## Docket Nos. UE-180167 and UG-180168 (Consolidated) - Vol. III

## In the Matter of: Avista Corporation d/b/a Avista Utilities

April 2, 2019



COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



		Page	22		Page 24
	BEFORE THE WASHINGTON		·	1	APPEARANCES (Cont.)
	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION			2	FOR SIERRA CLUB:
	In the Matter of the Petition )Docket Nos. UE-180167 of )and UG-180168			3 4	(Via bridge) MATTHEW GERHART
	)(Consolidated) AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a )				Staff Attorney
	AVISTA UTILITIES )			5	Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
	For an Order Authorizing the ) Company to Revise its Electric )			6	1536 Wynkoop Street, Suite 200
	Book Depreciation Rates and ) Authorizing Deferred Accounting)			7	Denver, Colorado 80202 (510) 847-7721
	Treatment for the Difference ) in Depreciation Expense )			8	matt.gerhart@sierraclub.org
				9	FOR AWEC:
	TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE, VOLUME III			10	(Via bridge)
	Pages 22-48			11	TYLER PEPPLE Davison Van Cleve, PC
	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ANDREW O'CONNELL			12	1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201
	April 2, 2019			13	(503) 241-7242 tcp@dvclaw.com
	10:00 a.m.			14 15	
	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest			16	* * * * *
	Olympia, Washington 98504			17 18	
	REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358			19 20	
	Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840			21 22	
	Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066   Seattle			23	
	(360) 534-9066   Olympia (800) 846-6989   National			24 25	
	www.buellrealtime.com			2.5	
		Page	23		Page 25
1	APPEARANCES			1	OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON; APRIL 2, 2019
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:			2	10:00 A.M.
3	ANDREW O'CONNELL			3	000
4	Utilities and Transportation Commission			4	PROCEEDINGS
5	1300 South Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, Washington 98504			5	
6	(360) 664-1160			6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record.
7	andrew.j.oconnell@utc.wa.gov			7	Good morning. We're here today for a telephonic order
8 9	FOR COMMISSION STAFF: NASH CALLAGHAN			9	clarification conference regarding consolidated Dockets UE-180167 and UG-180168. The time is approximately ten
10	Assistant Attorney General PO Box 40128			10	after 10 o'clock in the morning.
11	Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1187			11	My name is Andrew O'Connell. I'm an
12	nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov			12	administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities
	FOR AVISTA:			13	and Transportation Commission, and I am presiding in
13 14	(Via bridge) DAVID MEYER			14	this matter.
15	LIZ ANDREWS Avista Corporation			15	I am joined in the Commission's hearing room
16	PO Box 3727 Spokane, Washington 99220			16	today by a court reporter, but all parties except Staff
	(509) 495-4316			17	are appearing telephonically.
17 18	patty.hanson@avistacorp.com			18	We are here today to discuss clarification
19	FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: (Via bridge)			19	of Order 04 entered in these dockets on
20	NINA SUETAKE Assistant Attorney General			20 21	March 25th, 2019. Avista has raised a concern, and it
21	Attorney General's Office 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000			21	and Public Counsel requested this order clarification conference.
22	Seattle, Washington 98104			23	This conference is intended to help us
23	(206) 430-2422 ninas@atg.wa.gov			24	understand the concern raised by Avista and help the
24 25				25	parties understand our decision in Order 04. I intend

1 (Pages 22 to 25)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

		1
	Page 26	Page 28
1	to address clarification of Order 04 and hear from the	1 math on it as soon as the order came out, and true
2	parties regarding concerns they may have, but first,	2 enough, that \$104.1 million figure appears over and over
3	let's take appearances beginning with Avista.	3 again in the order reflecting the undepreciated balance
4	MR. MEYER: Thank, Your Honor. David Meyer	4 of Colstrip that is to be recovered in due course.
5	on behalf of Avista.	5 But if if the Colstrip rates are
6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And Commission Staff?	6 depreciation rates, not the recovery, just the
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Assistant Attorney General,	7 depreciation rate, is to change on April 1st along with
8	Nash Callaghan, of behalf of Commission Staff.	8 the other changes of depreciation rates, that will have
9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And Public Counsel?	9 the effect of, as I said in the in the letter,
10	MS. SUETAKE: Nina Suetake on behalf of	10 working down that \$104.1 million balance over the next
11	Public Counsel.	11 12 months assuming the general rate case runs its
12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And the Alliance of	12 course, and we haven't even filed it yet.
13	Western Energy Consumers?	13 So with reasonable assumptions being made,
14	MR. PEPPLE: Tyler Pepple for AWEC.	14 if you were to take the annual impact of that, that's
15	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And Sierra Club?	15 just over \$5 million that the that would come off of
16	MR. GERHART: Matthew Gerhart on behalf of	16 the balance, because it's you're working with a new
17	Sierra Club.	17 Colstrip depreciation rate. And that would serve to
18	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you all for	18 revise downward month by month by month the
19	being here. By way of clarification, I want to start	19 undepreciated balance of 104 million.
20	out by offering some clarification. We approve in Order	20 So that as as a result of the
21	04 the proposed undepreciated balance of Colstrips	hereunder rate case, we will be left with a decision on
22	Colstrip units 3 and 4 of \$104.1 million. We do not	how and what methodology to use to handle what will then
23	approve the method proposed by the parties to recover	be roughly 100 million, actually slightly below \$100
24	this amount, and we will determine that methodology in	<sup>24</sup> million of undepreciated Colstrip plant.
25	the next general rate case.	25 But in the meantime, in the in the
	5	
	Page 27	Page 29
1	_	
1	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3	1 meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,
2	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing	<ol> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> </ol>
2 3	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> </ul>
2 3 4	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> </ul>
2 3	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case.	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer?	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> </ul>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> </ul>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful.	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars.	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or 2025 is the right date to use for end of depreciable	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do have a couple</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or 2025 is the right date to use for end of depreciable life. And, you know, we can't argue about and won't	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do have a couple</li> <li>follow-up questions for you, and I still want to hear</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or 2025 is the right date to use for end of depreciable life. And, you know, we can't argue about and won't argue that it shouldn't be handled in the in the rate	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do have a couple</li> <li>follow-up questions for you, and I still want to hear</li> <li>from the other parties. But in helping me understand</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or 2025 is the right date to use for end of depreciable life. And, you know, we can't argue about and won't argue that it shouldn't be handled in the in the rate case at this point.	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do have a couple</li> <li>follow-up questions for you, and I still want to hear</li> <li>from the other parties. But in helping me understand</li> <li>what Commission's what Avista's concern is, can you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We did not intend for there to be a \$5.3 million loss to Avista, and I am interested in hearing from Avista how such a loss would occur. I am also interested in how Avista's proposed language would modify the Commission's order, as the order already provides for Avista to recover the current level of annual depreciation expense at \$4.5 million until the next general rate case. So let me now turn to the parties to hear from them starting with Avista. Mr. Meyer? MR. MEYER: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And also thank you for agreeing to have this order conference. I think that's very helpful. And then also at the outset, Avista, to be clear, does not otherwise object to to addressing the Colstrip issues in the next rate case. I understand there are apparently, there may or may not be remaining concerns about the use of some tax dollars. Also, there may be some concerns about whether 2027 or 2025 is the right date to use for end of depreciable life. And, you know, we can't argue about and won't argue that it shouldn't be handled in the in the rate	<ul> <li>meantime, we will have essentially the taken earnings,</li> <li>or offset to earnings, the impact of this annual amount</li> <li>of Colstrip depreciation that we will never recover,</li> <li>because we're never we're not going to be recovering</li> <li>any more of the 104 million. So that's a long-winded</li> <li>attempt to at least make the issue in our minds clear.</li> <li>We agree that the parties certainly did</li> <li>not at least not from our vantage point, the parties</li> <li>did not contemplate that the settlement would result in</li> <li>a recovery of other than 104.1 million. So we're in</li> <li>we're sort of mixing and matching the Colstrip issues</li> <li>here in that everything has been kicked over to the</li> <li>general rate case for Colstrip depreciation except for</li> <li>the actual rate itself, which which would still</li> <li>apply, the revised rate would still apply on April 1st.</li> <li>And I don't think anybody intended that, and I suspect</li> <li>the Commission did not intend that either, especially</li> <li>given your opening comments.</li> <li>Does that help or confuse?</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: I do have a couple</li> <li>follow-up questions for you, and I still want to hear</li> <li>from the other parties. But in helping me understand</li> <li>what Commission's what Avista's concern is, can you</li> </ul>

