424:11	413:9 416:17		407:1 408:14	438:10,25 442:12
evidence 402:10	417:10 418:3	F	410:12 411:21	443:23 444:22
436:3	421:7 424:14	facility 415:8	414:6 419:16	forecasts 396:21
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>

414:25 415:20
438:9 442:1 gains 422:15 412:3 416:22 gradualism 469:2 449:6 465:23 forgotten 448:1 gas 380:21 382:16 420:6 421:3 429:12 467:4 473:16 formal 393:18 424:8 456:7 436:6 437:22 granted 389:5 457:4 forms 441:15 gases 425:8 447:19 456:8 GRC 396:9 398:12 happens 392:23 formula 378:17 411:14 378:8 379:23 385:8,12 387:13 477:20 403:15 412:14 417:24 433:25 448:3 formulas 431:3 385:8,12 387:13 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 418:1 434:8 hardening 403: forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 416:5 419:21 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 436
foregoing 479:8,12 forgotten 448:1 game 469:20,21 gas 380:21 382:16 417:23 418:13 429:12 grant 408:20 429:12 happening 388 429:12 467:4 473:16 happening 388 429:12 form 383:17 formal 393:18 424:8 forms 441:15 formula 378:17 411:14 formulas 431:3 forth 456:18 479:9 forward 406:11,19 407:2,15,17 474:6 gases 425:8 gears 398:22 447:1 general 373:13 389:17 390:19 397:11 402:2 407:2,15,17 474:6 417:23 418:13 429:12 grant 408:20 429:12 granted 389:5 granting 442:14 happening 388 427:14 430:20 granted 389:5 granting 442:14 happens 392:23 happy 424:22 403:15 forward 406:11,19 407:2,15,17 474:6 460:4 467:6 470:7 400:2 402:15,16 403:15 great 378:24 412:4 403:15 hard 387:7 403 hardening 403: 412:14 417:24 hard 387:7 403 hardening 403: 412:14 415:11 GOETZ 374:13 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 happening 388 427:10 happening 388 427:10 happening 388 427:10 happening 388 427:14 430:20 granted 389:5 granting 442:14 happens 392:23 happy 424:22 doi:10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.10.1
forgotten 448:1 gas 380:21 382:16 420:6 421:3 429:12 happening 388 form 383:17 418:10 431:16 456:7 436:6 437:22 granting 442:14 happens 392:23 forms 441:15 gears 398:22 447:1 gears 398:22 447:1 460:4 467:6 470:7 477:20 GRC 396:9 398:12 433:25 448:3 formula 378:17 general 373:13 goal 438:12 469:2 great 378:24 412:4 Harbor 374:5 formulas 431:3 385:8,12 387:13 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hard 387:7 403 forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 300:19 300:19 300:19 300:19 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 400:12
form 383:17 418:10 431:16 427:14 430:20 granted 389:5 457:4 formal 393:18 426:7 436:6 437:22 granting 442:14 happens 392:23 424:8 gases 425:8 447:19 456:8 GRC 396:9 398:12 happy 424:22 formula 378:17 gears 398:22 447:1 460:4 467:6 470:7 400:2 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 formulas 431:3 378:8 379:23 goal 438:12 469:2 great 378:24 412:4 Harbor 374:5 formulas 479:9 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hard 387:7 403 forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 300:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
formal 393:18 456:7 436:6 437:22 granting 442:14 happens 392:23 forms 441:15 gases 425:8 447:19 456:8 GRC 396:9 398:12 happy 424:22 formula 378:17 general 373:13 477:20 400:2 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 formulas 431:3 378:8 379:23 goal 438:12 469:2 great 378:24 412:4 Harbor 374:5 forth 456:18 479:9 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hard 387:7 403 forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 416:5 419:21 GOETZ 374:13 greater 466:21 Hayes 374:10 d07:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 436
424:8 gases 425:8 447:19 456:8 GRC 396:9 398:12 happy 424:22 forms 441:15 400:2 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 formula 378:17 411:14 411:14 400:2 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 formulas 431:3 378:8 379:23 385:8,12 387:13 385:8,12 387:13 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 465:12 472:24 449:22 forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 416:5 419:21 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 416:5 419:21 407:2,15,17 474:6 47:20 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 400:2 402:15,16 450:12 450:12 450:12 450:12 400:2 402:15,16 400:
forms 441:15 gears 398:22 447:1 460:4 467:6 470:7 400:2 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 formula 378:17 general 373:13 477:20 geat 378:24 412:4 450:12 formulas 431:3 385:8,12 387:13 385:8,12 387:13 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hard 387:7 403 forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 416:5 419:21 400:2 402:15,16 403:15 450:12 403:15 GOETZ 374:13 412:14 417:24 418:1 434:8 420:12 402:15,16 433:25 448:3 407:2,15,17 474:6 407:2,15,17 474:6 403:15 403:15 412:14 417:24 412:14 417:24 418:1 434:8 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 42:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 43:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 44:14 417:24 <t< td=""></t<>
formula 378:17 general 373:13 477:20 403:15 450:12 formulas 431:3 378:8 379:23 goal 438:12 469:2 great 378:24 412:4 Harbor 374:5 forth 456:18 479:9 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hardening 403: forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
411:14 378:8 379:23 385:8,12 387:13 389:17 390:19 416:5 419:21 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 417:24 418:1 434:8 465:12 472:24 418:1 434:8 465:12 472:24 416:5 419:21 416:5 419
formulas 431:3 385:8,12 387:13 goes 391:24 397:9 412:14 417:24 hard 387:7 403 forth 456:18 479:9 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hardening 403: forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
forth 456:18 479:9 389:17 390:19 414:14 415:11 418:1 434:8 hardening 403: forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
forward 406:11,19 397:11 402:2 GOETZ 374:13 465:12 472:24 Hayes 374:10 407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
407:2,15,17 474:6 416:5 419:21 going 382:23 383:8 greater 466:21 hear 376:10 430
00045004004
462:15 General's 373:19 385:3,15 387:12 grid 403:6 410:6 467:19
