Docket Nos. UE-190334, UG-190335, and UE-190222 (Consolidated) - Vol. III

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

October 28, 2019



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 131 Page 133 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON 1 SPOKANE, WASHINGTON; OCTOBER 28, 2019 UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 2 5:58 P.M.) DOCKETS UE-190334, UG-190335 3 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND -000-TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,) and UE-190222 (Consolidated) 4 **PROCEEDINGS** 5 Complaint, 6 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Good evening, everyone, and 7 thank you for coming out on what appears to be a cold AVISTA CORPORÁTION, d/b/a 8 evening. I wasn't expecting that, but we're glad to be here AVISTA UTILITIES, 9 at the Northeast Community Center. And this is the public Respondent.) 1.0 comment hearing in the general rate case that was filed by 11 Avista on April 30th, 2019. And just for the record, this PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING VOLUME III 12 is Docket UE-190334 and UG-190335. Pages 131-161 13 My name is Dave Danner. I'm the chair of the Utilities CHAIRMAN DAVE DANNER PRESIDING 14 and Transportation Commission. And I am joined by my October 28, 2019 15 colleagues, Commissioner Ann Rendahl and Commissioner Jay 6:00 P.M. 16 Balasbas, and our purpose tonight is to hear from members of Northeast Community Center 17 the public, customers of Avista, for their thoughts about 4001 North Cook Street 18 the proposal that we have before us from Avista. Spokane, Washington 99207 19 As I mentioned, on April 30th, 2019, Avista filed a 20 request with the Washington Utilities and Transportation TRANSCRIBED BY: Shanna Barr, CET 21 Commission to increase its rates for electric, natural Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 22 gas -- for electric and natural gas service for the next two 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 23 (206) 287-9066 I Seattle 24 In the first year, the company proposes an electric rate (360) 534-9066 I Olympia (800) 846-6989 I National 25 increase of 45.8 million and a gas rate increase of www.buellrealtime.com Page 132 Page 134 1 COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT 1 12.9 million, and these would be, respectively, a 2 Chairman David Danner 2 9.1 percent increase for electricity, and a 13.8 percent 3 Commissioner Jay Balasbas 3 increase for gas. 4 Commissioner Ann Rendahl 4 In the second year, the company proposes to increase 5 5 electric rates by an additional 18.9 million, an increase 6 PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS 6 of -- I'm sorry -- and natural gas rates by 6.5 million. So 7 PAGE 7 for the electric bill, that would be a 9.8 percent increase, 8 Mike Bell, Northwest Citizens Power Coalition Treasurer..... 5 8 and for the gas, that would be a 9.9 increase in the first 9 Lucy Lepinski, Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners COO...... 11 9 year. In the second year, the increase would be an 10 Ed Duhaime......14 10 additional 3.9 percent for electricity and 5 percent for 11 11 gas. And so if I didn't get that right, I will expect the 12 12 Brian Henning......17 company to correct me, but I believe that those are correct 13 Mavis Barnes...... 21 13 numbers. 14 Stacy Cossey......23 So the way the UTC processes work is the three of us sit 14 15 Pat McCormick......24 15 as judges. The utility makes a request, submits a proposal, 16 and submits the supporting testimony. We then have -- we go 16 17 17 into an adjudicatory proceeding, where the company is just 18 18 one party among many. There are other -- the customers are 19 19 represented and the public is represented by the Public 20 20 Counsel Unit of the Attorney General's Office. We also have 21 21 certain other groups, such as industrial customers and 2.2 2.2 environmental groups who participate. 23 23 But tonight, our purpose is to hear directly from 2.4 24 customers who are concerned or interested in the proposal 2.5 25 the company has to make, and so tonight we will be listening

1 (Pages 131 to 134)

	Page 135		Page 137
1	to you about your thoughts about what the company is	1	At issue today is the commissioners' consideration of the
2	proposing.	2	Avista rate increase, and we offer the following comments:
3	We will make the decision we have 11 months by statute	3	The Idaho Utility Commission approved a 2.9 percent
4	to make our decision, and so that will be the longest time	4	electric rate increase effective October 1, with an average
5	we will take to render a decision in this case.	5	bill going up by \$2.40. The Idaho rate is well below or
6	So unless my colleagues have anything to say, what I'd	6	rate increase is well below the recommended Washington
7	like to do is just open it up for testimony. I see we have	7	electric rate increase of, as I computed, 5.1 percent, which
8	a number of people signed up tonight, and I will start just	8	would add to the monthly residential rate about \$4.72. So
9	in the order that people have signed up.	9	the amounts that were approved by the Idaho commission were
10	So let's start with Mr. Mike Bell.	10	roughly half, or less than half, of what's being recommended
11	MR. BELL: Do you have a preference which seat I take?	11	by staff, and we'd like to know why Avista's Washington
12	CHAIRMAN DANNER: No. You take any seat you want. We	12	electric customers are paying more than Idaho electric
13	only have one microphone, so you and us, we are going to	13	customers for essentially the same electricity.
14	share.	14	The Oregon Utility Commission approved a 4.2 percent gas
15	MR. BELL: Oh, I thought that one might be	15	rate increase effective October 8, 2019, with an average
16	CHAIRMAN DANNER: That one won't do much for you, so	16	monthly residential increase of \$2.19. The Oregon rate
17	MR. BELL: Okay. Well, thank you for coming to Spokane,	17	increase is well below the recommended Washington gas rate
18	and I appreciate you all having your meeting in the evening	18	increase of 6.4 percent, according to my calculations. And
19	when normal working people can show up and give their	19	so we would again like to know why Washington Avista gas
20	opinion if they so choose. Too many of these commission	20	customers are paying more than Idaho gas customers for
21	hearings are during the day, and a lot of people complain	21	essentially the same natural gas.
22	about the fact they can't show up or they have to take off	22	When NWCPC was denied intervener status by the Washington
23	from work.	23	Utility Commission, we received assurances from the
24	My name is Mike Bell. I'm the treasurer for the Northwest	24	Washington Attorney General's Office that they would provide
25	Citizens Power Coalition, NWCPC. Our members are all Avista	25	staff and they provide staff to the Utility Commission
	Daga 126		Daga 120
	Page 136		Page 138
1	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the	1	that they would make every effort to safeguard the
2	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer	2	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader
2	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We	2	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the
2 3 4	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation	2 3 4	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final
2 3 4 5	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to	2 3 4 5	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high.
2 3 4 5 6	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent	2 3 4 5 6	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is
2 3 4 5 6 7	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One.	2 3 4 5 6 7	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following statement was made: "Having found that the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven months ago. At that time, the Avista price was trading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following statement was made: "Having found that the proposed transaction did not make customers better off than they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven months ago. At that time, the Avista price was trading share price was trading as \$40.63. In the seven short
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following statement was made: "Having found that the proposed transaction did not make customers better off than they would have" "they would be without it, we conclude as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven months ago. At that time, the Avista price was trading share price was trading as \$40.63. In the seven short months since the rate process started, Avista's share price
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following statement was made: "Having found that the proposed transaction did not make customers better off than they would have" "they would be without it, we conclude as a matter of law that the proposed transaction does not provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven months ago. At that time, the Avista price was trading share price was trading as \$40.63. In the seven short months since the rate process started, Avista's share price has increased by 17 percent to 47.62. That represents an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ratepayers. Our organization was formed as a result of the previous request by Avista to get permission to transfer ownership through sale or merger to Hydro One. We appreciate the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission commissioners for doing a thorough job to get to the bottom of the Hydro One request and your subsequent denial of their request to transfer ownership to Hydro One. I need to mention at this time we are disappointed, too, that the UTC staff and other organizations that have been granted petitions to intervene on behalf of the customers, to safeguard the Avista customers and the broader public interest, because they recommended that the Hydro One Avista deal go through. And I was, personally, and a lot of our members were totally appalled by that recommendation coming from staff and coming from the other interveners. We believe the organizations' granted intervener status should have done a much better job to safeguard the Avista customers and the broad er public interest. In the UTC's denial of that request, the following statement was made: "Having found that the proposed transaction did not make customers better off than they would have" "they would be without it, we conclude as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that they would make every effort to safeguard the customer the Avista customers' interests and the broader public interest. And we believe the UTC has reduced the original Avista rate request substantially, but the final recommended rate increase is still too high. Included in the rate increase arguments that Avista is that Avista shareholders must receive an equitable rate of return for their investment to ensure that Avista can attract investors in the future. The original request was for a 9.5 percent return for their shareholders. A 9 percent 9.5 percent return for shareholders investing in a utility is ridiculous because Avista has a monopoly on the local utilities, and that return to the shareholders is pretty much guaranteed. In this day and time, 9.5 percent for an investment is substantially more than Avista needs to attract shareholders in the future, and the even though the WUTC staff reduced the rate of return to approximately 9 percent, in our opinion, it's still way too high. The Avista rate process began back in April of 2019, seven months ago. At that time, the Avista price was trading share price was trading as \$40.63. In the seven short months since the rate process started, Avista's share price