2 (Pages 26 to 29)

		1	
	Page 30		Page 32
1	that you've calculated you would not be able to recover	1	for Colstrip, those rates will assume what has not yet
2	over the next year?	2	been decided or agreed upon, those rates will assume May
3	MR. MEYER: Sure. In fact, there's a much	3	2027 end of useful life. So we're we're sort of
4	better person than I, and that's Liz Andrews in the	4	getting the cart behind behind, before the horse.
5	room, if I might have her give you that very	5	And so it it just doesn't it just doesn't fit
б	explanation.	6	together to presume a depreciation rate, which is based
7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Please.	7	on a matter still at issue, and that is whether 2027 is
8	MS. ANDREWS: Yes, this is Liz Andrews for	8	the appropriate date. Does that help?
9	Avista. The current depreciation rate on a system basis	9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, and I've reviewed
10	equates to a little over \$7 million. Washington share	10	Avista's proposed edits to the order, and to the
11	of that is 5.3 million, I I think it is. By changing	11	appendices, which includes a settlement stipulation, and
12	the depreciation rates to reflect a 2027 depreciable	12	I notice that it remains in the settlement stipulation
13	date, that increases that system depreciation expense	13	that paragraph 15(a), (as read) The company agrees to
14	over 13.7 million.	14	adopt a depreciation schedule for Colstrip units 3 and 4
15	Therefore, on an annual basis, the	15	that assumes a remaining useful life for depreciation
16	difference of additional depreciation expense that we	16	purposes of December 31st, 2027.
17	would begin recording April 1, if these go into effect,	17	So from what I am hearing, I am I
18	would increase expense 6.6 million or the Washington	18	consider this to be only for accounting purposes that
19	share for for the portion that gets Colstrip is	19	you're having this concern; is that correct?
20	additional 4.3 million for Washington and then the	20	MR. MEYER: Well, no, it's it's not just
21	additional million on top of that that gets to the 5.3	21	an accounting on our books. It's it's more than
22	that we're talking about is the Washington share of	22	that. It would have an excess of a \$5 million impact on
23	beginning to depreciate the at the retirement	23	earnings, because if we start accounting on our books
24	obligation that we're currently not recovering from	24	for a depreciation rate for Colstrip as of April 1st,
25	customers.	25	that will have an impact on our depreciation expense,
		l	
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31	1	Page 33
1	So this is all because of increasing the	1	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12
2	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers	2	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is
2 3	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect	2 3	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff.
2 3 4	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019.	2 3 4	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the
2 3 4 5	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is	2 3 4 5	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull
2 3 4 5 6	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable?	2 3 4 5 6	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest	2 3 4 5 6 7	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub of all this, as Liz was explaining, is that we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated balance, and that if that was the goal of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub of all this, as Liz was explaining, is that we're kicking all of Col almost all of Colstrip over to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated balance, and that if that was the goal of the Commission in its in this order, then that goal of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub of all this, as Liz was explaining, is that we're kicking all of Col almost all of Colstrip over to the general rate case, including the 2027 or some other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated balance, and that if that was the goal of the Commission in its in this order, then that goal of finding a way to address the the depreciation on \$104
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub of all this, as Liz was explaining, is that we're kicking all of Col almost all of Colstrip over to the general rate case, including the 2027 or some other date as the end of the depreciable life.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated balance, and that if that was the goal of the Commission in its in this order, then that goal of finding a way to address the the depreciation on \$104 million of plant at the end of the rate case, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So this is all because of increasing the rates compared to what we're recovering from customers today if this if these rate changes went into effect April 1, 2019. Is there do I need to clarify more or is that understandable? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let me let me digest for a moment what you've said. So I think I'd like to ask, then, about the language that Avista has proposed in its letter. MR. MEYER: Yes, it was a simple addition of a short sentence, and this would clarify what and I think it's and you may learn when you canvas the other parties, that there was enough ambiguity in the order as written that people came to different conclusions on this, but I'll let the other parties state their position. But the the language would the simple fix would simply say, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged." So the nub of all this, as Liz was explaining, is that we're kicking all of Col almost all of Colstrip over to the general rate case, including the 2027 or some other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and we will under-recover that for over the next 12 months. So it has a real life dollar impact. This is not just on the books kind of stuff. JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Mr. Meyer, the addition of the sentence into the order, let me pull that up so I can make sure that I read it right, the addition of, "In the meantime, the depreciation rates for Colstrip shall remain unchanged," would that addition mean that what is going to be recovered by the company as it relates to Colstrip would be the \$4.5 million currently in rates, but it would I guess to a certain extent well, let me stop there. Does it mean that if we accept this language, and depreciation rates for Colstrip remain unchanged, would that mean that Avista would continue to recover at \$4.5 million currently in rates? MR. MEYER: It it does, but more importantly is and maybe this clarifies it, is it preserves for a determination in the general rate case. The treatment of the \$104 million of undepreciated balance, and that if that was the goal of the Commission in its in this order, then that goal of finding a way to address the the depreciation on \$104