four 388:4,6,11 generally 380:18 389:10 393:14 group 457:2,3,6 heard 440:20 4
400:21 455:3 381:16 390:14 403:11 405:12,13 458:21 459:2 453:11 456:19
469:24 424:21 460:23 412:13 413:13 groups 456:21 hearing 372:13
four-year 386:25 generated 381:1 416:16 419:15 guaranteeing 377:25 417:16
469:11 generation 391:22 422:18 423:5,18 429:11 434:8 473:25
Francisco 374:10 418:10 461:25 424:13 426:17 guardrails 449:5 474:21,23
frankly 470:18 genuinely 444:14 436:15 437:16 469:6 471:23 heart 423:24 42
free 394:12 geography 454:9 438:15,23 439:11 guess 378:8,9,16,24 hedging 450:21
front 412:3 433:15 getting 391:25 439:15,24 440:7 379:1,22 384:2 451:3
448:2,12 441:3 442:6 386:7 393:4 help 433:24,25
fuel 451:2 give 384:10 388:19 443:14,15,17,25 401:12,15 402:1 450:12
full 387:6 400:17 416:19 417:6 444:24 445:6 419:24 432:3 helpful 424:23
415:1 463:16,19 424:22 428:9 447:1 449:11 436:4 448:5 427:21
466:15 431:2 448:20 453:7 456:11 454:19 456:14 helping 434:10
fully 416:2 461:6 472:16 462:14,17,24 462:9 476:12 hereunto 479:1
function 393:19 given 377:9 384:20 467:5 471:6,24 477:6 hesitant 467:6
439:11 442:5,6,6 418:19,25 423:6 475:4,25 476:6,7 guidance 393:18 Hey 423:15
functionality 439:4 425:20 428:20 477:11,23 424:8 high 389:1 438:
fundamentally 434:6,12 461:9 good 376:11,15,24 guys 427:17 440:13 449:12
441:19 466:15 467:3 377:14,16,20 — 465:2 469:9
further 394:17 469:22 475:14 380:6 389:18 H higher 380:21
401:8 419:25 glad 450:10 394:13 395:2,3,10 H-I-L-L-S-T-E 392:2,25 393:
425:21,23 451:5 GLORIA 374:18 395:12,20,21 404:12 396:22 440:25
457:12,15 464:1 gloria.smith@sie 404:1,2,10,21,22 hand 376:16 395:4 443:20 445:8
467:6 476:22 374:20 408:8,9 409:18 398:24 409:23 449:23 463:15
479:12 go 378:14,17 411:3 417:22 453:3 458:10 Hillstead 375:9
future 402:25 382:21 384:6 435:22 452:25 467:21 479:19 403:25 404:2,
403:15 430:16 386:13 391:18,19 453:1,6 457:25 handle 438:22 404:13,21
446:21 455:4,7 391:20,21 397:4 458:8 459:17,18 happen 382:25 hindsight 385:7
473:18 399:12 401:8 468:23 477:25 461:20 387:10,14,18

historical 436:15	439:10,24	436:19 439:24	405:17 407:9,9,16	irrelevant 442:11
hit 443:21	implicit 393:10	444:18 461:17	407:19 465:2	issue 388:24 394:10
holding 442:19	importance 421:11	inclusion 408:12	inflationary 405:18	398:2 416:15
holistically 387:5	important 400:22	434:17	inflection 466:24	419:18 425:23
honestly 456:24	419:1 438:14	income 453:10,15	inform 381:15	426:3 430:5 462:7
Honor 376:7,20	450:9 465:5	453:17,20 454:6	464:10	465:7 474:11
377:14 390:23	466:11	454:12,17 455:1	informal 423:25	476:7
451:7 459:13	imported 379:14	455:19 456:5,8	information 381:22	issued 393:18
467:10,13 474:2,7	impose 422:20,21	465:9,14,16	387:22,23 388:2	419:13 424:9
474:16 476:9	impression 477:17	inconsistency	420:10,11 446:11	472:8
hope 423:21 440:14	improvement	418:20 419:1	450:5,6 454:8	issues 388:23
461:8,9	461:11	incorrect 412:14	455:18 456:5,11	423:21 462:23
Hopefully 443:21	improvements	increase 378:13	461:18 466:6	464:7,14,23,24
hourly 431:10,11	461:13	391:15 392:4	inherently 387:15	465:21 466:5,10
436:5	inadvertently	393:12 408:12	initial 406:13	467:5 475:15
households 454:6,8	411:16	412:8 428:19	453:23 463:5,13	issuing 381:17
454:13 465:10	incentive 421:15,21	429:14,17,18	466:14	443:17
466:3,9	470:14 471:3	440:8 444:2,4,13	initially 405:1	iterations 455:4,7
housekeeping	473:7	459:25 460:10	407:1 477:8	IV 372:13
474:5	incentives 470:16	461:6 462:4	initiative 439:15	J
hydro 382:16	incidentally 445:25	463:15 466:8,18	445:2	
hypothetical 383:3	include 379:7,10,25	467:7	input 425:22	J 373:8
384:14,19 386:1	380:2,15,25	increases 408:23	inputs 381:15	JAMES 372:16
387:2 388:13,15	391:11,13 405:14	409:1,4 461:9	instance 467:7	373:2
388:16,18	407:25 412:6	464:16 465:6,15	471:12	jcaviglia@parso
hypothetically	414:18 418:8,21	465:16	intended 407:17	374:25
378:14	420:13 421:1	increasing 477:16	454:5 462:3	JDW-1TC 432:13 JDW-1TCr 385:19
I	431:12 433:18	incur 422:18	intent 400:19	JDW-11Cr 385:19 JDW-24CTr
I-S 458:19	437:17 438:19,25	430:22 437:17	415:24	428:11 444:18
Idaho 438:18	444:23 450:24	471:21	intention 394:6	JDW-36X 416:17
idea 451:12	461:19 463:6	incurred 390:12	interest 430:13	417:10
ideal 421:13,14,20	included 379:16	426:14 430:8,13	479:17	JEFF 373:12
421:22	382:11 383:11,23	430:15 435:15	interested 425:23	jeff.roberson@at
ideally 438:19	384:23 400:2	436:22 437:9	interesting 442:9	373:16
identify 402:21	402:25 415:5 419:10,11 423:8	439:1 446:17 INDEX 375:1	interpret 421:17 interpretation	job 390:10,15
II 372:16 373:2	419:10,11 423:8	indicate 401:2	415:4 416:3	424:11 426:7
immediately	423:10 429:8	458:17 462:3	415:4 416:3 interveners 471:4	John 375:12 409:20
440:15 456:8	438:14 446:1	468:4	interview 420:23	410:4
impact 384:24	463:4	indicates 465:14	421:1,24 422:6	Josephine 373:13
386:17 387:12	includes 391:5,7	individual 431:20	423:25 443:13	377:15
394:12 400:12	414:13 415:7	431:23	introduction	josephine.strauss
410:15 464:8	429:23 444:22	individually 440:5	398:10	373:16
impacts 391:5	including 381:2	inflate 405:1	invented 446:6	Journal 465:13
implementation	383:5 415:11	inflating 407:22,23	invest 401:10	Judge 376:4,9,11
394:7 415:24	426:11 429:4	inflation 405:7,17	investment 402:11	376:14,15,18
	120,11 127,7	105.7,17	1111000110110 TUZ.11	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

377:12,16 390:21	Kinney's 433:15	473:14,15	limits 475:14	looking 387:17,18
390:25 394:18,21	434:15 435:9	knowledge 470:21	LINA 453:24	388:10 394:5
395:1,3,6 403:21	KMH-16C 404:14	known 385:10	454:24 455:9	402:14 405:3
404:1,3,5 408:4,6	KMH-1T 404:14	387:19,22,24	LINA/EBA 454:3	428:3 431:25
409:10,13,22,25	knew 385:10 457:7	405:25 408:25	LINAs 454:10,16	432:13 433:21
416:25 417:13,18	470:4,9,19,20	459:24 460:25	454:17,21 455:4	434:6 450:14
417:22 451:6,8,11	471:7,20 476:23	470:4 471:20	line 385:15,15,20	454:23,25 455:17
451:19 452:1,9,10	know 378:9,17	472:3	389:15 391:6	465:13,24 472:12
452:12,16,18,20	379:16,19,21	Kristen 375:9	398:8 407:5,5	473:21
452:23 453:2,5	381:2,9 382:10,13	403:25 404:12,13	414:12 415:9	looks 397:9 454:22
457:18 458:10,12	382:15,20,23	403.23 404.12,13	418:5,19 419:21	454:24 471:20
