Docket Nos. UE-191024, UE-190750, UE-190929, UE-190981 and UE-180778 (Consolidated) - Vol. V

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

August 24, 2020



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u>

email: info@buellrealtime.com



	age 83	Pag	re 85
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)Docket Nos. UE-191024, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)UE-190750, UE-190929,	2 FOR THE ENERGY I 3 SIMON FF Attorney at 4 321 High S Suite D-3, 5 Bainbridge (206) 669-4 simon@fft 7 FOR PCA: 8 TYLER PE Davison V: 9 1750 SW I Portland, C 10 (503) 241-7 tcp@dvclar 11 FOR WALMART: 12 VICKI BAL 13 Parsons B: 201 South 14 Salt Lake 6 (801) 536-6	ITCH Law School Road NE Box No. 383 Island, Washington 98110 8197 Ichlaw.com PPLE an Cleve, P.C. Harbor Way, Suite 450 Dregon 97201 7242 w.com DWIN ehle & Latimer Main Street, Suite 1800 City, Utah 84111 6918 Ipparsonsbehle.com WILDING PLIHA ALL AHL AHL AHL AHL ARLE AUFMAN OULLINS DNAUER MEREDITH	
1 APPEARANCES 2 COMMISSIONERS: 3 DAVE DANNER, Chair ANN RENDAHL, Commissioner 4 JAY BALASBAS, Commissioner 5 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 7 ANDREW O'CONNELL 8 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 10 JENNIFER CAMERON-RULKOWSKI 11 Office of the Attorney General PO Box 40128 12 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 664-1186 13 jennifer.cameron-rulkowski@utc.wa.gov 14 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 15 NINA SUETAKE 16 Office of the Attorney General 800 - 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 430-2422 ninas@atg.wa.gov 19 FOR PACIFICORP: 20 AJAY KUMAR Pacific Power, Rocky Mountain Power 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1800 Portland, Oregon 97232 (503) 813-5161 ajay.kumar@pacificorp.com	2 EXHIBITS FOR A 3 BE-1 Response 4 BE-2 Response 5 BE-3 Response 6 BE-4 Response 7 BE-5 Response 8 BE-6 Response 9 Settlement Se (UE-191024) (I 10 (Appendix A, B,C) 11 JT-1r Joint Testi 12 Stipulation 13 JT-2 Detail of th EDIT 14 Settlement Se (UE-180778) U (Attachment 1, 2, 3) 17 JT-1 Joint Te (UE-180778) Sett 18 SAB-1T Direct (UE-191024) 20 EL-1T Direct (UE-191024) 21 EL-2 PacifiC 22 (UE-191024) Allo 24	HIBIT INDEX ADMISSION PAGE to Bench Request No. 1 101 to Bench Request No. 2 101 to Bench Request No. 3 101 to Bench Request No. 4 101 to Bench Request No. 5 101 to Bench Request No. 6 101 to Bench Request No. 6 101 mony in Support of 101 Dockets EU-191024 et al.) Finally Stipulation (Docket 101 JE-180778) Destimony in Support of 101 thement Stipulation (Docket 101 JE-180778) Testimony 101 Testimony 101	re 86

1 (Pages 83 to 86)

		Page 87		Page 89
1 EXHIBIT LIST (cont.) 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION 3 MGW-1CT Direct Testimony (UE-191024)	PAGE		EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE RTL-3C Nominal Henry Hub Natural Gas Price 101 (UE-191024) Forecasts *Confidential*	
MGW-2 Washington Inter-Ju 5 (UE-191024) Allocation Methodo 6 MGW-3 Washington Allocate (UE-191024)	ology		RTL-4 Project-Wide Wind Repowering SO and 101 5 (UE-191024) PaR PVRR(d)(Benefit)/Cost, February 2018	
	etimony *Confidential* 101 ed Net Power Costs 101		RTL-5 Project-Wide Wind Repowering Nominal 101 (UE-191024) Revenue Requirement PVRR(d)(Benefit)/ Cost, February 2018 RTL-6 Combined Projects SO and PaR PVRR(d) 101	
(UE-191024) 10 MGW-6 Net Power Costs Up 11 (UE-191024) 12 AEB-1T Direct Testimony		1:	9 (UE-191024) (Benefit)/Cost, February 2018 0 RTL-7 Combined Projects Nominal Revenue 101 (UE-191024) Requirement PVRR(d)(Benefit)/Cost, February 2018	
12 AEB-1T Direct Testimony (UE-191024) 13 AEB-2 Resume 14 (UE-191024)	101	1:	(UE-191024) 3 CAT-2C Energy Vision 2020 Wind Capital Cost 101	
AEB-3 Testimony Listing of A (UE-191024) AEB-4 Summary of Results	Ann E. Bulkley 101 101	1:	5 CAT-3 Site Plan Ekola Flats 101 (UE-191024) 6 CAT-4C Ekola Flats Assessment and Wind 101	
17 (UE-191024) 18 AEB-5 Proxy Group Selectio (UE-191024) 19 AEB-6 Constant Growth DCI		1:	*Confidential* 8 CAT-5C Ekola Flats Project Schedule 101	
20 (UE-191024) 21 AEB-7 Projected DCF Mode (UE-191024)		2:	0 CAT-6 Large Generator Interconnection 101 (UE-191024) Agreement Ekola Flats 1 CAT-7C Ekola Flats Easements *Confidential* 101	
AEB-8 Capital Asset Pricing (UE-191024) 24 AEB-9 Risk Premium Approx (UE-191024) 25		2:	CAT-8 Permit Status Record Ekola Flats 101 (UE-191024)	
		Dago 99	5 (UE-191024)	D2~2 00
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (con 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION	PAGE		1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE	Page 90
3 AEB-10 Expected Earnings A (UE-191024) 4 AEB-11 Capital Expenditures 5 (UE-191024)	•		3 CAT-10C TB Flats Assessment, Wind Resource (UE-191024) and Energy Production Estimate, and 4 Wind Resource Assessment Review *Confidential*	
6 AEB-12 Regulatory Risk Ana (UE-191024) 7 AEB-13 Capital Structure Ana			CAT-11C TB Flats Project Schedule 101 (UE-191024) *Confidential* CAT-12 Large Generator Interconnection 101 (UE-191024) Agreement TB Flats	
8 (UE-191024) 9 AEB-14 S&P 500 Industry Bri (UE-191024) Yardeni Research	efing: Utilities, 101		8 CAT-13C TB Flats Easement *Confidential* 101	
		1		
NLK-1T Direct Testimony (UE-191024) 12 NLK-2 Cost of Long-Term Di (UE-191024)	101 ebt 101	1:	0 CAT-14 TB Flats Permit Status Record 101 (UE-191024) 1 CAT-15 Site Plan Cedar Springs 101 2 (UE-191024)	
NLK-1T Direct Testimony 11 (UE-191024) 12 NLK-2 Cost of Long-Term D (UE-191024)	ebt 101 se Company Letter 101 edit Rating on 101	1:	CAT-14 TB Flats Permit Status Record 101 (UE-191024) CAT-15 Site Plan Cedar Springs 101 (UE-191024) CAT-16C Cedar Springs Assessment and Wind 101 (UE-191024) Energy Analysis "Confidential" CAT-17C Cedar Springs Project Schedule 101 (UE-191024) "Confidential"	
NLK-1T Direct Testimony (UE-191024) 12 NLK-2 Cost of Long-Term Direct (UE-191024) 13 NLK-3 Arizona Public Service (UE-191024) 15 NLK-4 Impact of a Lower Cre (UE-191024) Cost of Long-Term 16 NLK-5C S&P Ratings Direct I 17 (UE-191024) *Confidential* NLK-6 Variable Rate PCRB,	ebt 101 se Company Letter 101 edit Rating on 101	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CAT-14 TB Flats Permit Status Record 101 (UE-191024) CAT-15 Site Plan Cedar Springs 101 (UE-191024) CAT-16C Cedar Springs Assessment and Wind 101 (UE-191024) Energy Analysis "Confidential" CAT-17C Cedar Springs Project Schedule 101 (UE-191024) "Confidential" CAT-18 Large Generator Interconnection 101 (UE-191024) Agreement Cedar Springs CAT-19C Rights-of-Way Record Cedar Springs 101	
NLK-1T Direct Testimony (UE-191024) 12 NLK-2 Cost of Long-Term Di (UE-191024) 13 NLK-3 Arizona Public Servic (UE-191024) 15 NLK-4 Impact of a Lower Cre (UE-191024) Cost of Long-Term 16 NLK-5C S&P Ratings Direct I (UE-191024) "Confidential" NLK-6 Variable Rate PCRB, (UE-191024) Revenue Bond 19 NLK-7 Cost of Preferred Stor (UE-191024)	ebt 101 se Company Letter 101 edit Rating on 101 n Debt November 19, 2013 101 Pollution Control 101 ck 101	1: 1: 1: 1: 1:	CAT-14	
NLK-1T Direct Testimony	ebt 101 se Company Letter 101 edit Rating on 101 I Debt November 19, 2013 101 Pollution Control 101 ck 101 101	1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 1: 2: 2:	CAT-14	

2 (Pages 87 to 90)

	Page 91		Page 93
EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3 SEM-4C Property Tax Estimation Procedure (UE-191024) "Confidential" 4 SEM-5 TCJA Deferrals Amortization Schedules 101 (UE-191024) 6 SEM-6T Supplemental Testimony 101 (UE-191024) 7 SEM-7 Summary of Washington Results of 101 (UE-191024) Operations for the Test Period SEM-8C Updated Results of Operations for 101 (UE-191024) 12 Months Ended June 30, 2019 "Confidential" SEM-9 Updated TCJA Deferrals Amortization 101 (UE-191024) Schedule 12 RMM-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-191024) RMM-2 Cost of Service by Rate Schedule- 101 (UE-191024) Summaries 15 RMM-3 Cost of Service by Rate Schedule- 101 (UE-191024) All Functions 17 RMM-4 Cost of Service Study 101 (UE-191024) RMM-4 Cost of Service Study 101 (UE-191024) RMM-4 Cost of Service Study 101	Page 93
CAT-3 Éstimated Decommissioning Costs (UE-180778) TJH-1CT Direct Testimony *Confidential* 101 (UE-191024) TJH-2 Major Components of a Wind Generator 101 (UE-191024) TJH-3 List of Repowering Projects 101 (UE-191024) TJH-4C Repowering Project Details, Capital 101 (UE-191024) Costs, and In-Service Dates *Confidential*	1 2 2 2 2 2 2	RMM-5 Renewable Future Peak Credit 101 (UE-191024) Calculation RMM-6 Proposed Allocation of Revenue (UE-191024) Requirement Increase RMM-7 Proposed Pricing and Billing 101 (UE-191024) Determinants RMM-8 Monthly Billing Comparisons 101 (UE-191024) RMM-9 Calculation of Costs Included in (UE-191024) Residential Basic Charge	
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.)	Page 92	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.)	Page 94
2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3 TJH-5 Existing and Repowered Turbine Power 101 (UE-191024) Curve Comparison 4 TJH-1T Direct Testimony 101 5 (UE-180778) 6 TJH-2 Existing and Proposed Depreciable 101		2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3 RMM-10C MidC Wholesale Price Forecast (UE-191024) and Calculation of Time of Use 4 Scalars "Confidential" 5 RMM-11 Calculation of Proposed Schedule 19- (UE-191024) Residential Time of Use Pilot Prices 6	
(UE-180778) Lives for Renewable Resources RAV-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-191024) RAV-2 Idaho Asset Exchange Maps 101 (UE-191024)		RMM-12 Present and Proposed Schedule 17 Low 101 (UE-191024) Income Bill Assistance Credits RMM-13 Calculation of Proposed Schedule 40 (UE-191024) Irrigation Time of Use Pilot Prices RMM-14 Calculation of Proposed Schedule 29 101	
RAV-3 Energy Vision 2020 Wind Network 101 (UE-191024) Improvements RAV-4 Wallula-McNary Project 101 (UE-191024) RAV-5 Snow Goose Project 101	1	1.0 (UE-191024) Prices 1.1 RMM-15 Street and Area Light Cost Study 101 (UE-191024) 1.2 RMM-16 Decoupling Mechanism Calculation 101 1.3 (UE-191024)	
14 (UE-191024) 15 RAV-6 Vantage-Pomona Project 101 (UE-191024)	1	L4 RMM-17 Calculation of Proposed Federal Tax 101 (UE-191024) Act Adjustment Prices L5 RMM-18 Revised Tariff Pages 101	
RAV-7 Goshen-Sugarmill-Rigby Project 101 (UE-191024) RAV-8 Gromore Project 101 (UE-191024)	1	L6 (UE-191024) RMM-19 Rate Design/Cost of Services 101 (UE-191024) Collaborative Presentation, July 18, 2017 RMM-20T Supplemental Testimony 101	
RAV-9 StadeIman Fruit Project 101 (UE-191024) 21 SEM-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-191024) 22 SEM-2 Summary of the Washington Results 101 (UE-191024) of Operations for the Test Period	2 2	(UE-191024) RMM-21 Updated Cost of Service Summaries by 101 (UE-191024) Rate Schedule RMM-22 Updated Cost of Service Results by 101 (UE-191024) Class and Function	
24 SEM-3C Results of Operations for Twelve (UE-191024) Months ended June 30, 2019 *Confidential*	2	RMM-23 Detailed Results of the Updated Cost 101 24 (UE-191024) of Service Study 25 RMM-24 Impact of the Proposed Increase by 101	

3 (Pages 91 to 94)

	Page 95	Page 97
EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE RMM-25 Updated Pricing and Billing (UE-191024) Determinants RMM-26 Updated Monthly Billing Comparisons 101	1 2 3	EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE SRM-3T Supplemental Testimony 101 (UE-180778) SRM-4 Washington-Allocated Depreciation 101
5 (UE-191024) 6 RMM-27 Updated Calculation of Costs Included 101 (UE-191024) in the Residential Basic Charge	5 6	(UE-180778) Rates Reflecting 2019 IRP and CETA SRM-5 Washington-Allocated Depreciation 101 (UE-180778) Rates Reflecting WIJAM and Company GRC
RMM-28 Calculation of Schedule 19 Residential 101 (UE-191024) Time of Use Pilot Prices 9 RMM-29 Updated Schedule 17 Low Income Bill 101 (UE-191024) Assistance Credits	8	JJS-8T Supplemental Testimony 101 (UE-191024) JJS-9 Updated 2020 Depreciation Accrual 101
10 RMM-30 Updated Calculation of Scheduled 40 101 11 (UE-191024) Irrigation Time of Use Pilot Prices 12 RMM-31 Updated Calculation of Schedule 29 101 (UE-191024) Non-Residential Time of Use Pilot	10	(UE-191024) Rates for Colstrip and Jim Bridger Assets JJS-10 Updated 2020 Depreciation Calculations 101 (UE-191024) for Colstrip and Jim Bridger Assets JJS-14 Updated 2020 Representation Calculations 101
13 RMM-32 Updated Street and Area Lighting Cost 101 (UE-191024) Study 15 RMM-33 Updated Federal Tax Act Adjustment 101 (UE-191024) Prices	13 14 15	JJS-11 Updated 2020 Production Net Salvage 101 (UE-191024) Analysis for Colstrip and Jim Bridger Assets JJS-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-180778)
RMM-34 Updated Tariff Pages 101 17 (UE-191024) 18 RF-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-191024)	17 18 19	JJS-2 Qualifications of John J. Spanos 101 (UE-180778) JJS-3 Depreciation Study 101 (UE-180778)
RF-2 Deferred TCJA Tax Benefits 101 (UE-191024) 21 RF-3 EDIT Comparison to UE-171219 101 (UE-191024)	20 21 22	JJS-4 California and Washington Steam 101 (UE-180778) Production Plant JJS-5T Supplemental Testimony 101 (UE-180778)
RF-4 RSGM Worksheet 101 223 (UE-191024) 24 RF-5 Impact of Flow-Through Accounting 101 (UE-191024)	23	JJS-6 Updated Depreciation Accrual Rates 101 (UE-180778) for Colstrip and Jim Bridger, Scenario 1 JJS-7 Updated Depreciation Accrual Rates 101
	25	(UE-180778) for Colstrip and Jim Bridger, Scenario
1 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) 2 EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE 3 RF-6 State Income Tax Summary (UE-191024) 4 RF-7 Supplemental Testimony 101		Page 98 EXHIBIT INDEX (cont.) EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION PAGE DRM-1HT Supplemental Testimony *Highly 101 (UE-191024) Confidential*
5 (UE-191024) 6 RF-8 Updated Impact of Flow-Through 101 (UE-191024) Accounting		4 5 6
MSN-1T Direct Testimony 101 8 (UE-191024) 9 MSN-2 Schedule 300 Charge Review 101 (UE-191024)		7 8 9
MSN-3 Bill Credit Calculation 101 11 (UE-191024) 12 ALB-1T Direct Testimony 101 (UE-191024)	1 1 1	0 1
13 ALB-2 Nile Feeder (4Y1) Diagram 101 14 (UE-191024) 15 ALB-3 Delta Fire Rebuild (Line 14 Line 2) 101 (UE-191024) Diagram	1	3 4
16 ALB-4 Pacific Power Wildfire Mitigation 101 17 (UE-191024) Presentation 18 SRM-6T Supplemental Testimony 101 (UE-191024)	1 1 1 1 1	7 8
19	1 2 2 2	0 1
	4.	۵

4 (Pages 95 to 98)

Page 99 Page 101 1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; AUGUST 24, 2020 1 JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Walmart? 2 2 MS. BALDWIN: Good morning. This is Vicki 9:30 A.M. 3 --000--3 Baldwin, appearing on behalf of Walmart. 4 PROCEEDINGS 4 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 5 The parties have stipulated to the admission 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record. 6 of all the prefiled testimony and exhibits and no party 6 7 Good morning. It is Monday, August 24th, 2020. The 7 objects to PacifiCorp's motion to allow the errata 8 time is approximately 9:35 a.m. 8 exhibits filed on August 11th, 2020. The testimony 9 My name is Andrew O'Connell. I am the 9 exhibits are admitted and PacifiCorp's motion is 10 administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities 10 granted. 11 and Transportation Commission, and I will be presiding 11 (Prefiled exhibits admitted.) 12 JUDGE O'CONNELL: We will -- or I will 12 in this matter along with the Commissioners who have 13 joined us via video. 13 provide a copy of the finalized exhibit list to the 14 We are here today for a settlement hearing 14 court reporter so that it can be made a part of the 15 in consolidated Dockets UE-191024, UE-190750, UE-190929, 15 record. 16 UE-190981, and UE-180778, which is PacifiCorp's electric 16 Now, Ms. Suetake, how long -- I want to talk 17 general rate case, the accounting petitions, and 17 about the public comments exhibit briefly. How long 18 does Public Counsel need to compile any public comments depreciation petition. 18 19 Let's take short appearances on the record 19 received regarding this proceeding? 20 starting with PacifiCorp. 20 MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, Your Honor. I 21 MR. KUMAR: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 believe we had spoken about this at the public comment 22 Appearing on behalf of PacifiCorp, it's Ajay Kumar. And 22 hearing, and we had agreed that a week would be fine 23 additionally in this docket, Matthew McVee, Carla 23 after this hearing. So I think we have it calendared 24 Scarsela for the Company along with Katherine McDowell 24 for the 31st right now. 25 of the law firm McDowell, Rackner, Gibson. But on this 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think that will Page 100 Page 102 call, only I will be appearing. be acceptable. So we will designate that as Bench 1 1 2 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 2 Exhibit 2, or BE-2. It will be filed in the docket by 3 And for Staff. 3 the end of the day Monday, August 31st, 2020. MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Appearing on --4 5 appearing on behalf of Commission Staff, Jennifer 5 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Are there any motions --6 Cameron-Rulkowski, Assistant Attorney General. And we 6 before we begin, any motions or requests from any of the 7 do have other AAGs from our office in the case; however, 7 parties? Okay. Thank you. 8 8 for the purposes of the settlement hearing today, it Let's talk about the schedule for today's 9 will just be me. 9 hearing. So the Commissioners have joined me via video, 10 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 10 and after we are done discussing the schedule, I will invite a presenter from the settling parties to present 11 And for Public Counsel. 11 MS. SUETAKE: For Public Counsel, I am Nina 12 12 its opening statement in support of the settlement. At 13 13 Suetake, Assistant Attorney General, for -- and we also that time, only the Commissioners, myself, and the 14 have in this docket Ann Paisner, but for the purposes of 14 presenters should have their video turned on. 15 this hearing, I will only be appearing. 15 Then we will have a settlement panel to JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 16 16 answer questions from the bench. All witnesses should 17 For Packaging Corporation of America. 17 turn their video on for the entirety of the segment of 18 MR. PEPPLE: Good morning, Commissioners. 18 the hearing and should only unmute the microphones to 19 Tyler Pepple for Packaging Corporation of America and 19 speak. 20 with me is Corinne Milinovich. 20 While all the dockets in this proceeding 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. 21 have been consolidated, there are two unopposed 22 22 settlement documents. One resolves all disputed issues And for The Energy Project. 23 MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Commissioners. at PacifiCorp's depreciation filing, Docket UE-180778. 23 24 24 This is Simon ffitch, appearing on behalf of The Energy The other resolves all disputed issues in the general 25 25 Project. rate case and the remaining documents and incorporates

5 (Pages 99 to 102)

Page 103

the depreciation settlement. So for purposes of this hearing, we are going to address the settlements at the same time, and we intend to ask questions regarding the depreciation settlement while we have all witnesses on the panel.

Last, we will hear any last comments from the parties and address any outstanding procedural matters.

Are there any other questions before we get started? Okay. Seeing none, Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Balasbas have joined us, and now we have an opportunity for opening statements on behalf of the settling parties. And I'd like to ask that Mr. Wilding and Ms. Kopliha turn on their video and we will give the stage to them to present their opening statement.

And one other thing, Ms. -- Ms. Karen Schubert, can you please turn off your video? Ms. Schubert, one more time if you can hear me, will you please turn off your video by selecting the turn camera off button on the popup menu when you move your mouse?