3 (Pages 30 to 33)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 34		Page 36
1	Because if you otherwise change the depreciation rates	1	MS. ANDREWS: If we were to include the
2	now for Colstrip in advance such a general rate case	2	higher rates April 1, we would depreciation we would
3	determination, then you're going to be working with a	3	depreciate more of that balance down, we would hit
4	lesser number, and I don't think that was what the	4	earnings for that 5.3 million and that \$53.5 million
5	Commission intended.	5	bucket that we were had agreed to recover over the
6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. If if Avista is	6	close of the 35 years, that's the bucket that's going to
7	recovering at a rate of \$4.5 million in annual	7	be reduced and we have no opportunity to recover it.
8	depreciation expense over the next 12 months, would that	8	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I want to be very
9	\$4.5 million not work down that \$104.1 million	9	careful and very clear about what I'm going to say next.
10	undepreciated balance?	10	And I want to be very clear with the parties that Order
11	MS. ANDREWS: It's more to do with the	11	04 makes no decision or determination on the proposed
12	amount that the parties had agreed to that we would	12	methodology if it is presented in the next general rate
13	recover through through current depreciation rates	13	case.
14	over the time period would be that 4.53 over the	14	Order 04 is limited to stating that we do
15	whatever remaining life of the Colstrip. The difference	15	not approve the proposed methodology to recover the \$104
16	was basically going into a the proposal was to go	16	million that the parties have presented and believe that
17	basically almost defer it into a regulatory asset to be	17	because of all the additional issues that involve that
18	recovered over a longer period of time.	18	proposed recovery method, that method would require us
19	Now, I understand that we would be having to	19	to consider other things that would be presented in a
20	propose that methodology in the rate case that it's not	20	general rate case. And I believe that is conveyed
21	what what is being agreed to now, but it still allows	21	through the order.
22	us whatever changes to depreciation rates allows us	22	And, Mr. Meyer and Ms. Andrews, I'm still
23	to put it in that regulatory bucket to be recovered over	23	unsure how it is that if we are not approving the
24	a period of time, different than what we're currently	24	methodology for recovering the \$104 million, how Avista
25	recovering from rates.	25	would not be able to recover that \$104 million in the
	Page 35		Page 37
1	So it does not have the same impact, because	1	future.
2	the intent was to recover the 4.53 from customers	2	MR. MEYER: Let me just take another crack
3	currently in rates, and that amount, through	3	at it. As part of the Order 04, it also approved
4	depreciation, would remain recovered from from rates	4	attachment B or it also had reference to attachment
5	from customers, and any other changes that are	5	B, and and as as you can see in our letter, we
6	associated with that 104.1 million would be recovered	6	made corresponding changes to that attachment which
7	differently through a regulatory asset.	7	otherwise stated before we eliminated this language, it
8	JUDGE O'CONNELL: All right. I understand.	8	provided, (as read) Starting April 1st, 2019, Colstrip
9	And the the parties' proposal in this settlement	9	capital additions will be depreciated at the revised
10	stipulation for recovering the \$104.1 million, we we	10	depreciation rates reflecting a 2027 depreciable life.
11	do not approve, at least at this time. But my	11	And so hence the tension between that which
12	understanding is that there are essentially three	12	talks about a a revised Colstrip depreciation rate
13	buckets from which the parties propose to recover the	13	effective April 1st based on a 2027 end date for
14	\$104.1 million. And as I recall, approximately 39,	14	depreciation purposes.
15	almost \$40 million was from the continued recovery of	15	So if, in fact, that that were to stand,
16	\$4.5 million in annual depreciation expense. Is that	16	i.e., that we would revise the depreciation rates now,
17	what you're referring to, Ms. Andrews?	17	okay, then what we will be arguing about in the rate
18	MS. ANDREWS: Yes, so that that recovery	18	case is not the 104 million, but something \$5 million
10	of the 39.7 million would still be recovered because	19	less than that. So we will we will not have a chance
19		20	to recover that full \$104.1 million regardless of the
20	that's what we're recovering from customers today. What	1	
20 21	is intact is the \$53.5 million bucket of dollars that we	21	methodology employed and agreed on.
20 21 22	is intact is the \$53.5 million bucket of dollars that we had the parties had proposed to recover over over	22	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think I
20 21 22 23	is intact is the \$53.5 million bucket of dollars that we had the parties had proposed to recover over over a longer period of time. That's the bucket that	22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think I understand. Thank you, Mr. Meyer, and thank you,
20 21 22 23 24	is intact is the \$53.5 million bucket of dollars that we had the parties had proposed to recover over over a longer period of time. That's the bucket that actually gets reduced.	22 23 24	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think I understand. Thank you, Mr. Meyer, and thank you, Ms. Andrews.
20 21 22 23	is intact is the \$53.5 million bucket of dollars that we had the parties had proposed to recover over over a longer period of time. That's the bucket that	22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think I understand. Thank you, Mr. Meyer, and thank you,

4 (Pages 34 to 37)

	Page 38	Page 40
1	from them. Commission Staff?	1 Honor. So AWEC submitted a letter agreeing with the
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	2 condition. Our understanding of the order was that it
3	First, Commission Staff agrees with Avista's assessment	<ul> <li>just left everything unchanged with respect to Colstrip</li> </ul>
4	that the effect of the order would be to increase their	4 relative to the how it was treated before the
5	expense by 5.3 million until the next general rate case.	5 depreciation study.
6	Commission Staff's preference would be to	6 So, you know, in essence, so before this
7	amend the order to allow the defer a deferral	7 current depreciation study, the assumed depreciable
8	similar to the alternative that Avista proposes in its	8 lives for Colstrip 3 and 4 were 2034 and 2036
9	letter except that it mentions offsetting the deferral	9 respectively. Our understanding is that the order
10	by 1.5 or 1.6 million based on the electric depreciation	10 maintains those assumed depreciable lives for now until
11	benefits.	11 the general rate case when possibly a different
12	Staff would be in favor of also offsetting	12 depreciable life will be set at that point.
13	by the gas side benefits, because the gas side also	13 And if the if the previous depreciable
14	reduces the annual depreciation expense.	14 lives remain the same at 2034 and 2036 for now, Avista's
15	In general, Staff discourages deferred	15 concern about not being able to recover that incremental
16	accounting, but in this case, I think our position is	16 depreciation expense is resolved. And I think that's
17	that it would be appropriate.	17 the proposal that they are making in terms of the change
18	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Does Staff have a rough	18 to the order that they've proposed. So we don't have an
19	estimate of what the gas side benefits would be it	19 objection to that.
20	proposes to include?	20 I think we would prefer that to a deferral
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: That would be 1.28 million,	21 for a couple of reasons: One, it seems unnecessarily
22	and I believe that that's a figure that's in Order 04.	22 complicated to do a deferral when you could just keep
23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Let	the same rates the same as they are today without going
24	me is there anything else from Staff?	24 through that exercise.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: No, Your Honor.	25 The other is simply that, you know, we tend
	Page 39	Page 41
1		
1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel,	1 to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not
2	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there?	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> </ol>
2 3	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here.	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> </ol>
2 3 4	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead.	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if	<ol> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely.	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition.	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> <li>were there was a proposal and an alternative</li> <li>proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no</li> <li>objection to either of the proposals?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> <li>were there was a proposal and an alternative</li> <li>proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no</li> <li>objection to either of the proposals?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> <li>were there was a proposal and an alternative</li> <li>proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no</li> <li>objection to either of the proposals?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we</li> <li>don't have a position as between what Staff is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> <li>were there was a proposal and an alternative</li> <li>proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no</li> <li>objection to either of the proposals?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we</li> <li>don't have a position as between what Staff is</li> <li>suggesting and and Avista's proposal.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the	1to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not2necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.3Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really4see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would5be AWEC's position.6JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.7And, Mr. Gerhart?8MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So9Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to10seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the11benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection12to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.13JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there14were there was a proposal and an alternative15proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no16objection to either of the proposals?17MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we18don't have a position as between what Staff is19suggesting and and Avista's proposal.20JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the gas impacts as well to sort of offset the deferral for	<ul> <li>to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not</li> <li>necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.</li> <li>Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really</li> <li>see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would</li> <li>be AWEC's position.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>And, Mr. Gerhart?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So</li> <li>Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to</li> <li>seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the</li> <li>benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection</li> <li>to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there</li> <li>were there was a proposal and an alternative</li> <li>proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no</li> <li>objection to either of the proposals?</li> <li>MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we</li> <li>don't have a position as between what Staff is</li> <li>suggesting and and Avista's proposal.</li> <li>JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. MEYER: Your Honor, may I have a chance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the gas impacts as well to sort of offset the deferral for the Colstrip expenses.	1       to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not         2       necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.         3       Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really         4       see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would         5       be AWEC's position.         6       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         7       And, Mr. Gerhart?         8       MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So         9       Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to         10       seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the         11       benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection         12       to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.         13       JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there         14       were there was a proposal and an alternative         15       proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no         16       objection to either of the proposals?         17       MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we         18       don't have a position as between what Staff is         19       suggesting and and Avista's proposal.         20       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         21       MR. MEYER: Your Honor, may I have a chance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the gas impacts as well to sort of offset the deferral for the Colstrip expenses. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	1       to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not         2       necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.         3       Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really         4       see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would         5       be AWEC's position.         6       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         7       And, Mr. Gerhart?         8       MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So         9       Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to         10       seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the         11       benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection         12       to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.         13       JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there         14       were there was a proposal and an alternative         15       proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no         16       objection to either of the proposals?         17       MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we         18       don't have a position as between what Staff is         19       suggesting and and Avista's proposal.         20       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         21       MR. MEYER: Your Honor, may I have a chance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the gas impacts as well to sort of offset the deferral for the Colstrip expenses. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Pepple?	1       to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not         2       necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.         3       Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really         4       see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would         5       be AWEC's position.         6       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         7       And, Mr. Gerhart?         8       MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So         9       Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to         10       seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the         11       benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection         12       to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.         13       JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there         14       were there was a proposal and an alternative         15       proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no         16       objection to either of the proposals?         17       MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we         18       don't have a position as between what Staff is         19       suggesting and and Avista's proposal.         20       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         21       MR. MEYER: Your Honor, may I have a chance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Public Counsel, Ms. Suetake, are you there? MS. SUETAKE: Yes, I'm still here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Please go ahead. MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, Public Counsel issued its letter asking for this clarification conference because after talking to parties, it was clear that it wasn't entirely certain if the order was saying that the the accelerated depreciation rates for Colstrip were going into effect by this order or if the rates would also included would be included in the GRC completely. And since parties weren't in agreement in my discussions with the parties as to how the order actually was going to be implemented, I couldn't actually agree or disagree with your condition. I in speaking to Avista and Staff, I agree with their interpretations of the impact if the accelerated rates are put into effect now, and I have I agree with Staff's recommendation to also defer the gas impacts as well to sort of offset the deferral for the Colstrip expenses. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.	1       to you know, Staff mentioned, you know, that it's not         2       necessarily supportive of these types of deferrals.         3       Normally we would agree with that, and we don't really         4       see a need to implement a deferral here. So that would         5       be AWEC's position.         6       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         7       And, Mr. Gerhart?         8       MR. GERHART: Thank you, Your Honor. So         9       Sierra Club sent its letter of acceptance prior to         10       seeing Avista's letter and, you know, not having the         11       benefit of having seen that, we don't have an objection         12       to the proposal that Avista put forward in its letter.         13       JUDGE O'CONNELL: And is that the there         14       were there was a proposal and an alternative         15       proposal. Are you saying that Sierra Club is has no         16       objection to either of the proposals?         17       MR. GERHART: I think at this point, we         18       don't have a position as between what Staff is         19       suggesting and and Avista's proposal.         20       JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.         21       MR. MEYER: Your Honor, may I have a chance