459:12 464:2	383:15,17 384:2,8	$\overline{\mathbf{L}}$	432:16 433:19	Loop 372:20
467:9,11,14,20,23	384:9,10,11,18,20	la- 469:14	434:9,10 444:15	lost 414:22 416:7
468:18 473:2,25	384:21 385:15	Lacey 372:21	447:6,8 460:16	lot 384:9 397:11
474:3,10 475:8,11	386:14 387:1,2,3	lack 420:18 423:3	lines 389:11 413:7	399:16 424:11
476:6,20 477:3,9	, ,	laid 477:1	413:24 420:7	428:25 439:8,9
476:6,20 477:3,9	387:5,5,5,6,13,14 387:16,17,19	large 377:5 401:16	433:12 472:14,21	440:1 441:11,12
JUDGES 372:15	388:1,2,7,8,19,20	422:9,10 430:4,15	linked 406:6	450:8 462:13
373:2	388:22,23,23	439:23 464:16,22	listening 377:24	465:9,18,19
jump 417:23	389:2,2,5,5,6,18	466:18	little 398:20 411:5	475:25 476:1
June 402:5 405:21	389:19,20,21,24	larger 465:15	416:9 417:3 419:8	473.23 476.1
jurisdictional	389:19,20,21,24	Latimer 374:23	419:24 432:3	lots 448:19
439:2 441:4	391:15,21,22,24	law 372:15 373:2		Louisiana 459:2
jurisdictions	391:13,21,22,24	415:17	443:20,20 447:1 458:2	low 389:1 438:13
438:25 440:18		laws 390:18 445:16	LLC 468:6	
JUSTINA 374:22	392:11,12,14,15 392:18,19,20,23	learning 399:7	LLC 408:0 LLP 374:9	443:20 453:10,15 453:17,19 454:6
JUSTINA 374.22		led 430:18	load 379:18 382:8	454:12 455:1,19
K	393:5,6,8,13,14	left 376:5 451:13	382:13,15 412:19	456:5,8 465:14
K33 410:19	393:15,16,22 394:10,12 397:6	legal 447:25	412:19 414:20,20	lower 396:21
Kaufman 452:14	399:4 401:4,8,18	legitimate 435:3	431:13 433:4,7,10	441:23 442:1,4
keep 462:21 465:5	406:13,17,19	lens 385:7	loads 378:11,19	449:9,22 465:9,14
475:25 476:4	411:9 415:2 417:4	lesser 466:21	located 379:10,12	luck 477:25
keeping 442:19	420:15,17 422:8	let's 403:14 413:19	380:7 415:13	lucky 424:6
kind 382:11 383:13	420.13,17 422.8 423:16,18 430:6	418:25 433:18	long 408:25 449:25	lunch 452:3
383:13 387:4	435:19 438:13	437:5 449:3 456:8	longer 445:24	1411011 452.5
388:8 389:17	439:11,12,14,23	475:24,25 476:4	472:15,22	M
391:3 393:5,10,10	440:16,19 441:16	476:15	look 387:6 396:7,19	M 458:19
394:14 399:7	440.10,19 441.10	letter 424:15	397:5,8,13 399:12	M-U-L-L-I-N-S
422:9 430:5	448:1 449:18	425:12	400:19,22 403:7	377:2
436:18 446:22	451:13 453:25	level 396:11 400:16	400.19,22 403.7	macro 465:1
447:15 449:14		401:2 402:11		magnitude 467:2
450:6 462:9	454:4 457:3,12 460:23 464:8,21	431:20 444:10	423:15 456:4,8,12 461:22 463:11	main 445:2
464:19 465:5		Liberty 374:23		maintenance
kinds 423:20 451:3	464:25 466:24 467:6 469:19,19	light 454:6	466:5 478:6 looked 396:10	404:24 406:1,6,11
Kinney 435:22	469:20,21 471:8	limit 476:21 477:23	397:2,12 461:16	major 440:18
446:14	471:23 473:13,14	478:6	463:7	making 377:24
110111	+/1.45 4/5.15,14	., 0.0	403.7	
	·		·	<u>'</u>

				<u> </u>
383:20 438:1,6,7	477:21	440:11 444:3,17	400:21,21 402:6	name 376:25 377:1
438:8 439:22	means 412:12	444:18 445:8,9,10	406:12,19,25	395:10,11 404:10
442:21 449:17	434:22 439:14	445:21 466:19	407:15 469:24	404:11 409:19
450:2	meant 443:21	million-dollar	476:2	410:3 458:16,18
manage 392:16	measurable 405:25	412:8	morning 376:11,24	468:3,5,5
447:13	measure 405:17	mind 385:17 448:3	377:14,16,20	name's 377:1
managed 441:12	mechanism 430:10	462:22 463:9	395:2,3,10,12,20	natural 399:10
management	470:13,15 471:3	465:5	395:21 404:1,2,10	418:10
447:11 449:14,17	471:17	minds 420:21 456:8	404:21,22 408:8,9	necessarily 380:5
450:3,13,24 451:4	meet 390:5 470:17	minimize 447:11	409:18 411:3	384:2 386:7
manner 382:24	475:4	minimum 408:22	452:25 453:1,6	388:12 392:15
447:10 449:17,20	member 457:2	minus 442:16	457:25 459:17,18	456:10 457:7
marginal 449:23	members 457:6	minute 476:16	468:23	necessary 382:8
marked 417:9,10	mention 383:16	minutes 426:21	Moser 374:4 375:3	454:12 470:6,7,10
market 380:19,19	393:20	451:25 452:21	375:4,13 376:7,20	necessity 396:4
380:25 381:6,9	mentioned 443:4	misfiled 411:10	376:23 377:9	need 398:23 410:8
382:10 412:7	445:3 457:5	missing 438:7	389:14 390:22	410:13 413:3
414:8 415:14	merit 400:15,24	misstated 473:11	391:2 411:2	416:1 417:23
422:19 426:22	met 456:20	mistake 423:11	413:11,13,19,22	424:17 427:1
428:18 429:7	method 379:5	misunderstanding	414:9 417:9 418:1	431:4 438:23
431:14,15,15	381:3	422:3,4	427:6,10,13,15,20	447:24 454:12
432:7 442:16,18	methodology 380:1	mitigate 434:13,20	427:24 428:2,8,11	457:12 464:13
442:19 471:22	381:24	434:23 439:13	428:15,16	470:1,2 471:19
472:3	MEYER 373:8	441:1,4 444:5,6,7	motion 474:17	476:25 478:8
markets 391:16	413:9 475:10,12	mitigated 435:17	477:4	needed 471:23
Mary 458:19	475:17,22 476:3,9	435:18 441:23	move 385:5 405:20	needs 398:23 401:6
mask 465:11	476:24 477:12,23	mitigation 402:22	413:13 461:1	401:9 442:15
match 410:22	478:1	435:21 436:14	474:5	443:6 453:10,15
443:11,16	mic 390:23	mixed 475:18	Mullins 375:2	453:17,20 454:13
matches 411:19	MICHAEL 374:13	Mm-hmm 401:24	376:6,10,13,24	456:9
material 386:19	micromanaging	432:21	377:1,20 391:3	neglected 433:18
403:17 410:15	389:19	model 381:8,8	Mullins's 415:2	neither 479:16
419:11 443:22	microphone 417:2	392:21 411:13	433:1	net 391:23 392:12
materialize 393:1	417:12 458:3	414:3,5 434:4	multi-language	412:8 428:19
matter 426:15	Mihaly 374:9	437:16,19 438:22	456:18,22,25	429:15,15,18,22
468:7,12	mike@nwenergy	439:4	457:9	441:6 443:2,23,25
matters 474:5	374:16	modeling 391:8,17	multi-year 396:9	444:3
mean 378:16 381:7	million 385:25	392:21	398:1 399:8 401:7	nevertheless 420:12
382:6 388:12,13	386:3,17,19	moment 413:17	408:20 460:1,21	new 398:10 400:1
388:25 393:2,4,4	388:10 393:12,13	416:19 417:6	multiple 434:13	446:5 447:11
396:18,20 397:7	393:14,15 406:10	424:22 428:21	MULTNOMAH	450:13
401:4 402:13	406:14,18,23	431:3	479:3	nice 399:12 430:19
406:2,5 433:9	407:3 416:14	money 397:17,19	murky 392:5	434:2,2
439:10 447:23	420:4 428:18	399:4,5,18 401:14	MW 377:4	no-cost 378:14
449:16 460:23	429:5,7,17 430:3	401:18	N	379:3 380:22
466:18 471:1	430:7 432:4 440:8	months 396:12		381:19 382:3,18
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

429:10,12 432:18	375:10,17,18,20	391:17 392:6	operate 422:13	overestimate
432:24 433:3,5,9	375:10,17,18,20		423:12 444:24	397:16 399:22
, ,		393:17,24 394:4		
434:12 439:13	451:21 452:2,7	397:22 398:5	operating 406:1	overestimated
440:21 442:14	457:22 458:2,6,15	400:4,14,23	operation 406:10	398:19 401:16