Okay. Let's -- let's go ahead and proceed. Mr. Wilding, I will turn it over to you.

MR. WILDING: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Mike Wilding. I am the director of net power

include the rate stability as mentioned, the overall result of the stipulation of a rate decrease of

approximately .06 percent, which is approximately 55 cents per month for the average residential customer.

Additionally, as part of this stipulation, the Company will not file a rate case that would have a rate effective date before January 1 of 2024; however, this stipulation does require two proceedings next year.

The first is a limited issue rate filing to review certain pro forma generation and transmission investments that are included in rates subject to refund as far as the stipulation. This limited issue rate filing will provide the opportunity for stakeholders and the Commission to review the actual costs of these investments.

Second, is a power cost only rate case that updates the net power cost baseline to reflect the changes to day ahead scheduling that are currently being implemented by the Company. This stipulation also provides for the return of all tax benefits from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act including the 2020 deferred current tax benefits, the nonprotected excess deferred income taxes, or EDIT, and protected EDIT through the end of 2020.

Additionally, the stipulation maintains

Page 104

costs and regulatory policy for PacifiCorp and appreciate the time to present a -- all issue, all party settlement in the Washington -- in PacifiCorp's Washington general rate case.

Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Commissioner Balasbas. Appreciate this time this morning, again, to present this settlement -summary of our settlement.

I would like to start off by saying that
PacifiCorp is very appreciative of the engagement and
hard work done by parties to reach this stipulation.
This is PacifiCorp's first general rate case in
approximately five years, and it included a number of
very complex and difficult issues. However, through the
diligence of all parties involved, we feel we've been
able to come to a settlement that is beneficial to
PacifiCorp's customers in Washington.

Parties believe that this stipulation is in the public interest and we request that the Commission approve it. This stipulation provides for continued rate stability for customers over the next three years and update PacifiCorp's revenue requirements to reflect the Company's operations and the significant investments in renewable energy.

The main provisions of this stipulation

Page 106

Page 105

PacifiCorp's existing capital structure and cost of
equity, which strikes a balance between rate stability
for customers and provides the Company with the access
to financing to support the continued capital investment
that is necessary for PacifiCorp's transition to a
cleaner energy future.

Additionally, a part of this stipulation is the approval of the Washington Interjurisdictional Cost Allocation Methodology, which we refer to as WIJAM, and also the 2020 protocol which dictates the cost allocations among PacifiCorp's service territory.

The WIJAM was the result of two years of work with Staff, Public Counsel, and Packaging Corporation of America and provides for the inclusion of cost and benefits of all of PacifiCorp's nonemitting resources in the rates for Washington customers. This allows Washington customers the benefits of PacifiCorp's geographic diversity and including the significant investment in wind generation included in this case. PacifiCorp looks forward to continuing to work with these parties through our multistate process for continuing to resolve cost allocation issues.

The stipulation also settles the rate spread and rate design. It maintains PacifiCorp's current basic charge and flushes the tiered energy rates by 25

6 (Pages 103 to 106)

Page 107

percent for residential customers to provide for a number of innovating pricing pilots.

Finally, the stipulation requires an increased reporting for customer disconnections and creates a low income advisory group to examine the low income bill assistance with dates set for which that committee will report back on proposed updates and improvements.

Overall, this stipulation strikes a fair balance and provides rate stability for customers, and over the next three years, the parties recommend that the Commission approve this stipulation.

And thank you for your time today.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wilding, before you turn off your camera, can you clarify for us that the accounting petitions from Dockets UE-190750, 190929, and 190981 that those are resolved by the settlement?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct. This is -- all -- all issues are resolved in this settlement.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And when the parties say that the settlement resolves every issue in dispute in the consolidated dockets, does this mean that the Company's position in its initial filing for the three accounting petitions is accepted or otherwise unchallenged?

Staff, Public Counsel, and the Packaging Corporation of America. The stipulating parties agree that the depreciation study should be approved and results in a

reduction of approximately 1.48 million to Washington allocated depreciation rates relative to the initial filing.

Parties have agreed to a number of changes to certain generation, transmission, and distribution accounts, which are specified in my joint testimony and the stipulation. Additionally, as PacifiCorp develops or requires new solar and/or battery storage assets before the Company files its next depreciation study, the Company will use a 25-year life span for solar facilities with corresponding depreciation rates. And PacifiCorp has agreed to provide additional information and collect additional data on the FERC Account 390 [inaudible] in Utah.

Respectfully, I ask the Commission to issue an order approving, one, the terms and commission -- excuse me, the terms and conditions of the stipulation; and two, the depreciation rates submitted in attachment three to the stipulation on July 17th, 2020. Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

Let's at this time ask that all the settlement panel witnesses turn on their video.

Page 108

MR. WILDING: Yes, that's correct.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.
I'd like to invite Ms. Kopliha to give her
opening statement for the settlement in the depreciation
Docket UE-180778.

MS. KOPLIHA: All right. Good morning. So I'm Nikki Kopliha. I'm the chief financial officer for PacifiCorp, and I was part of not only the rate case but the depreciation case. So my summary provides an overview of the key terms of the depreciation settlement stipulation that's before the Commission today.

The stipulation is the result of many meetings held between February of 2019 and June of 2020 involving the parties in this docket. Additionally, there were meetings with parties involved in the Company's depreciation proceedings in Utah, Idaho, Oregon, and Wyoming, and we believe that this stipulation is in the public interest.

On September 13th, 2018, PacifiCorp filed an application requesting authorization to update depreciation rates effective January 1st, 2021, based on the study that was performed under my direction by Mr. John Spanos.

On July 17th, 2020, the Company submitted a settlement stipulation that was signed by PacifiCorp,

Page 110

Page 109

And, Mr. Wilding, you can rejoin the video.
MS. KOPLIHA: Can I actually note, so
Mr. Wilding and I are actually in the same room since I
don't have a camera on my computer, so I can flip it
back to him. We're, of course, trying to stay six feet
apart, and we won't both necessarily be on the camera at
the same time.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: That will be fine and we will direct our questions or -- or if we ask a question that is better answered by one of you than the other, please indicate that to us and we can take a moment for you to switch the camera.

Okay. To all witnesses, I'm waiting to make sure I see everyone and I think I do. Okay. So to all witnesses, will you please raise your right hand?

(Witness panel sworn.)

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Let's have each of the witnesses introduce themselves for the record, spelling their last name beginning with PacifiCorp, Mr. Wilding.

MR. WILDING: Yes, my name is Michael Wilding, W-i-l-d-i-n-g.

 $\label{eq:MS. KOPLIHA: I am Nikki Kopliha, N-i-k-k-i, K-o-p-l-i-h-a.} MS. KOPLIHA: I am Nikki Kopliha, N-i-k-k-i, K-o-p-l-i-h-a.$

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

7 (Pages 107 to 110)

Page 111 And for Staff? MR. BALL: This is Jason Ball with Commission Staff, B-a-I-I. JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Public Counsel? MR. DAHL: This is Corey Dahl. First name is C-o-r-e-y, last name D-a-h-l. MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle for Public Counsel. Last name is spelled E-a-r-l-e. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for Packaging Corporation of America? MR. KAUFMAN: This is Lance Kaufman for Packaging Corporation of America. My last name is K-a-u-f-m-a-n. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for The Energy Project. MR. COLLINS: Shawn Collins, S-h-a-w-n, C-o-l-l-i-n-s. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. And for Walmart. MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. Alex Kronauer, K-r-o-n, as in Nancy, a-u-e-r. I'm the senior manager on the energy servicing in Walmart. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Good morning to you all. Thank you. Okay. I will start us off with the first question. We will ask specific follow-up

Page 113

representative from the Company.

MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. Yes, I'd be happy to start. So there's a lot there to -- a lot of questions you asked there, and so I'll -- I'll start with the -- the net power cost proceeding in this case, and then what it will look like next year with the power cost only rate case.

This year at PacifiCorp, we used our grid model to fork out pro forma net power costs for 2021 and then those are allocated to Washington customers under the WIJAM methodology. Those costs were updated using a December 31st of 2019 official forward price curve, and that's just because of the timing and setting and filing of the rate case.

So we've now agreed that we will update those costs, that power cost baseline, for a final update in October of -- October 15th of 2020, and we will use the September 30th official forward price curve that will obviously come out the two weeks before that update. So that will give us the most up-to-date market conditions that we have for those -- for the net power cost baseline in 2021.

And then in 2021, we've agreed to do an additional update to our net power cost baseline. So as part of the MSD process in the 2020 protocol and the

Page 112

```
questions in our effort to understand the settlement, but first, the bench needs more clarity from the parties on the content and workings of the settlement in general. And we are giving you the opportunity first before we get into our very detailed follow-up questions to better explain how the various elements of the settlement work together, power costs, the nodal pricing method, the agreed reductions to power cost, and the October 2020 update.
```

Please explain what the parties envision as part of the limited proceedings and the PCORC in 2021 which issues will be included and what issues will be excluded.

Also we want to hear more from what ways this settlement sets rates using the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol and what is the Commission being asked to accept with regard to the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol. For instance, how would our acceptance of the WIJAM and 2020 protocol affect future Commission decision-making.

So let's start back at the beginning of my question. Please take this opportunity to better explain the contents and workings and how different elements fit together in the settlement. Who would like to start?

Mr. Wilding, I would like to invite you as a

Page 114

WIJAM, the Company agreed that we would move to a nodal pricing model for purposes of allocating cost to the different states.

And the reason why we've -- we've gone down the path is because under the current 2020 protocol, we still share amongst all of our six states a dynamic resource portfolio where all resources are -- are shared amongst all states. But moving forward, once that protocol expires, the goal is to get to a place where each state will have its own unique resource portfolio that serves loads based on that state's energy policy and the resources that it wants to serve.

And so in order to get to the place where we can have state-specific energy portfolios, the parties at -- in MSD and as to the 2020 protocol including Washington Staff, Public Counsel, and Packaging Corporation all agreed to the nodal pricing MOU. And so what that nodal pricing does is it agrees that we should implement that nodal pricing on a dispatch basis, or a day ahead scheduling basis rather, next year in 2021 so that we can gain experience and learn how it works and really refine -- refine it before we start using it for cost allocation methodology in 2024.

And so we're currently working with the California ISO to implement that as part of our actual

8 (Pages 111 to 114)

Page 115

operations and as part of our front office to implement that day ahead dispatch based on a nodal dispatch.

And so we have agreed that as part of this case, we would update next year, update our net power cost baseline to capture those changes in the dispatch the best we can through our forecast model. And to do that, we are currently working on moving from our in-house brig model that's about 20 years old that we've been using in regulatory proceedings all during that time to -- to the Aurora model, which will have some -- entire functionality and different capabilities that would allow us to potentially capture that day ahead dispatch that we're implementing in our actual operations.

So that is the purpose of that PCORC or that power cost only rate case filing is to update that baseline with the most up-to-date information next year and also with using the new model that the Company is currently working on to forecast its regulatory net power cost to include that as the new baseline of next year in a power cost only rate case.

So I'm -- I'm happy to move on and -- and dive deeper into the 2020 protocol and the WIJAM, but I'm also happy to stop there to see if there's any further questions about net power cost and how all of

Page 117

and we are on track, the last report I got, and so that day ahead dispatch signal from CAISO will be in place in 2021, but the actual cost allocation, that piece, that accounting piece, is not -- is not agreed to until 2024, once we move to this new cost allocation methodology that also includes -- that includes state-specific portfolios.

And I say -- I give that term "agreed to" loosely because it's agreed to that nodal pricing seems like it should be able to solve the problem that should be able to fairly allocate the net power cost amongst states under that scenario, but there's still lots of questions and lots of items that still need to be worked out over the next couple of years, but contracting with CAISO and getting that first dispatch solution, that's the first step in -- in first getting the data and the experience necessary to answer some of the other questions.

And so next year when we come in for the power cost only rate case, we will switch to the Aurora Model, because the Aurora model has the better functionality to capture what we will be doing in the dispatch, but the allocation of the net power cost still will not use that nodal pricing model yet because it's not fully developed and we don't expect the allocation

Page 116

those things are -- are related.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning. So just so I can understand what you've just described, so when you come in for the update in 2021, you will be planning to use the Aurora model, not a nodal pricing model because you'll be in transition; is that the intent?

MR. WILDING: Partially. The intent is to move -- so right now, and including this case, we -- we use our grid model is what's the name of it, and so we're moving from the grid model to the Aurora model.

The nodal pricing model is a cost allocation term that we developed through our MSP, our multistate process negotiations, as a method for allocating the -- allocating the net power cost, so that does have a piece of it that is -- so there's that accounting piece that's the allocation, but there's also the dispatch piece where we are engaging with CAISO and contracting with CAISO to provide us a day ahead schedule on an -- at a nodal level that we will then follow and then use to allocate the net power cost to states.

That -- so that first piece where we are contracting with CAISO, we are working on that right now, and that is being implemented in January. And --

Page 118

piece to be fully developed until closer to 2024, and as we work stakeholders in all of our jurisdictions to fully develop that allocation.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Thank you. So just to follow up on that, so, Mr. Wilding, I think what I heard you say is that for purposes -- for setting the baseline for power cost, we will continue to use -- or we -- or the Company will transition from the grid model to Aurora for purposes of dispatch and the cost associated with that. At the same time, then, Washington will be -- you will be using the nodal pricing model kind of, I guess for lack of a better term, as maybe more like a parallel or a shadow kind of way of deciding what costs -- power costs are and how they could be allocated under that method; did I

MR. WILDING: I -- I think mostly. I would just maybe just correct a few -- a few things.

understand that correctly?

First, the Aurora model will not be used for dispatch. The Aurora model is simply a forecasting tool that will be used for regulatory purposes. That dispatch and that day ahead schedule, that's what we're contracting with CAISO to provide us, and CAISO will

9 (Pages 115 to 118)

Page 119

actually use their market models to give us that day ahead dispatch. And so Aurora will just be used in a ratemaking setting like a rate case or a power cost only rate case to set that baseline.

And then -- and then as far as -- yes, we will have that in place with CAISO over the next couple of years the -- as you pointed out, to gather the data to gain experience to help us answer the questions on exactly how we can use it that allocate those net power costs to our different jurisdictions.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I think you did a pretty good job covering most of the topics I asked you, Mr. Wilding. I would like to ask a follow-up for the general question to Mr. Ball.

Perhaps you can add some clarity to us about what the Commission is being asked to accept as far as the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol if we accept the settlement and what effect might that have on future Commission decision-making.

MR. BALL: Thank you, Judge O'Connell. I'm happy to do that, but I believe Chairman Danner had his hand raised.

CHAIR DANNER: Yes, thank you. Yeah, you know, I did have a question for Mr. Wilding before we move on. I just -- we had a couple of definitions. You

specific and narrow cases and -- and --

CHAIR DANNER: And that was my understanding too. I just want to make sure that we don't have any -- any scope [inaudible] and just want to make sure that it's your understanding that we can -- we can scope in this [inaudible].

MR. WILDING: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. BALL: Good morning, Chairman, good morning, Commissioners. Jason Ball with Commission Staff. The -- to address Judge O'Connell's general questions, I'm going to try not to repeat the majority of what Mr. Wilding just said, but I do want to add a little bit of color to a couple of pieces.

The first is in October, we're having a power cost update. Generally speaking, that's just to provide newer information than what was initially filed in the case or included in the supplemental filing. A component of the stipulation was that if that new information comes in and it causes rate -- or it causes a change to rates such that there -- that there is no longer a refund in the base revenue requirement, the parties agreed respectively to grab some money that's already built into the deferral of the power cost mechanism to help maintain this settlement as a rate refund over the next three years.

Page 120

know, we're talking about a limited issue filing and that's one where I want to talk about pro forma adjustments and then we talk about PCORC. Of course, PCORC was something we did in a -- in a settlement in another utilities rate case.

And so just to be clear, because I didn't see real good definitions, although your descriptions were really good this morning, I just want to be -- I want to be clear that we don't start bringing in ancillary issues in that.

And insofar as we don't have typed definitions, are you -- is it your understanding that the Commission would be able to scope those proceedings to make sure that they are focused on what you described this morning and don't go beyond that so to bring in ancillary or unrelated issues?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that is my understanding. And, in fact, in the stipulation on page 6 of the stipulation, when we talk about the pro forma capital additions, those are actually identified which assets would be eligible for this limited issue rate filing, and so absolutely agree with that, that those -- those -- both of those proceedings, the limited rate filing for those certain assets and the net power cost resetting of the baseline are intended to be very

Page 122

Page 121

So we were concerned that if the power cost baseline -- or excuse me, the power cost update that came out in October happened to represent higher power costs than were protected now, then that -- there might be -- it might cause the rate refund to no longer be a refund.

So that was one of the things we built into that mechanism to -- to -- to deal with those forecasts and the differences between a forecast in the future and a forecast now.

So that was what happened in October. Then in January, on January 1, rates from the entire case go into -- would go into effect. That includes a multitude of different pieces. That's the -- the accounting petitions, the depreciation rates, the base rates, the tax benefits, all those things were timed so that we can get them going at the same time to prevent rates from causing a yo-yo in -- in what customers' bills look like.

Then sometime after January 1, we see this new filing from PacifiCorp, and this new filing is a limited issue filing to deal with pro forma plant that was brought to our attention included in the rate, but we didn't feel like we could review it in sufficient time for a hearing of -- or for the rate effective

10 (Pages 119 to 122)

Page 123

period. And that is looking at very specific plant, as Mr. Wilding identified, it was included in the stipulation and identified what plant would be subject to that filing. And that that plant also, because it was included in the rates set in January 1, the revenue requirement was included in January 1, but the prudency determination wasn't necessarily. Those rates were then -- that revenue associated with those plants were then subject to refund.

Assuming that there is no issue and that the case comes in and all the parties have a chance to look at it and they all say yes, we think this is all good, nothing changes to rates after that filing.

Then sometime later in the year, we have what we call the PCORC, which is a power cost only rate case. Power cost only rate cases, as the Chairman alluded to, were originally designed as a settlement for PSE back I believe in the early 2000s. PCORCs had different components to them that were specific to PSE based upon how their power cost mechanisms work.

However, the nomenclature, the -- the power cost only rate case as a nation, was really important for us because what it implied was that we're only looking at power costs.

So that new filing that comes into play in

costs.

Then the question was about the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol. So the WIJAM was a negotiation between Staff, the Company, PCA, and Public Counsel to examine the existing allocations of rates to Washington by PacifiCorp. The WIJAM is not an agreement between PacifiCorp, Washington, and the other five operating jurisdictions that PacifiCorp works in, it's only an agreement between Washington and PacifiCorp.

And what it does is it incorporates a variety of new elements and changes a few things that historically have been allocated to Washington based upon new information that's available to us as well as a better understanding of the cost causation that these assets provide.

Another big key of the -- to the WIJAM was the Idaho Asset Exchange that occurred back in 2015 and was a part of the 2015 rate case, pieces of it were, that are now being fully resolved as a part of this settlement. The Idaho Asset Exchange opened up some transmission capability between the Company's east and western operating areas, which is one of the reasons why we believe this WIJAM now better reflects the actual operations the Company engages in on a dispatch basis.

The WIJAM has an effect on cost allocations.

Page 124

the later half of next year is just about resetting the baseline using the new information available to us from the nodal pricing model.

On that note, so the nodal pricing model, the reason why -- one of the main reasons why Staff supported the nodal pricing model and continues to support it is because we believe it is both a far more transparent and effective just examination of the Company's power costs as well as we believe it will -- both the dispatch that they are engaging in through CAISO and the modeling of that dispatch through the Aurora model will result in a reduction of the power costs. That's what we believe right now based on the information that we have. We can't be absolutely certain about it because we don't have it physically in front of us, but based on the information we have, that's what we believe.

So we wanted to get the Company onto that new model now, especially because they were going to start -- they are working with CAISO to switch over their dispatch, and that way the power costs in 2022 will match the way they are actually adjusting -- or excuse me, match the way they are actually dispatching their power under the CAISO dispatch methodology. So that's all the proceedings in the plant and the power

Page 126

Page 125

It includes all of transmission plant across both
 PacifiCorp East and PacifiCorp West. It includes all of
 renewable resources both of PacifiCorp East and
 PacifiCorp West. Neither of those things have happened
 before.

The WIJAM is meant to be a permanent change to the western control area methodology that we have historically used in Washington. It's meant to be a standalone agreement between Washington and the Company on how to assign cost, and it is also meant to meet the Commission's test, which is whether or not resources provide quantifiable, direct, or indirect benefits to Washington ratepayers commensurate with their costs. We believe that the WIJAM meets that test.

The 2020 protocol is a slightly different animal. What it does is it outlines specific cost allocations that are agreed to by all of Washington -- of PacifiCorp operating jurisdiction, not just Washington, but it doesn't finally resolve them. What it says is here are the ones we've agreed to, here are the ones we're still working on, one of them which is the assignment of power costs using the nodal pricing model, which is what Mr. Wilding was just talking about, and it says we're still working on those, give us three years, and then we'll have a final version. We'll

11 (Pages 123 to 126)

Page 127

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 129

The WIJAM is incorporated into that as by ref- -- by -- as an appendix. And it basically says this is the way Washington's doing it, but the WIJAM is also separate in that it includes a provision if the 2020 protocol gets to 2024 and the states can't agree on anything, then we just continue going forward with the WIJAM. It can stand alone.

figure -- we'll have this all figured out.

If, however, we get to 2024 and the -- all the states have agreed on something and Washington's been a part of those negotiations and we've agreed to something as well, we would come to this Commission with a new allocation methodology that incorporates what components of the WIJAM needed to be incorporated and what pieces don't.

So --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Ball, let's take a pause right there for some questions.

CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. I just -- thank you for the discussion. Can you just clarify for me what -- is Washington -- did we sign onto all of the 2020 protocol or just certain components of

MR. BALL: Staff signed onto all of 2020 protocol and all of the WIJAM. However, the 2020 that way, because that would imply that the previous methodology was incorrect and that's not what we're

What we're saying is that the circumstances changed, and because those circumstances have changed, we can now include these new assets into rates. For instance, or to provide a little color, one of the key pieces of this was the Idaho Asset Exchange. Prior to that exchange, the transmission assets that connected Jim Bridger to the western control area, physically connected us to the western control area, were very limited in how they could operate. And it meant that power really could not physically flow very often from the eastern control area to the western control area except under specific conditions.

That change, when the Idaho Asset Exchange updated those agreements and turned them from legacy contracts into FERC open access tariffs, now there was not the limitation that these transmission lines be solely used by Jim Bridger, it was now what could happen is those transmission lines could be used however they needed to be used.

So we looked at that and we said okay, we now have access to a whole host of resources. Which of those resources can meet our used and useful test, which

Page 128

Page 130

protocol is very explicit in which sections apply to Washington and which ones don't. And by incorporating the WIJAM, we basically said this is the way we're doing it and these other sections, they apply in the manner in which they can be applied.

Does that make sense?

CHAIR DANNER: Well, yeah. I mean, I was thinking about, you know, what we had agreed to in the 2020 protocol is we were going to continue to work on the framework issues, I think we're going to work on the bringing out the coal and making sure that we're in compliance with state laws there.

So -- so let me just ask this question since I have -- I have you here. Is -- is it -- are you confident that under this new methodology that only resources that would meet the used and useful test are being brought into Washington rates?

MR. BALL: Yes.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So things that were formerly excluded now you're saying well, wait a minute, that's -- that's important because that is going to help us achieve our CETA objectives or CETA just -- it's a recognition that what in the past we had excluded was in fact benefitting Washington?

MR. BALL: Not -- I wouldn't quite put it

of those resources can meet the benefit commensurate cost test, and that's what we identified in the WIJAM as the renewable resources, the transmission assets because those resources are all commensurate with the cost.

CHAIR DANNER: And when you say the words "can be used," do you mean will be used or is there some uncertainty about that?

MR. BALL: Well, there's only so much un- -the uncertainty that I referred to is you can't color-code electrons. The -- the assets will be dispatched to meet PacifiCorp's load obligations, and they will continue to do that in a manner that they believe -- that is least cost and is under the rules of economic dispatch.

So to the extent that you can say a Wyoming wind plant is being used to meet Washington load, it's not as -- it's not that we can suddenly specifically identify those assets as providing direct power to Washington, it's that we now know that they have the ability to do it whereas before we were almost certain they didn't.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So good morning, Mr. Ball.

MR. BALL: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Good morning. So

12 (Pages 127 to 130)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 131

just to make sure that I heard what you were saying correctly, and I appreciate the explanation you gave about both the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol, but I want to summarize what I think I heard you say and I want you to respond to that to make sure that I think I understood this correctly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what we're being asked to do via this settlement is -- is not only to approve the use of the WIJAM, but also the parts of the 2020 protocol that have been agreed to and specifically applied to Washington State. First is, I guess, did I understand that correctly?

MR. BALL: Yes, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And so then I think I heard you say that as the framework issues and other things in the 2020 protocol, as discussions continue between the Company and all six states, by I believe it's 2024, if there is agreement, then -- then the Company and other parties will come to the Commission and effectively propose a new cost allocation method based on what has been agreed to? MR. BALL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And in the event there is not an agreement among those framework issues and any other outstanding issues, then we will continue

the net power cost having the adjustments in the hole and then having the PCORC moving to the nodal -- nodal pricing model, Aurora, from our point of view is going

to be very beneficial because it will echo what CAISOs do we use, dispatch and will likely lead to a much more

accurate estimate of the net -- net power cost going forward. And that, of course, is important for the accuracy of rates, the stability of rates going forward.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you.

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you mentioned going to this new nodal pricing model and the CAISO dispatch model will provide more transparency. Now, I would assume that the nodal pricing method and CAISO's dispatch model are proprietary and maybe not available to other parties in cases going forward. And so I ask the parties if there's any concerns going forward, and maybe my assumption is not correct, that parties to future cases would have access to those models to understand what is going on assuming you all say that there's more transparency.

MR. WILDING: This is Mike Wilding from the Company, if I can jump in and answer that first, Commissioner. As part of the 2020 protocol, one of the first things we agreed to was to further investigate the

Page 132

to operate under the auspices of the WIJAM? MR. BALL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank

you. MR. BALL: I -- I didn't have anything else actually. That was the end of my answer to the Judge O'Connell's question.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Ball. I'm learning that I should pause after someone finishes speaking just to make sure that there -- there isn't more to come from someone else before I jump in. So thank you for your response.

Is there anything from any of the other witnesses that was not included in either Mr. Wilding's or Mr. Ball's explanation that, you know, the other settling parties would like to explain? And this is regard- --

MR. EARLE: So --

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm sorry, I apologize. This is regarding my general how this all fits together question. So there will be more time and opportunity for more specific questions. So, I'm sorry, I

interrupted someone who was about to speak. Go ahead. MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle for Public

Counsel. I just wanted to add that the framework for

Page 134

Page 133

1 nodal pricing model and to start reaching out to 2 CAISO -- or we had already reached out, but to begin 3 working with CAISO to implement the day ahead scheduling. And one of the provisions in there is that we will provide training in all settlement documents that we can.

> However, your point is well, taking the -the CAISO model themselves are proprietary; however, all the outputs that the Company receives from CAISO we will share with the Company, and then our models will be shared -- or sorry, share with the Company and the Company will share with parties, and that our model, including the Aurora model, the input and the output of that, I know some parties have access to Aurora already, but that will be shared with parties in any regulatory proceeding.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. Are there -- are there any other folks who want to comment on that?

MR. BALL: This is Jason Ball with Staff if I may. I just want to echo what Mr. Wilding said, which is that the CAISO model and the CAISO -- or the CAISO model itself, which is, as you said proprietary, that will be used for actual system dispatch. When it -- and so we will see the output of that and see what they

13 (Pages 131 to 134)

Page 135

actually did. When it comes to setting rates and setting the baseline rates and determining what goes into the -- the baseline revenue requirement, that will be based right now off the Aurora model, which we have full access to. We have Aurora power cost modelers staff and we have our own independent license.

If in 2024 -- or as part of 2020 negotiations as we re-examine -- or as we examine how to do nodal pricing going forward, I can't speak for the other parties, but at least for Washington, that will be a -- Washington Staff, that will be an incredibly important component of whatever methodology is used to assign baseline rates, that it be fully transparent, that we can examine the model and all of its inputs regardless of how actual dispatch occurs on the back end using the CAISO proprietary version.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.

MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle for Public
Counsel, if I can add that I think that provision of the
inputs and the outputs, the ability Staff has to run
Aurora is important. I think thinking forward to 2024,
it will be important to think about transparency of
assumptions and exactly how -- how the model works. And
I think that sort of information is possible to get
without necessarily having CAISO's model in -- in hand.

representative to make comment or explain some legal aspects that we touched on in this proceeding.

Page 137

Okay. So with that, let me turn over to the Commissioners for any more follow-up questions on this topic. Chair?

CHAIR DANNER: So I have a few discreet questions. I -- Mr. Wilding, I wanted to know, the Bridger Coal Company Reclamation Trust Fund is something you're including in power costs and I was wondering if you could explain that.

MR. WILDING: Yes. Yeah, part of the -- the stipulation, we wanted to point out what we've already recovered as part of the -- as part of power costs. So that's -- if those funds, those reclamation funds, have always been included in the coal cost of the Jim Bridger plant, which, of course, comes from the Bridger Coal Mine, and so that's historically how it's been -- been done.

And so in this case, we've -- we've recognized what's been included thus far in rates, and then there's an incremental portion that we will have to collect from Washington customers over a shorter time period as they will be -- have pullout of rates. And so -- and I apologize, I -- and so that piece, that incremental piece that is associated with -- with the

Page 136

These things work in fairly standard ways, and knowing what the assumptions are that go into it is often much more important than understanding well, what's behind the linear program or the -- or the mixed integer program that goes into this -- into the specific dispatch.

So I think, you know, particularly for 2024, we'll want to think about the types of information, being assured that that's going to be available. But I don't feel particularly concerned that that's an impossibility. I think that, you know, that is sort of more fairly normal and that can be dealt with in due course.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Earle.
Mr. Pepple, I -- I saw that you wanted to be recognized, and I have seen your explanation of why you were wanting to be recognized in the chat. We'd like to use that for technical issues only, but to answer your question, as far as it pertains to any legal components of how the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol will interact with the settlement, we are going to have an opportunity for the attorneys to explain that perspective after we hear from the settlement panel. And that will be one of the things that can be addressed by the attorneys when we come to the end of the hearing and allow for each

Page 138

shorter life is included in base rates, but then is -so included in base rates, but not as part of coal costs. And then that is amortized over ten years, consistent with the stipulation.

CHAIR DANNER: And then -- thank you. Another question is, in Ms. Lockey's testimony, she said that the limited realignment may allocate to Washington Chehalis plant because that would help with CETA, greater flexibility in CETA compliance, and I was wondering if you could expand on that, tell me why that Chehalis gas plant would be helpful for CETA compliance.

MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. So what Ms. Lockey is referring to, that limited realignment is one of the framework issues of the 2020 protocol, and so that's an open issue that's currently being worked on by stakeholders from all six of our service territories. And one of the ideas, one of the proposals is a limited realignment of resources that would put Chehalis and Washington rates, fully allocate Chehalis to Washington customers.

And the reason why that would potentially help with CETA compliance is that it gives Washington control over the single thermal unit in PacifiCorp's fleet that is within -- geographically located within Washington. And so -- and then other states' policies

14 (Pages 135 to 138)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

Page 139

would not affect what happens at Chehalis because it would be fully allocated to Washington customers at the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, again, this is one piece of what potentially could be lots of moving pieces in the 2020 protocol. As we try to resolve those framework issues, that -- that is something that we are investigating and that we are researching and analyzing as we go forward over the next [inaudible].

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So this -- this question is for either Mr. Wilding or maybe Mr. Ball. It has to do with power costs and the October baseline -- or October 2020 update. So what I want to understand is, is the ten and a half million dollar adjustment to the power cost baseline in the settlement, is that effectively what is assumed to be already in the baseline when the October 2020 update arrives or is that an estimate of what the October 2020 update will be?

MR. WILDING: This goes back to one of the clarifying points that Mr. Ball made earlier. That's an estimate of what we think the October baseline will be. Of course, until we get the September price curve and we run the models, we won't exactly know. And then we have a few other modeling adjustments that we already agreed

if October comes around and it's at ten and a half or

it's at negative 11, we don't have to. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So the -- so

effectively, then, everyone is expecting that it will be at least ten and a half million dollar reduction, at least that is the hope?

MR. BALL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then so if that -- if it's greater than ten and a half million dollars, then it will be whatever that number is?

MR. BALL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And, I guess, is there any -- is there any concern or maybe -or worry among any of the parties that -- that the baseline adjustment estimate will be so much less than ten and a half million that it will exceed whatever is in the PCAM deferral balance?

MR. BALL: I -- I -- I will ask Mr. Wilding to answer that question after me, but from Staff's perspective, no. The PCAM balance that exists right now is pretty high. So in order for it to fully exhaust and then some, that PCAM deferral balance, it would have to cause a very large swing in power costs sufficient that there would be a lot of other questions raised.

Page 140

to that we know will upgrade that power cost up, down. And then if it's not at that -- that level at the September baseline, then -- or in the October update, sorry, then as Mr. Ball stated, we will use the PCAM balance to bring it down to that level agreed to in this stipulation.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So is the -- so is the other things that have been mentioned such as the 1.4 million of black box adjustments, time loss savings, and reliability cost savings, are those part of the ten and a half million dollar estimate or are they in addition to that?

MR. WILDING: As part of the ten and a half million dollars.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then, I think, Mr. Ball, you mentioned earlier in your prior -- in your previous comments that in the event that that ten and a half million dollar estimate is perhaps less than what it is, then the settlement, my understanding, proposes to use what is currently in PacifiCorp's PCAM deferral balance to -- to offset that amount?

MR. BALL: Correct. That's -- the point was to try and preserve the base rate reduction to the extent possible by dipping into those funds, but if --

Page 142

Page 141

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So this is Commissioner Rendahl, and I just got a message from Judge O'Connell. He is having technical issues and actually has dropped off, so he's asked that we take our mourning break right now, and I would say that would be -- I would assume is ten minutes sufficient? Come back at -- what time is it? Let's say 10:55 we'll come back on the record. So we'll be off the record.

> (A break was taken from 10:44 a.m. to 10:56 a.m.)

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be back on the record. We're back on the record after our morning break. It is approximately 10:55 in the morning.

Let's have questions -- [phone interference].

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Commissioner Balasbas, did you finish your line of questioning?

18 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I believe I did. I 19 think I have one more and then I'm ready to turn it back 20 to my colleagues for other questions.

> So just to finish on the -- actually, no, I think I am done for now and then I will have more later. So I will turn it to my colleagues for other questions on power costs or any other issues.

> > COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you

15 (Pages 139 to 142)

Page 143

Page 145

have a question? Because I have one, but if you have one, I'll defer to you.

CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead, Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So related to the -- this is still on power costs. In the joint testimony and in Mr. Wilding's testimony, there are references to net power costs being allocated using a spreadsheet method that reflects assets included in Washington rates, and it also references the grid model to forecast net power costs. So just to clarify terms, we've now got the grid model and the Aurora model and now the spreadsheet method.

So can you explain what is the spreadsheet method and how it interacts with the grid model or Aurora and the proposed nodal pricing method? Clearing that up would be very helpful.

MR. WILDING: Thank you. The spreadsheet method is -- it existed prior to this case and it was the way that we allocated our actual net power costs to Washington. And so we -- we modified that a little bit and now fit in with the new WIJAM allocation methodology, and so maybe -- maybe easiest to explain how it was before and then going forward why the change was necessary.

So prior to using the WIJAM method under the

energy, to Washington, and then we look at the load and resource balance for Washington based on that allocation and then we make an adjustment to the market purchases and sales that balance that out. We either -- if Washington has -- has excess energy based on all of its resources, then the system sales are adjusted -- or no, excuse me, the system percentages are adjusted, and if too little energy, the system sales are adjusted.

So we can still tie it back to that fully optimized grid run, but then to do the allocations, we have to make some adjustments to get to Washington. And that's the spreadsheet.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. That is a -- that's a helpful missing piece.

Any -- any further comments from any other witness?

MR. BALL: This is Jason Ball with Commission Staff. I just want to make sure it's abundantly clear why we have spreadsheet method versus nodal pricing method versus grid and all that. So the grid and spreadsheet method exists because we have to do something for 2021. We don't have access right now to the Aurora nodal model and the CAISO dispatch method and all that is still being worked out and negotiated with the Company.

Page 144

WTA method, only -- only the generation assets located in PacifiCorp's west balance area authority were recognized in Washington rates. And so for pro forma net power costs in a rate case, what we would do is we would run the grid model of just the west side of our system and the west side load.

Now, with the change to WIJAM, we've incorporated all nonemitting resources into Washington rates, and -- and all of the transmission assets as Jason pointed out as well. So now that grid model includes a fully optimized system run of the Company's net power cost. And so -- so includes both Pac West and Pac East balancing area authorities.

And then we start -- we -- but because of the WIJAM, not all assets are included in Washington rates, we take that fully optimized system run from grid and then -- then we use the spreadsheet method to allocate it to allocate the net power cost to Washington.

So this is very similar to the way we used to start off in actuals with our actual net power cost, solar companies power cost to allocate it to Washington. And the way that works is we first take the allocation percentage of all the assets that are in Washington rates and allocate those, both the dollars and the

Page 146

So once they get that finalized and the Aurora model finalized, that's -- will come into play in the PCORC proceeding next year, but we're not anticipating that happening until six or eight months into the rate effective period. So we need something to fill that gap and the grid and the spreadsheet model are what we have historically used as Mr. Wilding just stated, modified for the changes under the WIJAM and that will be used to fill that gap until we can fully transition to the nodal pricing model.

CHAIR DANNER: I think we may have lost Judge O'Connell again.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm -- I'm here. CHAIR DANNER: Oh, good, okay.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So more on power costs, so for us to figure out exactly what is going on with power costs before we get to the October update, maybe, Mr. Wilding, or any other party, can you identify where in the settlement or the documents what resources are being included in the settlement's calculation of power cost and if -- and were those the resources that were historically allocated to Washington?

MR. WILDING: Yes, one second. I believe the -- my testimony -- and I'm just verifying the exhibit. My Exhibit 2, MGW-2, is the WIJAM and that

16 (Pages 143 to 146)

Page 147

specifies that nonemitting resources are system allocated to Washington and then perhaps -- well, the other place to look is my MGW-3, which is the Washington allocated net power cost, and you can see the list of all resources there. And if there are dollar amounts, those are allocated to Washington; however, maybe the easier thing to do might be for the Company to provide a list to the Commission of all the assets that are included in Washington rates under the WIJAM.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think that might be helpful, and so, Judge O'Connell, for our purposes, I think a bench -- bench request identifying a specific listing of the assets in addition to what is in Mr. Wilding's exhibits would be helpful for identifying what is -- what is in power costs as a base before we get to the October update.

And so those -- those were the -- so I guess what would also be helpful, then, is to update your exhibit, and I think you were referring to MGW-3. If there's anything in the settlement that updates what was in MGW-3 so that we have a clear indication of what might have changed in the settlement for the power costs; does that make sense, Mr. Wilding?

MR. WILDING: Yes. Yes, we can -- we can provide that.

as part of our filing in April.

So that was the -- the starting point for the negotiations, and then as we -- as the parties worked through the settlement in arriving at that balance outcome that kept rates flat, and then the -- is how we got to the baseline for net power cost. So that included certain modeling adjustments that are in -- that are identified in the stipulation for the black box settlement and the line loss statements.

Page 149

Of those, it was based on certain parties' analysis of where they think net power costs are going as far as what market prices have been -- have been doing since the time that we filed the case. And -- and so the update will include -- useful and used grid model will include those modeling adjustments will improve the black box settlement. And then if it does not get to that ten and a half million, that's when we'll use the PCAM. And then the grid model will become the basis for that, which will then use the spreadsheet method to get to the Washington [inaudible] up from the grid model.

And then next year we will use the Aurora model that will take into account the CAISO day ahead scheduling that we're currently implementing at the conclusion that was agreed to in the nodal pricing MOU as part of 2020.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank

Page 148

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And I will defer to my colleagues if they have other power cost or other questions.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Before we move on, for the benefit of the parties and for our organization, I'm going to send any -- a list of any bench requests that we make via email to the parties at the conclusion of this hearing so that the parties are very clear about any bench requests that we ask for during this hearing. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank you. So maybe this -- I'll start this question to Mr. Wilding and if Mr. Ball or other parties have any other comments, please add them.

So if you could just briefly explain how the power cost baseline was derived in this settlement and how that is connected or aligned with the 2020 protocol, the WIJAM, and the nodal pricing method MOU.

MR. WILDING: Yes, thank you. The baseline settlement in this -- sorry, the baseline net power cost in the settlement was a negotiated outcome. The starting point for those negotiations was the net power cost that the Company filed as part of -- of -- we filed as part of our direct filing in December and then we had an update with some corrections and some updates in --

Page 150

2 you.

If anyone has anything to add, if not, I will turn the floor back to my colleagues.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have a question? Because I have a follow-up, not -- to an earlier question that Chair Danner asked about the Bridger Coal Company Reclamation Trust Fund.

There's a workshop that is discussed in the settlement stipulation at paragraph 27, and just a question whether that is a workshop that the parties expect the Commission will initiate. If not, who's going to initiate, what's the -- is it just for the parties? A little more detail about that workshop and what's expected from that workshop and when it might take place would be helpful. Thank you.

MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. The workshop is anticipated to be held in the fall of 2020 for the stipulation, and I think PacifiCorp envisions -- I mean, there's certain things here that -- in the stipulation that will be addressed about historical contribution to Bridger Coal Company costs, although their costs are reflected in rates and in what amount, and the estimated remaining of the reclamation costs for Washington customers.

17 (Pages 147 to 150)

Page 151

And so those are all things that we -- we've already stipulated to -- to cover. I think PacifiCorp, we intend to reach out to parties as it gets closer and, you know, collaboratively work on the scope of that workshop, what needs to be -- what questions they have. We want to make sure that as we're hitting on these topics, that we are answering the specific questions, that we have the right people at the workshop.

I think the -- the stipulation does agree that the workshop is with parties, and so PacifiCorp could take the lead to get that scheduled with parties; however, I don't think we would be opposed if that's something that the Commission wanted to attend and turn into a Commissioner workshop. The Company would not be opposed to that, but absent that requirement, it would be something that the Company would work with the parties to facilitate and to accomplish this.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And -- and is the -- the intent to have all six states represented or is this just a Washington-specific workshop that PacifiCorp will be organizing similar to maybe some of the protocol meetings that it has organized?

MR. WILDING: Yes, it will be a Washington only workshop. This is not intended to be an all six-state party workshop. This is just for Washington.

Mr. Wilding, these are meetings that you -- your company is going to convene, this is not a Commission workshop, right?

MR. WILDING: That is correct. Unless directed otherwise.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So I want to change the subject a little bit to talk about the production tax credits.

PacifiCorp's testimony talks about PTCs as a benefit -- as one of the benefits of the WIJAM, but, Mr. Kaufman, you stated some concerns about the expiration of these. I was wondering if you can expand on that a little bit.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, the -- the concern is -- is just related to the -- the magnitude of the impact of the expiration, and in addition to that, there is a number -- other components associated with the cost, but I expect that to change substantially over the next few years. For example, the large depreciation expense will be drawing down rates substantially, and so we just wanted to keep the door open to carefully review the issue and assure that one-off type of rate treatment is appropriate there.

CHAIR DANNER: But you're not saying this is so substantial that it would offset the benefits of the

Page 152

And not that these won't be addressed based on these same issues, will obviously be discussed in the multistate process with parties, but for purposes of this stipulation, there will be a Washington only workshop on this.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And this is just for this one specific issue, there are no other issues in the settlement that are also going to be discussed or is it a larger issue than just the reclamation issue?