5 (Pages 38 to 41)

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

	Page 42		Page 44
1	And also thank you, Tyler, for your comments	1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: And that crunch results
2	in support of the amending language in the conditioning	2	from, I'm assuming a couple things; the shortening of
3	paragraph.	3	the depreciable life, and are you is Staff also
4	You know, we we we agreed as an	4	considering the length of time until the end of the
5	alternative to our recommended language that we could on	5	return of approximately \$208 million in protective EVAT
6	the electric side do a deferral. I think I I do	6	benefits?
7	think it unnecessarily complicates things, and it	7	MR. CALLAGHAN: My understanding was that
8	confuses or it can lead to confusion about when and	8	the focus was mostly on the shorter amount of time, the
9	when is it not appropriate to use deferrals, none of	9	first issue.
10	which we need to address if our preferred language is	10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Then I don't see
11	built into the conditioning paragraph.	11	the need to repeat my clarification if the proposed
12	What we do not agree with is that aspect of	12	methodology is not approved. And that I want to
13	what I heard for the first time this morning, that any	13	comment, then, to just restate that, in the order, while
14	deferral would also need to take into account	14	it's not determinative and the Commission doesn't base
15	approximately \$1.3 million on the gas side. I I know	15	its decision on it, we are aware that the depreciable
16	that the parties had discussed that very issue and	16	life for Colstrip may have to change to a time even
17	whether that should be captured in the settlement	17	shorter than 2027. And that's a possibility, but it's
18	agreement or not, and as you can see by on the face	18	not for certain yet, but something that we are conscious
19	of the settlement agreement, it was not.	19	of and aware of.
20	So now we're in a position where this issue	20	Okay. Mr. Meyer, do you have a last word?
21	has migrated over to the gas side and instead of it	21	MR. MEYER: Yes yes, thank you. First of
22	simply being a quick and easy fix on the electric	22	all, again, I think this has been a very helpful
23	depreciation rate implementation date, now it now	23	conference and we appreciate the opportunity to bring
24 25	we're bringing into this the gas piece of this having	24 25	clarity to this.
20	nothing to do with Colstrip.	25	But final word is, if those depreciation
	Page 43		Page 45
1	So that's and and it would be	1	rates become, or allowed by inference to become
2	different if that hadn't been addressed by the parties	2	effective April 1st, then we then the order might as
3	during settlement discussions, but it was. And we did	3	well amend the \$104 million of undepreciated balance and
4	not agree at the time of the settlement to reflect the	4	reduce that downward, because we won't be recovering
5	impact of the hundred and hundred \$1.3 million on	5	that level anymore a year from now. We will be
6	the gas side.	6	recovering less than the the the \$100 million
7	So yes, we would agree to some kind of	7	amount.
8	deferral, but not one that now would pull in 1.3 million	8	So if as you said at the outset of this
9	on the gas side.	9	conference, if the objective here is to kick over to the
10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Let me follow up	10 11	rate case a discussion of methodologies to recover the
11	with Staff briefly. Staff has proposed an alternative to Avista's proposed alternative. What does Staff	12	\$104 million undepreciated balance, well, that's not
10	to Avista's proposed alternative - what does Stall	1 12	what we're talking about anymore. We're talking about
12		1 1 2	loss than a hundred million. So Livet want to be clear
13	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by	13	less than a hundred million. So I just want to be clear
13 14	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista?	14	on that.
13 14 15	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would	14 15	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment.
13 14 15 16	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has	14 15 16	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the
13 14 15 16 17	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to	14 15 16 17	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals,
13 14 15 16 17 18	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the	14 15 16 17 18	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time	14 15 16 17 18 19	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time in which ratepayers would be paying the accelerated	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I will discuss with the Commissioners and we
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time in which ratepayers would be paying the accelerated depreciation. And it would essentially delay the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I will discuss with the Commissioners and we will determine what next step is appropriate. Is there
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time in which ratepayers would be paying the accelerated depreciation. And it would essentially delay the accelerated depreciation for another year, and that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I will discuss with the Commissioners and we will determine what next step is appropriate. Is there anything else from the any of the other parties that
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time in which ratepayers would be paying the accelerated depreciation. And it would essentially delay the accelerated depreciation for another year, and that would create a crunch. And so that's my understanding	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I will discuss with the Commissioners and we will determine what next step is appropriate. Is there anything else from the any of the other parties that we need to address today?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have an opinion or a position on the first proposal by Avista? MR. CALLAGHAN: So Commission Staff would prefer the alternative with the changes that Staff has proposed, in part because if Avista's first proposal to not change the depreciation rates until the end of the GRC is adopted, that provides a shorter amount of time in which ratepayers would be paying the accelerated depreciation. And it would essentially delay the accelerated depreciation for another year, and that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on that. I agree, again, with Tyler's assessment. It's the cleanest way that honors the spirit of the settlement is to simply amend the language. Deferrals, while they're an option, are not our preferred approach. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I will discuss with the Commissioners and we will determine what next step is appropriate. Is there anything else from the any of the other parties that

6 (Pages 42 to 45)