Page 139 Page 141 1 reduce operating costs in other areas. Cooperatives have 1 value, or increase in stock value, would be about 5 percent 2 2 per year, or 2.9 percent over a seven-month period, not 17 better customer satisfaction, lower rates, and better 3 3 infrastructure than investor-owned utilities, and it's -- it 4 4 The primary reason why Avista's share price would go up by is the -- it is past time that we make this change. 5 5 more than 17 percent is because they anticipate a rate And I provided the commission with a copy of this, and so 6 6 increase that is substantially more than the investors are that's my testimony. 7 7 expecting and, in my opinion, overly generous. In fact, the Thank you for your time. 8 price has increased -- or increase also suggests that there 8 CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you. And you provided 9 9 that to (inaudible). is no shortage of investors for Avista stock. 10 10 What type of rate increase should the commissions -- or All right. Thank you. 11 the WUTC commissioners approve to keep Avista's share price 11 Carol Welsh (phonetic), you do not wish to testify? 12 increase at a reasonable amount of 5 percent annually? I 12 Lucy Lepinski. think that the UTC staff have missed the mark and should 13 MS. LEPINSKI: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is 13 14 14 consider granting a rate increase for both electric and gas Lucy Lepinski, and I serve as the COO of Spokane 15 15 rates that is closer to half the currently recommended Neighborhood Action Partners, better known as SNAP. 16 16 amount or 9. -- or 2.9 percent for electric and 3.2 for gas. For over 50 years, SNAP has served as the Spokane area 17 17 Finally, it's my opinion that the process of increasing community action agency. In 2018, we served 45,124 18 utility rates in Washington, Idaho, and Oregon are overly 18 unduplicated individuals through nearly 30 programs aimed at 19 generous and have been for the last decade. And November --19 either stabilizing low-income individuals or equipping them 20 on November 1, 2009, Avista's share price was less than 20 to exit poverty. 21 21 \$19 per share, as compared to the current price of close to I share three recommendations today: That 150 percent of 22 \$48 a share. This is a 150 percent increase in the share 22 the federal poverty limit should increase for LIRAP, that 23 23 the LIRAP plan shouldn't change, and that the low-income price. It also reflects an increase in the shareholder 24 24 stock value of almost \$1.9 billion in the last ten years, weatherization budget should increase. 25 and the vast majority of this is due to rate increases that 25 In 2018, SNAP provided energy assistance to 11,999 Page 140 Page 142 1 have been approved and -- by the various commissions. 1 low-income households through a mix of public, private, and 2 2 ratepayer dollars. Avista customers with income at or below Since Avista's primary source of revenue is the 3 150 percent of the federal poverty level are eligible for 3 ratepayers, it clearly indicates that the ratepayers will 4 bill assistance through LIRAP. Other measures of need 4 eventually be required to repay the shareholders' equity in 5 5 the form of higher utility rates. This is another indicate that the federal poverty level is a conservative 6 indication that the rate setting process has been overly 6 metric for measuring poverty. For example, the 7 generous for a decade and is broken. It needs to stop. At 7 Self-Sufficiency Standard that was developed at the 8 8 University of Washington measures how much income families a 5 percent rate of return on equity for the last ten years, 9 9 Avista's share price would be approximately \$31 a share, not of various size need to make ends meet without assistance. 10 48, and perhaps a zero percent rate increase to shareholders 10 If the Self-Sufficiency Standard is used, 200 percent of the 11 poverty level is a more accurate measure of poverty. Per 11 should be approved until the utility's share price returns 12 to a reasonable level. 12 the Spokane Regional Health District, in 2010, more than 13 3 in 10, or 34 percent of Spokane County residents lived 13 In conclusion, there are members of the Avista rate 14 14 setting community that believe that the Inland Northwest has below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. The 15 15 outgrown its need for investor-owned utilities. We believe proportion of Spokane residents living below that level was 16 significantly higher than the statewide percentage of 30 16 that Avista should be converted to a ratepayer-owned 17 17 cooperative with a primary focus on ratepayers' well being, percent. SNAP serves 7,213 households with LIRAP funds in 2018. 18 as opposed to shareholders' well being. If a lower rate of 18 19 19 return of investment is not acceptable to the Avista LIRAP is currently operating under a five-year plan approved 20 shareholders, then the Avista shareholders need to know that 20 by the commission in 2015. It is SNAP's opinion that there 21 there are ratepayers waiting in the wings to operate Avista 21 is no need to modify the LIRAP program plan or formula at 2.2 22 this time. SNAP recommends that the commission extend the as a co-op and eliminate the need for outside investment. 23 23 LIRAP plan formula for the duration of any rate plan This type of conversion would eliminate \$100 million of 24 24 dividends going to investors, primarily in New York City, approved. 25 25 Let me tell you about Amy here in Spokane. She previously eliminate income tax, eliminate costly advertising, and

	Page 143		Page 145
1	owned two small businesses which ceased operations when she	1	That said, I would note that the Public Counsel is in the
2	was bedridden with a rare blood disorder. Her husband lost	2	audience and
3	his job as well, and they both faced financial crisis. A	3	Nina Suetake, do you want to raise your hand, from Public
4	community worker informed them about SNAP's energy	4	Counsel?
5	assistance, which provided critical support that winter and	5	In addition, there are several representatives of the
6	the next. These funds kept their power from being shut off.	6	company. So I would start with the questions there. We
7	Amy now has become a project share donor as a way of giving	7	also have commission staff here. They will probably have to
8	thanks.	8	refer your question to our expert staff. But we're not
9	SNAP weatherized 246 low-income homes in 2018 and received	9	going to get we're not going to engage that, and it's
10	2,337 inquiries about weatherization. Growing the available	10	just basically the nature of the proceeding.
11	budget for weatherization would allow for more households to	11	MR. DUHAIME: Okay.
12	mitigate the increase in their rates as a result of this	12	CHAIRMAN DANNER: So I appreciate the questions. I just
13	case. It will also help to expand services to as yet	13	am not in a position to answer them.
14	unserved customers. SNAP has a wait list of 487 households	14	MR. DUHAIME: So are you taking any questions at all, even
15	interested in weatherization.	15	about the rates?
16	SNAP supports The Energy Project's recommendation to	16	CHAIRMAN DANNER: No.
17	increase the low-income weatherization budget, allow for	17	MR. DUHAIME: Okay.
18 19	additional repairs, and increase the health and safety	18 19	MR. BELL: You can make a statement. MR. DUHAIME: Yes.
20	measures allocation to 30 percent.	20	
21	Allow me to tell you about Connie. She is a client whose	21	CHAIRMAN DANNER: You can make a statement. And, again, the staff, the company, and Public Counsel are here for the
22	husband fell on poor health. Her home was inefficient and hiked her utility bills. SNAP did a great job weatherizing	22	questions.
23	her home. And now, gone are the days when she had to choose	23	MR. DUHAIME: Okay. All right.
24	between a warm home or her husband's medications.	24	CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you.
25	Lastly, thank you for holding a hearing hear in Spokane	25	Pauline Druffel.
	Page 144		Page 146
1	and in the evening and for the effort you make to set fair,	1	MS. DRUFFEL: Thank you.
2	just, reasonable, and sufficient rates.	2	Good evening. Good evening. I am Pauline Druffel, and I
3	Thank you.	3	reside here in Spokane. I am grateful that you have come to
4	CHAIRMAN DANNER: Thank you, Ms. Lepinski. Thank you for	4	Spokane to hear our voices related to Avista's requested
5	the work that you and SNAP do.	5	rate increase, and I am grateful that you take our concerns
6	All right. Next, Ed Duhaime. Did I get that right?	6	into consideration as you evaluate the rate increases.
7	MR. DUHAIME: Duhaime.	7	I actually hope you do not give Avista the increase they
8	CHAIRMAN DANNER: Duhaime.	8	are currently asking for. It seems to me they, as a policy,
9	MR. DUHAIME: Yes.	9	would like the rates to go up each year. This can be
10	CHAIRMAN DANNER: Okay. Just, is it H-A-I-N-E or	10	especially hard on low-income elderly folks or on families
11	MR. DUHAIME: M.	11	just caring to survive in their homes. And you've already
12	CHAIRMAN DANNER: M-E. Okay.	12	heard from the representative from SNAP, so I'm not going to
13	Come forward if you'd like to address us.	13	go into that.
14	MR. DUHAIME: I just have a question or two. One question	14	My primary focus today is my concern that Avista and the
15	is: Does the commission have a way to independently check	15	other owners of the Colstrip coal power plant are going to
16	on the quality of the infrastructure for Avista? Is there	16	keep trying to prop up this plant, in spite of the fact that
17	an independent like auditing of the you know, that's	17	the burning of coal is adding to global warming. And in
18	because what I understand, that the like the co-ops that	18	addition, our 2019 Washington state legislature passed the
19 20	surround Avista have a better infrastructure than Avista	19	100 percent clean energy bill, which requires that by 2025
21	has. CHAIRMAN DANNER: So let me Lusually set the ground	20 21	no coal-based electricity be sold in Washington state.
22	CHAIRMAN DANNER: So let me I usually set the ground rules at the very beginning. Because we are an adjudicative	21	For many years, citizens of Spokane, myself included, have
23	body and this is an adjudicative hearing at the time, we	23	been working at getting Avista to divest itself of this fossil fuel-burning plant. We are very pleased with the
	don't we take all questions as rhetorical, and we don't	24	state legislature's action. We surely don't want to now
24			
24 25	actually get into a give-and-take here.	25	have increased Avista rates to pay for capital expenses