443:5,24 447:22	458:24 459:9	401:22,25 402:17	operational 437:25	overestimating
448:7,16	464:5 467:16	403:11 404:25	438:6 442:12	397:21
non-itemized	468:2 473:5	405:20 407:8	operations 392:8	overestimation
411:13	474:13,24 475:3	408:2,19 409:3,5	393:1 404:24	401:23
non-jurisdictional	O&M 405:12	411:5,24,24	406:6,23 425:9	overlap 402:12
441:5	Oakland 374:19	412:11,15 413:2,8	442:12 444:23	403:5
nonexempt 437:3	objection 405:15	413:15 414:9,11	opinion 381:4	overpaid 393:2
nonunion 408:21	obligation 379:13	414:17 415:11,16	430:12	overpaying 440:11
409:1	379:21 380:9,20	415:18 416:16	opportunity 402:15	overrun 386:2,7
normal 470:25	430:22 432:6	417:18,22,24	422:22 436:2	387:3
471:1	435:13	418:4,13 424:4,17	469:25	oversight 451:2
Northwest 399:10	obligations 390:5	424:22,25 425:1,2	oppose 459:20,24	owner 468:6
noted 452:13	392:24 415:20	425:3,6,11,18	464:7	Oz 435:19
464:18	435:25 439:13	426:2,17,19,23	opposed 392:23	
notice 425:1,14,16	441:22,24	427:13,20 428:14	405:16 430:15	P
425:19	obtain 419:2	428:15 432:2,10	option 422:17,19	P 374:13
notices 425:23	obviously 454:15	433:14,18 434:7	448:7	P.C 374:4
Nova 448:23	472:22	434:17 435:1	options 448:9	P.O 373:9,14
November 439:17	occur 387:15	437:14 439:6	order 425:1,15	PacifiCorp 414:13
NO x 423:9	392:24 393:23	440:4,6 446:25	426:12 452:11	414:17,21,23,24
NPE 447:11	440:12	447:6,15 448:5,14	462:25 467:2	415:20 416:5
number 378:18	October 372:14	451:5 452:7,17,19	478:4	446:1
410:11,20 412:12	376:2 479:20	456:16 457:11	Oregon 479:2,6,24	PacifiCorp's 415:1
421:7 427:21	offer 436:23,25	460:8,12,15,17,18	organizations	packed 450:8
428:10 429:1,19	437:2,4	461:7,16,22 462:2	455:17 456:4	pad 442:19
431:6 433:19,20	offered 442:21	462:9,24 463:2,18	orient 424:16	page 385:14,15,20
436:12 440:24	offers 455:3	463:22 464:1	428:22	389:11,14,15
441:3,7 454:6,7	Office 373:13,19	466:25 471:13	original 429:16	412:2 413:7,16,18
457:10 462:12	offset 393:9 429:9	472:5,12,24	originally 399:18	413:20 414:10,14
464:23 466:25	offsetting 393:7	473:10 475:2,6,23	ought 422:13	418:1,14,18 420:6
472:16	oh 384:8 388:17	477:13,14,16	out-of-state 391:14	421:5 425:3,13
numbers 396:25	398:15 400:7	478:10	391:22 392:17	426:20 427:4,7,9
443:16 461:6,21	408:3 414:15	Olympia 373:14	393:8 394:11	427:16,21 428:1
465:4,19 466:9	416:7 418:6	omitted 445:13	outcome 450:1	432:14 433:20
NV 374:24	427:13 428:2	once 396:11 408:12	479:18	434:8,9 444:17
NW 374:12,14	429:20 452:1	410:21 437:16	outside 379:12	447:4,9 460:16
NWEC 451:15	455:16 459:1	ones 429:3	380:8	461:22 472:12,14
452:24 453:13	466:25 475:2	ongoing 442:25	outweighs 421:13	472:16,19
454:10 456:4	okay 378:4 379:24	467:5	over-collection	pages 372:11
	381:18 383:9	online 449:8,12,20	434:19	396:19,20 413:3
0	385:5,21 386:4,24	op- 406:5	overall 422:15	413:24 475:14,16
O'Neill 373:18	388:4 390:9,22	open 448:4	435:15	475:21
	300.1370.7,22	open 110.7	133.13	

	193 465 15	102 16 122 10	407.12.410.1.4	440.15
paid 441:23 442:1	percentiles 465:15	402:16 422:18	407:13 419:1,4	449:15
paper 428:6	performance 472:2	431:20,23	422:1 423:4	practices 447:12
paragraph 390:7	472:4	plant's 396:10	426:11 460:22	450:14,21,25
425:5,19 435:2	performed 400:17	plants 401:15	462:6	prefiled 377:9
paraphrase 389:10	431:8 436:12	415:12 422:17	positions 418:20	prehearing 478:4
parity 459:24 460:9	438:12	438:18 442:22,23	possibilities 448:20	prepare 459:3,6
460:19 461:18	perilous 441:10	444:24	possibility 379:2	468:7,11
Park 379:9 391:12	period 386:25	play 450:7	380:2,15 382:2,6	prepared 410:13
415:8 437:18	387:7 388:8,25	please 376:24 384:7	382:17,19 383:24	preparing 474:14
Parsons 374:23	389:3 448:7,9	395:10 407:20	386:4,11	present 378:2,3
part 394:4 406:8,23	449:7 465:2	409:18 410:2	possible 382:20	403:23
411:12 414:22	469:11,14,15,23	412:1 413:14	383:1 417:2 426:9	presented 405:15
423:4 430:9 435:7	469:24 472:1,3	417:13 423:18	432:22,25 433:8	448:1 474:18
437:20 438:3	473:14,16,20	432:12 458:16	438:10 441:1	president 410:7
441:6 451:1	perspective 378:12	468:3 472:18	448:17,19 461:16	pressure 391:9
454:15 460:3	391:18 433:8	475:11	461:19,20 470:14	presumably 446:4
participate 416:10	464:15 465:1	plus 469:24	post-adjustment	presuming 451:22
participated	pertinent 455:8	point 393:21 415:4	408:21	pretty 394:9 399:17
448:23	phantom 379:16	422:16,25 424:9	potential 383:6,11	424:24 434:24
participation 466:8	phase 403:12	435:3,14,16	385:22,24 388:5	price 383:5,10,22
particular 411:10	phased 403:2	436:18 438:7,8	445:6 469:9 473:7	384:1 412:6,17
450:16 467:7	phasing 403:4	439:7 442:10,11	potentially 378:22	414:4,8 415:8
particularly 467:3	pick 376:5	443:13,15 452:10	379:4,20 381:22	429:4 437:8,18
parties 400:16	picked 402:9	461:12,14 462:20	384:1 388:10	438:19 444:19,23
423:4 425:23	picture 465:1	466:24 467:3	392:2 393:4,9	445:1,5 449:1,3
451:23 475:13,25	piece 456:11	474:4 475:8 477:5	440:10 447:12	449:22,23
476:22 477:7	pieces 383:13	policies 447:12	power 378:7	prices 381:10
478:7,10 479:17	place 389:12 418:7	450:13,24	379:14,19,20	442:21 445:10
partly 398:1	421:24 422:3	policy 377:21 394:1	380:6,12,13,19,19	465:2
pay 408:23 423:17	445:18 449:15	419:13,17,19,20	380:20 381:1,6	primary 459:23
436:24 437:12	470:10	424:15,16 425:3	382:16 391:7,9,17	principal 377:4
payments 465:20	places 464:25	425:15,16,21,24	391:18,20,25	principle 385:8,12
Pepple 374:3	plan 396:9 398:1	426:3,3 431:6	392:1 393:3,12	387:13 389:17
375:18 452:10,13	400:6 401:10	440:19 449:15	412:8,17,24 413:4	390:19
452:17,19 459:13	402:3 408:20	460:4 464:9	414:19,25 422:19	principles 392:13
459:16 463:9	460:1,21	466:10 472:6,7,23	426:8,13,16	392:16 444:25
percent 378:16	plans 399:8 401:7	portfolio 397:17	428:19 429:15,15	prior 396:8 405:3,3
386:2 401:16	470:10	398:21 401:5	429:18 436:24	430:10
405:2 413:3 414:8	plant 380:22	428:24 429:23	437:1,6,20 438:3	probably 394:13
416:2 435:4,6,12	391:23 395:24	447:13	438:17,18 440:8	420:19 443:8,9,19
435:24 436:3,7,9	396:14,17,25	portion 402:8	441:6,14 443:23	procedural 447:16
436:10 440:23	397:3,4,7,12,15	419:14 431:10	443:25 444:3,8,22	476:10 477:1
445:22 446:14	397:21 398:11,14	462:3,10 472:14	471:12	478:5