	Page 46		Page 48
1	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Go ahead.	1	CERTIFICATE
2	MS. SUETAKE: I just wanted to say and	2	OERTHTOATE
3	clarify that our position, if Staff's proposal to	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	include the gas expense deferral is not accepted, we	4	COUNTY OF THURSTON
5	would prefer to to just move all Colstrip issues,	5	
6	including the depreciation rates, as suggested by AWEC	6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
7	to the GRC, which would make sense particularly given	7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
8	the concern that the depreciation date might change	8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
9	given the pending bill.	9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
10	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.	10	
11	Is there anything else from the other	11	STOTCA D
12	parties?	12	
13	MR. PEPPLE: Judge O'Connell, just one last	13	Jayler grontinghouse_
14	quick point from AWEC, which is just that, you know,	14	Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
15	Staff mentioned that if, you know, this issue is delayed	15	
16	by another year, that's one less year for, you know,	16	
17	additional depreciation expense to be recovered over.	17	
18	And that's true, but because Avista would then also be	18	
19	deferring the impact, I think it's essentially six one	19	
20	way and half-dozen the other. I don't know that	20	
21	ratepayers are better or worse off either way. So just	21	
22	wanted to make that point.	22	
23	JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Well, if there's	23	
24	nothing else, then we will adjourn for today. Thank you	24	
25	all for your time.	25	
	Page 47		
1	(Adjourned at 10:47 a.m.)		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12 13			
13 14			
$14 \\ 15$			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

7 (Pages 46 to 48)

				Page 49
A	Alliance 26:12	28:7 29:15 30:17	34:10 36:3 45:3	27:23 28:11,21
<b>a.m</b> 22:16 25:2 47:1	<b>allow</b> 38:7	31:4,25 32:24	45:11	29:13 31:23 33:19
ability 48:9	allowed 45:1	36:2 37:8,13 45:2	<b>base</b> 44:14	33:24 34:2,20
able 30:1 36:25	<b>allows</b> 34:21,22	argue 27:21,22	<b>based</b> 32:6 37:13	36:13,20 37:18
40:15	alternative 38:8	arguing 37:17	38:10	38:5,16 40:11
accelerated 39:9,19	41:14 42:5 43:11	asking 39:6	basically 34:16,17	45:10
43:20,22	43:12,16,25	aspect 42:12	basis 30:9,15	<b>CCR</b> 22:20 48:14
accept 33:13	ambiguity 31:14	assessment 38:3	beginning 26:3	certain 33:12 39:8
accept 35.15 acceptance 41:9	amend 38:7 45:3	45:15	30:23	44:18
accepted 46:4	45:17	asset 34:17 35:7	<b>behalf</b> 26:5,8,10,16	certainly 29:7
<b>account</b> 42:14	amending 42:2	Assistant 23:9,20	<b>believe</b> 36:16,20	Certified 48:6
accountants 27:25	amount 26:24 29:2	26:7	38:22	certify 48:8
accounting 22:8	34:12 35:3 43:19	associated 35:6	<b>benefit</b> 41:11	<b>chance</b> 37:19 41:21
32:18,21,23 38:16	44:8 45:7	<b>assume</b> 32:1,2	benefits 38:11,13	<b>change</b> 28:7 34:1
accurate 48:9	Andrew 22:13 23:3	<b>assumed</b> 40:7,10	38:19 44:6	40:17 43:18 44:16
actual 29:14	25:11	assumes 32:15	<b>best</b> 48:9	46:8
addition 31:11 33:5	andrew.j.oconnel	assuming 28:11	<b>better</b> 30:4 46:21	changes 28:8 31:3
33:7,9	23:6	44:2	<b>bill</b> 46:9	34:22 35:5 37:6
additional 30:16,20	Andrews 23:14	assumptions 28:13	Book 22:8	43:16
30:21 36:17 46:17	30:4,8,8 34:11	attachment 37:4,4	books 32:21,23	changing 30:11
additions 37:9	35:17,18 36:1,22	37:6	33:3	clarification 25:8
address 26:1 33:23	37:24	attempt 29:6	Box 23:10,15	25:18,21 26:1,19
42:10 45:23	<b>annual</b> 27:7 28:14	<b>Attorney</b> 23:9,20	bridge 23:13,19	26:20 39:6 44:11
addressed 43:2	29:2,24 30:15	23:21 24:4 26:7	24:3,9	clarifies 33:18
addressing 27:15	34:7 35:16 38:14	Authorizing 22:7,8	<b>briefly</b> 43:11	<b>clarify</b> 31:5,12 46:3
adjourn 46:24	anybody 29:16	<b>Avenue</b> 22:22	bring 44:23	clarity 44:24
Adjourned 47:1	anymore 45:5,12	23:21	bringing 42:24	cleanest 45:16
administrative	apparently 27:17	Avista 22:5,6 23:12	bucket 34:23 35:21	clear 27:15 29:6
22:13 23:2 25:12	appearances 26:3	23:15 25:20,24	35:23 36:5,6	36:9,10 39:8
adopt 32:14	appearing 25:17	26:3,5 27:2,3,6,10	buckets 35:13	45:13
adopt 32.14 adopted 43:19	appears 28:2	27:14 30:9 31:9	<b>Buell</b> 22:21	<b>Cleve</b> 24:11
advance 34:2	appendices 32:11	33:15 34:6 36:24	<b>built</b> 42:11	<b>close</b> 36:6
agree 29:7 39:16,18	apply 29:15,15	38:8 39:17 41:12		Club 24:2,5 26:15
39:20 41:3 42:12	appreciate 44:23	43:14 46:18	C	26:17 41:9,15
43:4,7 45:15	approach 45:18	Avista's 27:4 29:23	C 23:1 24:1 25:4	<b>Col-</b> 31:22
<b>agreed</b> 32:2 34:12	appropriate 32:8	32:10 38:3 40:14	48:1,1	Colorado 24:6
34:21 36:5 37:21	38:17 42:9 45:21	41:10,19 43:12,17	calculated 30:1	Colstrip 26:22
42:4	approve 26:20,23	aware 44:15,19	Callaghan 23:9	27:16 28:4,5,17
agreeing 27:12	35:11 36:15	<b>AWEC</b> 24:9 26:14	26:7,8 38:2,21,25	28:24 29:3,11,13
40:1	approved 37:3	40:1 46:6,14	43:15 44:7	30:19 31:20,22
<b>agreement</b> 39:13	44:12	AWEC's 41:5	<b>canvas</b> 31:13	32:1,14,24 33:8
42:18,19	approving 36:23		capital 37:9	33:10,14 34:2,15
agrees 32:13 38:3	approximately 25:9	B	captured 42:17	37:8,12 39:10,22
<b>abead</b> 39:4 41:24	35:14 42:15 44:5	<b>B</b> 37:4,5	careful 36:9	40:3,8 42:25
46:1	<b>April</b> 22:15 25:1	balance 26:21 28:3	<b>cart</b> 32:4	44:16 46:5
40.1	1	28:10,16,19 33:21	case 26:25 27:8,16	
				I