	5 145		D 140
	Page 147		Page 149
1	aimed at buttressing up Colstrip, especially as renewable	1	ratepayers to pay for the expenses related to extending the
2	energy gets cheaper, cheaper than coal.	2	life of Colstrip beyond 2025. Why should it be that
3	Another issue is the reality that Colstrip is a toxic	3	Washington Avista customers should be bearing the costs of
4	waste site. Its coal ash ponds were not properly lined, and	4	investments that they will not benefit from? I would hope
5	the water has leaked out from them and polluted the water	5	that UTTC would ask Avista to commit to immediately ramping
6	all around the town and out into the country, where ranchers	6	down all unnecessary operations and maintenance funding, and
7	have depended upon that water for their cattle.	7	systematically eliminate any new capital expense funding for
8	Avista and the other owners of Colstrip surely should not	8	Colstrip.
9	be allowed to walk away from the mess that they have made in	9	Second, Avista should make clear the financial
10	that part of Montana. For years, many concerned citizens	10	implications to ratepayers of the bankrupt Rosebud Mine that
11	have been pointing out the travesty of what has been	11	supplies Colstrip and the expected cost increase related to
12	happening there, and all the while Avista's top management	12	that bankruptcy. Again, why should Avista customers have to
13	and shareholders have been accumulating considerable wealth.	13	shoulder the additional costs associated with this
14	When the Hydro One deal fell through, Avista received a	14	increasingly expensive coal asset that Washington is seeking
15	\$103 million windfall from the failed merger. I think	15	to eliminate entirely from its energy mix?
16	Avista should have to use that 103 million to help pay for	16	Third, my understanding is that part of the rate request
17	the cleaning up the toxic coal ash ponds. They should also	17	increase that they are putting forward is in order to be
18	be required, or at least with goodwill set aside money to	18	reimbursed for a cost associated with replacing the
19	help transition the workers of Colstrip to new clean energy	19	electricity that they had to buy when Colstrip went down
20	jobs. Those costs certainly should not be put on the backs	20	last summer due to Clean Air quality violations. However, I
21	of us who over the years have been pointing out the	21	would argue that ratepayers should not be responsible for
22	unjustice that Colstrip has been doing to the area there and	22	these costs, and I would encourage you and your staff to
23	the country in general. The world, actually, in general.	23	look at the closely at the Idaho commission, which I
24	Thank you.	24	believe just recently has ruled on the rate case in Idaho
25	CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.	25	that these are extraordinary expenses that ratepayers should
	3 , ,		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 148		Page 150
			1030 100
1	Brian Henning?	1	
1 2	Brian Henning? DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista	1 2	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned,
	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista		not have to pay.
2	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have	2	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage
2	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold	2	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this
2 3 4	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of	2 3 4	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for
2 3 4 5	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very	2 3 4 5	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip.
2 3 4 5 6	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy.	2 3 4 5 6	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate	2 3 4 5 6 7	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip. In particular, I have four concerns:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate amount for Avista's ownership would put that about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip. In particular, I have four concerns: First, I'm concerned that Avista is pouring millions of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate amount for Avista's ownership would put that about \$100 million, about the same amount that they received in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip. In particular, I have four concerns: First, I'm concerned that Avista is pouring millions of dollars right now and today into the Colstrip plant to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate amount for Avista's ownership would put that about \$100 million, about the same amount that they received in the windfall, yet so far, again, I don't believe that Avista
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip. In particular, I have four concerns: First, I'm concerned that Avista is pouring millions of dollars right now and today into the Colstrip plant to continue its existence beyond 2025 as mandated by our new	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate amount for Avista's ownership would put that about \$100 million, about the same amount that they received in the windfall, yet so far, again, I don't believe that Avista has committed to setting aside any money for the cleanup of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DR. HENNING: Good evening. Dr. Brian Henning, Avista ratepayer, resident of the Spokane. Really happy to have you here tonight. Thanks for coming over here on the cold side of the state. We appreciate it, especially with all of the rule-making that you have going on. I know you're very busy. My testimony this evening relates to Avista's rate request, 13.7 percent two-year increase, and its connection to Avista's 15 percent stake in the Colstrip Units 3 and 4 that Ms. Druffel was just mentioning. I want to maybe expand a little bit on several of her points. I am concerned that despite the 100 percent clean energy legislation that was passed by our legislature last spring, which requires that coal by phased out of our grid by 2025, is not being followed in terms of how to sunset the Colstrip plant, and that not sufficient work is being done to develop a plan making sure that ratepayers don't end up having to pay for the capital costs and the cleanup related to Colstrip. In particular, I have four concerns: First, I'm concerned that Avista is pouring millions of dollars right now and today into the Colstrip plant to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not have to pay. And, finally, fourth, Avista, as Ms. Druffel mentioned, received this considerable windfall, and I would encourage you to decline expenses and encourage them to set aside this money or shareholder money in order to do to plan for these two things related to the shutting down of Colstrip. First, they need to plan for a just transition of those workers affected by the closure. They talked about this when they were planning for the merger. And they need to help pay for the massive cleanup of the toxic coal ash on site. So far, Avista has not committed any funds, to my knowledge, to transition Colstrip workers, whereas Puget Sound Energy has set aside \$10 million for the transition costs, with half of that money coming from shareholders rather than ratepayers. This seems like a really fair arrangement. And maybe as a down payment, I would hope that Avista would do the same thing. Similarly, again, Puget Sound Energy has set aside up to \$350 million for the cleanup of Colstrip. A proportionate amount for Avista's ownership would put that about \$100 million, about the same amount that they received in the windfall, yet so far, again, I don't believe that Avista

	Page 151		Page 153
1	what worries me is that that financial burden would be	1	this year has started, more than I can ever remember, so I'm
2	placed on future ratepayers, so I would suggest that that	2	not sure how this infrastructure is more reliable, I
3	needs to be considered now, since ratepayers shouldn't be on	3	suppose.
4	the hook to pay for these costs.	4	So thank you for coming to Spokane and all that.
5	The growing climate crisis requires that we quickly move	5	CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you very much,
6	away from fossil fuels, especially the most polluting and	6	Ms. Barnes.
7	carbon intensive forms such as coal. So, please, I	7	Stacy Cossey, you signed up but not wishing to testify?
8	encourage you to continue to do your work of protecting	8	MS. COSSEY: I've been sitting here. I will.
9	Avista customers from unfair rate increases that support	9	CHAIRMAN DANNER: Come on up.
10	prolonging the life of an expensive and outdated	10	MS. COSSEY: I am a member of Northwest Citizens Power
11	coal-burning plant, while failing to pay for future cleanup	11	Coalition. I was one who worked to try to stop the merger
12	costs. We owe better to the workers and the community in	12	and to also encourage the idea, the concept, of a
13	Colstrip, Montana, who have sacrificed their clean air and	13	cooperative instead of a shareholder-owned utility.
14	water to supply Washington's energy needs.	14	And listening at this dynamic, on one side you have the
15	Avista's customers rely on your good judgment to protect	15	shareholders and the staff of Avista, and on the other side
16	us from future balloon payments for remediation of defunct	16	you have, you know, common people, you know, in boots and
17	energy production sites. Please also consider in your	17	jeans, saying, "You know what? We're having problems paying
18	judgment, the future generations of Washingtonians and their	18	our bills. You know what? You know, this wealth transfer
19	need for and rights to a safe and stable climate in which to	19	is we're at the end of this, and it's not working for
20	prosper.	20	us." And so you look down the line. Maybe you look down
21	Thank you.	21	another two or three years, or five years, or ten years.
22	CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you, Dr. Henning.	22	It's just going to get worse. They're going to want more
23	Mavis Barnes? Would you like to	23	and more money, and we're not going to have that money to
24	MS. BARNES: Yes. Yes.	24	pay our own utilities.
25	CHAIRMAN DANNER: speak to us? You had a question mark	25	And so I am struck with just how interesting this is, as
	Page 152		Page 154
1	by you. Okay.	1	the system clearly is not working, and yet we're unable to
2	MS. BARNES: Hi. My name is Mavis Barnes, and I am just a	2	get out of the box that we're in. They want more rates. We
3	resident, who I am opposed to the rate hike, rate increase	3	can't pay more rates. And so this box, in my view, just
4	for that, just, I guess, especially since the 43 million	4	really needs to be shaken up and turned around and be in a
5	they say that Avista should pay back to ratepayers, I don't	5	situation where you have ratepayers owning your own utility,
6	understand how they can ask for more money when technically	6	so we don't have the shareholders who need more and more
7	we're already owed 43 million because of an unjust rate	7	money, and employees who are on that side, who need to
8	increase in 2017.	8	support that concept. And so I am just throwing out the
9	I would just like to say that Avista is one of the	9	idea. A ratepayer cooperative would cut down a lot of the
10	largest publicly traded companies for the Northwest in 2016	10	expenses that are going out of our community, and these rate
11	at \$2.5 billion, I guess. And that's kind of a lot of	11	cases may not be as necessary to be as high. It would be
12	money.	12	just purely for the good of the people who the energy is
13	Yeah. I'm just opposed to it for so many reasons, and I'm	13	provided to.
14	just curious how much land Avista is how much public land	14	So that's all I'd like to say.
15	a private company is going to be able to own is going to	15	CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Thank
16	be able how much land are they going to be able to own as	16	you.
	a private company and what their interest in operating the	17	Masooma Mohammadi. You signed up. It was not clear. Do
17		18	you wish to speak? Okay.
17 18	dams is. Because I just saw Mr. Danner on TVW saying that		Det Me Censelele consulet con librate conserve 0
	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that	19	Pat McCormick, would you like to come up?
18	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in	20	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick,
18 19 20 21	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in building all these dams? And if that's what they're	20 21	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick, and I'm a citizen of Spokane and a ratepayer for Avista, and
18 19 20 21 22	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in building all these dams? And if that's what they're investing their money in, that's their choice, and we	20 21 22	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick, and I'm a citizen of Spokane and a ratepayer for Avista, and I would echo some of the things that were said by
18 19 20 21 22 23	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in building all these dams? And if that's what they're investing their money in, that's their choice, and we shouldn't have to pay the burden of that for all the	20 21 22 23	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick, and I'm a citizen of Spokane and a ratepayer for Avista, and I would echo some of the things that were said by Dr. Henning and Pauline Druffel concerning Colstrip and the
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in building all these dams? And if that's what they're investing their money in, that's their choice, and we shouldn't have to pay the burden of that for all the improvements to their infrastructure and this, that, and	20 21 22 23 24	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick, and I'm a citizen of Spokane and a ratepayer for Avista, and I would echo some of the things that were said by Dr. Henning and Pauline Druffel concerning Colstrip and the need not to continue to support that.
18 19 20 21 22 23	they actually have no rights to the hydroelectricity that they that the dams produce. So what is their interest in building all these dams? And if that's what they're investing their money in, that's their choice, and we shouldn't have to pay the burden of that for all the	20 21 22 23	MR. MCCORMICK: Good evening. My name is Pat McCormick, and I'm a citizen of Spokane and a ratepayer for Avista, and I would echo some of the things that were said by Dr. Henning and Pauline Druffel concerning Colstrip and the