465:16 466:8	398:19 399:21,22	Portland 374:5	power's 391:23	proceed 376:19
percentage 382:14	399:25 401:1,5,9	posed 468:25	powers 392:12	390:25 395:6
405:2,7	401:19,20 402:9	position 407:10,12	practice 392:19,20	404:5 409:22
		F - 53-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13-13	F-40110100000,200	

417:23,25 423:5	proposing 402:24	467:14,16 474:11	393:5 394:17,18	440:6,13,15
453:5 457:19	403:12 432:4	474:13	394:24 395:18,18	441:24 444:13
458:12 467:23	471:17	Puget 470:13	398:6 408:2,6	446:20 461:10
468:18	protection 470:15	pull 410:11 416:19	409:8 446:25	ratification 408:15
proceed- 478:3	provide 397:10	424:17	451:5 452:5,14	ratified 408:13
proceeding 400:18	426:7 469:6	purchase 412:18	457:12,15 459:19	ratio 441:4 460:19
416:10 424:6	470:15,16	414:19 422:19	464:1 467:8,9	460:25
426:7,15 450:19	provided 396:3	432:6	473:1,24 474:8,9	ratios 459:25 460:9
477:7	397:12 408:14	purchases 380:25	476:22 478:7	461:18
proceedings 375:1	463:12	412:7 415:14	quick 377:20	read 413:19 420:19
438:3 452:22	province 448:22	431:15	424:24 453:7	434:16
478:13 479:8,9,11	provisional 395:24	purchasing 378:10	quickly 431:1	reading 434:23
479:13,14	396:10,14,17,25	purpose 388:21	quite 399:3	476:1
process 378:22	397:7,10,15,21	396:4 421:18	quoted 414:4	ready 410:24
381:15 393:22	398:11,13,21	purposes 392:7	quoting 415:10	411:25 417:25
398:14 400:18	399:1,2,15,21,25	412:25 437:14	418:24	452:4
418:15 429:11	401:1	purview 381:12,23		real 469:13
441:6 449:21	provisionally	push 451:14	<u>R</u>	reality 450:8
450:16 469:14	399:11	put 397:7 449:15	raise 376:15 395:3	realized 449:10
471:16,25 474:14	prudence 385:6	450:23 470:10	409:23 453:2	really 382:7,13,14
produces 414:5	386:8 387:9,13,15	puts 391:9	458:10 467:20	387:5 388:23,24
Professional 479:7	388:5 389:20		raised 465:7	389:1,4 392:11,13
program 382:22	396:10 400:20	Q	raises 397:20	393:16,21 399:12
388:21 444:11	423:20 450:4	Q&A 418:8,13,18	range 442:17 449:2	403:13 422:25
448:24 466:7	470:25 471:1	432:16,17 460:18	449:3,10,13,24	423:2 435:21
prohibited 433:5	prudency 422:15	Q&As 461:24	rate 391:9 396:9,13	437:24 439:7
prohibition 433:13	470:3,8 471:19	quantity 443:24	397:7,10,11,13	456:24 464:19
project 374:8 396:2	472:1	question 378:25	398:1 399:8,14	465:10,20 469:19
396:5 453:14	prudent 386:5,9,12	379:1,22 383:8,19	400:6 401:2,7	469:21
project-by-project	386:16 390:3	391:4 397:22	402:2,3,4,6,7	realtime 418:6
399:9	403:9 420:12	399:22 402:1	403:7 406:8 407:8	425:5,9 437:25
projects 397:24	423:6 426:12	408:7 414:21,22	407:16,19 408:17	reason 398:2
398:18,24 399:11	444:20 447:10	418:7 430:19	408:20,22 416:6	411:14 445:25
399:13,16 400:1,8	448:15,18 449:16	431:5,24 432:1	416:18 426:14	459:23 460:5
400:13,15,22	470:17,21 471:9	437:23 439:5 441:17 442:2,9	430:10 445:23	reasonable 401:13
401:14,17 406:7	prudently 390:12	,	459:19,20,25	405:11 435:11
properly 390:16	PSE 398:25 399:15	446:8,9 447:20	460:1,10,21 461:5 462:22 463:4,7,11	436:15 446:15
proposal 407:8,10	417:8 418:8,21	450:12 456:14 472:5	, ,	reasonably 426:13
407:14 408:16	419:22 420:1,5		463:15,16,19,23	reasoning 419:22
414:6 415:11,18	421:5,6	questioned 464:6	464:7,8,14 465:6	reasons 400:20
429:16	PSE's 416:18	questioning 391:6 393:24 397:5	465:24 466:12,14	444:19 460:4,6
propose 416:12	public 373:17		467:4 469:3	464:10
proposed 407:16	393:18 404:17	398:8	rates 386:18 390:10 390:13 403:10	rebuttal 407:14
413:5 416:13,14	406:15 407:8,10	questions 375:7,7,8 375:11,15 377:13	414:13 423:19	433:16 459:3
463:23 465:25	451:22 457:19	377:20 390:20,24	432:7 434:18	466:20
473:8,9,11,12	460:4 463:18	311.20 390.20,24	434.1434.18	recall 439:5 448:12
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

462:7 466:13,15	391:21 407:8	relevant 454:8	416:24 417:17,19	381:5,9 382:4,14
472:11	421:15,21 435:12	472:15 474:17	417:21 458:9,23	384:25,25 391:14
receive 463:14,19	435:20 436:9,10	remember 394:2	458:25 463:8,10	391:16 392:17
received 436:23,25	reduced 414:7	421:6 434:23	479:1,6,7,7	393:8 394:11
437:2	445:21 479:15	446:1 463:17	reporter's 455:25	397:23 398:4
recision 425:12	reduces 383:24	472:11 474:22	reports 455:13,13	418:10 431:14
recognized 453:23	reduction 413:4	reminding 478:2	representation	449:8,11,19 450:3
recognizing 444:9	redundant 401:20	removal 429:23	448:10	456:13
recommendation	refer 385:13 424:13	removed 419:14,19	representatives	respect 435:23
389:4 393:11	453:14	Rendahl 373:4	478:11	450:17
405:6 420:1,11	reference 385:18	375:7 385:17	representing	respects 462:18
426:10 440:7,24	385:23	398:7,13,16	377:15	respond 440:18
441:20 444:21	referenced 394:1	399:23 400:4,14	represents 377:5	responded 462:6
447:17 450:17	411:11 429:5	400:23 401:22,25	request 406:15,16	Respondent 372:11
464:10 466:14	453:16	402:17 409:7	417:8 436:5	373:7
473:6	referred 454:2	427:4,18,22 428:1	463:16,19 475:18	response 385:14
recommendations	referring 408:10	428:14 451:17	requesting 466:19	408:10 412:21
441:16 447:7	421:7 427:6	455:21,24 457:14	477:5	437:24 463:22
455:3,5,8	428:17 429:21	467:10 474:9,20	requests 400:10	responsibility
recommended	435:1	475:2,6,24 476:4	416:24 417:17	390:1
420:8,13 441:20	refers 385:22	476:12,18 477:6	458:23 463:8	restate 407:20
450:20 459:20	reflect 426:13	477:10,13,15,21	require 422:20	restriction 433:9
463:14	436:14	renewable 449:8,11	444:24 447:1,11	result 386:2 392:8
recommending	reflection 461:5	449:19 461:24	required 421:16,21	401:23 406:8
397:16 399:9	reflects 402:5	renewables 382:16	requirement 423:7	413:3 415:19
403:3 420:3,4	refunds 397:17	Reno 374:24	445:7	429:14 434:19
444:2 463:18	regard 476:21	reopen 440:15	requirements	445:6
reconvene 451:20	477:5	reoriented 432:3	434:14,21,23	resulted 406:10
452:20	regardless 466:23	repeal 439:16	470:18	results 410:22
record 376:25	Registered 479:7	repealed 440:9	requiring 450:22	441:13 445:7,15
395:11 404:11	regret 424:10	repeat 383:8 385:3	470:18	retail 412:19
409:19 410:3,13	regulate 390:10	417:7 458:24	rescinded 377:22	414:20 418:11,21
452:21 458:17	regulated 462:14	476:18	394:2 419:18	429:9,13 433:10
468:3 476:15,17	regulations 445:16	repeating 385:18	472:8,10,11,23	443:3,6
478:12 479:13	445:17	463:9	rescinding 424:15	retrospective
recover 383:25	rejected 398:1	rephrase 383:19	425:14,16	398:15