Page 50				
Colstrips 26:21	contemplate 29:9	<b>deferrals</b> 41:2 42:9	Docket 22:4	46:4,17
come 28:15	continue 33:15	45:17	dockets 25:8,19	expenses 39:22
comment 44:13	continued 35:15	deferred 22:8 38:15	<b>dollar</b> 33:2	explain 29:24
comments 29:18	conveyed 36:20	deferring 46:19	dollars 27:18 35:21	explaining 31:21
42:1	<b>copy</b> 27:24	delay 43:21	downward 28:18	explanation 30:6
Commission 22:2	<b>Corporation</b> 22:5	delayed 46:15	45:4	<b>extent</b> 33:12
22:18 23:4,8	23:15	<b>Denver</b> 24:6	Drive 22:18 23:5	<b>eye</b> 27:24
25:13 26:6,8	correct 32:19	depreciable 27:20	<b>due</b> 28:4	• 
29:17 33:22 34:5	corresponding 37:6	30:12 31:24 37:10		F
38:1,3,6 43:15,24	Counsel 23:18	40:7,10,12,13	E	<b>F</b> 48:1
44:14	25:21 26:9,11	44:3,15	<b>E</b> 23:1,1 24:1,1	face 42:18
Commission's	39:1,5 45:25	depreciate 30:23	25:4,4 48:1,1	fact 30:3 37:15
25:15 27:5 29:23	<b>COUNTY</b> 48:4	36:3	earnings 29:1,2	favor 38:12 43:24
Commissioners	couple 29:20 40:21	depreciated 37:9	32:23 36:4	figure 28:2 38:22
45:20	44:2	depreciation 22:8,9	<b>easy</b> 42:22	<b>filed</b> 28:12
company 22:7	<b>course</b> 28:4,12	27:7 28:6,7,8,17	edits 32:10	<b>final</b> 44:25
32:13 33:10	<b>court</b> 25:16	29:3,13,24 30:9	effect 28:9 30:17	finding 33:23
compared 31:2	<b>crack</b> 37:2	30:12,13,16 31:19	31:3 38:4 39:10	first 26:2 38:3
completely 39:12	<b>create</b> 43:23	32:6,14,15,24,25	39:19	42:13 43:13,17
complicated 40:22	crunch 43:23 44:1	33:7,14,23 34:1,8	<b>effective</b> 37:13 45:2	44:9,21
complicates 42:7	current 27:6 30:9	34:13,22 35:4,16	either 29:17 41:16	<b>fit</b> 32:5
<b>concern</b> 25:20,24	34:13 40:7	36:2 37:10,12,14	46:21	fix 31:19 42:22
29:23 32:19 40:15	currently 29:25	37:16 38:10,14	<b>electric</b> 22:7 38:10	<b>focus</b> 44:8
46:8	30:24 33:11,16	39:9 40:5,7,16	42:6,22	<b>follow</b> 43:10
concerns 26:2	34:24 35:3	42:23 43:18,21,22	eliminated 37:7	<b>follow-up</b> 29:21
27:18,19	customers 30:25	44:25 46:6,8,17	employed 37:21	foregoing 48:8
conclusions 31:16	31:2 35:2,5,20	determination	<b>Energy</b> 26:13	forward 41:12
condition 39:16	D	33:19 34:3 36:11	entered 25:19	Fourth 22:22
40:2		determinative	entirely 39:8	<b>full</b> 37:20
conditioning 42:2	<b>D</b> 25:4	44:14	Environmental	<b>future</b> 37:1
42:11	<b>d/b/a</b> 22:5	determine 26:24	24:5	G
conference 22:11	date 27:20 30:13	45:21	equates 30:10	$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 25:4
25:8,22,23 27:13	31:24 32:8 37:13	difference 22:9	especially 29:17 essence 40:6	Garlinghouse
39:7 44:23 45:9	42:23 46:8 <b>David</b> 23:14 26:4	30:16 34:15		22:20 48:6,14
confuse 29:19	Davison 24:11	different 31:15	essentially 29:1 35:12 43:21 46:19	gas 38:13,13,19
confuses 42:8	<b>December</b> 32:16	34:24 40:11 43:2	estimate 38:19	39:21 42:15,21,24
confusion 42:8	decided 32:2	differently 35:7	<b>EVAT</b> 44:5	43:6,9 46:4
conscious 44:18	decision 25:25	<b>digest</b> 31:7	Evergreen 22:18	general 23:9,20
consider 32:18	28:21 36:11 44:15	disagree 39:16	23:5	26:7,25 27:8
36:19	<b>defer</b> 34:17 39:20	discourages 38:15	excess 32:22	28:11 29:13 31:23
considering 44:4	<b>defer-</b> 38:7	discuss 25:18 45:20	exercise 40:24	33:19 34:2 36:12
consolidated 22:5	<b>deferral</b> 38:7,9	discussed 42:16	expense 22:9 27:7	36:20 38:5,15
25:8	39:21 40:20,22	discussion 45:10	29:24 30:13,16,18	40:11
Consumers 26:13	41:4 42:6,14 43:8	discussions 39:14	32:25 34:8 35:16	<b>General's</b> 23:21
<b>Cont</b> 24:1	43:25 46:4	43:3	38:5,14 40:16	Gerhart 24:4 26:16
	10.20 10.1		20.2,11 10.10	

Page	51
------	----

				1 age 51
26:16 41:7,8,17	46:19	43:10 44:1,10	maintains 40:10	mixing 29:11
getting 32:4		,		8
0 0	impacts 39:21	45:19 46:1,10,13	making 40:17	<b>modify</b> 27:5
give 30:5	implement 31:25	46:23	March 25:20	moment 31:8
given 29:18 46:7,9	41:4	K	matching 29:11	month 28:18,18,18
<b>go</b> 30:17 34:16 39:4	implementation		math 27:25 28:1	months 28:11 33:2
41:24 46:1	42:23	keep 40:22	matt.gerhart@si	34:8
goal 33:21,22	implemented 39:15	kick 45:9	24:7	morning 25:7,10
going 29:4 33:9	importantly 33:18	kicked 29:12	matter 22:4 25:14	42:13
34:3,16 36:6,9	<b>include</b> 36:1 38:20	kicking 31:22	32:7	<b>move</b> 46:5
39:10,15 40:23	46:4	kind 33:3 43:7	Matthew 24:4	
Good 25:7	included 39:11,11	know 27:21 40:6,25	26:16	N
GRC 39:12 43:19	includes 32:11	41:1,1,10 42:4,15	mean 33:9,13,15	N 23:1 24:1 25:4
46:7	including 31:23	46:14,15,16,20	mentioned 41:1	name 25:11
guess 33:11	46:6	knowledge 48:9	46:15	Nash 23:9 26:8
<b>Succes</b> 55.11	<b>increase</b> 30:18 38:4		mentions 38:9	nash.callaghan@
Н	increases 30:13	L	method 26:23	23:11
half-dozen 46:20	increasing 31:1	language 27:4 31:9	36:18,18	National 22:24
handle 28:22	incremental 40:15	31:18 33:14 37:7	,	necessarily 41:2
handled 27:22		42:2,5,10 45:17	methodologies 45:10	need 31:5 41:4
Harbor 24:11	inference 45:1	law 22:13 23:2 24:5		42:10,14 44:11
hear 26:1 27:9	intact 35:21	25:12	methodology 26:24	45:23
29:21 37:25 41:23	intend 25:25 27:1	lead 42:8	28:22 34:20 36:12	never 29:3,4
	29:17	learn 31:13	36:15,24 37:21	,
heard 42:13	intended 25:23	left 28:21 40:3	44:12	new 28:16
hearing 25:15 27:2	29:16 34:5	length 44:4	<b>Meyer</b> 23:14 26:4,4	Nina 23:20 26:10
32:17	intent 35:2	lesser 34:4	27:10,11 30:3	45:24
help 25:23,24 29:19	interested 27:2,4		31:11 32:20 33:4	ninas@atg.wa.gov
32:8	interpretations	let's 25:6 26:3	33:17 36:22 37:2	23:23
helpful 27:13 44:22	39:18	letter 28:9 31:10	37:23 41:21,24,25	Normally 41:3
helping 29:22	<b>involve</b> 36:17	37:5 38:9 39:6	44:20,21	Nos 22:4
hereunder 28:21	issue 29:6 32:7	40:1 41:9,10,12	migrated 42:21	<b>notice</b> 32:12
higher 36:2	42:16,20 44:9	<b>level</b> 27:6 45:5	million 26:22 27:2	<b>nub</b> 31:20
hit 36:3	46:15	life 27:21 31:24	27:7 28:2,10,15	number 33:25 34:4
Honor 26:4 27:11	<b>issued</b> 39:6	32:3,15 33:2	28:19,23,24 29:5	
38:2,25 39:5 40:1	issues 27:16 29:11	34:15 37:10 40:12	29:10,24,25 30:10	0
41:8,21 45:24	36:17 46:5	44:3,16	30:11,14,18,20,21	<b>O</b> 25:4
honors 45:16	JU.17 40.J	limited 36:14	32:22 33:11,16,20	o'clock 25:10
horse 32:4	J	little 30:10		O'Connell 22:13
hundred 43:5,5	<b>joined</b> 25:15	lives 40:8,10,14	33:24 34:7,9,9	23:3 25:6,11 26:6
45:13	judge 22:13 23:2	Liz 23:14 30:4,8	35:6,10,14,15,16	26:9,12,15,18
+3.13	25:6,12 26:6,9,12	31:21	35:19,21 36:4,4	29:20 30:7 31:7
I		LLC 22:21	36:16,24,25 37:18	32:9 33:4 34:6
<b>i.e</b> 37:16	26:15,18 29:20	long-winded 29:5	37:18,20 38:5,10	35:8,25 36:8
<b>III</b> 22:11	30:7 31:7 32:9	longer 34:18 35:23	38:21 42:15 43:5	37:22 38:18,23
	33:4 34:6 35:8,25	0	43:8 44:5 45:3,6	,
<b>impact</b> 28:14 29:2	36:8 37:22 38:18	<b>loss</b> 27:2,3	45:11,13	39:1,4,23 41:6,13
32:22,25 33:2	38:23 39:1,4,23	M	<b>minds</b> 29:6	41:20,23 43:10
35:1 39:18 43:5	41:6,13,20,23			44:1,10 45:19
	I	I	I	I