MR. WILDING: There are other items where we have agreed to, you know, work with parties collaboratively to -- such as power costs. And before we filed the -- the PCORC, that we would meet with parties to work collaboratively, fair, and things that we've talked about, you know, trading and transparency and data pitfalls. But this is just specifically for the Bridge Coal Reclamation cost, this workshop.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But there will be other workshops related to -- or other meetings related to preparing for the October update and other issues in the settlement that still need to be resolved?

MR. WILDING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: And -- and just to be clear,

PTC?

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't have a -- I guess a specific -- specific numbers in mind or whether -- whether there's an offset one way or the other, which one would be greater in terms of change of cost and then the removal of the PTCs. I'm not sure if I totally understand your question, whether you're asking about the changes in the revenue requirement that time or the benefits of the PTCs currently.

CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I was just referring to your testimony where you said given the number of PTCs acquired, both the repowering and through the EP 2020 projects, the costs are likely to be substantial. And cost increases attributed to the large amount of PTCs expiring in ten years should be recovered in a rate case. And I'm just trying to figure out what kind of magnitude possible we're talking about here.

MR. KAUFMAN: Chairman, I would have to apologize, I don't have the -- the number off the top of my head as -- as to the annual dollar impact that the production tax credit. The main -- the main -- or the general concern is, is that when the PTCs expire, there may be an associated cost increase associated with those expirations, but at that time, there will also have been a lot of other changes to PacifiCorp's operation.

18 (Pages 151 to 154)

Page 154

Page 153

Page 155

And to the extent that PacifiCorp requests a reprieve associated with the expiration, it would be appropriate to apply that rate increase or investigate that rate increase within the context of a general rate case. And I can get back to you if you want on the question of magnitude for the expiration of the PTCs.

MR. WILDING: Chair Danner, perhaps I can jump in. [Inaudible] opening testimony shows that on the WIJAM allocation methodology of Washington customers are -- are allocated to \$119 million of PTC benefits.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So following -- following up on questions related to PTCs, the settlement agreement talks about surcharges, potential surcharges of PTCs. Is this more of a timing issue related to the fact that the PTCs -- the benefits of the PTCs are being put into rates in advance of knowing and because some of this is hardly subject to refund? Is that what is meant by potential surcharge of PTCs? And I will maybe start with Mr. Wilding and if Mr. Ball or any of the other parties want to comment on that, please go ahead.

MR. WILDING: Thank you. The -- the settlement implements a PTC tracker, a production tax credit tracker, and so what that means is that customers

mechanism in place now, the PTC tracker, for those benefits to flow through. So as far as knowing there's a path into the cost of benefits, there is an interplay, but I don't expect the PTC tracker to be a big part of that limited issue.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. All right. Thank you. And then just to -- just to clarify that, the -- there is -- the proposed tracker would be an annual true-up on June 15th of each year; is that correct?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So just concerning the energy vision 2020 projects and the -- the COVID-19 pandemic, has there been any impact on the projects that are not already in service? Has the pandemic impacted the expected late 2020 completion dates? And if so, to what extent beyond the Q4 completion dates are we anticipating these projects to go into service?

MR. WILDING: Yeah, that's a great question, and that information is being constantly updated and being updated every day. We have -- so maybe I will just run through the projects.

Cedar Springs turned out expected to be online as anticipated at the end of the year. Ekola is

Page 156

will receive the actual PTC benefits that are produced by the wind release. So if the wind is -- is favorable in a -- in a certain area or we produce more than what we forecast in this case, those PTCs will be passed back to customers as a reduction to their rate. And if the wind in the reverse history is still symmetrical, so if the wind is less than what we forecast, those -- there would be a surcharge to -- to customers based on the fact that benefits and base rates are greater than the actual benefits.

And this -- so this allows for customers to receive the actual PTCs based on the actual fluctuation in the generation from the wind and then also allows to capture any changes in the PTC rates that may occur between rate cases.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And so does the -- okay. So then do you expect this to be addressed as part of the limited rate filing?

MR. WILDING: The limited rate filing -- the production tax credit tracker is part of this stipulation; however, there -- there could be some interplay with the limited rate filing if one of the wind assets -- or if there's any change to what is allowed in the rates, then the cost and benefits and those benefits would -- could flow through. We have the

Page 158

Page 157

also expected to be online as well as TB Flats 1. And that now leaves TB Flats 2 and then Pryor Mountain.

And -- and I'll just -- before I talk about those two,
I'll get back to all of the repowering is also either already online or expected to be online by the end of the year.

So TB Flats 2 and Pryor Mountain, we did

So TB Flats 2 and Pryor Mountain, we did experience some delays with asbestos and the components -- delivery of the components of the wind turbine. We've worked through those where we will have all of the parts, and now we are working with our -- our balance of plan contractor to come up with a new schedule to get those plants online.

And so we don't have final estimates yet as we're continuing to work with that contractor, but we are estimating that there could potentially be some delays into 2021 for Pryor Mountain and TB Flats 2.

But like I said, that's kind of evolving daily and -- and so as -- they'll have all of the information. We don't have all of the information yet as we're continuing to work with contractors and -- and finalize a schedule.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So would then that have an impact on the production credits associated with those resources?

19 (Pages 155 to 158)

Page 159

MR. WILDING: Yes. The production tax credits, and if those were delayed into 2021, either fully delayed or a portion, we -- we believe that worst case scenario, we'll still be able to have a portion of those plants online, but then that would cause -- any delay into 2021 would cause that production tax credit that's included in rates to be too large as what we projected in this case.

And then also that limited issue, it would be subject in that limited issue refund -- or sorry, in that limited issue case where we would review the prudency of those plants and those costs. Of course if it was not used and useful, if it was not online, that any amount between January 1, that rate effective date, and the actual online date would be subject to refund for customers because of it not being online yet.

And then the other important note is that they will still be -- and going back to your production tax credit, and maybe this is what you were asking, Commissioner, is that the IRS did issue a notice that it extended the eligibility for 100 PTCs through the end of 2020. So in the event that they are delayed or partially delayed, they will still qualify for those 100 percent PTC benefits.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So thank you

Page 161

Most likely what that does is it would take away the benefits that are protected under the CETA compliance position.

However, we did show in my testimony that there's substantial benefits for net power costs and just the zero fuel cost energy that's being added to the system drives that power cost down, there are substantial benefits for production tax credits. It's a true-up of about \$10 million. There's additional wheeling revenues that are provided to Washington customers, which are an offset to our revenue requirement. So there's still substantial benefits for all of those reasons.

However, I will just say that when we were working through this with Staff and with Public Counsel and Packing Corporation, we had CETA in mind, and everything that we allocated, everything that was previously on the east side of our -- or that's located on the east side of our system that was not previously allocated to Washington that has now been allocated to Washington, was done with the -- the intention that those would qualify for CETA compliance. And upon reviewing, you know, the -- the newly passed law that says all nonemitting resources would be eligible to fulfill that environmental compliance obligation.

Page 160

Page 162

for that, and I think you also answered my next question which is, if there is any adjustment to what has been included in the settlement and net power cost, that that would be adjusted out in the limited issue rate case or limited issue filing?

MR. WILDING: Yes.

exceed the cost of implementation?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So I want to turn back to the -- the WIJAM generally, and I want to ask this question here as, you know, all of the parties testified one of the benefits of moving to the WIJAM is that it improves PacifiCorp's CETA compliance position. And if the resources are included in WIJAM that were previously not allocated to Washington are not found to be compliant with CETA, I guess this first question is, would the benefits of moving to the WIJAM still equal or

MR. WILDING: I want to make sure I understand your question right. So if anything that is being allocated to Washington under the WIJAM is found not to be compliant with CETA and the environmental targets set by CETA, and when we say "compliant" meaning that it qualifies to meet those environmental targets, then would it still be cost effective for Washington

customers? Unfortunately, I have to say I don't know.

So yes, there is still benefits even if for whatever reason they end up not being eligible for CETA compliance. However, I am confident based on my understanding of CETA that what we are allocating, the new resources that are being allocated to Washington are eligible and will be eligible through CETA.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So are you saying, then, that the -- I guess, one of the primary motivations in the development of the WIJAM was CETA compliance?

MR. WILDING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And are you asking this Commission in any way to preapprove CETA compliance through this settlement or through the WIJAM?

MR. WILDING: No.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right.
MR. BALL: Commissioner, this is Jason. I
would just like to add a little bit of color, which was
that Mr. Wilding's absolutely correct, that while we
were going through those negotiations, CETA was a very
big component of all that. And the potential -- or
compliance with CETA was a very big concern that a lot
of parties -- or a lot of people had. However, that
did -- that was, I would argue, weighted by and equal to

20 (Pages 159 to 162)

Page 163

our concern with establishing a cost allocation methodology that meets the Commission's prior standards for how cost allocations need to occur in Washington.

So it wasn't just about here's this new renewable obligation, this new law we have to comply with, it was also we have an existing standard that the WCA meets, this new methodology has to continue to meet that standard.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Mr. Ball and Mr. Wilding, when -- and any other party who wishes to weigh in, as you were constructing the settlement and talking about the CETA benefits, were you just simply looking at the renewable nonemitting resource requirements or were there other elements of CETA that you were also contemplating as providing benefits to Washington from -- from this settlement?

MR. BALL: This is Jason again. I will take a first whack at that. We were looking at it from a total portfolio perspective, which is that the combination of transmission access across all PacifiCorp's service territory gives us access to potential new sites for a new plant if that is required to meet Washington compliance.

The new assignment of nonemitting resources gives us a greater share of plant that we believe could

we've been -- at the time, they were still -- there was I believe when we were doing these negotiations that was prior to some Commission workshops on equity, so there was a lot of uncertainty around how that would work and how that would operate.

So we weren't -- we weren't focused in on that component so much as just the -- just the generation and the resource portfolio piece, but there was -- as you mentioned, there are other aspects of CETA, for instance, resource adequacy and viability, and one of the big pieces of the 2020 protocol is how the Company is going to plan to meet those obligations and what steps it takes to plan to meet state specific requirements. And we believe that the WIJAM was an enabling factor to continue those negotiations under the 2020 protocol.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.

Mr. Wilding, do you have anything to add?

MR. WILDING: No, no, I -- I agree with what

Mr. Ball has stated there and he summarized it well.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And any other party have any other thoughts on this topic? Okay. Thank you.

So I have a question about the discussion of the transmission allocation and specifically the

Page 164

meet compliance obligations under CETA. And the WIJAM sets up a -- a -- or positions the cost allocation framework in such a way that it can enable further negotiations under the 2020 protocol, whereas if we had continued with the WCA allocation, certain components of the 2020 protocol, for instance, I believe the Chairman mentioned the Chehalis transfer, would have been much more difficult under the historic WCA allocations.

So it was the combination of multiple factors, and they were all -- I would argue not any one was weighted more than the other, it was a truly portfolio approach.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I guess I will ask specifically, there are other provisions with CETA that are unrelated to resource acquisition or -- or resource mixed portfolio, and so were the parties looking at all at the provisions of Subsection 040, sub 8, which are the, you know, equitable distribution of benefits, was -- was that a part of it or was it really primarily the resource mix, resource portfolio issues that the parties were discussing when they mentioned CETA benefits and CETA compliance?

MR. BALL: From Staff's perspective, I believe it was primarily the portfolio and the resource components. The equity -- the questions around equity,

Page 166

Page 165

testimony talking about the Company presenting a method for excluding the cost and benefits of all transmission voltage radio lines connecting resources not otherwise included in Washington rates to PacifiCorp's interconnected network transmission system. It was at -- starting at page 17 and going to page 18.

So, I guess, Mr. Wilding, can you explain to us what -- what is meant by the radio lines? What do you -- how do you define "radio lines"?

MR. WILDING: Yes, thank you. And in this piece of the WIJAM, what we're trying to identify there is there are still certain generation assets that are not in Washington, like our thermal fleet on -- it seems like our thermal fleet on the east side of our service.

However, transmission costs are system allocated, but we've identified or we need to identify any lines that -- whose sole purpose is to connect that thermal unit that is not included in Washington rates to the larger transmission system. And if there are lines that that is their sole purpose. That is what we're trying to identify here, and that's what we're -- what we're talking about.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if I can paraphrase, maybe this is -- these are lines in the Pac East balancing area that serve the Pac East load, but

21 (Pages 163 to 166)

Page 167

don't contribute to transfer capability of the Pac East system; is that another way to describe it?

MR. WILDING: No, not necessarily, because the transmission system provides benefits for the entire system, allows us to move energy back and forth that, as you pointed out, but there are certain lines that, for example, may -- their sole purpose may just be to connect that generating resource to the larger transmission system. And then once it gets on that transmission system, then we say that transmission system provides benefits to the entirety of PacifiCorp's system.

But to the extent that a line's sole purpose is to connect a thermal resource and PacifiCorp be [inaudible] to the transmission, then that's -- that's what we're describing here in this part of the WIJAM and in this testimony.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So -- so will the incremental cost of those lines be subject to refund in Washington rates once this is all sorted out?

MR. WILDING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Okay. So currently under the WCA formula, Washington pays about 22 percent of the costs of the Jim Bridger transmission assets. correct?

in your direct testimony that the Jim Bridger and

Colstrip depreciation rates will be allocated to Washington customers and will continue to be allocated on a WCA basis; is that correct?

MR. WILDING: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And in the settlement, it has -- includes Jim Bridger and Colstrip depreciation accelerated to December 31, 2023. And my question -- couple of questions related to that. First, hypothetically, if those two plants are reassigned to other states after the Washington share is fully depreciated, are we talking about just fully depreciating Washington share of those assets?

MR. WILDING: In Washington rates, yes.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So -- so could you maybe talk about, then, how it's in the public interest for Washington customers to pay accelerated depreciation if those plants are reassigned to other states in the future?

MR. WILDING: Well, I'll say first -- couple things, but first I want to point out Jim Bridger is a four-unit coal plant. Jim Bridger 1 will be closing December 31, 2023. That's the current date anticipated in the 2019 IRP. And so that aligns well with what we have in Washington rates.

Page 168

MR. WILDING: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So under the WIJAM formula, it appears Washington will pay 8 percent of the total Pac East transmission costs. So under the settlement, is Washington still paying 22 percent of the Jim Bridger transmission costs or will it pay based on the WIJAM formula?

MR. WILDING: So based on the WIJAM. So all transmission is now system allocated, so it's approximately 8 percent of all transmission costs are allocated to Washington.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So then the rates proposed in this settlement reflect that cost of -- of rolling in the transmission costs in the eastern part of the system that previously hadn't been reflected in the WCA, correct?

MR. WILDING: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So over the three-year period of the settlement -- I'll stop. I'll stop there for now.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I'd like to -- I'd like to switch topics here and talk about the accelerated depreciation and the exit order components that are included in the settlement.

So, Mr. Wilding, I just want to confirm that

Page 170

Page 169

And then as far as the 2023, the other piece of that is, it is two years earlier than required by CETA, which requires coal to be out of Washington rates by December 31, 2025. And so we, of course, will remove those out of Washington rates no later than that date as stated by CETA.

And then as far as it being in the public interest, this allows flexibility with the portfolio as we move forward in the NSP negotiations and on negotiation reassignment and realignment of the other cases -- or with the other states, excuse me. And it's in the public interest because Washington customers have benefitted from the Jim Bridger and Colstrip plant over its useful life. The useful life for Washington, it will be no later than 2025 or perhaps 2023 depending on how things shake out in -- in negotiations and with realignment there, but it is -- yeah, Washington customers have benefitted from these plants, and it is in the public interest that they -- they pay the cost and as they receive those benefits forward.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Mr. Ball.

MR. BALL: Thank you. I would just like to
add that it -- let's assume that we get to 2023 and we
don't have a negotiation -- but we don't have an
agreement about a new protocol. Well, then what has

22 (Pages 167 to 170)

Page 171

happened is Washington has just -- Washington customers have paid for their -- historically their allocated share of those plants and they're two years ahead of schedule. And either the Company's going to close them down because that's what their IRP says to do or they -- we wait two years and we get undepreciated power.

If, however, we have negotiated through in -- through that 2020 protocol something to do with those plants, for instance, transferring those plants to another state, the depreciation reserve is absolutely part of that negotiation. And so whatever new allocation protocol is presented to the Commission for approval, it will discuss here's the plant value we transferred and here's the depreciation value transferred and here's what we got in return. And you will absolutely be able to make a judgment at that point whether thought -- whether you think we got a good deal and whether that deal is in the public interest.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank you. Thank you for that. I appreciate that clarification.

So, Mr. Wilding, just to confirm, that if the Commission approves the settlement and the proposed accelerated depreciation dates for Jim Bridger and Colstrip, that would constitute under the 2020 protocol Page 173

Page 174

MR. WILDING: I -- I wonder if you can clarify for me exactly what you mean by -- by "liability." I just want to make sure I understand.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Well, so -- so let's assume for the moment that that -- the December 31, 2023 date is when Washington customers would fully depreciate their value and share of Jim Bridger and Colstrip, and those are then, for sake of argument, here no longer in Washington rates. So are customers then liable for any decommissioning and remediation costs that would be incurred after that date?

MR. WILDING: And I'm sorry to -- to think about this and to pause a minute. I just want to -- maybe I can answer it this way. The Washington customers will be liable for any decommissioning costs, for actual decommissioning costs subject to a prudence review.

Maybe the best example I could -- could think of is, is maybe after -- after Washington customers quit using that plant and that plant is removed from Washington rates, maybe there's new costs that -- new requirements and no, Washington customers would not be responsible for those -- for those new requirements. They would only be responsible for the actual requirements at the time that they -- based on

Page 172

1490 172

an exit order by this Commission; is that correct?

MR. WILDING: Yes, approval of this settlement would approve the 2020 protocol, which then establishes an exit order and starts the process for other states to look at and consider any potential reassignment or realignment of the stipulation.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So then does Washington -- or do Washington customers then remain liable for any decommissioning and remediation costs related to the generation from those plants after that exit order date?

MR. WILDING: My -- the settlement and my testimony outlines the balancing account for which the decommissioning costs will be tracked and reevaluated at each rate case, will be updated for actual decommissioning costs. And then once those actual decommissioning costs are -- are known, then Staff and parties will be able to review those, Commission will be able to review those for prudence at that time, but we will -- we will establish a balancing account to track those.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. I understand that. But I guess what I'm asking is, what is Washington -- or what is Washington's cutoff date for liability for decommissioning and remediation costs?

benefits.

CHAIR DANNER: So -- so this is Dave Danner. Just to be clear, so if there -- let's say there are unknown liabilities that become apparent five years after 2023 and those are so great that they exceed what's available in the trust fund, are you going to be coming back to Washington ratepayers to fund that remediation that's unknown to us at this time?

MR. WILDING: I think it depends on the why those were unknown. Were they unknown because it's a new regulation or is it -- was that unknown because when we dug into the ground to remove the coal pile of the Jim Bridger plant, we had to dig three feet deeper than we had anticipated before. So I think the answer is I don't know. It depends on -- on maybe why those were unknown and -- and that would be a -- something that we would need to -- to evaluate in the future.

But the WIJAM and my understanding in CETA is that Washington customers would be responsible for the actual closure costs of coal plants.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So I take that answer as yes, it's possible that there could be new liabilities in the future that you would come back to us?

MR. WILDING: Yes, in a future date and, of

23 (Pages 171 to 174)

Page 175

course, those would be subject to a prudence review and those would be tracked in the balancing account.

1.0

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.

MR. BALL: Commissioner and Chairman, this is Jason. I just wanted to add that this is an issue that a lot of -- that the other states in the 2020 protocol are very concerned with and Washington also is -- Washington Staff is party to that protocol and those negotiations we're also very concerned with. I fully anticipated absolutely being one of the terms that is negotiated as a part of the new 2020 protocol, so there's two -- two kinds of tracts that can occur here.

One is let's say nothing happens. We don't get a new negotiation -- we don't get a new protocol and we are stuck with the WIJAM. Well, then everything that Mr. Wilding just said is absolutely true. They come in for a prudency review based on the actual costs of those decommissioning remediation, post the four liabilities related to the operation of the plant prior to when we stopped assigning the plant to Washington rates.

If, however, there's a new protocol, then that new protocol absolutely is going to have to discuss this issue and is going to have to identify how decommissioning and remediation is shared amongst the states for trans- -- plants that are transferred or not

ordered in that case to include them in the PCAM until we filed a rate case and could include them in base and in our normal base rates.

Page 177

And so we've done that in this case, and the then EIM benefits are now reflected and will be reflected in our update, and then we have agreed that we will, if there is an investigation or any party wants an investigation into EIM benefits, that we will not -- the Company will not oppose it. But they are included in this baseline for net power costs, they will be included in October update, and they will -- and EIM benefits will be included in the PCORC next year as a reduction.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Mr. Earle, that's your understanding?

MR. EARLE: Yes, it is.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a few questions about Colstrip 4 and Colstrip 4 maintenance. So for the what would be the 2021 PCORC, have the parties come to an understanding on what can and cannot be included in the PCORC?

MR. WILDING: The settlement is -- provides for a deferred accounting treatment of major maintenance expenses at Colstrip Unit 4. And so I think that is something that will obviously be in the PCORC, but won't

Page 176

transferred have historically been allocated. And so you'll have your opportunity in 2023 to review that system on how to -- how those costs are apportioned.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And so regardless of the amount of the decommission remediation costs, I want to clarify, those will -- those costs will be -- continue to be allocated on a WCA basis; is that correct?

MR. BALL: Correct, assuming there's no new allocation protocol, yes.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Could I ask about EIM costs, just I want to make sure that it's clear that the EIM costs and benefits are reflected in the settlement; is that correct?

MR. BALL: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Are there any EIM costs or benefits that are left for discussion or resolution in the PCORC or are they all dealt with here?