Page 155 Page 157 1 1 of justice. And my concern is not primarily or exclusively prudential step possible to reduce the use of fossil fuels 2 2 with the disproportionate burden that's going to be placed and to move as swiftly as possible to renewable energy. 3 3 on the ratepayer but on what I would consider to be the Which makes the continued reliance upon or support of 4 4 institutional responsibility of a public corporation which Colstrip not only questionable in that it puts it in tension 5 5 is meant to serve the common good, and that as a public with the recent change in Washington law and the corporation there are some duties to the larger community disproportionate burden that it places upon the Washington 6 6 7 7 that go far beyond the duty to one's shareholders. state energy consumer, but there is a kind of moral 8 8 blindness here that constitutes a failure of a basic And I would say, in particular, any corporation that's 9 9 been involved in delivering energy in this country or, responsibility to deliver one's goods. 10 10 indeed, on the planet for the last 50 years, has known and And so I would like to suggest that any rate increase that 11 had ample scientific evidence that we were approaching and 11 might be approved for this should only be dedicated to the 12 have moved into climate change, and that we have now moved 12 shift to renewables, to shutting down Colstrip, and to 13 into climate crisis, and that there is a certain amount of 13 retraining the employees in that region to move into other 14 responsibility for people stewarding a corporation with a 14 sectors or other job areas. 15 15 public obligation to be aware of the contribution of the The last thing I'd like to say is this. Prudence, the 16 consumption of nonrenewable or fossil fuels in the 16 thing that we are asking for, or moral responsibility from 17 production of disastrous environmental and health effects, 17 these corporations, means that they are able to envision the 18 which have been clearly demonstrated by a wide range of 18 future. I believe that it's reasonable to say that in 19 scientific and medical experts. 19 nearly -- that everyone in this room and nearly everyone in 20 What concerns me is that -- so I'm going to take two 20 this state knows that the condition of the state of 21 21 examples. Recently, PG&E in California has felt the need to Washington and Montana and Northern Idaho are going to be 22 shut down operations and delivery of energy to people 22 severely and negatively impacted by climate change now and 23 23 because of the spread and the rise of wildfires in in the coming decades. And, therefore, we have a moral 24 California. But, certainly, this should have come as no 24 obligation that extends beyond these corporations as 25 surprise to anyone who has been tracking wildfires in 25 citizens to ask you and to ask the State to take whatever Page 156 Page 158 1 California for the last 40 years. It's reasonable to 1 steps are necessary to address this moral blindness in the anticipate that as they have been increasing, both in their 2 2 corporation and to hold them to an accountability that they 3 3 severity and in their frequency, that one would expect that have themselves not heretofore demonstrated. 4 at some point they would create the kind of damage and 4 Thank you. 5 5 threat and danger that would make it necessary for this CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you very much, 6 company to shut down its delivery of energy, and so it's a 6 Mr. McCormick. 7 reasonable thing to say that that energy company had a moral 7 Elizabeth Williams. 8 obligation to the larger community to begin to take steps 8 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. 9 years or even decades ago to prepare for this eventuality. 9 I am speaking to Docket No. UE-190334 and UG-190335. 1.0 And that represents, for me, a failure to plan, a failure to 10 Along with Pauline Druffel and Dr. Brian Henning and Pat 11 examine, a failure to be prudent in the prediction of the 11 McCormick, I want to thank you for coming to Spokane and 12 future. 12 giving us a chance to share our concerns about Avista's 13 More recently, we have heard about another energy company, 13 proposed rate increases. I am Elizabeth Williams, an Avista 14 Exxon, who now we know without the shadow of a doubt was 14 Utilities customer and an active member of 350 Spokane. 15 guilty of a failure to disclose, and that is that they had 15 We were thrilled about the passage of the 100 percent 16 information about the direct correlation between the 16 renewable electricity measure phasing out coal from our grid 17 17 consumption of fossil fuels and the destruction or the by 2025. And Avista ratepayers should not have to pay for 18 18 climate crisis and all of the bad effects. Avista propping up the existence of the Colstrip plant which 19 So what I would like to suggest is that it may not be 19 is to be phased out by 2025, anyway. It seems crazy to put 2.0 reasonable to make this expectation of every individual 20 millions of dollars into infrastructure, when in about five 21 citizen, but it is a reasonable expectation that if a 21 years the plant is supposed to be shut down. 22 corporation is in the business of energy delivery, and if 22 Now, should Avista ratepayers be expected to help pay for 23 they've been exposed to the scientific evidence that's 23 the additional costs related to the bankruptcy of the 2.4 published about this for the last four decades, then it's 24 Rosebud Mine that supplies Colstrip? 25 25 reasonable to anticipate that they would make every Avista shareholders need to make a commitment to set aside

Page 159 Page 161 1 CERTIFICATE 1 4 to 10 million dollars to help the Colstrip workers and 2 2 community to transition after the closure of the plant to 3 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 new clean energy jobs. 4 4 Avista should be setting aside \$100 million, which is 5 COUNTY OF KING 5 proportional to the 350 million Puget Sound Energy has set 6 aside, to assist with the cleanup of the toxic Colstrip coal 7 7 ash ponds. Avista already received a \$103 million windfall I, the undersigned, do hereby certify under penalty 8 from the failed merger with Hydro One, so the money is right 8 of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings, recorded 9 9 statements, hearings and/or interviews were transcribed under my there as far as I can see. 10 10 Finally, I am concerned with those in our community who direction as a certified transcriptionist; and that the 11 are disproportionately affected by large rate increases such 11 transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and 12 ability, including any changes made by the trial judge reviewing 12 as those proposed by Avista Utilities. For some, it may 13 13 mean they would have to choose between keeping their place the transcript; that I am not a relative or employee of any 14 14 warm or eating a hot meal. I personally know of some people attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor 15 15 financially interested in its outcome. who have only been able to find part-time work, are living 16 16 paycheck to paycheck, and are having to make similar hard 17 17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this choices. 18 11th day of November, 2019. 18 In summary, I would ask you to hold Avista Utilities 19 19 accountable as to a fair percentage rate increase, as well 20 2.0 as how that money is to be spent. 21 21 Again, I thank you for this chance to speak on behalf of una Berr 22 22 all the people in Washington state who want their utility 23 23 payments to go towards clean energy rather than dirty 24 coal-fired plants, and who don't want future generations to 24 25 have to pay for the dirty cleanup of coal plants which have 25 Page 160 1 operated on our watch. 2 Thank you. CHAIRMAN DANNER: All right. Thank you very much, 3 Ms. Williams. 5 Ms. Roberts, are there any additional people signed in? 6 That is everyone who was signed in to speak to us tonight. 7 Is there anyone in the room who has not signed in who wishes 8 to speak to us? Okay. That brings us to the end of our meeting tonight. 9 10 So, again, I want to thank everybody for coming out tonight 11 and sharing their thoughts with us. We are going to take 12 this case under advisement, as we always do, and what we've 13 heard tonight will be part of the report in that case and 14 will be part of our consideration going forward. 15 So, again, I think it's important that customers of the 16 utility and interested citizens are participating in our 17 processes, and I appreciate all the input that we have received tonight. 18 19 I turn to my colleagues. Unless there's anything they 20 wish to say tonight, then we will be adjourned. 21 So thank you again. 2.2 (Adjourned at 6:46 p.m.) 23 24 25