recovered 390:13	related 402:22	replies 477:5	residential 460:20	returns 464:20
401:13 430:14	403:8 412:5 418:6	reply 476:8,10,13	462:5,19 463:14	revenue 437:10,11
445:11	419:20 464:13	476:14,14,20,25	464:15,24	review 386:6,22,24
recovery 390:2	479:16	477:7,16,17,19	resolved 378:23	388:4 396:11,13
redirect 375:4,18	relative 391:15	478:3	resource 380:14,14	397:3,3,8,8,12,24
375:21 390:21	414:6 429:16	report 479:10	380:16 391:10	398:11,14,21
391:1 403:21	462:5 464:16	reported 372:25	398:2	399:1,9 400:20
408:4 451:6,7	466:6	376:1 399:25	resources 378:6,11	401:1,5 402:16
464:2,4 473:2,4	relatively 464:16	479:8	379:6,8,12,13,17	415:1 423:20
reduce 378:9 383:6	465:2,15	reporter 400:10	379:24 380:1	424:5 426:8 438:3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

448:3 450:20	RLE-17T 472:13	440:22 441:5	440:16,17 450:7	Shorthand 479:1,7
463:3 468:24	Roberson 373:12	443:3,7	461:11,11 465:15	shortly 402:3
469:1,5,12 470:19	375:6,10 394:23	Sam 458:19,20	sees 454:10	showing 457:20
471:13,19 473:12	395:9,17 403:24	San 374:10	sell 422:22 437:5	Shute 374:9
473:13,15	404:6,9,16 408:5	save 393:14	442:23,23 447:9	side 401:12 407:4
reviewing 402:10	409:11	saying 390:8 422:6	447:10 448:7	444:15
470:23	Robert 375:19	422:11,12 435:23	selling 438:17,18	sides 449:5
reviews 389:20	467:17 468:5	444:5 456:3	438:20 442:20	Sierra 374:17,18
398:19 399:15	Robinson 373:18	460:19 471:11,13	448:17 449:16	signed 409:2
469:10	375:10,17,18,20	says 389:17 421:10	sense 396:2,21,23	significant 400:5
revised 408:14,16	375:21 404:20	425:19	443:21 455:12	significantly
427:16 428:3	451:21 452:2,7	scenario 383:3,3,9	sentence 414:1	386:17
revisions 441:16	457:22 458:2,6,15	383:21 385:23	434:5	similar 379:21
Rhinehart 372:25	458:24 459:9	407:22	sentences 450:9	411:15 416:13
479:5,22	464:5 467:16	schedule 476:10	separate 382:11	448:24 454:5
right 376:4,16,18	468:2 473:5	477:2 478:5	454:4	455:17
381:8 383:15	474:13,24 475:3	scheduled 477:1	separately 439:19	simpler 471:16
384:16 387:16	robust 394:14	scope 438:10	serious 465:11	simply 436:7
390:25 391:9	roll 403:9 465:3	score 469:20	serve 378:11,19	441:13 442:19
392:9 394:18,20	rolled 407:2	Scotia 448:23	379:18 382:8,15	473:21
395:4 402:18	room 395:22	screen 457:23	service 454:7,24	single 473:21
403:18 405:4	Rouge 459:2	467:17	455:2 456:7	sir 459:5,8,22
407:5 409:13,23	roughly 412:7	scrutinize 396:17	463:11	460:11,14 462:1,8
415:9,21 421:20	row 411:15	396:24	serving 418:11	463:6,17,21,25
427:3 428:5,12	RPR 372:25 479:22	scrutiny 396:3	431:13,13	466:17
430:2,8 432:7	rule 378:18 383:16	400:16	set 422:8 434:4	situation 384:14
433:25 438:4	384:19 393:21	SE 372:20	440:13 447:24	388:14 420:16,24
439:10,17 440:6	394:16	search 434:5	476:8 479:9,19	471:11
441:1,24 442:8	rules 425:24 426:4	Seattle 373:20	sets 392:25 420:22	situations 469:9
450:5 451:9,11,19	433:8 447:24	374:15	440:6	six 400:21 402:6
452:20 453:2,3,5	448:2,11	second 426:21	setting 392:11,13	406:12 407:15
455:9,11 457:16	run 411:14 413:4	445:20 460:1,10	392:15 443:19	six-month 407:17
458:10,12 459:21	414:3,5 437:20	460:20 461:5,17	settlement 401:3	size 461:9 465:24
460:13 461:5	449:25 469:23	464:8	445:24 464:17	SJK-17T 433:16
464:23 466:4		section 418:5 425:4	shadow 415:8	sjm@dvclaw.com
467:20,20 472:22	S	447:6	437:18	374:7
474:10 475:8	s/Stephanie 479:22	see 376:9 397:12	share 438:24	skip 418:18
476:12 477:3	sa- 396:16	413:19 418:25	shed 454:6	slightly 380:21
risk 402:23 439:21	sale 436:20	425:25 426:1	shift 406:2,11	432:1 447:2
443:22 444:10	sales 382:10 426:22	431:1 433:18	407:15,24 447:1	slow 455:21 456:1
445:2 447:11	427:1 428:18	434:22 435:13	shifted 406:1,18	small 429:14,18,21
449:14,17 450:3	429:7,9,13 430:23	436:5,10 454:4,11	shifting 406:5,7	430:3
450:13,24 451:4	430:25 432:7,24	461:25 465:6	407:17,21,23	smaller 466:21
risk-sharing 470:13	434:14,21 435:13	467:17	shock 469:3	SMITH 374:18
risks 440:3 444:13	437:20 438:1,15	seeing 412:5 444:14	short 384:12	SO2 423:8
riveting 420:19	438:24 439:2	seen 398:18,24	421:11 456:14	social 425:8
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Bt 450.0	401 10 426 20	4 4 276 24 200 17	. 1 461 17 462 2	276 17 205 5
soft 458:3	401:18 426:20	state 376:24 390:17	study 461:17 463:3	sworn 376:17 395:5
sold 380:8	spending 400:25	395:10 404:10	463:24	404:4 409:24
sole 460:5	spent 397:15,18,19	408:11 409:18	subject 381:25	453:4 458:11
somewhat 392:5,5	398:3 399:2,18	410:2 415:13	399:24 400:3	467:22
421:23 443:9,9	401:19,20	453:25 468:3	428:25 441:17	system 428:23
464:13	spite 423:2	479:2	448:10,14	438:24 454:14,14
SOMMER 374:4	Spokane 373:9	statement 377:22	submission 421:12	471:14 473:8
sorry 384:5 385:3	spread 459:19,20	378:8 379:23	submit 436:2	systemic 465:21
385:19 389:11,14	462:22 463:4,7,12	394:1 419:13,17	submitted 395:14	
397:4 407:13	463:23 464:7,14	419:19,20 421:4,8	404:13 420:20	
410:1 413:11,17	466:12,15 469:10	421:9,10 422:9	435:7	tab 410:19 411:19
413:24 414:15,21	spreadsheet 411:10	423:22 424:15,16	subset 454:25	table 410:17 411:7
414:23 416:9	Springs 380:6,7	425:3,15,17,21	substantive 411:21	411:19,19 412:2,4
418:7,23 427:10	392:1,3	426:3 430:20	substituted 419:15	426:20 427:7,8,20
427:20,23 433:21	Square 372:20	434:25 438:5	success 475:18	428:2,22 429:14
455:24 459:1	ss 479:2	472:6,7,23	sufficient 429:12	443:4 444:17
463:9 472:16,19	staff 373:11 377:12	statements 425:24	443:6	tac- 423:6
473:11	377:15 393:5,10	states 465:8	suggest 470:11	TAD 373:18
sort 383:16 392:19	394:22 395:12	statistics 465:4,10	suggested 421:14	tad.oneill@atg.w
393:6,6,20 422:14	396:6 397:2,8	stay 475:24	421:14	373:21
431:20 435:19	398:9,17 399:7,12	stenographically	suggesting 422:10	take 383:17 396:7
439:7 445:14	400:16 403:23,24	479:14	Suite 373:19 374:5	417:5,13 422:2,23
446:4 448:1 449:4	405:13 408:11	step 475:22	374:14,19,23	428:21 431:21
450:2 471:24	409:10 416:12	Stephanie 372:25	summarizing	436:3,7 447:3
Sound 470:13	420:23 421:24	479:5	418:24 443:4	451:14,17,19
sounds 411:24	422:6,11,12 424:1	steps 417:6	summary 447:7	464:22 465:23
417:19 435:18	426:10,25 438:11	Stokes 474:8	supervision 479:15	466:10 473:18
448:11,11	444:12,15 446:6	storm 403:6	supply 378:6 443:6	taken 406:25