MR. BALL: They are all dealt with here. So what is happening is in the last -- the expedited rate filing from about four or five years ago, we had certain capital costs through EIM that were not included in base rates but were instead included in the PCAM, and we were

Page 178

be included in rates until the next general rate case.
 And that will be part of that kind of prefiling meeting
 where we will work collaboratively with parties to
 identify what we plan to include and see if there's any
 issues there.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So for the major maintenance expense for Colstrip Unit 4 that's proposed to be in review in the 2021 PCORC, understanding you all are going to be having some conversations, so for the Company, is it your thinking that this -- this is routine maintenance or is it major maintenance that would be needed to extend the life of the plant?

MR. WILDING: No, this is would be routine maintenance planned at -- I -- my understanding is there is a planned overhaul during that time, and but it's routine. It's not intended to extend the life.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And is that the understanding of the other parties?

MR. BALL: This is Jason, yes, that was my -- that was Staff's understanding as well.

MR. EARLE: And this is Robert Earle for Public Counsel. It's my understanding as well.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sorry, I don't have any further questions about this topic. I was on mute,

24 (Pages 175 to 178)

Page 179

Page 181

sorry.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. I think we've come to a good stopping point for lunch. Let's plan to take a break and reconvene back at 1 o'clock in the afternoon. We still have a few more bench questions that we'd like to pose to the parties, and then after those questions, we will have some time to allow any of the attorneys who wish to address some of the legal issues that have been raised, those attorneys will have a chance to address those on behalf of their respective parties.

Any questions before we go off the record and take our lunch break any -- from any of the attorneys? I'm going to pause just a moment to give you a chance to get on the video if you have anything you'd like to say before we take our break.

Okay. With that, let's be off the record. (A luncheon break was taken from 11:58 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be back on the record. We are back on the record in the PacifiCorp general rate case and accounting petitions and decoupling petition. The time is approximately 1:00 p.m. on August 24th, 2020, and we are going to resume with some bench questions for our panel of witnesses,

will be still one of the framework issues in the 2020 protocol. There's still pieces that need to be determined. There are still outstanding questions that need to be worked through with not only the Washington parties but parties from all states.

So yes, at this time, we are not asking for the nodal pricing model to be -- and the allocations associated with the nodal pricing model to be approved. That will come in a future proceeding. We're only asking for approval for as part of this stipulation to do a PCORC next year that would take into account the operational impact of using the CAISO for day ahead -- for the Company's day ahead schedule.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So for the CAISO day ahead scheduling, you're looking at sort of a share of the -- I guess like the licensing cost of that, plus some other expenses, but that would be the Washington share based on WIJAM?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right.
And then one other question and I'll turn it over to my colleagues. So for renewable energy credits, in the joint testimony, the parties state that the stipulation supports the Company's proposed treatment for RECs and that the \$300,000 REC one-time purchase should be

Page 180

Page 182

and after those questions, which we expect to take somewhere between 30 minutes and an hour, we're going to allow the attorneys to have an opportunity to provide any legal comments regarding the issues that have been raised. And then we will address any procedural matters and we will adjourn for the afternoon and for the case.

So with that, let me turn it over to the Commissioners. Commissioner Rendahl will be asking our first question.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good afternoon. So this is a follow-up question from this morning about the nodal pricing method. And just -- just to clarify that -- that the parties in this settlement aren't asking the Commission at this time to approve the nodal pricing method, correct? Just that the use of it for I guess as Commissioner Balasbas referred to it as sort of a comparer, a shadow price? So I guess that's the threshold question.

And then if so, are we approving the cost and allocation of the cost associated with the tool at this point? So maybe, Mr. Wilding, you can start off with that.

MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. The Commission -- we are not asking the Commission to approve the nodal pricing model at this point. That

amortized but tracked for true-up in the existing mechanism over three years. And so just to clarify what's meant by the existing mechanism, do the parties mean that that is the Schedule 95 tracker or some other mechanism?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct. It's the Schedule 95 mechanism. That -- that is what was meant by existing mechanism.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Thank you. I turn it over to my colleagues for their questions.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Chair Danner, we can't hear you. Looks like your mic's muted.

CHAIR DANNER: Can you hear me now? MR. WILDING: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. I wanted to ask about the monthly decoupling deferral calculation. And I don't know if -- if you --

Mr. Meredith, maybe you have direct testimony of Mr. Meredith in front of you?

MR. WILDING: Yes, it'll take me a minute to find it, but I have it.

CHAIR DANNER: You may not need it. I have one question about it.

MR. WILDING: I got it. I'm there.

25 (Pages 179 to 182)

Page 183 Page 185 CHAIR DANNER: Turn to page 63 if you would. 1 1 questions regarding time of use and some of the rate 2 MR. WILDING: Okay. 2 design and -- and new pilot programs are probably best 3 3 CHAIR DANNER: And you'll see on this page, answered by Robert Meredith. I think he might be 4 this is -- so Mr. Meredith presents the proposed tariffs 4 available if he'd like to talk now or we could respond 5 5 changed to step eight and step nine for calculating the on a bench request. I apologize, but some of the more 6 monthly decoupling deferral and decoupling tariff. And 6 technical aspects, probably require Bob. 7 in step eight, the actual base revenue is calculated by 7 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. Yes, that --8 subtracting revenue from the nonbase adjustment 8 that's fine if -- if Mr. Meredith is available in the 9 schedules from the total actual nonweather adjusted 9 next few minutes. If not, then yeah, we can --10 monthly revenue. But the current tariff does not adjust 10 MR. MEREDITH: This is Robert Meredith. I 11 for nonbased adjustment schedules. 11 am on the line. Can you hear me okay? 12 12 So why is it appropriate or why are you COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yes, I can. Thank you, Mr. Meredith. 13 adjusting for nonbased adjustments scheduled in the new 13 14 methodology but not in the existing methodology? 14 MR. MEREDITH: I'm on the line. I don't 15 MR. WILDING: Sorry, just one minute. I 15 have video here and I think your question -- maybe you 16 16 can rephrase that again. It was around just the want to read this. 17 CHAIR DANNER: Sure, it's line 16 through 17 interactions between the time of use pilots and the decoupling mechanism; is that --18 18. 18 19 MR. WILDING: Okay. Both the adjustments 19 CHAIR DANNER: Judge O'Connell, do you need 20 that were made into the decoupling mechanism is -- is to 20 to swear Mr. Meredith in? 21 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, thank you. get to the correct level of revenue to account for the 21 22 actual revenues received by the Company. And so 22 Sorry, let me interrupt you, Mr. Meredith. 23 23 Will you please raise your right hand wherever you are? that's -- that's the motivation and the reasoning for 24 24 (Robert Meredith sworn.) the changes here. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And would you 25 CHAIR DANNER: So the current -- the current 25 Page 184 Page 186 1 please identify yourself, your name, position, who you 1 methodology does not capture that and -- and so do 2 you -- do you feel you need to make that change? 2 work for, and spell your last name, please. 3 MR. WILDING: Yes, to capture the actual 3 MR. MEREDITH: Sure. My name is Robert M. 4 revenue. The current methodology is not as precise as 4 Meredith. I'm the director of pricing and cost of what we are -- are proposing in this settlement. 5 5 service for PacifiCorp. My last name is spelled 6 CHAIR DANNER: All right. And anyone else 6 M-e-r-e-d-i-t-h. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you very 7 want to weigh in on that? 7 8 8 MR. BALL: This is Jason. I -- I fully much. Go ahead, Mr. Meredith. 9 agree with the way Mr. Wilding characterized it and I 9 MR. MEREDITH: Sure. So let me just make 10 just want to add that I think a portion also was the 10 sure I understand the question. So I think you're 11 wondering why we wanted to have the decoupling mechanism 11 potential impact that could occur from any one of the 12 pilot programs that are coming into play. So they're --12 modified for these time of use pilots, and I don't know 13 13 we're just trying to make sure that the revenue that is that it's all entirely because of the time of use 14 decoupled is the correct revenue amount for customers 14 pilots, it's just our current method of calculating 15 that experience decoupling. 15 actual revenue is not actual revenue. What it actually CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, yeah, I think we 16 16 is right now is it's just looking at specifically what 17 have some questions about the -- the pilot inside the 17 was the average price in the test period for the rate 18 decoupling as well, but thank you for the answer. 18 case and applying that by rate schedules to megawatt 19 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. I -- I 19 hours within the actual period, the actual energy. 20 want to turn to the time of use pilot and specifically 20 And so it wasn't actually a very precise way 21 in relation to the decoupling mechanism. So my first 21 of determining actual revenue, and so what we're 22 22 question is, why is the Company proposing to include the proposing instead is to actually get that actual 23 23 time of use pilot schedules in the decoupling revenue. And that's why we're removing those items that 24 24 mechanisms? are not related to actual revenue and getting to that

26 (Pages 183 to 186)

actual base revenue, so that way it corrects for a

25

MR. WILDING: Some of these more technical

25

Page 187

number of things. Not only the time of use pilots or

anything could be part of it, but just how actual

3 revenue may vary within an actual year. This could be,

you know, higher load factor or low -- lower load
 factor, a commercial customer, for example, or it could

he you know just a result of different types of

be, you know, just a result of different types of

customers using energy differently and incurring actual charges that are different than what the actual was that was set in the base period.

And from the discussions with Staff, this is my understanding is that this would be an improvement to what we're doing right now, and so it is in response to discussions that I've had with Staff in the past about ways to make the decoupling mechanism more accurate than it is right now.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So I understand all that, Mr. Meredith, and thank you for that. But how does including the time of use pilot address that issue you just talked about?

MR. MEREDITH: Yeah, so I think, then, if there are -- let's say that we do have a bunch of customers adopt time of use, which is -- is our hope, is that it does have a decent level of participation and customers are able to move their energy consumption to off peak periods. What we would see then is that that

fair question. I think that putting them in the decoupling mechanism gives the Company the right incentives to encourage them and get customers to participate without having to take -- and I'm not saying that we would take this per se, but, you know, being

that we would take this per se, but, you know, being
 more threatened by time of use pilots or time bearing
 rate options.
 I think just in general across this history,

I think that if there isn't something like this in place, I think a lot of utilities just historically have been very conservative and very, quite frankly, concerned about the revenue impacts of time of use pricing. And I think there's a lot of great potential with -- with time of use and with getting customer behavioral changes.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So I want to address the question -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. BALL: I was just wondering if I could --

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Well, Mr. Ball, I was actually about to address the same question to you and also to either Mr. Dahl or Mr. Earle from Public Counsel why you are supporting inclusion of time of use as a decoupling mechanism.

MR. BALL: I read your mind.

Page 188

actual revenue would be -- would be less, okay? And so making sure that the -- it's truly capturing the actual revenue, it would more accurately reflect what the Company's revenue collected was during the decoupling period.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So I -- but my understanding of the settlement is that the number of people in the residen- -- at least in the residential time of use pilot is capped, I believe, at 500 customers; is that correct?

MR. MEREDITH: It is. So that is a fairly limited amount, but we also have an irrigation pilot. We also have a nonresidential pilot as well. And so there is -- there are caps, but I think there's still -- you know, that's only -- and I don't know what the magnitude of this is, but it -- it would affect the Company's revenue.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So -- so I understand that all three time of use pilot programs have a cap in them, but I guess my -- my -- my question still remains is, why not -- why not exclude the time of use pilot until those pilots are concluded and then we can talk about whether they should be included in the decoupling mechanism at that point instead of now?

MR. MEREDITH: Sure. I think that's a very

Page 190

Page 189

So from Staff's perspective, the primary purpose of the time of use pilot is to measure the potential price that -- the potential that price signals have for encouraging and incentivizing consumer behavior that reduces peak and contributes to better load curves and lower overall system costs. A key component of that price signal is a decoupling mechanism because we're operating under the assumption that the decoupling mechanism will continue.

And in regards of whether we have 500 customers or 5,000 or 50,000 customers, that's not necessarily true. It could be that ten years from now or five years from now the Commission rolls back the decoupling mechanism for PacifiCorp. But in the event that it doesn't, that piece is still a really important component of the overall price signal that those customers need to have in order to make sure that we understand how effective the program is.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Then I will ask the same question of Public Counsel, why -- why you are supporting inclusion of time of use -- the time of use pilot in the decoupling mechanism.

MR. DAHL: Yeah, this is Corey Dahl. I would say as a general matter, the decoupling component of the settlement and more specifically the time of use

27 (Pages 187 to 190)

Page 191

pilot was not one of the major issues that we looked at in terms of our petition to join the settlement. As I indicated in testimony, you know, we view the settlement as a complete package and in the public interest. So that's -- that's just as, you know, a general statement.

And, you know, the incorporating time of use pilot in the decoupling mechanism, you know, we want to understand more about the impact of that type of rate design on customer behavior before it's implemented on a broader scale. But I guess the bigger takeaway from the answer is just, you know, our view is looking at the settlement as a whole versus, you know, one -- one small component.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank you. And then one last question on this and maybe I'll pose this one to Mr. Ball. You touched on this a little bit in your answer just a few minutes ago. But I'm wondering, what other factors should we be looking at as we evaluate the time of use pilot particularly if it is included in the decoupling mechanism?

MR. BALL: Do you mean -- let me make sure I understand your question -- in general or as it relates to decoupling?

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I would -- I would say both. If you could talk about what factors we

sounds like the details for this pilot will be fleshed out as time goes on.

But it seems particularly there's very little there in the settlement about how many low income or vulnerable customers are going to be included, how to identify, what the outreach is, all of those various questions, which you have keyed up before.

So maybe you can -- is it the expectation that that will all be developed before this goes live and will that be shared with the Commission? So those are some of the questions I have.

MR. BALL: I think these are excellent questions and -- and I can't speak for the Company in terms of what they were -- how they were interpreting this, but the way Staff was interpreting it was we would work with the Company to set up those evaluation protocols ahead of time, and we would absolutely share them with the Commission and say this is the way we believe this program should be evaluated.

And vulnerable populations was absolutely a key element of that and was identified not just by Staff but by other groups in the settlement discussion as a key component of approving the time of use -- settling on the time of use projects.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But not

Page 192

should be evaluating both in general and also specifically as if it's part of the decoupling mechanism.

MR. BALL: If it's part of the decoupling mechanism, I think one of the key components to examine with regards to the time of use is what the response was in relation to the price signal and what the effect it was on the different types of -- of customer groups. Especially when it comes to residential, we want to be especially focused on vulnerable populations and, for instance, low income groups to understand how time of use is benefitting them and whether or not it's benefitting them.

And so it's a combination of both program design and program evaluation that yields this -- yields a good overall pilot project, and I believe the stipulation actually outlined that Staff is going to work with the Company over the next few months to come up with certain evaluation protocols so that there would be more certainty about how the program was ultimately judged.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm glad to hear you refer to that because in prior testimony in the prior proceeding, you had some ideas about how to go forward with setting up pilots and reporting, and so it

Page 194

Page 193

just -- and I will get to you, Shawn, in just a minute, Mr. Collins. But it doesn't appear that the settlement identifies how many low income or vulnerable customers are intended to be targeted, what percent of the 500. So not just the evaluation and, you know, review protocols, but what are -- what is the actual structure of the program going forward? There's not very much in the settlement.

So that question is not only for Staff and the other stakeholders but also the Company in terms of whether that information will be forthcoming in terms of what the outreach planning is. It's clear it's a great idea, but we need more than that. And so that's my query to all of you.

And, Mr. Collins, you were about to say something.

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Rendahl. Shawn Collins with The Energy Project here. I just want to make a note that as we understand it, this will be an opt-in program for time of use, and it was a concern for us that low income individuals and other vulnerable communities were identified up front because we do -- we're interested to see how it impacts those specific customers and agree that the -- the pilot lacked clarity in terms of what all of those specific

28 (Pages 191 to 194)

Page 195

outreach mechanisms and recruitment will look like. And I expect that as part of a advisory committee member, that will be consulted with that as it's developed. But certainly don't want to speak for the Company there, but just share that we have similar concerns and also, you know, within the scope of the settlement, comfort level that those customer types will -- will be specifically identified.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So maybe, Mr. Wilding, you can talk to the specifics or the intent and how this is going to be developed going forward and then if there are any other parties who wish to comment.

MR. WILDING: Yes, the stipulation does support the Company's proposed pilot program as outlined in Mr. Meredith's testimony; however, as Mr. Ball indicated, we have agreed to work collaboratively with parties, and as Mr. Collins indicated as well, over the next two months. And that is something that we're happy to report back to the Commission as we make progress, but I also would let -- maybe Mr. Meredith might have further insight or further commentary on that if that's okay with you, Commissioner Rendahl.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.

MR. MEREDITH: Yes, I agree with everything said by -- by Staff and by Public Counsel and by The

protocols were not finished before the program started. So at least from Staff's perspective, the way we meant it was we would work with them before the tariff program began.

Page 197

Page 198

MR. WILDING: I think the Company is also comfortable with that as well. I think that's in the spirit of the stipulation.

MR. DAHL: This is Corey Dahl. I'll just, you know, echo what the other parties have indicated, but from Public Counsel's perspective, in the way we've looked at time of use pilots in the past, you know, the program design up front is just as important as the criteria used in the evaluation. And we know the -- the discussion that we've been having amongst stakeholders for many years about whether or not time of use is a rate design that's worth exploring and piloting, you know, the same concerns about vulnerable populations have come up.

So, you know, we'll want to be sure that those considerations are not only included in the evaluation of program design that's going to require the Company to work collaboratively with stakeholders, which, you know, we have every expectation it will happen, you know, in line with the way that pilots have been conducted among other IOUs and -- and with

Page 196

Energy Project. I think -- you know, I really look forward to working with -- with all the different stakeholders to develop an appropriate outreach plan, I think, and also just evaluation protocols to make sure that we're understanding those impacts and how the time of use options would be able to benefit low income communities and -- and disadvantaged communities. I think there's a real great potential here for them to be helpful for them, for those groups.

CHAIR DANNER: And, Mr. Meredith, how long do you think it would be before such a plan would be developed?

MR. MEREDITH: That's hard to say. You know, I think probably with a meeting or two, I think a pretty robust plan could be developed, you know, just basing that off of how well I think a lot of these parties work together and are able to collaborate. I have a lot of faith in being able to come up with some really robust plans for outreach, for evaluation, to be able to ensure that this is a successful time of use pilot that meets the goals laid out in the stipulation.

MR. BALL: Chairman, this is Jason. The stipulation didn't specify a specific date, it just said over the next several months. I -- I think Staff would have a high -- would be far more uncomfortable if those

PacifiCorp historically.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. So, Mr. Meredith, I asked a question about the monthly decoupling deferral calculation before I

knew you were online and available. You probably heard that -- that testimony from Mr. Wilding and Mr. Ball, do you have anything to add?

MR. MEREDITH: No, I think we covered it. I think you were specifically asking about my testimony and how it would be calculated, and I think you were --memory serves me right, you were asking about specifically in the tariff where some of those -- I think there's different steps that are laid out in the decoupling tariffs and --

CHAIR DANNER: Right.

MR. MEREDITH: -- show exactly how we would calculate it, and you were kind of curious about one of these steps, I think, and why specifically we asked for that; is that --

CHAIR DANNER: You changed -- you changed the calculation so that you are now subtracting revenue from nonbase adjustment schedules, and the current tariff doesn't adjust for nonbased, and I was just wondering what the -- why --

MR. MEREDITH: Right, right. I think that's

29 (Pages 195 to 198)

Page 199

a great question. I think right now what it does is it -- it looks at the actual base that is within the rate case period. So what is the average price that we had month by month per megawatt hour for each rate schedule that was part of base revenue. And so that's already what is built into the rate case and what's established by the rate case.

And so we're taking the opposite approach, which is going to the Company's accounting information so the actual revenue that was booked and then taking out those pieces that are not base to get to the base. And so that's -- that's the difference and that's -- we laid that out as a -- how we came to that wording was looking at how we would functionally do this to get to base revenue, and that was how we worded the tariff in -- in what we proposed to -- to get to that level so that way we could get to actual base revenue is by taking out those nonbase components to what was booked in the accounting system.

CHAIR DANNER: So you agree with the others that this is a more precise calculation than what we currently have?

MR. MEREDITH: Yes.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. MR. MEREDITH: You're welcome.

any adjustments that need to be made, we will be able to go back and identify -- so we can identify the rate base and we can identify the revenue requirement associated with these capital additions, and so if cost of that limited issue rate filing adjustments need to be made, we will be able to.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right. So -- so the pro forma capital additions are not in the amount that was in the Company's supplemental filing? I'm just trying to make sure we have this all clear. So these are an addition or they -- what was included in the base -- in the rate base for the supplemental filing?

MR. WILDING: They were included in the supplemental filing.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right. Thanks. I think I've now beaten that horse, so thank you very much.

MR. WILDING: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. I want to turn to -- I want to turn to taxes actually.

Actually, before I do that, I do have one follow-up question to Commissioner Rendahl, which is, what level of rate base is subject to refund under the settlement?

Page 200

Page 202

Page 201

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a few questions about pro forma capital additions, and this is for -- for all parties, whoever wants to weigh in.

So in the settlement stipulation at paragraphs 14 and 15, it addresses the proforma capital additions. I just want to clarify that whether the -- the rates subject to refund are in a separate tariff schedule or are they part of base rates?

MR. WILDING: They are part of base rates. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in addition, the settlement doesn't explicitly define a total rate base. Is the level of the rate base in the settlement the same as what was in PacifiCorp's supplemental filing?

MR. WILDING: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And also the settlement doesn't really bifurcate the rate base levels related to the pro forma capital additions, so if the pro forma capital additions are in base rates not rate base, how are we going to figure out how this plays out?

MR. WILDING: The -- the pro forma capital additions, the rate base is in -- sorry, the capital cost of those -- of these pro forma capital additions, those are included in rate base and there's a revenue requirement in part of base rates. And so if there's

MR. WILDING: It would be the revenue requirement associated with any of these -- any of the plants in paragraph 14. And if -- I don't have specific dollar amounts, but if you'd like specific dollar amounts, we can provide that with the other bench requests.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. All right. Thank you. I think -- Judge O'Connell, let's maybe add that piece to our bench requests.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: I will include that as bench request No. 4, and I will also note that 3 and 4 and any others that we have after the conclusion of this hearing. Go ahead, Mr. -- Commissioner Balasbas.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank you.