	and/or 161:9	audience 145:2	Barr 131:20 161:23	budget 141:24
A	Ann 132:4 133:15	auditing 144:17	basic 157:8	143:11,17
ability 161:12	annually 139:12	available 143:10	basically 145:10	Buell 131:21
able 152:15,16,16	answer 145:13	Avenue 131:22	bearing 149:3	building 152:21
157:17 159:15	anticipate 139:5	average 137:4,15	bedridden 143:2	burden 151:1
acceptable 140:19	156:2,25	Avista 131:7,8	began 138:19	152:23 155:2
accountability	anyway 158:19	133:11,17,18,19	beginning 144:22	157:6
158:2	appalled 136:14	135:25 136:2,11	behalf 136:10	burning 146:17
accountable 159:19	appears 133:7	136:12,17 137:2	159:21	business 156:22
accumulating	appreciate 135:18	137:19 138:2,4,6	believe 134:12	businesses 143:1
147:13	136:4 145:12	138:7,8,12,15,19	136:16 138:3	busy 148:7
accurate 142:11	148:5 160:17	138:20 139:9	140:14,15 149:24	buttressing 147:1
161:11	approaching	140:13,16,19,20	150:23 157:18	buy 149:19
action 132:9 141:15	155:11	140:21 142:2	Bell 132:8 135:10	buy 147.17
141:17 146:24	approve 139:11	144:16,19,19	135:11,15,17,24	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$
active 158:14	approved 137:3,9	146:7,14,22,25	145:18	C 132:1,6,6,6 133:4
add 137:8	137:14 140:1,11	147:8,14,16 148:2	benefit 136:24	161:1,1
adding 146:17 addition 145:5	142:19,24 157:11	148:22 149:3,5,9	149:4	calculations 137:18
146:18	approximately	149:12 150:2,12	best 161:11	California 155:21
additional 134:5,10	138:17 140:9	150:18,23 151:9	better 136:17,21	155:24 156:1
143:18 149:13	April 133:11,19	152:5,9,14 153:15	141:2,2,15 144:19	capital 146:25
158:23 160:5	138:19	154:21 158:13,17	151:12	148:19 149:7
address 144:13	area 141:16 147:22	158:18,22,25	beyond 148:24	carbon 151:7
158:1	areas 141:1 157:14	159:4,7,12,18	149:2 155:7	caring 146:11
adjourned 160:20	argue 149:21	Avista's 137:11	157:24	Carol 141:11
160:22	arguments 138:6	138:22 139:4,11	bill 134:7 137:5	case 133:10 135:5
adjudicative	arrangement	139:20 140:2,9	142:4 146:19	143:13 149:24
144:22,23	150:17	146:4 147:12	billion 139:24	160:12,13
adjudicatory	ash 147:4,17	148:8,10 150:21	152:11	cases 154:11
134:17	150:10 159:7	151:15 158:12	bills 143:22 153:18	cattle 147:7
advertising 140:25	aside 147:18 150:4	aware 155:15	bit 148:12	ceased 143:1
advisement 160:12	150:14,19,24		blindness 157:8	Center 131:17
agency 141:17	158:25 159:4,6	<u>B</u>	158:1	133:9
ago 138:20 156:9	asking 146:8	B 132:1,6	blood 143:2	certain 134:21
agree 136:24	157:16	back 138:19 152:5	body 144:23	155:13
aimed 141:18 147:1	asset 149:14	backs 147:20	boots 153:16	certainly 147:20
air 149:20 151:13	assist 159:6	bad 156:18	bottom 136:6	155:24
allocation 143:19	assistance 141:25	Balasbas 132:3	box 154:2,3	certified 161:10
allow 143:11,17,20	142:4,9 143:5	133:16	Brian 132:12 148:1	certify 161:7
allowed 147:9	associated 149:13	balloon 151:16	148:2 158:10	CET 131:20 161:23
amount 139:12,16	149:18	bankrupt 149:10	brings 160:9	chair 133:13
150:21,22 155:13	assurances 137:23	bankruptcy 149:12	broad 136:18	Chairman 131:13
amounts 137:9	attorney 134:20	158:23 Parmag 122:12	broader 136:11	132:2 133:6
ample 155:11	137:24 161:14	Barnes 132:13	138:2	135:12,16 141:8
Amy 142:25 143:7	attract 138:9,16	151:23,24 152:2,2	broken 140:7	144:4,8,10,12,21
		153:6		145:12,16,20,24

T ago 100	-	-	•	
147:25 151:22,25	151:7 158:16	139:10 140:1	consideration	create 156:4
153:5,9 154:15	159:6,25	commit 149:5	137:1 146:6	crisis 143:3 151:5
158:5 160:3	coal-based 146:20	commitment	160:14	155:13 156:18
chance 158:12	coal-burning	158:25	considered 151:3	critical 143:5
159:21	151:11	committed 150:12	Consolidated 131:4	curious 152:14
change 141:4,23	coal-fired 159:24	150:24	constitutes 157:8	current 139:21
155:12 157:5,22	Coalition 132:8	common 153:16	consumer 157:7	currently 139:15
changes 161:12	135:25 153:11	155:5	consumption	142:19 146:8
cheaper 147:2,2	cold 133:7 148:4	community 131:17	155:16 156:17	customer 138:2
check 144:15	colleagues 133:15	133:9 140:14	continue 148:24	141:2 158:14
choice 152:22	135:6 160:19	141:17 143:4	151:8 154:24	customers 133:17
choices 159:17	Colstrip 146:15	151:12 154:10	continued 157:3	134:18,21,24
choose 135:20	147:1,3,8,19,22	155:6 156:8 159:2	contribution	136:10,11,18,21
143:23 159:13	148:10,16,20,23	159:10	155:15	136:24 137:12,13
citizen 154:21	149:2,8,11,19	companies 152:10	conversion 140:23	137:20,20 142:2
156:21	150:6,13,20,25	company 133:24	converted 140:16	143:14 149:3,12
citizens 132:8	151:13 154:23	134:4,12,17,25	COO 132:9 141:14	151:9,15 160:15
135:25 146:21	157:4,12 158:18	135:1 145:6,21	Cook 131:18	customers' 138:2
147:10 153:10	158:24 159:1,6	152:15,17 156:6,7	cooperative 140:17	cut 154:9
157:25 160:16	come 144:13 146:3	156:13	153:13 154:9	
City 140:24	153:9 154:19	compared 139:21	Cooperatives 141:1	D D
clean 146:19	155:24	complain 135:21	copy 141:5	D 133:4
147:19 148:13	coming 133:7	Complaint 131:5	corporation 131:7	d/b/a 131:7
149:20 151:13	135:17 136:14,15	computed 137:7	155:4,6,8,14	damage 156:4
159:3,23	148:4 150:15	concept 153:12	156:22 158:2	dams 152:18,20,21
cleaning 147:17	153:4 157:23	154:8	corporations	danger 156:5
cleanup 148:19	158:11 160:10	concern 146:14	157:17,24	Danner 131:13
150:10,20,24	comment 131:11	155:1	correct 134:12,12	132:2 133:6,13
151:11 159:6,25	133:10	concerned 134:24	correlation 156:16	135:12,16 141:8 144:4,8,10,12,21
clear 149:9 154:17	comments 137:2	147:10 148:13,22	Cossey 132:14	144:4,8,10,12,21
clearly 140:3 154:1	commission 131:2	159:10	153:7,8,10	147:25 151:22,25
155:18	131:4 133:14,21		cost 149:11,18	152:18 153:5,9
client 143:20	135:20 136:5	concerns 146:5	costly 140:25	152:18 153:5,9
climate 151:5,19	137:3,9,14,23,25	148:21 155:20	costs 141:1 147:20	160:3
155:12,13 156:18	141:5 142:20,22	158:12 conclude 136:22	148:19 149:3,13	Dave 131:13
157:22	144:15 145:7	conclude 136:22 conclusion 140:13	149:22 150:15 151:4,12 158:23	133:13
close 139:21	149:23 Commissioner	conclusion 140:13 condition 157:20	counsel 134:20	David 132:2
closely 149:23 closer 139:15	132:3,4 133:15,15	condition 157:20 connection 148:9	145:1,4,21 161:14	day 135:21 138:14
closer 139:13 closure 150:8 159:2	commissioners	Connic 148:9	country 147:6,23	161:18
co-op 140:22	136:5 139:11	conservative 142:5	155:9	days 143:23
co-ops 144:18	141:13	consider 139:14	County 142:13	deal 136:13 147:14
coal 146:15,17	commissioners'	151:17 155:3	161:5	decade 139:19
147:2,4,17 148:15	137:1	considerable	court 161:8	140:7
149:14 150:10	commissions	147:13 150:3	crazy 158:19	decades 156:9,24
117.11130.10		117.13 130.3	Ciuzy 150.17	157:23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