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Page \$	52
---------	----

46:1,10,13,23	26:2,23 27:9 29:7	previous 40:13	45:10	referring 35:17
<b>000</b> 25:3	29:8,22 31:14,16	<b>prior</b> 41:9	ratepayers 43:20	reflect 30:12 43:4
object 27:15	34:12 35:13,22	Program 24:5	46:21	reflecting 28:3
objection 40:19	36:10,16 37:25	proposal 34:16	rates 22:8 28:5,6,8	37:10
41:11,16	39:7,13,14 42:16	35:9 40:17 41:12	29:25 30:12 31:2	regarding 25:8
objective 45:9	43:2 45:22 46:12	41:14,15,19 43:13	31:20,25 32:1,2	26:2
obligation 30:24	parties' 35:9	43:17 46:3	33:7,11,14,16	regardless 37:20
occur 27:3	patty.hanson@a	proposals 41:16	34:1,13,22,25	regulatory 34:17
offering 26:20	23:17	propose 34:20	35:3,4 36:2 37:10	34:23 35:7
<b>Office</b> 23:21	paying 43:20	35:13	37:16 39:9,11,19	relates 29:25 33:10
offset 29:2 39:21	<b>PC</b> 24:11	proposed 26:21,23	40:23 43:18 45:1	<b>relative</b> 40:4
offsetting 38:9,12	<b>pending</b> 46:9	27:4 31:9 32:10	46:6	remain 31:20 33:8
okay 26:18 34:6	<b>people</b> 31:15	35:22 36:11,15,18	read 32:13 33:6	33:14 35:4 40:14
35:25 36:8 37:17	<b>Pepple</b> 24:10 26:14	40:18 43:11,12,17	37:8	remaining 27:18
37:22 38:23 39:1	26:14 39:24,25	44:11	real 33:2	32:15 34:15
39:4,23 41:6,20	46:13	proposes 38:8,20	really 41:3	remains 32:12
41:25 43:10 44:10	period 34:14,18,24	protective 44:5	Realtime 22:21	repeat 44:11
44:20 45:19 46:23	35:23	provided 37:8	reason 27:24	<b>REPORTED</b> 22:20
<b>Olympia</b> 22:19,23	person 30:4	provides 27:6	reasonable 28:13	reporter 25:16 48:7
23:5,10 25:1	Petition 22:4	43:19	reasons 40:21	Reporting 22:21
opening 29:18	piece 42:24	<b>Public</b> 23:18 25:21	recall 35:14	requested 25:21
opinion 43:13	plant 28:24 33:24	26:9,11 39:1,5	recommendation	require 36:18
opportunity 36:7	<b>Please</b> 30:7 39:4	45:25	39:20	resolved 40:16
44:23	<b>PO</b> 23:10,15	<b>pull</b> 33:5 43:8	recommended 42:5	respect 40:3
option 45:18	point 27:23 29:8	purposes 32:16,18	record 25:6	respectively 40:9
order 22:7 25:7,19	40:12 41:17 46:14	37:14	recording 30:17	respond 41:22
25:21,25 26:1,20	46:22	put 34:23 39:19	recover 26:23 27:6	restate 44:13
27:5,5,12 28:1,3	portion 30:19	41:12	29:3 30:1 33:16	result 28:20 29:9
31:15 32:10 33:5	Portland 24:12		34:13 35:2,13,22	results 44:1
33:22 36:10,14,21	<b>position</b> 31:17	Q	36:5,7,15,25	retirement 30:23
37:3 38:4,7,22	38:16 41:5,18	questions 29:21	37:20 40:15 45:10	return 44:5
39:8,10,14 40:2,9	42:20 43:13 46:3	quick 27:25 42:22	recovered 28:4	reviewed 32:9
40:18 44:13 45:2	possibility 44:17	46:14	33:9 34:18,23	revise 22:7 28:18
<b>Oregon</b> 24:12	possibly 40:11		35:4,6,19 46:17	37:16
outset 27:14 45:8	prefer 40:20 43:16	R	recovering 29:4	revised 29:15 37:9
	46:5	<b>R</b> 23:1 24:1 25:4	30:24 31:2 34:7	37:12
P	preference 38:6	48:1	34:25 35:10,20	right 27:20 33:6
<b>P</b> 23:1,1 24:1,1	preferred 42:10	raised 25:20,24	36:24 45:4,6	35:8
25:4	45:18	rate 26:25 27:8,16	recovery 28:6	room 25:15 30:5
Pages 22:12	presented 36:12,16	27:22 28:7,11,17	29:10 35:15,18	rough 38:18
paragraph 32:13	36:19	28:21 29:13,14,15	36:18	roughly 28:23
42:3,11	preserve 33:25	30:9 31:3,23 32:6	reduce 45:4	runs 28:11
Park 22:18 23:5	preserves 33:19	32:24 33:19,24	reduced 35:24 36:7	
part 37:3 43:17	presiding 25:13	34:2,7,20 36:12	<b>reduces</b> 38:14	S
particularly 46:7	presume 32:6	36:20 37:12,17	reference 37:4	<b>S</b> 23:1 24:1 25:4
parties 25:16,25	• ·	38:5 40:11 42:23		saying 39:9 41:15
	l	l	I	I