All right. So going to the issue of taxes now, just have a couple of clarifying questions here. What are the respective interest rates that are used in the settlement?

MR. WILDING: The interest rates for the tax benefits?

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yes.

MR. WILDING: Or --COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: For the --

specifically for the tax benefits.

30 (Pages 199 to 202)

Page 205 Page 203 1 MR. WILDING: Sorry, I just want to make 1 will be amortizing back through base rates. What's the 2 sure I understand this correctly. Is it the interest 2 approximate number of years that that will be amortized? 3 rate during the amortization period in which we're 3 MR. FULLER: So in -- in the -- I filed an 4 returning the -- the tax benefits to customers, is that 4 errata exhibit on I believe August 11th and that was --5 5 I will refer to Exhibit RF-4, and -- so sorry, JT-2. what you're referring to? 6 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, that's what 6 But we have basically multiple categories of -- of 7 7 I'm referring to. classes of assets and each one has its own life. And 8 MR. WILDING: Okay. Also, I do have Ryan 8 the way that we categorize those is roughly with respect to how we determine categories and depreciations. So 9 Fuller in the room with me, who is our director of 9 10 taxes, who also was a witness in the case who can answer 10 there's a period in the depreciation study and there's a 11 these more detailed questions about the taxes if -- if 11 corresponding unit and it's in our calculations. And, 12 12 that's okav. you know, they range from, you know, a high of probably COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: That -- that's fine, 13 13 53 years for transmission to [phone interference] for 14 because I was about to ask some questions that would 14 some of the generation assets. So I will say on the 15 refer to Mr. Fuller's testimony, so that's -- that's 15 average if I'm just off the cuff of mind probably 16 16 somewhere in [phone interference]. very timely. 17 MR. WILDING: Okay. So -- so I'll also pass 17 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Fuller, I didn't 18 this question over to him. 18 hear the last part of that. 19 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: That's fine. 19 MR. FULLER: Oh, I'm sorry. I said if I had to just off the cuff it would be 30-plus years range on 20 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's have Mr. Fuller 20 21 21 appear on video since he's in the room and, Mr. Fuller, average for the amortization. COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And how 22 I'm going to, in a moment, swear you in. I will wait 22 23 23 until you're on the video. much of the annual protected EDIT amortization is 24 (Ryan Fuller sworn.) 24 included in the settlement revenue requirement? JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Will 25 25 MR. FULLER: Right. So in the base rates, Page 206 Page 204 1 there is \$6.4 million of EDIT amortization not --1 you please state your name, position, who you are employed by, and then spell your last name for the 2 2 separate and aside from the -- the EDIT amortization for 3 record. 3 2018, '19, and '20, which are being deferred and are 4 MR. FULLER: Yes, my name is Ryan Fuller. 4 returning through a separate scale. 5 I'm the senior tax director from PacifiCorp and my last 5 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. 6 name is spelled F-u-l-l-e-r. 6 Mr. Fuller, could you repeat that first number? 7 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Very good. 7 MR. FULLER: I'm looking here at 6.310 was 8 Let's -- Commissioner Balasbas, could you 8 the base level. repeat the question for Mr. Fuller? 9 9 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank 10 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Sure. Good 10 you. And then a couple of questions about the provision in the settlement regarding normalized accounting of the 11 afternoon, Mr. Fuller. 11 12 12 tax -- of taxes, and the Company will be using the MR. FULLER: Hi. 13 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And so I 13 reverse South Georgia method; is that correct? MR. FULLER: That's correct. 14 asked what are the respective interest rates that the 14 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And do 15 settlement uses for the amortization of the tax benefits 15 16 you have the amount of the regulatory asset associated 16 being passed back? 17 MR. FULLER: Yeah, I think we're going to 17 with that and how many approximate years of amortization 18 have to track that down for you with a bench request. 18 that that will be --Sorry, I'm looking at Mr. Wilding here. 19 19 MR. FULLER: Yeah, I think that's what we 20 COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: That -- that's fine 20 were just discussing at the onset of -- and so perhaps 21 if we -- we can -- we can also add that to our bench 21 maybe I misunderstood the first question, but the asset 22 requests catalog. Not a problem. 22 before gross [phone interference]. 23 So, Mr. Fuller, actually, referring to your 23 THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court 24 24 testimony in testimony RF-1T, you talk about the reporter. You're breaking up --25 25 JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Fuller, we couldn't approximately 70.6 million remaining protected EDIT that

31 (Pages 203 to 206)

Page 207

hear you. Your audio is very garbled. The amount for the regulatory asset, could you be more clear?

MR. FULLER: Yes, so \$70.6 million for gross of -- for income taxes.

2.1

rates in the future?

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And, again, that would be the what you mentioned earlier, the approximately the average 30 years or so?

MR. FULLER: Yeah, right. Yeah, exactly.
COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then specifically again on the normalized accounting treatment of tax -- of tax benefits, under what kind of a scenario would the proposed normalized method of accounting result in a significant increase to customer

MR. FULLER: I don't -- you know, so under the reverse South Georgia method, the amortization on the assets become -- is a straight line over the remaining regulatory lines. And so it, you know, a typical shape assuming no change in depreciable lives if you had decline each per, if you would, each class amortizes off, so more of a straight down kind of even curve.

And so I can't think of anything that would generate a sudden increase in customer rates because the amount should decline over time. I guess if there was a

scenario could that lead to a significant net rate increase in the future?

MR. FULLER: Right. Okay. Thank you. And I appreciate the clarification there. So just to be -- to restate the -- what was adopted in the stipulation that the Company had been using flow-through accounting for certain tax differences. And we requested to use a normalized method accounting for all of those tax differences -- all temporary tax differences other than [inaudible]. So that was -- that was what was adopted in the settlement stipulation.

So the -- the nice thing about the normalized method of accounting is it doesn't generate big spikes in ratemaking because it's only with respect to temporary tax differences, and so it doesn't broadly affect those temporary tax differences primarily limited to rate base and taxes and so any changes in temporary tax differences. But the [phone interference] so that's one of the kind of normalized methods of accounting is the --

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Fuller, let me stop you. I need to ask for you to repeat your last couple thoughts because we're getting a lot of interference from your audio, and I apologize.

MR. FULLER: Maybe it's my voice. I will

Page 208

large extension of a regulatory life that would -- that could cause a curve to change, so if you had like a five-year life and decided to go to 25-year life, then the amount of amortization would change. But I think other than that, I can't think of anything that would under the South Georgia method.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So just -- just to make sure that we're talking about the right -- I guess the -- and maybe I -- maybe this is not clear in my own mind here, but I think we have maybe two different normalization pieces that we're talking about here. We had the -- we have normalizing the return of the EDIT over time, and that I understand and understood is the reverse South Georgia method over time. But if I understand the settlement correctly, there's another provision regarding just the flow-through -- flow-through accounting -- flow-through of tax benefits versus normalizing --

MR. FULLER: Oh, yes, okay.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So the last question I asked was in relation to the switch of method for how the Company will account for taxes under -- so, again, I will repeat the question is, under what kind of scenario would switching to this normalized accounting method for rate-making treatment of taxes, under what kind of a

try to be clearer.

So normalized method of accounting generally results in less variability in rates flow-through method of accounting. So -- and the question is getting to the answer is what would generate a large increase in rates in the future as this method of accounting, and it would only be with respect to a tax difference that would have the effect of creating a large deferred tax asset very significant for tax asset in a large change.

So I can't think of anything off the top of my head that would intuitively lead me to believe or lead me to say this one thing could cause this to happen just because the method of accounting in and of itself is a more levelized method of accounting.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then I will pose a question to the other parties here about how ratepayers will benefit from PacifiCorp switching to this accounting method for taxes other than producing a lower revenue requirement in this specific circumstances under this case.

MR. BALL: This is Jason for Staff. I think for us at least one of the chief components of this method is that it's simpler for us to understand, it's more straightforward, and also it aligns the liabilities, the money that is owed to ratepayers with

32 (Pages 207 to 210)

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

Page 210

Page 209

Page 211

the assets that they correspond to. So for our perspective, it was a -- it's a good way of matching the benefit with the cost that originally yielded these tax deferrals.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Anyone else want to weigh in on that?

All right. If not, then I think I am done with my questions on taxes.

MR. FULLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think I just have one other questions for the parties.

Actually, Mr. Ball, I believe this is for you. So this morning, you testified that the Idaho Asset Exchange was a key element of Staff's support for the WIJAM in this case. In his direct testimony, Mr. Wilding notes that the Company had previously proposed changes to the WCA based on the Idaho Asset Exchange in its 2015 general rate case.

So what is different regarding the Idaho Asset Exchange in this case compared to the 2015 case?

MR. BALL: That's a great question,
Commissioner. The 2015 case was a limited issue
proceeding. There were several pieces that were not
included in that case for -- for -- to be contested.
One of them was cost of capital; another one was cost of

Page 213

WIJAM in this case and then three years down the road, five years down the road the Commission wanted to go back to the WCA, it absolutely could because the WIJAM is built on the exact same set of principles. I wouldn't recommend it because I believe that the WIJAM is a better representation of how the Company works and operates their system in relationship to Washington, but it's still based on the same set of principles.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Anything from the Chair or from Commissioner Balasbas? Chair?

CHAIR DANNER: I just have one question. I want to go back to the pilot, the customer payment pilot. This is something that Avista and PSE already do. I guess my question for Mr. Wilding and others is, is this really a pilot? Does it have a -- it doesn't seem to have an end date on it. I'm just trying to figure out what is it -- pilots are basically things we try out to learn, can you -- do you characterize this as a pilot and if so, do we need to put a timeframe on it?

MR. WILDING: Yes, it is a pilot. I think the timeframe is the next general rate case when we have the ability to -- to revisit. But so in answer to your question, yes, it is a pilot.

Page 212

service. At -- in 2015, we did not have a strong understanding of all of the components of the Company's operations in relationship both to the Idaho Asset Exchange and to the -- just to the way that it was -- the way it affected their operations.

We spent the next four years working with the Company through the MSP process to understand and evaluate how they operated their system, how they moved power between the balance area authorities, how they planned and built for their system. That ultimately led to the negotiations that yielded the -- the WIJAM, and it was just based upon our understanding and our interpretation of the facts that we had been given and our ability to analyze those facts.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So there might have been changes to the WCA in the 2015 case, this -- the WIJAM has further changes based on a further understanding of the Idaho Asset Exchange; is that a -- is that a good way of describing that?

MR. BALL: Yes, I think that's -- that's a perfectly accurate way of describing it. The WIJAM is -- I think what you could say is that the WIJAM is based on the exact same set of principles that use the WCA. And so what that means is if in the future the Commission wanted -- if -- if the Commission adopted the

Page 214

CHAIR DANNER: It's a three-year - three-year project?

MR. WILDING: Yes.

CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Judge O'Connell, at this point, I do not have any further questions.

CHAIR DANNER: Nor do I.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner Rendahl, do you have anything further for these witnesses?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Nope, thank you. JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Then we've finished the bench's questions for the panel of witnesses. All

the witnesses are excused. Thank you.

And I'd like to invite the attorneys, a representative from each party to please turn on your video. The witnesses can turn off their video.

We're going to afford an opportunity for the attorneys to provide any, you know, clarity if they feel that there needs to be any regarding some of the legal points that were raised in some of our questions. In particular, I think one of the things that you might choose to address is the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol and how do they meet the Commission's used and useful

standard.

Mr. Pepple, I'm aware that you -- you in

33 (Pages 211 to 214)

4

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 215

particular are wanting to be heard on that matter, so I would like to start with you and we will go to the other parties' attorneys and representatives and we will conclude with the Company.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, Mr. Pepple, let's hear from you first, please.

MR. PEPPLE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. I had just a couple of points I wanted to respond to. One was sort of a question about how the WIJAM and the 2020 protocols interact and, you know, what -- what happens if the Commission approves the 2020 protocol. And, you know, I -- I participated in the MSP process for quite a while -- you know, a couple years now, and, you know, the -- there is nothing in the 2020 protocol that substantively impacts Washington other than what is in the WIJAM. There's some things like exit orders that would apply to the Commission, but those -- the impacts of those things are really impacts on other states, not on Washington.

And so it's really what is in the WIJAM that is relevant to Washington. And in terms of, you know, sort of how the WIJAM meets used and useful standard, you know, if you go back to the Commission's order when it first rejected the revised protocol, you know, the way that the Commission interpreted the used and useful

1 it -- it doesn't really address that issue. And the

reason it doesn't address that issue is because the

3 WIJAM is dedicated to interjurisdictional cost

allocation to Washington. And, you know, when I think

5 of we inter -- of equitable benefits, I think more of

6 the allocation of benefits, cost of benefits among

7 customer classes, and the WIJAM is really more about

8 here's the pot of dollars that goes to Washington and

9 then we figure out -- you figure out how it gets

10 distributed.

> And the only other thing I wanted to mention was Commissioner Balasbas discussed the decommissioning remediation costs for Jim Bridger and Colstrip, I believe, and, you know, asked whether Washington customers would be allocated decommissioning costs after they were -- these units were removed from customer

And, you know, the -- the settlement leaves that question open basically. It allows -- it explicitly allows all parties to take any position they want on future decommissioning costs. It does not sort of establish the estimate that's included in this settlement as the final estimate or anything like that.

We would -- PCA would certainly agree that to the extent that customers are not receiving the

Page 216

standard, they found it to mean, you know, benefits to ratepayers in Washington either directly -- and so I'm quoting from Order 4 in UE-050 -- 050684 and this is paragraph 50, and it benefits ratepayers in Washington either directly, e.g., flow of power from a resource to customers and/or indirectly, e.g., reduction of costs to Washington customers through exchange contracts or other tangible or intangible benefits.

And it's -- so, you know, whether or not the east side wind resources are going to be sort of able to physically deliver to Washington, you know, if Jim Bridger is taken out of service or not taken out of service to me is not particularly relevant.

I think the real relevancy is that, you know, the benefits that those resources provide to Washington, particularly in a CETA world, are real, tangible benefits. And it's frankly difficult for me to see how PacifiCorp meets its CETA obligations if we don't get access to those types of resources. So I think -- I think those are real benefits to Washington that meet the used and useful standard.

And one other thing, I think, Commissioner Rendahl, you -- you asked about how the WIJAM sort of complies with CETA's requirements related to equitable benefits, and I think the answer to that really is that

Page 218

Page 217

1 benefits from these plants, decommissioning costs 2 incurred after that point should not be included in 3 customer rates. But that is an issue that will -- may 4 or may not be litigated in a future case, but it's certainly subject to a future case's determination.

> So I think those are all the points I wanted to cover.

> JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Pepple.

So I'd like to hear from Mr. ffitch, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Suetake, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, and then Mr. Kumar. So if I could turn now to The Energy Project's representative, Mr. ffitch. Is there -- are there any comments that you'd like to make based on the legal issues that were raised?

MR. FFITCH: Not at this time, Your Honor. I am just double-checking with my client to make sure that I haven't overlooked anything, but at this time, I'm happy to defer to other counsel.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Very well. Ms. Baldwin, is there anything you'd like to

add on the legal issues?

MS. BALDWIN: No, Walmart does not have anything to add at this time.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you.

34 (Pages 215 to 218)

Page 219

Ms. Suetake from Public Counsel, is there anything you would like to add?

MS. SUETAKE: No, Your Honor. I think Mr. Pepple covered all of the assets that we might have had concerns about.

But I -- I'd like to clarify that Public Counsel has not signed onto the larger -- the larger protocol, and we were largely focused on WIJAM and in this settlement. So we didn't have those larger concerns.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Ms. Suetake, to follow up on that just a little bit and your interpretation of what is in the settlement is not going to bind Public Counsel's ability to take position in the future?

MS. SUETAKE: As Mr. Pepple had clarified, the aspects of the larger protocol that bind Washington are included in WIJAM. So to the extent that there might have been other outside activities happening within the protocol negotiations, we weren't concerned about it with respect to WIJAM.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski for Staff, is there anything else you'd like to add on the legal issues?

MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I would add that I agree with what Mr. Pepple stated concerning the

Page 221

MR. KUMAR: Yes, Your Honor. I have two -before I discuss any of these legal issues, I'd like to
clarify that we have gotten the interest rate
information on the current tax balance and deferred
current tax balance and the deferred EDIT balance. I
can provide that clarification in the record right now
if it's helpful.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, that would be helpful. Can you please repeat it clearly which numbers you're referring to and just so we make sure we keep it separate and clear.

MR. KUMAR: Yes, the interest rate on the deferred current tax balance is 5.4 percent, which I believe is the -- the FERC rate, the -- that's the -- that's the rate published by the -- by FERC used -- they use this calculation as an estimate and will be updated quarterly when the new rate is published by FERC.

And I believe the interest rate on the deferred EDIT balance, the E-D-I-T balance, is 7.17 percent, which is the rate of return for the Company.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And there was another matter or two that you wished to address, yes?

MR. KUMAR: Yeah, I would like to -- in addition to echoing the comments made by Mr. Pepple, I'd

Page 220

Page 222

standard, which is from that Docket UE-050684, and I am looking at specifically Order 4, paragraph 68, which is the test for including a resource in rates is whether it provides quantifiable, direct, or indirect benefits to Washington commensurate with its cost. And Staff had it very much in mind when they were negotiating the WIJAM. And I would refer you back to the testimony of Jason Ball earlier today regarding the benefits that Staff considered when it was involved in the -- this process.

And I would just add that if it would be helpful for the Commission, the joint parties could provide supplemental testimony on the -- on the costs and benefits of the WIJAM.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. We will -- we'll consider that request, and if we -- in looking more closely and thinking about the testimony that's been offered today, if we think we would benefit from that, we may request that in the future. We're not going to make any request at this moment, but if we need it, we will ask for it.

Let me move on to Mr. Kumar from the Company. You get the -- the last chance to put in a word on any of the legal issues that were raised during today's hearing. Do you have anything you'd like to add?

like to address sort of the WIJAM and the used and useful issues that were considered by the Commission earlier in this hearing.

You know, I would echo the references to the order, and I will say that when we developed the WIJAM, we specifically had those orders in mind, and we referenced those orders both in the -- they're referenced in detail in the actual text of the WIJAM memorandum of understanding, and they're also referenced in -- throughout the testimony of Mr. Wilding where he -- he goes through and details in -- in I think a good amount of detail how the -- each element of those tax groups met through the WIJAM and specifically quantifies in the elements of those costs and benefits.

Specifically he details how they are significant benefits for net power costs, significant benefits in terms of increased PTCs for Washington customers and increased wheeling revenues totaling almost \$25 million, a little less than \$25 million in revenue requirement benefits from the WIJAM.

And this is important because the -- the test the Commission has articulated for the WIJAM is that it must provide quantifiable and direct and indirect benefits to Washington ratepayers commensurate with its costs. And so the detail in Mr. Wilding's

35 (Pages 219 to 222)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 223

testimony MGW-1CT through almost his entire testimony and [inaudible], both those quantifiable benefits and we quantify them where possible, and we also discuss some of the more nonquantifiable benefits and, you know, how it could possibly help for CETA legislation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I do think that there is a significant record there to draw upon with regards to the benefits to the WIJAM.

Specifically, I think the other element is that in order to show that a new cost allocation change should be adopted, parties must demonstrate that any changes proposed must more closely align the allocation of costs with the allocation of costs based on causation. And this is again from -- this is actually specifically for Docket UE-130043, I believe it's Order 5. It's in paragraphs 92 to 94.

And, you know, I think there's been a lot of discussion today about the Idaho Asset Exchange, and I want to, you know, specifically thank Staff, Public Counsel, and PCA for all the work because it -- two to four years of discussion and effort went into developing the WIJAM, and we spent a lot of time discussing how our system works, walking them through, you know, a lot of analysis and a lot of data on PacifiCorp's system and, you know, how -- how things are -- should be allocated.

those bench requests to be addressed.

As far as responses on those bench requests, let's talk about timing. Would one week be sufficient for the parties to respond to any bench requests?

Page 225

Page 226

MR. WILDING: Your Honor, that's the amount of time I was going to suggest, so that -- that would work for the Company.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just to clarify, are we talking business days or calendar days?

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Seven calendar days, so one week -- so in anticipation that by the end of the day tomorrow at the latest we issue the bench requests, assuming that it would be -- well, I'm asking if it would be sufficient amount of time until next Tuesday, close of business next Tuesday to publish any response that parties might want to make? And we've heard from the Company and I have heard no objections or opposition from any of the other parties, so we will plan on issuing a deadline of one week after we issue the bench requests.

Okay. Hearing nothing else from the parties, we will be adjourned for this afternoon. Thank you all for your attendance and your testimony and your thoughts. All right. We will be off the record. We

Page 224

are adjourned. Thank you. (Adjourned at 2:11 p.m.)

And so I feel like the WIJAM does represent a more deeper understanding of -- of PacifiCorp's cost and the cost causation and it reflects a number of assets that are -- are used and useful for Washington customers. And so we would request the Commission approve this stipulation and the WIJAM -- and the WIJAM, which is sort of an integral part of the 2020 protocol. And I'm happy to answer any questions that any of the Commissioners have.

JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Let me ask, are there any follow-up questions from the Commissioners for any of the attorneys?

I don't -- okay. I see head shaking. So I think that brings us to the conclusion of this hearing.

Is there anything else that we should address before we adjourn? I'm hearing nothing, seeing nothing. I am going to pause just because sometimes the technology might take a second, but I don't hear anything.