delivery 155:22	145:17,19,23	159:3,5,23	expenses 146:25	focus 140:17
delivering 155:9 delivery 155:22	144:14 145:11,14 145:17,19,23	156:13,22 157:2,7 159:3,5,23	expense 149:7 expenses 146:25	five-year 142:19 focus 140:17
156:6,22	duration 142:23	engage 145:9	149:1,25 150:4	146:14
demonstrated	duties 155:6	ensure 138:8	154:10	folks 146:10
155:18 158:3	duty 155:7	entirely 149:15	expensive 149:14	followed 148:16
denial 136:7,19	dynamic 153:14	environmental	151:10	following 136:19
denied 137:22		134:22 155:17	expert 145:8	137:2
depended 147:7		envision 157:17	experts 155:19	foregoing 161:8
despite 148:13	E 132:1,1,1,1,6	equipping 141:19	exposed 156:23	form 140:5
destruction 156:17	133:4,4 161:1,1	equitable 138:7	extend 142:22	formed 136:1
develop 148:17	eating 159:14	equity 138:24	extending 149:1	forms 151:7
developed 142:7	echo 154:22	140:4,8	extends 157:24	formula 142:21,23
direct 156:16	Ed 132:10 144:6	er 136:18	extraordinary	forward 144:13
direction 161:10	effective 137:4,15	especially 146:10	149:25	149:17 160:14
directly 134:23	effects 155:17	147:1 148:5 151:6	Exxon 156:14	fossil 146:23 151:6
dirty 159:23,25	156:18	152:4	F	155:16 156:17
disappointed 136:8	effort 138:1 144:1	essentially 137:13		157:1
disastrous 155:17	either 141:19	137:21	F 161:1	found 136:20
disclose 156:15	elderly 146:10	evaluate 146:6	faced 143:3	four 148:21 156:24
disorder 143:2	electric 133:21,22	evening 133:6,8	fact 135:22 139:7	fourth 131:22
disproportionate	133:24 134:5,7	135:18 141:13	146:16	150:2
155:2 157:6	137:4,7,12,12	144:1 146:2,2	failed 147:15 159:8	frequency 156:3
disproportionately	139:14,16	148:2,8 154:20	failing 151:11 failure 156:10,10	fuel-burning
159:11	electricity 134:2,10 137:13 146:20	eventuality 156:9	,	146:23
District 142:12		eventually 140:4	156:11,15 157:8	fuels 151:6 155:16
divest 146:22	149:19 158:16	everybody 160:10	fair 144:1 150:16	156:17 157:1
dividends 140:24	eligible 142:3	evidence 155:11	159:19	funding 149:6,7
Docket 133:12	eliminate 140:22	156:23	families 142:8	funds 142:18 143:6
158:9	140:23,25,25	examine 156:11	146:10	150:12
DOCKETS 131:4	149:7,15	example 142:6	far 150:12,23 155:7	future 138:9,16
doing 136:5 147:22	Elizabeth 132:16	examples 155:21	159:9	151:2,11,16,18
dollars 142:2	158:7,13	exclusively 155:1	federal 141:22	156:12 157:18
148:23 158:20	employed 161:14	existence 148:24	142:3,5,14	159:24
159:1	employee 161:13	158:18	fell 143:21 147:14	
donor 143:7	employees 154:7	exit 141:20	felt 155:21	
doubt 156:14	157:13	expand 143:13	filed 133:10,19	G 133:4
Dr 148:2,2 151:22	encourage 149:22	148:12	final 138:4	gas 133:22,22,25
154:23 158:10	150:3,4 151:8	expect 134:11	finally 139:17	134:3,6,8,11
Druffel 132:11	153:12 ends 142:9	156:3	150:2 159:10 financial 143:3	137:14,17,19,20 137:21 139:14,16
		1 1 1 1 7 6 20	nan@191 1/13*3	1 13771 139174 16 1
145:25 146:1,2	energy 141:25	expectation 156:20	149:9 151:1	general 133:10

147:23,23	139:15 150:15	Hydro 136:3,6,7,12	144:17	154:25,25
General's 134:20	hand 145:3 161:17	147:14 159:8	independently	
137:24	happening 147:12	hydroelectricity	144:15	J
generations 151:18	happy 148:3	152:19	indicate 142:5	Jay 132:3 133:15
159:24	hard 146:10 159:16		indicates 140:3	jeans 153:17
generous 139:7,19	health 142:12	I	indication 140:6	job 136:5,17 143:3
140:7	143:18,21 155:17	Idaho 137:3,5,9,12	individual 156:20	143:22 157:14
getting 146:22	hear 133:16 134:23	137:20 139:18	individuals 141:18	jobs 147:20 159:3
give 135:19 146:7	143:25 146:4	149:23,24 157:21	141:19	joined 133:14
give-and-take	heard 146:12	idea 153:12 154:9	industrial 134:21	judge 161:12
144:25	156:13 160:13	III 131:12	inefficient 143:21	judges 134:15
giving 143:7 158:12	hearing 131:11	immediately 149:5	information 156:16	judgment 151:15
glad 133:8	133:10 143:25	impacted 157:22	informed 143:4	151:18
global 146:17	144:23	implications	infrastructure	justice 155:1
go 134:16 136:13	hearings 135:21	149:10	141:3 144:16,19	
139:4 146:9,13	161:9	important 160:15	152:24 153:2	<u>K</u>
155:7 159:23	help 143:13 147:16	improvements	158:20	keep 139:11 146:16
going 135:13 137:5	147:19 150:10	152:24	Inland 140:14	keeping 159:13
140:24 145:9,9	158:22 159:1	inaudible 141:9	input 160:17	kept 143:6
146:12,15 148:6	Henning 132:12	included 138:6	inquiries 143:10	kind 152:11 154:25
152:15,15,16	148:1,2,2 151:22	146:21	institutional 155:4	156:4 157:7
153:22,22,23	154:23 158:10	including 161:12	intensive 151:7	KING 161:5
154:10 155:2,20	hereto 161:14	income 140:25	interest 136:12,18	know 137:11,19
157:21 160:11,14	heretofore 158:3	142:2,8	138:3 152:17,20	140:20 144:17
good 133:6 141:13	hereunto 161:17	increase 133:21,25	interested 134:24	148:6 153:16,16
146:2,2 148:2	Hi 152:2	133:25 134:2,3,4	143:15 160:16	153:17,18,18
151:15 154:12,20	high 138:5,18	134:5,7,8,9 137:2	161:15	156:14 159:14
155:5	154:11	137:4,6,7,15,16	interesting 153:25	knowledge 150:13
goods 157:9	higher 140:5	137:17,18 138:5,6	interests 138:2	known 141:15
goodwill 147:18	142:16	138:24,25 139:1,6	intervene 136:10	155:10
granted 136:10,16	hike 152:3	139:8,10,12,14,22	intervener 136:16	knows 157:20
granting 139:14	hiked 143:22	139:23 140:10	137:22	KIIUWS 137.20
grateful 146:3,5	hold 158:2 159:18	141:22,24 143:12	interveners 136:15	$\overline{\mathbf{L}}$
great 143:22	holding 143:25	143:17,18 146:5,7	interviews 161:9	1131:23,23,24
grid 148:15 158:16	home 143:21,23,24	148:9 149:11,17	investing 138:11	132:6
ground 144:21	homes 143:9	152:3,8 157:10	152:22	land 152:14,14,16
groups 134:21,22	146:11	159:19	investment 138:8	large 159:11
growing 143:10	hook 151:4	increased 138:23	138:15 140:19,22	larger 155:6 156:8
151:5	hope 146:7 149:4	139:8 146:25	investments 149:4	largest 152:10
guaranteed 138:14	150:17	increases 139:25	investor-owned	Lastly 143:25
guess 152:4,11	hot 159:14	146:6 151:9 158:13 159:11	140:15 141:3	law 136:23 148:25
guilty 156:15	households 142:1		investors 138:9	157:5
H	142:18 143:11,14	increasing 139:17 156:2	139:6,9 140:24	leaked 147:5
H-A-I-N-E 144:10	husband 143:2,21	increasingly 149:14	involved 155:9	legislation 148:14
half 137:10,10	husband's 143:24	independent	issue 137:1 147:3	legislature 146:18
Hall 137.10,10		mucpenuent		

148:14	mark 139:13	152.47 150.1 4 5	155:21 158:25	onon 125.7
legislature's 146:24	151:25	152:4,7 159:1,4,5 159:7	needs 138:15 140:7	open 135:7 operate 140:21
Lepinski 132:9	Masooma 154:17	millions 148:22	151:3,14 154:4	operated 160:1
141:12,13,14	massive 150:10	158:20	1	operating 141:1
141.12,13,14	matter 136:23	Mine 149:10	negatively 157:22 Neighborhood	142:19 152:17
let's 135:10			132:9 141:15	
level 140:12 142:3	Mavis 132:13 151:23 152:2	158:24		operations 143:1 149:6 155:22
		missed 139:13	net 136:24	
142:5,11,14,15 life 149:2 151:10	McCormick 132:15	mitigate 143:12 mix 142:1 149:15	new 140:24 147:19	opinion 135:20
	154:19,20,20		148:24 149:7	138:18,25 139:7
limit 141:22	158:6,11	modify 142:21	159:3	139:17 142:20
line 153:20	meal 159:14	Mohammadi	Nina 145:3	opposed 140:18
lined 147:4	mean 159:13	154:17	nonrenewable	152:3,13
LIRAP 141:22,23	means 157:17	money 147:18	155:16	order 135:9 149:17
142:4,18,19,21,23	meant 155:5	150:5,5,15,24	normal 135:19	150:5
list 143:14	measure 142:11	152:6,12,22	North 131:18	Oregon 137:14,16
listening 134:25	158:16	153:23,23 154:7	Northeast 131:17	139:18
153:14	measures 142:4,8	159:8,20	133:9	organization 136:1
little 148:12	143:19	monopoly 138:12	Northern 157:21	organizations
lived 142:13	measuring 142:6	Montana 147:10	Northwest 132:8	136:9
living 142:15	medical 155:19	151:13 157:21	135:24 140:14	organizations'
159:15	medications 143:24	monthly 137:8,16	152:10 153:10	136:16
LLC 131:21	meet 142:9	months 135:3	note 145:1	original 138:4,9
local 138:13	meeting 135:18	138:20,22,25	November 139:19	outages 152:25
longest 135:4	160:9	moral 156:7 157:7	139:20 161:18	outcome 161:15
look 149:23 153:20	member 153:10	157:16,23 158:1	number 135:8	outdated 151:10
153:20	158:14	move 151:5 157:2	numbers 134:13	outgrown 140:15
lost 143:2	members 133:16	157:13	NWCPC 135:25 137:22	outside 140:22
lot 135:21 136:13 152:11 154:9	135:25 136:14 140:13	moved 155:12,12	137:22	overly 139:7,18 140:6
low-income 141:19	mention 136:8	N	0	owe 151:12
141:23 142:1	mention 130.8 mentioned 133:19	N 132:1,1,6,6 133:4	O 132:1,1,6 133:4	owed 152:7
143:9,17 146:10	150:2	name 133:13	o0o- 133:3	owned 143:1
lower 140:18 141:2	mentioning 148:11	135:24 141:13	obligation 155:15	owners 146:15
Lucy 132:9 141:12	merger 136:3	152:2 154:20	156:8 157:24	147:8
141:14	147:15 150:9	National 131:24	October 131:15	ownership 136:3,7
141.14	153:11 159:8	natural 133:21,22	133:1 137:4,15	150:21
M	mess 147:9	134:6 137:21	offer 137:2	owning 154:5
M 132:1,1,1,1,6,6	metric 142:6	nature 145:10	Office 134:20	owning 134.3
144:11	microphone 135:13	nearly 141:18	137:24	P
M-E 144:12	Mike 132:8 135:10	157:19,19	Oh 135:15	P 132:1,6,6,6 133:4
maintenance 149:6	135:24	necessary 154:11	Okay 135:17	p.m 131:16 133:2
majority 139:25	million 133:25	156:5 158:1	144:10,12 145:11	160:22
making 148:18	134:1,5,6 138:24	need 136:8 140:15	145:17,23 152:1	PAGE 132:7
management	140:23 147:15,16	140:20,22 142:4,9	154:18 160:9	Pages 131:13
147:12	150:14,20,22	142:21 150:7,9	Olympia 131:23	part 147:10 149:16
mandated 148:24	130.11,20,22	151:19 154:6,7,24	one's 155:7 157:9	160:13,14
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