source 392:2	447:12,16 450:14	Strategies 410:6	support 397:11	426:12 479:9,14
406:13,22	450:16,19 468:18	strategy 456:18,22	398:20 399:19	talk 404:23 461:24
Southwest 374:5	468:25 471:4	456:25 457:9	402:11 407:25	468:23
speak 417:1 455:16	475:4	Strauss 373:13	408:11,24	talked 387:9
456:3,24 458:4,4	Staff's 393:11	375:4,13,21	supposed 384:17	talking 380:12
speaking 417:1	405:6 409:11	377:14,15,19	sure 377:24 378:16	381:7 384:13,13
424:21 437:25	426:8	385:19,22 389:15	391:20 393:15	388:15 396:18
specific 431:5,25	standard 436:15	390:9 393:25	396:24 398:7	412:22 415:14
433:13 447:23	470:25 471:2	409:17 410:1,2,24	400:8,11 403:16	425:16 426:21
457:10 474:19	stands 384:10	451:7 468:19,22	411:23 412:11	429:3
specifically 455:1	start 383:14 465:3	472:25	424:5 428:8	talks 385:24 425:5
456:12	469:16,17	Street 374:10,19,23	447:23 457:24,25	435:2
speculate 445:9	started 449:12	465:13	464:19 469:4	target 443:19
spell 376:25 395:11	starting 385:14	strictly 402:22	471:1,22,24 475:5	targeted 440:19
404:10 409:19	403:5 414:12	structure 429:13	surplus 433:5	tcp@dvclaw.com
410:3 458:16	418:5,14,19 425:4	structured 469:13	swear 409:23	374:6
spelled 377:1 468:5	432:16 447:6,8	struggling 466:4	switch 398:22	team 397:23
spend 399:5 401:14	460:16	studies 466:2	switching 417:11	tell 428:9
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

ten 452:21 469:24	390:20,23 394:17	423:2,5,11,21	422:2,10 423:16	trick 435:20
ten-minute 451:20	394:19,20 395:1	424:7,19,24 426:6	423:17 430:14	trouble 390:22
tender 459:10	401:25 402:17,18	427:15 428:2,7	435:9 439:3 444:9	true 380:4 463:24
468:17	403:18,19,20,22	431:21 435:1,13	446:11 450:6	465:21 479:13
tenth 443:16	404:3,6 408:3	435:15,18,20,21	451:11,23 452:23	true-up 378:22
term 421:11 444:7	409:5,9,14,25	435:23 437:14,24	457:20 461:10	383:7,12,15,16,18
447:25	410:23 411:4,24	438:5 441:4,8,12	463:6,10 464:16	393:18 418:15
terms 379:14 387:1	417:5,11,13,24	441:25 442:9	465:9 467:11	429:11 439:11
387:25 389:16,23	423:24 424:7	443:8,10 444:20	470:5,9,10,20	442:4,5,9,11
390:5 464:20	428:12 430:2	446:16,23 450:18	471:21 474:3	443:1,22
470:9	434:2,10 439:6	450:23 451:1,17	timely 449:20	try 434:4 440:15
test 402:4,9 405:21	441:18 451:5,9,10	452:13 454:19	times 456:20	trying 396:20,23
406:3	452:19 453:6,21	455:15 457:4,18	timing 396:4	410:16 414:23
testified 439:10	455:24 456:16,23	460:3,3,24 462:16	447:16	427:12,18 438:9
testify 386:21	457:14,16,17	462:16 464:12	today 384:10,13,16	439:8,20 444:12
440:20	458:6 459:13	465:5,6,10,12,18	388:19 392:21,21	444:14 447:15
testifying 430:3	460:8 464:1 467:8	466:1,1,5,6,11	393:12 426:16	462:10,21 474:22
testimony 377:10	467:12,13 468:19	470:14 471:2,10	ton 414:4 443:16	Tuesday 376:2
385:13,14,24	473:24 474:2	471:14,18 473:22	449:4,4	474:15,21 475:1,5
389:9 402:10	475:7 476:3 478:1	474:3,20	tool 469:6	turn 412:1 413:2
408:11,13 410:9	478:2,10	thinking 434:24	topic 447:2	414:9 425:11
410:15,22 411:8	that'd 412:14	442:13 462:22	total 399:25 466:19	426:17 432:12
411:20 412:2	theoretical 392:22	464:14 465:3	totaled 431:11	460:15
413:14,23,23	thereabouts 445:22	466:12 473:20	totals 431:16	tweaking 443:14,15
414:10 415:2,9	thermal 378:6	476:14 477:19	trace 431:3	two 388:9,11 412:5
416:18 417:8,25	379:6,24 380:14	third 422:14	traced 431:22,23	420:22 425:14
418:2,14 419:8,9	380:14,16 381:5	Thompson 372:16	track 406:22	429:2 444:16
419:10,12,14,20	382:4 384:24	373:3 375:14	trade 449:2 471:13	450:8 451:23
419:21,22 420:7,9	391:22	416:25 417:13,18	trading 449:7,9,12	454:4,20 464:12
420:18 421:6	thing 394:13	417:22 451:16,22	traditional 470:8	two-year 400:6
426:18 427:25	things 401:9 414:1	451:24 452:6,24	transact 442:16	402:3
428:4,25 429:17	422:13 435:20	453:1,7	transacting 442:18	TYLER 374:3
432:13 433:15,16	439:18 464:12	thought 405:13	442:18	type 470:8
434:15 435:7,9	471:24	thoughts 408:21	transactions	types 402:24 456:7
441:9 446:12	think 381:14 382:6	thousands 396:18	434:12,18 435:3,4	typewriting 479:15
447:3 453:13,23	382:22,23 383:2	396:20	435:5,24 436:16	
454:3 455:3 459:3	383:19 384:9,12	three 383:13 424:3	transcript 424:6	U
459:3 460:7,15	384:21 386:1	439:18	479:12	U-230161 377:22
461:2,23 462:3,11	387:3 388:18	threshold 396:10	transfer 465:20	U-K-E-S 458:19
463:13,23 464:18	392:4,18 393:5,6	Thursday 474:25	transition 461:24	UE-240006 372:8
466:16 468:7,9,11	393:10 394:9,12	THURSTON 376:1	462:4	UG-240007 372:9
468:16 470:22,24	399:10,21 400:15	time 385:10 387:19	transitions 467:5	ultimate 466:12
472:12,13,15	401:5 405:2,10	388:3,8 389:7	Transportation	uncertainty 418:15
testimony's 392:14	415:17 416:7	393:19 396:19	372:4,7,19	441:2,5,7,10,13
thank 376:13,20	417:2 418:2,25	397:23 398:3,4,10	treating 396:24	444:10
377:8 379:5	420:15 422:12,13	417:14 420:20	trends 405:11	unclear 393:22
	·			

401.05 474.05	292.16.202.1		451.10 450 15	W-L-4 274 10
421:25 474:25	382:16 392:1	variables 441:7	451:13 452:15	Webster 374:19
undergo 471:19	unsupported	various 423:4	453:8,11,17 455:4	week 465:12
underlying 429:13	434:24	verify 467:18	wants 445:3 451:14	470:12 474:15,23
understand 396:3	unsure 399:20	version 410:10	Washington 372:3	weighs 401:12
412:11 414:24	up- 427:15	411:10,20 428:3	372:6,19,21	Weinberger 374:9
415:23 416:4	update 415:22,22	versus 390:1	373:19 376:1	welcome 455:10
419:24 431:7	updated 454:17	392:20 442:23	379:10,12,14	went 424:3
435:10 439:8,20	updates 450:24	469:11	380:8,8,13,13	weren't 382:22
444:6,12,14	upward 391:8,9	vice 410:7	381:18 390:17	400:2 423:17
447:15 454:12	usage 454:17	videoconference	415:13 436:25	West 374:23 377:5
476:24	use 378:6 379:7	374:13,18,22	437:4 438:21	Western 377:7
understandable	397:6,18 399:4	view 422:16,25	439:16 440:17	wheel-through
397:1 423:3	411:17 425:7	433:2 440:3	445:17 464:24	435:2,5
understanding	432:19 440:21	441:10,11 442:10	465:7 466:3 479:6	WHEREOF
382:10 394:5	useful 401:21 469:5	442:11 443:22	479:23	479:19
412:14,16 414:17	469:6	444:25 471:24	Washington's	wholesale 412:19
414:24 430:8	usually 389:18	views 453:12	448:25	414:20 427:1
437:15,16,21	474:22	VOL 372:13	wasn't 384:19	430:23,25 432:24
447:21 448:6	utilities 372:4,6,10	voters 439:16	397:17 399:2	433:4,6 434:12,18