Then -- we've already addressed the public comments will be in bench exhibit bench request 2. I will follow up with the bench requests that we have not gotten answers for during this hearing, and I will send that out today or at least tomorrow to the parties for

36 (Pages 223 to 226)

STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. In admittant Agrating flower. Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3353
STATE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. Jourth Orndingheuse Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3332
GOUNTY OF THURSTON I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. Jaylar Garlinghouse, CCR 335a Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 335a
I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. In the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. In the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. In accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358 In accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. 10 11 12 13 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
certify that the foregoing transcript is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. 10 11 12 13 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability. 10 11 12 13 Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
10 11 12
11 12
12
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
18 19 20 21 22 23 24
19 20 21 22 23 24
20 21 22 23 24
21 22 23 24
22 23 24
24
I I

37 (Page 227)

	207 10 12 200 17	200 11 201 11	07.2.00.2.00.2	121 10 21 122 25
A	207:10,13 208:17	200:11 201:11	87:2 88:2 89:2	131:10,21 133:25
a-u-e-r 111:21	208:24 209:6,8,13	221:25	90:2 91:2 92:2	139:25 140:5
a.m 83:17 99:2,8	209:19 210:2,4,6	additional 109:15	93:2 94:2 95:2	149:24 152:12
142:10,10 179:19	210:13,14,18	109:16 113:24	96:2 97:2 98:2	177:6 195:16
AAGs 100:7	accounts 109:9	161:9	101:5	agreement 89:20
ability 130:20	Accrual 97:9,22,24	additionally 99:23	admitted 101:9,11	90:7,16 91:5
135:20 212:14	accuracy 133:8	105:5,25 106:7	adopt 187:22	125:6,9 126:9
213:24 219:14	accurate 133:6	108:14 109:10	adopted 209:5,10	131:18,24 155:14
227:9	187:14 212:21	additions 120:20	212:25 223:11	170:25
able 104:16 117:10	227:9	200:2,6,18,19,22	advance 155:17	agreements 129:17
117:11 120:13	accurately 188:3	200:23 201:4,8	advisory 107:5	agrees 114:18
159:4 171:16	achieve 128:22	address 103:2,7	195:2	ahead 103:22
172:18,19 187:24	acquired 154:12	121:10 179:8,10	AEB-10 88:3	105:18 114:20
196:6,17,18,20	acquisition 164:15	180:5 187:19	AEB-11 88:4	115:2,12 116:20
201:1,6 216:10	Act 94:14 95:15	189:17,21 214:22	AEB-12 88:6	117:2 118:24
absent 151:15	105:21	217:1,2 221:23	AEB-13 88:7	119:2 132:23
absolutely 120:22	activities 219:18	222:1 224:17	AEB-14 88:9	134:3 143:3
121:7 124:14	actual 105:14	addressed 136:24	AEB-1T 87:12	149:22 155:22
162:20 171:10,16	114:25 115:13	150:21 152:1	AEB-2 87:13	170:21 171:3
175:10,16,22	117:3 125:23	156:17 224:21	AEB-3 87:15	181:12,13,15
193:17,20 213:3	134:24 135:15	225:1	AEB-4 87:16	186:8 189:17
abundantly 145:19	143:19 144:21	addresses 200:5	AEB-5 87:18	193:17 202:13
accelerated 168:23	156:1,10,12,12	adequacy 165:10	AEB-6 87:19	Ajay 84:20 99:22
169:8,17 171:24	159:15 172:15,16	adjourn 180:6	AEB-7 87:21	ajay.kumar@pa
accept 112:17	173:16,25 174:20	224:17	AEB-8 87:22	84:22
119:16,17	175:17 183:7,9,22	adjourned 225:23	AEB-9 87:24	al 86:9
acceptable 102:1	184:3 186:15,15	226:1,2	affect 112:19 139:1	ALB-1T 96:12
acceptance 112:18	186:19,19,21,22	adjust 183:10	188:16 209:16	ALB-2 96:13
accepted 107:24	186:24,25 187:2,3	198:23	afford 214:17	ALB-3 96:15
access 106:3 129:18	187:7,8 188:1,3	adjusted 145:6,7,8	afternoon 179:5	ALB-4 96:16
129:24 133:19	194:6 199:2,10,17	160:4 183:9	180:6,10 204:11	Alex 85:21 111:20
134:14 135:5	222:8	adjusting 124:22	225:23	align 223:12
145:22 163:20,21	actuals 144:21	183:13	ago 176:23 191:17	aligned 148:17
216:19	add 119:15 121:12	adjustment 94:14	agree 109:2 120:22	aligns 169:24
accomplish 151:17	132:25 135:19	95:15 139:16	127:6 151:9	210:24
account 109:16	148:14 150:3	141:16 145:3	165:19 184:9	allocate 116:22
149:22 172:13,20	162:19 165:18	160:2 183:8,11	194:24 195:24	117:11 119:9
175:2 181:11	170:23 175:5	198:22	199:20 217:24	138:7,19 144:18
183:21 208:22	184:10 198:7	adjustments 120:3	219:25	144:18,22,25
accounting 95:24	202:8 204:21	133:1 139:25	agreed 101:22	allocated 87:6
96:6 99:17 107:16	218:22,24 219:2	140:9 145:11	109:7,15 112:8	109:5 113:10
107:24 116:17	219:23,24 220:10	149:7,15 183:13	113:15,23 114:1	118:17 125:12
117:4 122:14	220:25	183:19 201:1,5	114:17 115:3	139:2 143:7,19
177:23 179:22	added 161:6	administrative	117:4,8,9 121:22	146:22 147:2,4,6
199:9,19 206:11	addition 140:12	84:6 99:10	126:17,20 127:10	155:10 160:14,20
	147:13 153:16	admission 86:2	127:11 128:8	161:17,20,20
			<u> </u>	l

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

	1	1		1
162:5 166:16	201:9 206:16	appearing 99:22	129:14,14 144:2	assigning 175:20
168:9,11 169:2,3	207:1,25 208:4	100:1,4,5,15,24	144:13 156:3	assignment 126:22
171:2 176:1,7	222:12 225:5,15	101:3	166:25 212:9	163:24
217:15 223:25	amounts 147:5	appears 168:3	areas 125:22	assistance 94:7
allocating 114:2	202:4,5	appendix 86:10	argue 162:25	95:9 107:6
116:15,16 162:4	analysis 88:3,4,6,7	127:3	164:10	Assistant 100:6,13
allocation 86:23	90:13 97:13	application 108:20	argument 173:8	associated 118:12
87:5 93:20 106:9	149:11 223:24	applied 128:5	Arizona 88:13	123:8 137:25
106:22 114:23	analyze 212:14	131:10	arrives 139:18	153:17 154:23,23
116:13,18 117:3,5	analyzing 139:8	apply 128:1,4	arriving 149:4	155:2 158:24
117:23,25 118:3	ancillary 120:10,16	155:3 215:17	articulated 222:22	180:20 181:8
127:13 131:21	and/or 109:11	applying 186:18	asbestos 158:8	201:3 202:2
143:21 144:23	216:6	apportioned 176:3	aside 206:2	206:16
145:2 155:9 163:1	Andrew 84:7 99:9	appreciate 104:2,6	asked 112:16 113:4	assume 133:14
164:2,5 165:25	animal 126:16	131:2 171:20	119:13,16 131:7	142:6 170:23
171:12 176:10	Ann 84:3 87:15	209:4	142:4 150:7 198:3	173:5
180:20 217:4,6	100:14	appreciative	198:18 204:14	assumed 139:17
223:10,12,13	annual 154:20	104:10	208:21 216:23	assuming 123:10
allocations 106:11	157:9 205:23	approach 87:24	217:14	133:20 176:9
125:5,25 126:17	answer 102:16	164:12 199:8	asking 154:7	207:19 225:14
145:10 163:3	117:17 119:8	appropriate 153:23	159:19 162:13	assumption 133:18
164:8 181:7	132:6 133:23	155:3 183:12	172:23 180:8,14	190:8
allow 101:7 115:12	136:18 141:20	196:3	180:24 181:6,10	assumptions 88:24
136:25 179:7	173:14 174:14,21	approval 106:8	198:9,11 225:14	135:23 136:2
180:3	184:18 191:11,17	171:13 172:2	aspects 137:2 165:9	assure 153:22
allowed 156:24	203:10 210:5	181:10	185:6 219:16	assured 136:9
allows 106:17	213:24 216:25	approve 104:20	Assessment 89:16	attachment 86:15
156:11,13 167:5	224:8	107:12 131:8	90:3,4,13,23	109:21
170:8 217:19,20	answered 110:10	172:3 180:14,25	asset 87:22 92:9	attend 151:13
alluded 123:17	160:1 185:3	224:6	125:17,20 129:8	attendance 225:24
America 100:17,19	answering 151:7	approved 109:3	129:16 206:16,21	attention 122:23
106:14 109:2	answers 224:24	181:8	207:2 210:8,9	Attorney 84:11,16
111:10,12	anticipated 150:18	approves 171:23	211:14,17,20	85:3 100:6,13
amortization 86:13	157:25 169:23	215:11	212:3,18 223:18	attorneys 136:22
93:4,11 203:3	174:14 175:10	approving 109:19	assets 97:10,12,14	136:24 179:8,9,14
204:15 205:21,23	anticipating 146:4	180:19 193:23	109:11 120:20,24	180:3 214:14,18
206:1,2,17 207:16	157:19	approximate 205:2	125:15 129:6,9	215:3 224:13
208:4	anticipation 225:12	206:17	130:3,10,18 143:8	attributed 154:14
amortized 138:3	apart 110:6	approximately 99:8	144:1,9,15,24	audio 207:1 209:24
182:1 205:2	apologize 132:19	104:13 105:3,3	147:8,13 156:23	August 83:16 99:1
amortizes 207:21	137:24 154:19	109:4 142:13	166:12 167:25	99:7 101:8 102:3
amortizing 205:1	185:5 209:24	168:10 179:23	169:13 205:7,14	179:24 205:4
amount 140:22	apparent 174:4	204:25 207:7	207:17 211:1	Aurora 115:10
150:23 154:14	appear 194:2	April 149:1	219:4 224:4	116:6,12 117:20
159:14 176:5	203:21	area 94:11 95:13	assign 126:10	117:21 118:11,21
184:14 188:12	appearances 99:19	126:7 129:10,11	135:13	118:22 119:2
L				

124:12 133:3	149:5 158:12	163:9,17 164:23	basic 93:25 95:6	185:5 202:5,9,11
134:13,14 135:4,5	212:9 221:4,5,5	165:20 170:21,22	106:25	204:18,21 224:22
135:21 143:11,15	221:13,19,19	175:4 176:9,17,21	basically 127:3	224:22,23 225:1,2
145:23 146:2	balancing 144:13	178:20 184:8	128:3 205:6	225:4,13,20
149:21	166:25 172:13,20	189:18,20,25	213:19 217:19	bench's 214:12
auspices 132:1	175:2	191:16,21 192:4	basing 196:16	beneficial 104:16
authorities 144:13	Balasbas 83:14	193:12 195:15	basis 114:19,20	133:4
212:9	84:4 103:11 104:6	196:22 198:6	125:24 149:18	benefit 130:1 148:5
authority 144:2	118:6 130:22,25	210:21 211:12,21	169:4 176:7	153:10 196:6
authorization	131:14,23 132:3	212:20 220:8	battery 109:11	210:17 211:3
108:20	139:11 140:7,15	Ball's 132:15	BE-1 86:3	220:17
available 124:2	141:3,8,13 142:17	base 91:11 121:21	BE-2 86:4 102:2	Benefit)/Cost 89:9
125:13 133:15	142:18 148:11	122:15 138:1,2	BE-3 86:5	benefits 95:19
136:9 174:6 185:4	150:1 155:12	140:24 147:15	BE-4 86:6	105:20,22 106:15
185:8 198:5	156:16 157:6,12	156:9 176:24	BE-5 86:7	106:17 122:16
Avenue 83:22	160:8 162:7,12,17	177:2,3 183:7	BE-6 86:8	126:12 153:10,25
84:16	168:21 169:6,15	186:25 187:9	bearing 189:6	154:9 155:10,16
average 105:4	170:21 171:19	199:2,5,11,11,15	beaten 201:17	156:1,9,10,24,25
186:17 199:3	172:7,22 173:4	199:17 200:8,9,12	began 197:4	157:2,3 159:24
205:15,21 207:7	176:4,11 180:16	200:12,17,19,20	beginning 110:20	160:11,16 161:2,5
Averages 86:22	184:19 185:7,12	200:22,24,25	112:20	161:8,12 162:1
Avista 213:15	187:16 188:6,18	201:2,12,12,24	behalf 99:22 100:5	163:12,15 164:19
aware 214:25	189:16,20 190:19	205:1,25 206:8	100:24 101:3	164:22 166:2
	191:14,24 201:20	209:17	103:13 179:10	167:4,11 170:20
$\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\mathbf{B}}$	202:7,13,14,22,24	based 108:21	behavior 190:4	174:1 176:15,19
B-a-l-l 111:3	203:6,13,19 204:8	114:11 115:2	191:9	177:5,8,11 202:21
B,C 86:10	204:10,13,20	123:20 124:13,16	behavioral 189:15	202:25 203:4
back 107:7 110:5	205:22 206:5,9,15	125:12 131:21	Behle 85:13	204:15 207:11
112:20 123:18	207:5,9 208:7,20	135:4 145:2,5	believe 101:21	208:17 216:1,4,8
125:17 135:15	210:15 211:5	149:10 152:1	104:18 108:17	216:15,17,20,25
139:20 142:7,8,11	213:12 214:5	156:8,12 162:3	119:21 123:18	217:5,6,6 218:1
142:12,19 145:9	217:12	168:6,8 173:25	124:7,9,13,17	220:4,8,13 222:14
150:4 155:5 156:4 158:4 159:18	Baldwin 85:12	175:17 181:18	125:23 126:14	222:16,17,20,24
	101:2,3 218:11,21	211:17 212:12,17	130:13 131:18	223:2,4,7
160:9 167:5 174:7 174:23 179:4,20	218:23	212:23 213:8	142:18 146:23	benefitted 170:13
174:23 179:4,20	Ball 85:18 111:2,2	218:14 223:13	159:3 163:25	170:18
195:19 201:2	119:14,20 121:8,9	baseline 105:17	164:6,24 165:2,14	benefitting 128:24
204:16 205:1	127:17,24 128:18	113:16,22,24	188:9 192:16	192:12,13
213:3,14 215:23	128:25 130:8,23	115:5,17,20 118:9	193:19 205:4	best 115:6 173:18
220:7	130:24 131:13,22	119:4 120:25	210:11 211:12	185:2 227:9
Bainbridge 85:5	132:2,5,8 134:20	122:2 124:2 135:2	213:5 217:14	better 110:10 112:6
balance 106:2	134:20 139:13,21	135:3,13 139:14	221:14,18 223:15	112:21 117:21
107:10 140:5,21	140:4,16,23 141:7 141:12,19 145:17	139:16,18,22 140:3 141:16	bench 86:3,4,5,6,7	118:14 125:14,23 190:5 213:6
141:18,21,23	141:12,19 143:17	140:3 141:16	86:8 102:1,16 112:2 147:12,12	beyond 120:15
144:2 145:2,4	155:21 162:18	148:16,19,20	148:6,9 179:5,25	157:18
1 1,	133.21 102.10	147.0 1//.10	140.0,7 1/7.3,43	137.10

bifurcate 200:17	128:17	107:15 110:4,6,12	cases 121:1 123:16	CCR 83:21 227:13
big 125:16 157:4	Buell 83:22	Cameron-Rulko	133:16,19 156:15	Cedar 90:11,13,14
162:22,23 165:11	built 121:23 122:7	84:10 100:4,6	170:11	90:16,17,19
209:14	199:6 212:10	218:11 219:22,24	CAT-10C 90:3	157:24
bigger 191:10	213:4	cap 188:20	CAT-11C 90:5	cents 105:4
bill 94:7 95:9 96:10	Bulkley 87:15	cap 100.20 capabilities 115:11	CAT-12 90:7	certain 105:10
107:6	bunch 187:21	capability 125:21	CAT-13C 90:8	109:8 120:24
Billing 93:21,23	business 225:10,16	167:1	CAT-14 90:10	124:15 127:22
95:3,4	button 103:21	capital 87:22 88:4	CAT-15 90:11	130:20 149:7,10
bills 122:18		88:7 89:13 90:20	CAT-16C 90:13	150:20 156:3
bind 219:13,16	C	91:24 106:1,4	CAT-17C 90:14	164:5 166:12
bit 121:13 143:20	C 84:1 85:1 99:4	120:19 176:24	CAT-18 90:16	167:6 176:23
153:7,13 162:19	227:1,1	200:2,5,18,19,21	CAT-19C 90:17	192:19 209:7
191:17 219:12	C-o-l-l-i-n-s 111:17	200:22,23 201:4,8	CAT-1CT 89:12	certainly 195:4
black 140:9 149:8	C-o-r-e-y 111:6	211:25	CAT-1T 91:15	217:24 218:5
149:16	CAISO 116:19,20	capped 188:9	CAT-2 91:16	certainty 192:20
Bob 185:6	116:24 117:2,15	caps 188:14	CAT-20 90:19	Certified 227:6
Bond 88:18	118:25,25 119:6	capture 115:5,12	CAT-21C 90:20	certify 227:8
booked 199:10,18	124:11,20,24	117:22 156:14	CAT-22 90:22	CETA 97:5 128:22
box 84:11 85:4	133:12 134:2,3,8	184:1,3	CAT-23C 90:23	128:22 138:8,9,11
140:9 149:8,16	134:9,22,22,22	capturing 188:3	CAT-24C 91:3	138:22 160:12,15
break 142:5,9,13	135:16 145:23	carefully 153:21	CAT-25 91:4	160:21,22 161:2
179:4,13,16,18	149:22 181:12,15	Carla 99:23	CAT-26C 91:6	161:16,22 162:2,4
breaking 206:24	CAISO's 133:14	case 99:17 100:7	CAT-27 91:7	162:6,9,13,21,23
Bridge 152:18	135:25	102:25 104:4,12	CAT-28T 91:9	163:12,14 164:1
Bridger 97:10,12	CAISOs 133:4	105:6,16 106:19	CAT-29C 91:10	164:15,22,22
97:13,23,25	calculate 198:17	108:8,9 113:5,7	CAT-2C 89:13	165:10 170:3,6
129:10,20 137:8	calculated 183:7	113:14 115:4,16	CAT-3 89:15 91:18	174:18 216:16,18
137:15,16 150:8	198:10	115:21 116:10	CAT-30C 91:12	223:5
150:22 167:24	calculating 183:5	117:20 119:3,4	CAT-31C 91:13	CETA's 216:24
168:6 169:1,7,21	186:14	120:5 121:17	CAT-4C 89:16	Chair 83:13 84:3
169:22 170:13	calculation 93:19	122:12 123:11,16	CAT-5C 89:18	103:10 104:5
171:24 173:7	93:24 94:3,5,8,9	123:22 125:18	CAT-6 89:20	119:23 121:2
174:13 216:12	94:12,14 95:6,7	137:19 143:18	CAT-7C 89:21	127:19 128:7,19
217:13	95:10,12 96:10	144:4 149:13	CAT-8 89:23	130:5 137:5,6
Briefing 88:9	146:20 182:18	154:16 155:5	CAT-9 89:24	138:5 139:10
briefly 101:17	198:4,21 199:21	156:4 159:4,8,11	catalog 204:22	142:25 143:3
148:15	221:16	160:4 172:15	categories 205:6,9	146:11,14 150:5,7
brig 115:8	calculations 97:11	177:1,2,4 178:1	categorize 205:8	152:25 153:6,24
bring 120:15 140:5	205:11	179:22 180:6	causation 125:14	154:10 155:7,11
bringing 120:9	calendar 225:10,11	186:18 199:3,6,7	223:14 224:3	174:2,21 175:3
128:11	calendared 101:23	203:10 210:20	cause 122:5 141:24	176:13,18 177:13
brings 224:15	California 97:19	211:15,18,20,20	159:5,6 208:2	177:16 182:12,14
broader 191:10	114:25	211:22,24 212:16	210:12	182:16,23 183:1,3
broadly 209:15	call 100:1 123:15	213:1,23 218:4	causes 121:19,19	183:17,25 184:6
brought 122:23	camera 103:20	case's 218:5	causing 122:18	184:16 185:19
	ı	ı	ı	1