part-time 159:15	148:9,10,13	power 132:8	134:15,24	
part-time 139:13 participate 134:22	158:15	135:25 143:6	proposed 136:20	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$
participate 154.22	percentage 142:16	146:15 152:25	136:23 158:13	R 132:1,1,6 133:4
160:16	159:19	153:10	150.23 138.13	161:1
particular 148:21	period 139:2	prediction 156:11	proposes 133:24	raise 145:3 154:25
155:8	perjury 161:8	preference 135:11	134:4	ramping 149:5
parties 161:14	permission 136:2	prepare 156:9	proposing 135:2	ranchers 147:6
Partners 132:9	personally 136:13	PRESIDING	proposing 153.2	range 155:18
141:15	159:14	131:13	prosper 151:20	rare 143:2
party 134:18	petitions 136:10	pretty 138:14	protect 151:15	rate 133:10,24,25
party 134.18 passage 158:15	PG&E 155:21	previous 136:2	protect 131.13	137:2,4,5,6,7,8,15
passage 138.13	phased 148:15	previous 130.2 previously 142:25	provide 136:23	137:16,17 138:4,5
148:14	158:19	price 138:20,21,22	137:24,25	138:6,7,17,19,22
Pat 132:15 154:19	phasing 158:16	139:4,8,11,20,21	provided 141:5,8	139:5,10,14,25
154:20 158:10	phonetic 141:11	139:4,8,11,20,21	141:25 143:5	140:6,8,10,13,18
Pauline 132:11	phonetic 141.11 place 159:13	primarily 140:24	154:13	142:23 146:5,6
145:25 146:2	placed 151:2 155:2	155:1	Prudence 157:15	148:8 149:16,24
154:23 158:10	places 157:6	primary 139:4	prudent 156:11	151:9 152:3,3,7
pay 146:25 147:16	plan 141:23 142:19	140:2,17 146:14	prudential 157:1	154:10 157:10
148:19 149:1	142:21,23,23	private 142:1	public 131:11	158:13 159:11,19
150:1,10 151:4,11	142:21,25,25	152:15,17	133:9,17 134:19	ratepayer 142:2
150:1,10 151:4,11	156:10	probably 145:7	134:19 136:11,18	148:3 154:9,21
· ·		problems 153:17	138:3 142:1 145:1	155:3
154:3 158:17,22 159:25	planet 155:10	_		ratepayer-owned
	planning 150:9	proceeding 134:17 145:10	145:3,21 152:14	140:16
paycheck 159:16 159:16	plant 146:15,16,23		155:4,5,15	ratepayers 136:1
	148:17,23 151:11 158:18,21 159:2	proceedings 161:8 process 138:19,22	publicly 152:10 published 156:24	140:3,3,21 148:18
paying 137:12,20 153:17	plants 159:24,25	139:17 140:6	Puget 150:13,19	149:1,10,21,25
	please 151:7,17	processes 134:14	159:5	150:16 151:2,3
payment 150:17	pleased 146:23	160:17	purely 154:12	152:5 154:5
payments 151:16 159:23	pieased 146:23 point 156:4	produce 152:20		158:17,22
	point 156:4 pointing 147:11,21	-	purpose 133:16 134:23	ratepayers' 140:17
penalty 161:7		production 151:17 155:17		rates 133:21 134:5
people 135:8,9,19 135:21 153:16	points 148:12		put 147:20 150:21 158:19	134:6 139:15,18
	policy 146:8	program 142:21		140:5 141:2
154:12 155:14,22	polluted 147:5	programs 141:18	puts 157:4	143:12 144:2
159:14,22 160:5	polluting 151:6	project 143:7	putting 149:17	145:15 146:9,25
percent 134:2,2,7	ponds 147:4,17	Project's 143:16	0	154:2,3
134:10,10 137:3,7	159:7	prolonging 151:10	quality 144:16	reality 147:3
137:14,18 138:10	poor 143:21	prop 146:16	149:20	really 148:3 150:16
138:11,11,14,18	position 145:13	properly 147:4	question 144:14,14	154:4
138:23 139:1,2,3	possible 157:1,2	proportion 142:15	145:8 151:25	Realtime 131:21
139:5,12,16,22	pouring 148:22	proportional 159:5	questionable 157:4	reason 139:4
140:8,10 141:21	poverty 141:20,22	proportionate	questions 144:24	reasonable 138:25
142:3,10,13,14,17	142:3,5,6,11,11	150:20	145:6,12,14,22	139:12 140:12
143:19 146:19	142:14	proposal 133:18	quickly 151:5	144:2 156:1,7,20
			quickly 131.3	

		Ī		
156:21,25 157:18	report 160:13	158:5 159:8 160:3	setting 140:6,14	similar 159:16
reasons 152:13	Reporting 131:21	rights 151:19	150:24 159:4	Similarly 150:19
receive 138:7	representative	152:19	seven 138:19,21,24	sit 134:14
received 137:23	146:12	rise 155:23	seven-month 139:2	site 147:4 150:11
143:9 147:14	representatives	Roberts 160:5	severely 157:22	150:25
150:3,22 159:7	145:5	room 157:19 160:7	severity 156:3	sites 151:17
160:18	represented 134:19	Rosebud 149:10	shadow 156:14	sitting 153:8
recommendation	134:19	158:24	shaken 154:4	situation 154:5
136:14 143:16	represents 138:23	roughly 137:10	Shanna 131:20	size 142:9
recommendations	156:10	rule-making 148:6	161:23	small 143:1
141:21	request 133:20	ruled 149:24	share 135:14	SNAP 141:15,16,25
recommended	134:15 136:2,6,7	rules 144:22	138:21,22 139:4	142:18,22 143:9
136:12 137:6,10	136:19 138:4,9		139:11,20,21,22	143:14,16,22
137:17 138:5	148:9 149:16	S	139:22 140:9,9,11	144:5 146:12
139:15	requested 146:4	S 132:1,1,1,1,6	141:21 143:7	SNAP's 142:20
recommends	required 140:4	133:4	158:12	143:4
142:22	147:18	sacrificed 151:13	shareholder 139:23	sold 146:20
record 133:11	requires 146:19	safe 151:19	150:5	sorry 134:6
recorded 161:8	148:15 151:5	safeguard 136:11	shareholder-own	Sound 150:14,19
reduce 141:1 157:1	reside 146:3	136:17 138:1	153:13	159:5
reduced 138:3,17	resident 148:3	safety 143:18	shareholders 138:7	source 140:2
refer 145:8	152:3	sale 136:3	138:10,11,13,16	speak 151:25
reflects 139:23	residential 137:8	satisfaction 141:2	140:10,20,20	154:18 159:21
region 157:13	137:16	saw 152:18	147:13 150:15	160:6,8
Regional 142:12	residents 142:13,15	saying 152:18	153:15 154:6	speaking 158:9
reimbursed 149:18	respectively 134:1	153:17	155:7 158:25	spent 159:20
related 146:4	Respondent 131:9	scientific 155:11,19	shareholders'	spite 146:16
148:19 149:1,11	responsibility	156:23	140:4,18	Spokane 131:18
150:6 158:23	155:4,14 157:9,16	seat 135:11,12	sharing 160:11	132:9 133:1
relates 148:8	responsible 149:21	Seattle 131:22,23	shift 157:12	135:17 141:14,16
relative 161:13	result 136:1 143:12	second 134:4,9 149:9	short 138:21	142:12,13,15,25
reliable 153:2	retraining 157:13		shortage 139:9	143:25 146:3,4,21
reliance 157:3	return 138:8,10,11	sectors 157:14	shoulder 149:13	148:3 153:4
rely 151:15	138:13,17 140:8	see 135:7 159:9 seeking 149:14	show 135:19,22	154:21 158:11,14
remediation 151:16	140:19	Self-Sufficiency	shut 143:6 155:22	spread 155:23
remember 153:1	returns 140:11	142:7,10	156:6 158:21	spring 148:14
Rendahl 132:4	revenue 140:2	serve 141:14 155:5	shutting 150:6	stabilizing 141:19
133:15	reviewing 161:12	serve 141.14 133.3 served 141:16,17	157:12	stable 151:19
render 135:5	rhetorical 144:24	served 141:10,17 serves 142:18	side 148:5 153:14	Stacy 132:14 153:7
renewable 147:1	ridiculous 138:12	service 133:22	153:15 154:7	staff 136:9,15
157:2 158:16	right 133:6 134:11	services 143:13	signed 135:8,9	137:11,25,25
renewables 157:12	141:8,10 144:6,6	set 144:1,21 147:18	153:7 154:17	138:17 139:13
repairs 143:18	145:23,24 147:25	150:4,14,19	160:5,6,7	145:7,8,21 149:22
repay 140:4	148:23 151:22	158:25 159:5	significantly	153:15
replacing 149:18	153:5 154:15	161:17	142:16	stake 148:10
		101.17		