454:20 456:25	372:19 389:20	vs 372:9	443:14 445:25	434:21 435:4,12
459:23 460:18	390:16 394:8		477:8	435:24 436:16
463:20	416:1,2 421:1	W	way 374:5 380:22	437:6,19 438:15
Understood 476:3	426:5 450:25	W 373:5	382:7 384:19,22	440:22
uneconomic 437:19	462:14 465:6	W-I-L-S-O-N	386:14 388:18	wildfire 402:19,23
438:1	utility 378:14	409:20 410:4	393:16 415:19,21	402:25 403:9
uneconomically	385:10 389:22	WA 373:9,14,20	442:6,10 450:23	Wilson 375:12
380:3,16	390:4 423:11	374:15	460:24	385:22 409:12,18
unfortunate 420:16	425:9 442:24	wage 408:12 409:4	ways 434:13	409:20 410:2,4
unfortunately	447:22 448:7,23	wages 408:22	we'll 451:19 452:20	411:3 416:25
446:24	449:6,18 454:7,14	wait 426:15	478:6	431:4
uniform 394:7	454:14,23 455:2	walk 431:2 439:19	we're 381:7 387:16	Wilson's 385:13
467:7	456:7 462:13	440:4	392:11,20 393:14	427:24
uniformly 462:16	469:16 470:4,9,16	walked 420:25	396:24 397:16	windfall 401:18
unintended 383:2	470:19 471:5	Wall 465:13	399:7,9,20 400:21	winner 469:20
union 408:12,15,21	473:18	WALMART	403:3 411:24,25	withdraws 425:20
408:25	utility's 379:2	374:21	412:22,23 415:13	witness 375:2,5,9
unique 467:3	400:25 450:20	want 385:13 391:6	423:18 424:6	375:12,14,16,19
unit 412:17 414:18		397:6,20 399:21	428:7 438:9	376:6,17 377:11
unknown 405:10	V	402:23 404:23	444:14 455:17	378:1 385:21
439:21	vague 393:20	412:11 421:19	456:11 464:18	389:16 394:20
unknowns 439:9,9	valid 421:13,14	424:5 426:20	465:24 475:4	395:5,21,25 396:6
440:3 462:12	439:15	430:18,20 431:4	477:19	397:1,25 398:12
unobservable	valuable 401:5	451:11 456:17	we've 387:9 422:8	398:15,18 400:3,7
461:13	value 392:3	468:23 477:7	429:3 440:20	400:11,19 401:4
unspecified 379:20	Van 374:4	wanted 396:1	450:19 465:1	401:24 402:13
380:20 381:5	variability 441:14	402:19 409:6	469:23 475:19	403:3,16,20,23

404 4 400 0 10 24	l	457.5.474.11.10	1541 405 00 465 14	35 206 2 410 2 10
404:4 408:9,18,24	X	457:5 474:11,18	15th 425:20 465:14	25 386:2 418:2,18
409:4,12,24	<u> </u>	yesterday's 377:24	472:8	250,000 466:3
410:24 413:10,25		397:5	16 435:4,6,12,24	26 420:6
417:5,15,24 433:1	yeah 379:4 385:12	YOCHI 374:9	436:3,7,9,10	27 385:14,20
433:14,15 451:10	386:1,13,19 387:1	yzakai@smwlaw	440:23 445:22	28 385:15 414:10
451:15,16 452:24	387:13 388:9,17	374:11	446:14	28C 410:12,17
453:4,21 455:15	389:16 391:14	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	1750 374:5	431:9
455:23 456:2,23	392:10 393:20	ZAKAI 374:9	18 413:3 414:8	29 466:8
457:17,20 458:11	394:9,9 401:24	ZAKAI 374.9	421:5 432:14	3
459:10 467:13,15	403:16 405:18	zero 410:20 411:11	19 377:22 425:5	3 385:15 389:11,15
467:22 473:1	413:7,12,25		19th 472:9	· ·
474:1,2,8 479:19	424:11 427:13	431:14 435:14,16 Zoom 376:8	1st 439:17	30 385:25 386:3,17
witnesses 394:22	428:8 430:3 431:7	Z00III 3/0:8	1TCr 385:14	386:19 401:16
441:9 451:13	431:22 434:5	0	2	445:9 476:14 477:19
452:3 453:14	437:23 452:9,12	05/26/2025 479:23	2 408:22 414:12	
457:19 474:4	455:15 456:2,2	09/25/2025 479:24	2408:22 414:12 434:9,10	30-page 476:21 305 374:14
478:11	457:9 460:3		20 393:12,15 449:3	32 447:4.9
Wizard 435:19	461:20 463:2	1	20 393:12,13 449:3 20- 413:16	32 44 7:4,9 323-1601 374:24
Woodland 372:20	464:12 472:17	1 372:14 376:2	20- 413:16 2000 373:19	
word 435:18 441:3	474:13,24 476:23	387:12,21,22	2000 373:19 2021 453:24	33 434:8,9,10
words 435:22 469:5	477:4,9,18,20,25	402:7 408:12,17	2021 453:24 2022 398:16 399:14	360 373:15,15
work 393:16,16	year 387:8,8,11,12	410:17 411:19		360,000 429:19 372 372:11
394:16 399:8	387:21,22,23,24	412:2,3 418:19	400:2 401:1,3 402:2 421:5,17	
436:11 438:11,11	396:12,13 397:14	426:20 427:7,20	402:2 421:3,17	3727 373:9 376 375:3
457:4,8	400:5 402:4,4,7,9	432:16 443:4	2023 398:16 399:24	377 375:4
worked 436:11	405:21,21,22	444:17 447:6,8	401:1 402:5	37X 424:14
450:19	406:3,12 407:15	460:20 461:1,3	2024 372:14 376:2	38 414:4 437:1,2,5
works 430:19	407:24 408:12,17	1/2 466:8	377:22 425:21	, ,
467:18	408:22 416:6	10 475:14,21	472:8,9 479:20	437:10,12 38.09 412:17
world 388:16	426:14 456:21	100 378:16 416:2	2026 408:23	38X 424:14
worse 407:22	460:1,10,21 461:5	11 385:15,20 427:9	2020 408:23 206 373:20 374:15	391 375:4
worth 442:20	461:17 464:9	428:1		
wouldn't 382:25	469:11,22 473:17	11:06 452:22	20th 465:14 21 400:1 444:18	395 375:6,7 396 374:10
384:12 388:12,12	473:18,22	11:16 451:20	445:8	398 375:7
388:17 424:12	year's 389:1,1	11:30 452:4	21.6 412:7 416:14	396 373:7
434:17 436:13	yearly 469:1	11:45 452:4	420:4 429:5	4
440:25 448:15	years 388:4,6,9,11	11:53 478:13	444:17	4 387:11,23,24
writing 443:11	388:11 405:4	12 389:11,15	2101 374:19	413:7,24 437:11
written 384:19	423:13 430:17	123 399:25	2101 374:19 22 418:2	460:16
422:8	453:16 465:17	13 413:7,18,20		40 445:10
wrong 418:7 443:8	469:15,24 473:20	418:5	22-0014 479:24 22013531 372:25	40128 373:14
450:2,6	Yep 394:3 458:18	1300 374:19	479:23	4012 3 375:14 402 375:8
wrong-headed	yesterday 376:5	132 466:19	23 405:21,22	404 375:10,10
473:22	395:23 396:16	15 460:16 472:14	406:24 418:14	408 375:10,10
wrote 474:25	398:9 404:23	472:21	241-7242 374:6	409 375:13
WUTC 373:4,5	453:9 456:19		4-1-14-4 3 14:0	10,0,0,10
	l	I		I

			Page 500
411 375:13	7		
415 374:11,20			
42 436:24 437:4,6	7 426:20 427:7		
437:10	428:1 433:12		
	444:17		
42's 437:5	70 393:13,14		
43 430:3,7 445:21	475:17 477:16,18		
43.1 428:18 429:7	477:22 478:6		
432:4	750 374:23		
44 429:17	775 374:24		
45 451:25			
450 374:5	8		
453 375:15	8 420:7		
458 375:17	800 373:19		
459 375:18	811 374:14		
464 375:18	89501 374:24		
464-6595 373:20	8T 389:10		
468 375:20,21	8th 479:20		
473 375:21			
479 372:11	9		
495-8620 373:10	9 389:11,15 9:11 376:2		
	94102 374:10		
5 413:7,24 415:9	94612 374:19		
433:12 461:22	97 406:16		
50 374:23 401:16	97201 374:5		
475:20	977-5532 374:20		
503 374:6	98104 373:20		
509 373:10	374:15		
552-7272 374:11	98503 372:21		
586-7777 373:15	98504 373:14		
	99220 373:19		
6	77220 373.7		
6 405:2 406:10,14			
406:18,19,23,25			
407:3 420:7 425:3			
472:14,14,19,21			
60 388:10 449:4			
475:16,17,20,24			
476:1,8 477:19			
60-page 475:14			
621 372:20			
621-0094 374:15			
65 440:8,11 444:3			
664-1188 373:15			
69 477:23			
U7 +11.43			