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

<b>F</b>				
schedule 32:14	43:11,11,12,15,16	telephonic 22:11	<b>types</b> 41:2	30:22 48:3,7
Seattle 22:22,23	43:24 44:3 46:15	25:7	typts +1.2	wasn't 39:8
23:22	<b>Staff's</b> 38:6 39:20	telephonically	U	wash (3).8 way 24:11 26:19
see 37:5 41:4 42:18	46:3	25:17	<b>UE-180167</b> 22:4	33:23,25 45:16
44:10	stand 37:15	ten 25:9	25:9	46:20,21
seeing 41:10	start 26:19 32:23	tend 40:25	UG-180168 22:4	we're 25:7 29:4,4
seen 41:11	starting 27:10 37:8	tension 37:11	25:9	29:10,11 30:22,24
<b>sense</b> 46:7	state 31:17 48:3,7	terms 40:17	unchanged 31:20	31:2,21 32:3,3
sense 40.7 sent 41:9	stated 37:7	thank 26:4,18	33:8,15 40:3	34:24 35:20 42:20
sentence 31:12 33:5	stating 36:14	27:11,12 37:23,23	undepreciated	42:24 45:12,12
serve 28:17	step 45:21	38:2,23 39:23,25	26:21 28:3,19,24	went 31:3
set 40:12	stipulation 32:11	39:25 41:6,8,20	33:20 34:10 45:3	weren't 39:13
settlement 29:9	32:12 35:10	41:25 42:1 44:21	45:11	Western 26:13
32:11,12 35:9	stop 33:12	45:19 46:10,24	under-recover 33:1	word 44:20,25
42:17,19 43:3,4	<b>Street</b> 24:6	<b>things</b> 36:19 42:7	understand 25:24	woru 44.20,23 work 34:9
45:17		44:2	25:25 27:16 29:22	working 28:10,16
<b>share</b> 30:10,19,22	<b>study</b> 40:5,7 <b>stuff</b> 33:3	<b>think</b> 27:13 29:16	34:19 35:8 37:23	34:3
share 30.10,19,22 short 31:12	sum 55.5 submitted 40:1	30:11 31:8,13	understandable	34.3 worse 46:21
	Sublitted 40.1 Suetake 23:20	34:4 37:22 38:16	31:6	worse 40:21 written 31:15
<b>shortening</b> 44:2 <b>shorter</b> 43:19 44:8	26:10,10 39:2,3,5	40:16,20 41:17	understanding	www.buellrealti
44:17	45:24,25 46:2	40:10,20 41:17 42:6,7 44:22	35:12 40:2,9	22:25
<b>Shorthand</b> 48:6	<b>suggested</b> 46:6	42.0,7 44.22 46:19	43:23 44:7	
side 38:13,13,19	suggesting 41:19	<b>three</b> 35:12	units 26:22 32:14	Wynkoop 24:6
42:6,15,21 43:6,9	41:22	THURSTON 48:4	unnecessarily	X
<b>Sierra</b> 24:2,5 26:15	<b>Suite</b> 22:22 23:21	time 25:9 34:14,18	40:21 42:7	
26:17 41:9,15	24:6,11	34:24 35:11,23	<b>unsure</b> 36:23	Y
similar 38:8	support 42:2	42:13 43:4,19	use 27:18,20 28:22	year 30:2 43:22
simple 31:11,18	supportive 41:2	44:4,8,16 46:25	42:9	45:5 46:16,16
simple 31:11,18 simply 31:19 40:25	supportive 41.2 sure 30:3 33:6	today 25:7,16,18	<b>useful</b> 32:3,15	years 36:6
42:22 45:17	suspect 29:16	31:3 35:20 40:23	<b>Utilities</b> 22:2,6,18	
six 46:19	SW 23:5 24:11	45:23 46:24	23:4 25:12	Z
skill 48:9	system 30:9,13	<b>top</b> 30:21		
slightly 28:23	<b>System</b> 50.7,15	transcript 48:8	V	$\frac{0}{0.125,10,25,25,1,21}$
<b>soon</b> 28:1	Т	Transportation	<b>Van</b> 24:11	<b>04</b> 25:19,25 26:1,21
sort 29:11 32:3	<b>T</b> 48:1,1	22:2,18 23:4	vantage 29:8	36:11,14 37:3
39:21	take 26:3 28:14	25:13	<b>VOLUME</b> 22:11	38:22
South 22:18 23:5	37:2 42:14	<b>treated</b> 40:4		1
South 22:18 23:3	taken 29:1	treatment 22:9	W	$\frac{1}{130:1731:436:2}$
speaking 39:17	talking 30:22 39:7	33:20	want 26:19 29:21	<b>1.28</b> 38:21
<b>spirit</b> 45:16	45:12,12	<b>true</b> 28:1 46:18	36:8,10 44:12	<b>1.20</b> 58.21 <b>1.3</b> 42:15 43:5,8
<b>Spokane</b> 23:16	talks 37:12	48:8	45:13	<b>1.5</b> 42.15 45.5,8 <b>1.5</b> 38:10
<b>Staff</b> 23:8 24:4	tax 27:18	<b>turn</b> 27:9 37:25	wanted 46:2,22	<b>1.6</b> 38:10
25:16 26:6,8 38:1	<b>Tayler</b> 22:20 48:6	<b>Tyler</b> 24:10 26:14	Washington 22:1	<b>10</b> 25:10
38:3,12,15,18,24	48:14	42:1	22:18,19,22 23:5	<b>10:23</b> .10 <b>10:00</b> 22:16 25:2
39:17 41:1,18,22	tcp@dvclaw.com	<b>Tyler's</b> 45:15	23:10,16,22 25:1	<b>10:00</b> 22:10 25:2 <b>10:47</b> 47:1
57.17 71.1,10,22	24:13	<b>L JUL S T J . L J</b>	25:12 30:10,18,20	IV.T/ T/.1

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Page 54

100 28:23,23 45:6 **39** 35:14 23:10 **104** 28:19 29:5 **39.7** 35:19 **99220** 23:16 33:20,23 36:15,24 4 36:25 37:18 45:3 **4** 26:22 32:14 40:8 45:11 **4.3** 30:20 **104.1** 26:22 28:2,10 **4.5** 27:7 29:24 29:10 34:9 35:6 33:10,16 34:7,9 35:10,14 37:20 35:16 **12** 28:11 33:1 34:8 **4.53** 34:14 35:2 **13.7** 30:14 40 35:15 **1300** 22:18 23:5 **40128** 23:10 **1325** 22:22 **430-2422** 23:22 **15(a)** 32:13 **450** 24:11 **1536** 24:6 **495-4316** 23:16 **1750** 24:11 **1840** 22:22 5 **1st** 28:7 29:15 **5** 28:15 32:22 37:18 31:25 32:24 37:8 **5.3** 27:1 29:25 37:13 45:2 30:11,21 36:4 38:5 2 **503** 24:12 **2** 22:15 25:1 **509** 23:16 **200** 24:6 **510** 24:7 2000 23:21 **53.5** 35:21 36:4 **2019** 22:15 25:1,20 **534-9066** 22:23 31:4 37:8 5th 23:21 **2025** 27:20 **2027** 27:19 30:12 6 31:23 32:3,7,16 **6.6** 30:18 37:10,13 44:17 **664-1160** 23:6 2034 40:8,14 664-1187 23:11 2036 40:8,14 **206** 22:23 23:22 7 **208** 44:5 7 30:10 **22-48** 22:12 **241-7242** 24:12 8 **25th** 25:20 800 22:24 23:21 **287-9066** 22:23 **80202** 24:6 **846-6989** 22:24 3 **847-7721** 24:7 **3** 26:22 32:14 40:8 **31st** 32:16 9 3358 22:20 48:14 **97201** 24:12 35 36:6 **98101** 22:22 360 22:23 23:6,11 **98104** 23:22 **3727** 23:15 **98504** 22:19 23:5