C4	124.16	41:-1-120.12	4 122.0	122.12.20.120.12
Standard 142:7,10	supporting 134:16	think 139:13	treasurer 132:8	133:13,20 138:13
start 135:8,10	supports 143:16	147:15 160:15	135:24	140:15 141:3
145:6	suppose 153:3	Third 149:16	trial 161:12	153:24 158:14
started 138:22	supposed 158:21	thorough 136:5	true 161:11	159:12,18
153:1	sure 148:18 153:2	thought 135:15	try 153:11	utility 134:15 136:4
state 146:18,20,24	surely 146:24 147:8	thoughts 133:17	trying 146:16	137:3,14,23,25
148:5,25 157:7,20	150:25	135:1 160:11	turn 160:19	138:12 139:18
157:20,25 159:22	surprise 155:25	threat 156:5	turned 154:4	140:5 143:22
161:3	surround 144:19	three 134:14	TVW 152:18	153:13 154:5
statement 136:20	survive 146:11	141:21 153:21	two 133:22 143:1	159:22 160:16
136:25 145:18,20	swiftly 157:2	thrilled 158:15	144:14 150:6	utility's 140:11
statements 161:9	system 154:1	throwing 154:8	153:21 155:20	UTTC 149:5
statewide 142:16	systematically	time 135:4 136:8	two-year 148:9	
status 136:16	149:7	138:14,20 141:4,7	type 139:10 140:23	V
137:22		142:22 144:23		value 138:24 139:1
statute 135:3	T	today 137:1 141:21	U	139:1,24
step 157:1	T 132:1,6,6,6 161:1	146:14 148:23	U 132:6	various 140:1
steps 156:8 158:1	161:1	tonight 133:16	UE-190222 131:4	142:9
stewarding 155:14	take 135:5,11,12,22	134:23,25 135:8	UE-190334 131:4	vast 139:25
stock 138:25 139:1	144:24 146:5	148:4 160:6,9,10	133:12 158:9	view 154:3
139:9,24	155:20 156:8	160:13,18,20	UG-190335 131:4	violations 149:20
stop 140:7 153:11	157:25 160:11	top 147:12	133:12 158:9	voices 146:4
Street 131:18	talked 150:8	totally 136:14,24	unable 154:1	VOLUME 131:12
struck 153:25	tax 140:25	town 147:6	undersigned 161:7	vs 131:6
submits 134:15,16	technically 152:6	toxic 147:3,17	understand 144:18	
subsequent 136:6	tell 142:25 143:20	150:10 159:6	152:6	W
substantially 138:4	ten 139:24 140:8	tracking 155:25	understanding	wait 143:14
138:15 139:6	153:21	traded 152:10	149:16	waiting 140:21
Suetake 145:3	tension 157:4	trading 138:20,21	unduplicated	walk 147:9
sufficient 144:2	terms 148:16	transaction 136:21	141:18	want 135:12 145:3
148:17	testify 141:11 153:7	136:23	unfair 151:9	146:24 148:11
suggest 151:2	testimony 134:16	transcribed 131:20	Unit 134:20	153:22 154:2
156:19 157:10	135:7 141:6 148:8	161:9	Units 148:10	158:11 159:22,24
suggests 139:8	thank 133:7 135:17	transcript 161:11	University 142:8	160:10
Suite 131:22	141:7,8,10 143:25	161:13	unjust 152:7	warm 143:24
summary 159:18	144:3,4,4 145:24	transcriptionist	unjustice 147:22	159:14
summer 149:20	146:1 147:24,25	161:10	unnecessary 149:6	warming 146:17
sunset 148:16	151:21,22 153:4,5	transfer 136:2,7	unreasonable	Washington 131:1
Superfund 150:25	154:15,15 158:4,5	153:18	148:25	131:4,18,22 133:1
supplies 149:11	158:8,11 159:21	transition 147:19	unserved 143:14	133:20 136:4
158:24	160:2,3,10,21	150:7,13,14 159:2	use 147:16 157:1	137:6,11,17,19,22
supply 151:14	thanks 143:8 148:4	Transportation	usually 144:21	137:24 139:18
	thing 150:18	131:2,4 133:14,20	UTC 134:14 136:9	142:8 146:18,20
support 143:5	152:25 156:7	131:2,4 133:14,20	138:3 139:13	148:25 149:3,14
151:9 154:8,24	157:15,16		UTC's 136:19	157:5,6,21 159:22
157:3	things 150:6 154:22	travesty 147:11	utilities 131:2,4,8	161:3
	VIIII 6 130.0 137.22		44114165 131.2,T,0	

XX 7 1	142.4	11 000 141.25		0.127.15
Washington's	worker 143:4	11,999 141:25	3	8 137:15
151:14	workers 147:19	11th 161:18	3 142:13 148:10	800 131:24
Washingtonians	150:8,13 151:12	12.9 134:1	3.2 139:16	846-6989 131:24
151:18	159:1	13.7 148:9	3.9 134:10	9
wasn't 133:8	working 135:19	13.8 134:2	30 141:18 142:16	9 138:11,18 139:16
waste 147:4	146:22 153:19	131-161 131:13	143:19	9.1 134:2
watch 160:1	154:1	1325 131:22	30th 133:11,19	9.5 138:10,11,14
water 147:5,5,7	world 147:23	14 132:10	31 140:9	9.8 134:7
151:14	worries 151:1	15 132:11 148:10	34 142:13	9.9 134:8
way 134:14 138:18	worse 153:22	150 139:22 141:21	350 150:20 158:14	98101 131:22
143:7 144:15	WUTC 138:17	142:3	159:5	99207 131:18
we're 133:8 145:8,9	139:11	17 132:12 138:23	360 131:23	77207 131.10
152:7 153:17,19	www.buellrealti	139:2,5	4	
153:23 154:1,2	131:25	18.9 134:5		
we've 160:12	X	1840 131:22	4 148:10 159:1	
wealth 147:13		19 139:21	4.2 137:14	
153:18	Y	2	4.72 137:8	
weatherization	Yeah 152:13	2,337 143:10	40 156:1	
141:24 143:10,11	vear 133:24 134:4,9	2.19 137:16	40.63 138:21	
143:15,17	134:9 139:2 146:9	2.40 137:5	4001 131:18	
weatherized 143:9	153:1	2.5 152:11	43 152:4,7	
weatherizing	years 133:23	2.9 137:3 139:2,16	45,124 141:17	
143:22	139:24 140:8	2.9 137.3 139.2,10 200 142:10,14	45.8 133:25	
Welsh 141:11	141:16 146:21	200 142.10,14 2009 139:20	460 138:24	
went 149:19	147:10,21 153:21	2009 139.20 2010 142:12	47.62 138:23	
WHEREOF	153:21,21 155:10	2010 142.12 2015 142:20	48 139:22 140:10	
161:17	156:1,9 158:21	2016 152:10	487 143:14	
wide 155:18	York 140:24	2010 132.10 2017 152:8	5	
wildfires 155:23,25		2017 132.8 2018 141:17,25	5 132:8 134:10	
Williams 132:16	Z	142:18 143:9	139:1,12 140:8	
158:7,8,13 160:4	zero 140:10	2019 131:15 133:1		
windfall 147:15		133:11,19 137:15	5.1 137:7	
150:3,23 159:7	0	138:19 146:18	5:58 133:2 50 141:16 155:10	
wings 140:21		161:18	534-9066 131:23	
winter 143:5	1	2025 146:19 148:15	334-9000 131.23	
wish 141:11 154:18	1 137:4 139:20	148:24 149:2	6	
160:20	1.9 139:24	158:17,19	6.4 137:18	
wishes 160:7	10 142:13 150:14	206 131:23	6.5 134:6	
wishing 153:7	159:1	20 131.23 21 132:13	6:00 131:16	
WITNESS 161:17	100 140:23 146:19	23 132:14	6:46 160:22	
work 134:14	148:13 150:22	24 132:15		
135:23 144:5	158:15 159:4	24 132.13 246 143:9	7	
148:17 151:8	103 147:15,16	28 131:15 132:16	7,213 142:18	
159:15	159:7	133:1		
worked 153:11	11 132:9 135:3	287-9066 131:23	8	
		407-9000 131:43		