	İ	İ	1	ı
196:10 198:2,15	209:4 221:6	colleagues 142:20	134:19 137:1	146:15 147:10
198:20 199:20,24	clarified 219:15	142:23 148:2	155:21 195:12	148:1,11 150:1,5
213:11,12,13	clarify 107:15	150:4 181:22	commentary	151:14,18 152:6
214:1,4,7	127:21 143:10	182:10	195:21	152:19,24 155:12
Chairman 119:21	157:7 173:2 176:6	collect 109:16	comments 101:17	156:16 157:6,12
121:8 123:16	180:12 182:2	137:22	101:18 103:6	157:13 158:23
154:18 164:6	200:6 219:6 221:3	collected 188:4	140:17 145:15	159:20,25 160:7,8
175:4 196:22	225:9	Collins 85:20	148:14 180:4	162:7,12,17,18
chance 123:11	clarifying 139:21	111:16,16 194:2	218:14 221:25	163:9 164:13
179:10,15 220:22	202:17	194:15,17,18	224:22	165:17,21 166:23
change 121:20	clarity 112:2	195:17	commercial 187:5	167:18,22 168:2
126:6 129:16	119:15 194:25	color 121:13 129:7	commission 83:2,4	168:12,18,21
143:23 144:7	214:18	162:19	83:18 84:9 99:11	169:6,15 170:21
153:6,18 154:5	class 94:22 207:20	color-code 130:10	100:5 104:19	171:19 172:7,22
156:23 184:2	classes 205:7 217:7	Colstrip 97:10,12	105:14 107:12	173:4 175:4 176:4
207:19 208:2,4	cleaner 106:6	97:13,23,25 169:2	108:11 109:18,19	176:11 177:17
210:9 223:10	clear 120:6,9	169:8 170:13	111:3 112:16,19	178:6,18,24 180:8
changed 129:5,5	145:19 147:21	171:25 173:7	119:16,19 120:13	180:10,16 181:14
147:22 183:5	148:8 152:25	177:18,18,24	121:9 127:12	181:20 182:9
198:20,20	174:3 176:14	178:7 217:13	131:20 145:18	184:19 185:7,12
changes 105:18	194:12 201:10	combination	147:8 150:12	187:16 188:6,18
109:7 115:5	207:2 208:9	163:20 164:9	151:13 153:2	189:16,20 190:19
123:13 125:11	221:11	192:14	162:13 165:3	191:14,24 192:22
146:8 154:8,25	clearer 210:1	Combined 89:8,10	171:12,23 172:1	193:25 194:17
156:14 183:24	Clearing 143:15	come 104:16	172:18 180:14,24	195:9,22,23 200:1
189:15 209:17	clearly 221:9	113:19 116:5	180:24 190:13	200:10,16 201:7
211:17 212:16,17	Cleve 85:8	117:19 127:12	193:10,18 195:19	201:16,20,23
223:12	client 218:17	131:19 132:11	212:25,25 213:2	202:7,13,14,22,24
characterize	close 171:4 225:16	136:25 142:6,7	215:11,17,25	203:6,13,19 204:8
213:20	closely 220:16	146:2 158:12	220:11 222:2,22	204:10,13,20
characterized	223:12	174:23 175:16	224:5	205:22 206:5,9,15
184:9	closer 118:1 151:3	177:20 179:2	Commission's	207:5,9 208:7,20
charge 93:25 95:6	closing 169:22	181:9 192:18	126:11 163:2	210:15 211:5,10
96:9 106:25	closure 174:20	196:18 197:18	214:23 215:23	211:22 212:15
charges 187:8	coal 128:11 137:8	comes 121:19	Commissioner	213:9,12 214:5,8
chat 136:17	137:15,16 138:2	123:11,25 135:1	83:13,14 84:3,4	214:10 216:22
Chehalis 138:8,11	150:8,22 152:18	137:16 141:1	103:10,11 104:5,6	217:12 225:9
138:18,19 139:1	169:22 170:3	192:9	116:2,3 118:4,5,6	Commissioners
164:7	174:12,20	comfort 195:6	130:22,25 131:14	84:2 99:12 100:18
chief 108:7 210:22	collaborate 196:17	comfortable 197:6	131:23 132:3	100:23 102:9,13
choose 214:22	Collaborative	coming 174:7	133:10,11,24	121:9 137:4 180:8
circumstances	94:17	184:12	134:17 135:17	224:9,12
129:4,5 210:19	collaboratively	commensurate	139:11 140:7,15	committee 107:7
City 85:14	151:4 152:13,15	126:13 130:1,4	141:3,8,13 142:1	195:2
Claimant 83:5	178:3 195:16	220:5 222:24	142:2,16,16,18,25	communities
clarification 171:21	197:22	comment 101:21	143:3,4 145:13	194:22 196:7,7
	1	1		•

	_	_	_	
companies 144:22	160:12 161:2,22	90:21,24 91:3,6	163:7 165:15	206:13,14
company 83:8	161:25 162:3,10	91:10,11,12,14,19	169:3 176:7 190:9	corrections 148:25
88:13 97:6 99:24	162:14,23 163:23	91:25 92:25 93:3	continued 104:20	correctly 118:18
105:6,19 106:3	164:1,22	93:10 94:4 98:3	106:4 164:5	131:2,6,12 203:2
108:24 109:12,13	compliant 160:15	confirm 168:25	continues 124:6	208:15
113:1 114:1	160:21,22	171:22	continuing 106:20	corrects 186:25
115:18 118:10	complies 216:24	connect 166:17	106:22 158:15,21	correspond 211:1
124:18 125:4,24	comply 163:5	167:8,14	contracting 116:19	corresponding
126:9 131:17,19	component 121:18	connected 129:9,11	116:24 117:14	109:14 205:11
133:23 134:9,10	135:12 162:22	148:17	118:25	cost 88:12,15,19,24
134:11,12 137:8	165:7 190:6,16,24	connecting 166:3	contractor 91:13	89:7,13 91:13
145:25 147:7	191:13 193:23	conservative	158:12,15	93:14,15,17 94:11
148:23 150:8,22	components 91:21	189:11	contractors 158:21	94:20,22,23 95:13
151:14,16 153:1	123:19 127:14,22	consider 91:12	contracts 129:18	105:16,17 106:1,8
165:12 166:1	136:19 153:17	172:5 220:15	216:7	106:10,15,22
177:9 178:10	158:9,9 164:5,25	considerations	contribute 167:1	112:8 113:5,7,16
183:22 184:22	168:23 192:5	197:20	contributes 190:5	113:22,24 114:2
189:2 192:18	199:18 210:22	considered 220:9	contribution	114:23 115:5,16
193:13,16 194:10	212:2	222:2	150:21	115:20,21,25
195:4 197:5,22	computer 110:4	consistent 138:4	control 88:18 126:7	116:13,16,22
206:12 208:22	concern 141:14	consolidated 83:5	129:10,11,14,14	117:3,5,11,20,23
209:6 211:16	153:14 154:22	99:15 102:21	138:23	118:9,11 119:3
212:7 213:6 215:4	162:23 163:1	107:22	convene 153:2	120:24 121:15,23
220:22 221:20	194:21	Constant 87:19	conversations	122:1,2 123:15,16
225:7,18	concerned 122:1	constantly 157:21	178:10	123:20,22 125:14
Company's 104:23	136:10 175:7,9	constitute 171:25	copy 101:13	125:25 126:10,16
107:23 108:16	189:12 219:19	constructing	Corey 85:19 111:5	130:2,4,13 131:20
124:9 125:21	concerning 157:13	163:11	190:23 197:8	133:1,6 135:5
144:11 171:4	219:25	consulted 195:3	Corinne 100:20	137:15 139:16
181:13,24 188:4	concerns 133:17	consumer 190:4	Corporation	140:1,10 144:12
188:17 195:14	153:11 195:5	consumption	100:17,19 106:14	144:18,21,22
199:9 201:9 212:2	197:17 219:5,10	187:24	109:1 111:10,12	146:21 147:4
compared 86:22	conclude 215:4	cont 85:1 87:1 88:1	114:17 161:16	148:3,16,20,23
211:20	concluded 188:22	89:1 90:1 91:1	correct 107:18	149:6 152:18
comparer 180:17	conclusion 148:7	92:1 93:1 94:1	108:1 118:20	153:17 154:5,14
Comparison 89:14	149:24 202:12	95:1 96:1 97:1	131:13,22 132:2	154:23 156:24
92:3 95:21 96:19	224:15	98:1	133:18 140:23	157:3 160:3,17,24
Comparisons 93:23	conditions 109:20	contemplating	141:7,12 153:4	161:6,7 163:1,3
95:4	113:21 129:15	163:15	157:10,11 162:20	164:2 166:2
compile 101:18	conducted 197:25	content 112:3	167:25 168:1,16	167:19 168:13
complete 191:4	confident 128:15	contents 112:22	168:17 169:4,5	170:19 180:19,20
completion 157:17	162:3	contested 211:24	172:1 176:8,9,16	181:16 186:4
157:18	Confidential 87:3,7	context 155:4	176:17 180:15	200:23 201:4
complex 104:14	88:17,22,24 89:3	continue 118:9	181:19 182:6	211:3,25,25 217:3
compliance 128:12	89:12,14,17,19,21	127:7 128:9	183:21 184:14	217:6 220:5
138:9,11,22	90:4,6,8,13,15,18	130:12 131:17,25	188:10 200:15	223:10 224:2,3
	I .	I .	Į	1

costs 87:9,10 90:20	215:8,13	217:7,16 218:3	177:16 182:12,14	decommissioning
91:12,18,24 93:24	course 110:5 120:3	customers 104:17	182:16,23 183:1,3	91:10,18 172:9,14
95:6 104:1 105:14	133:7 136:13	104:21 106:3,16	183:17,25 184:6	172:16,17,25
112:7 113:9,11,16	137:16 139:23	106:17 107:1,10	184:16 185:19	173:10,15,16
118:16,16 119:10	159:12 170:4	113:10 137:22	196:10 198:2,15	175:18,24 217:12
122:4 123:24	175:1	138:20 139:2	198:20 199:20,24	217:15,21 218:1
124:9,13,21 125:1	court 101:14	150:25 155:9,25	213:13 214:1,4,7	decoupled 184:14
126:13,22 137:9	205:17 206:23,23	156:5,8,11 159:16	data 109:16 117:16	decoupling 94:12
137:13 138:3	cover 151:2 218:7	160:25 161:11	119:7 152:17	179:23 182:17
139:13 141:24	covered 198:8	169:3,17 170:12	223:24	183:6,6,20 184:15
142:24 143:5,7,10	219:4	170:18 171:1	date 105:7 159:14	184:18,21,23
143:19 144:4	covering 119:12	172:8 173:6,9,15	159:15 169:23	185:18 186:11
146:16,17 147:15	COVID-19 157:14	173:20,22 174:19	170:5 172:11,24	187:14 188:5,24
147:23 149:11	creates 107:5	184:14 187:7,22	173:6,11 174:25	189:2,24 190:7,8
150:22,22,24	creating 210:8	187:24 188:10	196:23 213:18	190:14,22,24
152:13 154:13	credit 88:15 93:18	189:3 190:11,11	dates 91:24 107:6	191:7,20,23 192:2
159:12 161:5	96:10 154:21	190:17 193:5	157:17,18 171:24	192:4 198:4,14
166:15 167:24	155:25 156:20	194:3,24 203:4	Dave 84:3 127:19	decrease 105:2
168:4,6,10,14	159:6,19	216:6,7 217:15,25	174:2	dedicated 217:3
172:9,14,16,17,25	credits 94:7 95:9	222:18 224:5	Davison 85:8	deeper 115:23
173:10,15,16,21	153:8 158:24	customers' 122:18	day 102:3 105:18	174:13 224:2
174:20 175:17	159:2 161:8	cutoff 172:24	114:20 115:2,12	defer 143:2 148:2
176:3,5,6,14,15	181:22	Cuts 105:21	116:20 117:2	218:19
176:19,24 177:10	criteria 197:13		118:24 119:1	deferral 121:23
190:6 216:6	cuff 205:15,20	D	134:3 149:22	140:21 141:18,23
217:13,15,21	curious 198:17	D 99:4	157:22 181:12,13	182:17 183:6
218:1 220:12	current 105:21	D-3 85:4	181:15 225:13	198:4
222:14,16,25	106:24 114:5	D-a-h-l 111:6	days 225:10,10,11	deferrals 93:4,11
223:13,13	169:23 183:10,25	d/b/a 83:7	DCF 87:19,21	211:4
counsel 84:14	183:25 184:4	Dahl 85:19 111:5,5	deadline 225:20	deferred 95:19
100:11,12 101:18	186:14 198:22	189:22 190:23,23	deal 122:8,22	105:21,22 177:23
106:13 109:1	221:4,5,13	197:8,8	171:17,18	206:3 210:8 221:4
111:4,8 114:16	currently 105:18	daily 158:19	dealt 136:12 176:20	221:5,13,19
125:4 132:25	114:24 115:7,19	Danner 83:13 84:3	176:21	define 166:9 200:11
135:19 161:15	138:15 140:20	103:10 104:5	Debt 88:12,15	definitions 119:25
178:23 189:23	149:23 154:9	119:21,23 121:2	December 113:12	120:7,12
190:20 195:25	167:23 199:22	127:19,19 128:7	148:24 169:8,23	delay 159:6
218:19 219:1,7	curve 92:3 113:12	128:19 130:5	170:4 173:5	delayed 159:2,3,22
223:20	113:18 139:23	137:6 138:5	decent 187:23	159:23
Counsel's 197:10	207:22 208:2	139:10 142:25	decided 208:3	delays 158:8,17
219:14	curves 190:5	143:3 146:11,14	deciding 118:16	deliver 216:11
COUNTY 227:4	customer 105:4	150:5,7 152:25	decision-making	delivery 158:9
couple 117:14	107:4 187:5	153:6,24 154:10	112:19 119:19	Delta 96:15
119:6,25 121:13	189:14 191:9	155:7,11 174:2,2	decline 207:20,25	demonstrate
169:9,20 202:17	192:8 195:7	174:21 175:3	decommission	223:11
206:10 209:22	207:13,24 213:14	176:13,18 177:13	176:5	depending 170:15
		•	1	•

	1	1	<u> </u>	1
depends 174:9,15	determining 135:2	186:4 203:9 204:5	102:25 134:5	east 125:21 126:2,3
depreciable 92:6	186:21	disadvantaged	146:19	144:13 161:18,19
207:19	develop 118:3	196:7	doing 117:22 127:4	166:14,25,25
depreciate 173:6	196:3	disconnections	128:3 149:13	167:1 168:4
depreciated 169:12	developed 116:14	107:4	165:2 187:12	216:10
depreciating	117:25 118:1	discreet 137:6	dollar 139:15	eastern 129:14
169:13	193:9 195:3,11	discuss 171:13	140:11,18 141:5	168:15
depreciation 96:19	196:12,15 222:5	175:22 221:2	147:5 154:20	echo 133:4 134:21
96:21,24 97:4,6,9	developing 223:21	223:3	202:4,4	197:9 222:4
97:11,18,22,24	development 162:9	discussed 150:9	dollars 140:14	echoing 221:25
99:18 102:23	develops 109:10	152:2,9 217:12	141:10 144:25	economic 130:14
103:1,4 108:4,9	Diagram 96:13,15	discussing 102:10	217:8	EDIT 86:13 95:21
108:10,16,21	dictates 106:10	164:21 206:20	door 153:21	105:23,23 204:25
109:3,5,12,14,21	difference 199:12	223:22	double-checking	205:23 206:1,2
122:15 153:19	210:7	discussion 127:20	218:17	208:13 221:5,19
168:23 169:2,8,18	differences 122:9	165:24 176:19	draw 223:7	effect 119:18
171:10,14,24	209:7,9,9,15,16	193:22 197:14	drawing 153:20	122:13 125:25
205:10	209:18	223:18,21	drives 161:7	192:7 210:8
depreciations	different 112:22	discussions 131:17	DRM-1HT 98:3	effective 105:7
205:9	114:3 115:11	187:10,13	dropped 142:4	108:21 122:25
derived 148:16	119:10 122:14	dispatch 114:19	due 136:12	124:8 146:5
describe 167:2	123:19 126:15	115:2,2,5,13	dug 174:12	159:14 160:24
described 116:4	187:6,8 192:8	116:18 117:2,15	dynamic 114:6	190:18
120:14	196:2 198:13	117:23 118:11,22		effectively 131:20
describing 167:16	208:11 211:19	118:24 119:2	E	139:17 141:4
212:19,21	differently 187:7	124:10,11,21,24	E 84:1,1 85:1,1	effort 112:1 223:21
descriptions 120:7	difficult 104:14	125:24 130:14	87:15 99:4,4	eight 146:4 183:5,7
design 106:24	164:8 216:17	133:5,13,15	227:1,1	EIM 176:14,15,18
185:2 191:9	dig 174:13	134:24 135:15	E-a-r-l-e 111:8	176:24 177:5,8,11
192:15 197:12,16	diligence 104:15	136:6 145:23	E-D-I-T 221:19	either 132:14
197:21	dipping 140:25	dispatched 130:11	e.g 216:5,6	139:12 145:4
Design/Cost 94:17	direct 86:18,20	dispatching 124:23	Earle 85:19 111:7,7	158:4 159:2 171:4
designate 102:1	87:3,12 88:10,16	dispute 107:22	132:18,24,24	189:22 216:2,5
designed 123:17	88:21,22 89:12	disputed 102:22,24	135:18,18 136:14	Ekola 89:15,16,18
detail 86:13 150:14	91:15,19 92:4,7	distributed 217:10	177:13,15 178:22	89:20,21,23
222:8,12,25	92:21 93:12 95:18	distribution 109:8	178:22 189:22	157:25
detailed 94:23	96:7,12,22 97:15	164:18	earlier 139:21	EL-1T 86:20
112:5 203:11	110:9 126:12	dive 115:23	140:16 150:7	EL-2 86:21
details 91:14,24	130:18 148:24	diversity 106:18	170:2 207:6 220:8	EL-3 86:23
193:1 222:11,15	169:1 182:19	docket 83:4 86:14	222:3	EL-4 86:24
Determinants	211:15 220:4	99:23 100:14	early 123:18	electric 99:16
93:22 95:3	222:23	102:2,23 108:5,14	Earnings 88:3	electrons 130:10
determination	directed 153:5	220:1 223:15	Easement 90:8	element 193:21
123:7 218:5	direction 108:22	dockets 86:9 99:15	Easements 89:21	211:14 222:12
determine 205:9	directly 216:2,5	102:20 107:16,22	easier 147:7	223:9
determined 181:3	director 103:25	documents 102:22	easiest 143:22	elements 112:6,23
L	I	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

		I		I
125:11 163:14	especially 124:19	excess 105:22 145:5	150:15 157:17,24	187:5
222:14	192:9,10	exchange 92:9	158:1,5	factors 164:10
eligibility 159:21	establish 172:20	125:17,20 129:8,9	expecting 141:4	191:18,25
eligible 120:21	217:22	129:16 211:14,18	expedited 176:22	facts 212:13,14
161:24 162:2,6,6	established 199:7	211:20 212:4,18	Expenditures 88:4	fair 107:9 152:15
email 148:7	establishes 172:4	216:7 223:18	expense 96:19	189:1
employed 204:2	establishing 163:1	exclude 188:21	153:19 178:7	fairly 117:11 136:1
enable 164:3	estimate 89:17 90:3	excluded 112:13	expenses 177:24	136:12 188:11
enabling 165:15	91:11 133:6	128:20,23	181:17	faith 196:18
encourage 189:3	139:19,22 140:11	excluding 166:2	experience 114:21	fall 150:18
encouraging 190:4	140:18 141:16	excuse 109:20	117:17 119:8	far 105:12 119:5,16
ended 92:24 93:9	217:22,23 221:16	122:2 124:23	158:8 184:15	124:7 136:19
energy 85:2 89:13	estimated 91:16,18	145:7 170:11	expiration 153:12	137:20 149:12
89:17 90:3,13	150:23	excused 214:13	153:16 155:2,6	157:2 170:1,7
92:10 100:22,24	estimates 158:14	exhaust 141:22	expirations 154:24	196:25 225:2
104:24 106:6,25	estimating 158:16	exhibit 86:1 87:1	expire 154:22	favorable 156:2
111:15,22 114:11	Estimation 93:3	88:1 89:1 90:1	expires 114:9	February 89:5,7,9
114:14 145:1,5,8	et 86:9	91:1 92:1 93:1	expiring 154:15	89:11 108:13
157:14 161:6	EU-191024 86:9	94:1 95:1 96:1	explain 112:6,10,22	Federal 94:14
167:5 181:22	evaluate 174:17	97:1 98:1 101:13	132:16 136:22	95:15
186:19 187:7,24	191:19 212:8	101:17 102:2	137:1,10 143:13	Feeder 96:13
194:18 196:1	evaluated 193:19	146:25,25 147:19	143:22 148:15	feel 104:15 122:24
218:12	evaluating 192:1	205:4,5 224:22	166:7	136:10 184:2
engagement 104:10	evaluation 192:15	exhibits 86:2 87:2	explanation 131:2	214:18 224:1
engages 125:24	192:19 193:16	88:2 89:2 90:2	132:15 136:16	feet 110:5 174:13
engaging 116:19	194:5 196:4,19	91:2 92:2 93:2	explicit 128:1	FERC 109:16
124:10	197:13,21	94:2 95:2 96:2	explicitly 200:11	129:18 221:14,15
ensure 196:20	event 131:23	97:2 98:2 101:6,8	217:20	221:17
entire 115:11	140:17 159:22	101:9,11 147:14	exploring 197:16	ffitch 85:3 100:23
122:12 167:4	190:14	existed 143:18	extend 178:12,17	100:24 218:10,13
223:1	evolving 158:18	existing 92:3,6	extended 159:21	218:16
entirely 186:13	exact 212:23 213:4	106:1 125:5 163:6	extension 208:1	figure 127:1 146:16
entirety 102:17	exactly 119:9	182:1,3,8 183:14	extent 130:15	154:16 200:20
167:11	135:23 139:24	exists 141:21	140:25 155:1	213:19 217:9,9
environmental	146:16 173:2	145:21	157:18 167:13	figured 127:1
160:21,23 161:25	198:16 207:8	exit 168:23 172:1,4	217:25 219:17	file 105:6
envision 112:10	examination 124:8	172:11 215:16	F	filed 101:8 102:2
envisions 150:19	examine 107:5	expand 138:10	-	108:19 121:16
EP 154:12	125:5 135:8,14	153:12	F 227:1	148:23,23 149:13
equal 160:16	192:5	expect 117:25	F-u-l-l-e-r 204:6	152:14 177:2
162:25	example 153:19	150:12 153:18	facilitate 151:17	205:3
equitable 164:18	167:7 173:18	156:17 157:4	facilities 88:24	files 109:12
216:24 217:5	187:5	180:1 195:2	109:14	filing 102:23 105:9
equity 106:2	exceed 141:17	expectation 193:8	fact 120:18 128:24	105:13 107:23
164:25,25 165:3	160:17 174:5	197:23	155:16 156:9	109:6 113:13
errata 101:7 205:4	excellent 193:12	expected 88:3	factor 165:15 187:4	115:16 120:1,21
	1	1	1	1

120:24 121:17	89:20,21,23,24	forthcoming	Function 94:22	160:9 210:2
122:21,21,22	90:3,5,7,8,10	194:11	functionality	generate 207:24
123:4,13,25	158:1,2,7,17	forward 106:20	115:11 117:22	209:13 210:5
148:24 149:1	fleet 138:24 166:13	113:12,18 114:8	functionally 199:14	generating 167:8
156:18,19,22	166:14	127:7 133:7,8,16	Functions 93:16	generation 105:10
160:5 176:23	fleshed 193:1	133:17 135:9,21	fund 137:8 150:8	106:19 109:8
200:14 201:5,9,13	flexibility 138:9	139:8 143:23	174:6,7	144:1 156:13
201:15	170:8	170:9,20 192:25	funds 137:14,14	165:8 166:12
fill 146:6,9	flip 110:4	194:7 195:11	140:25	172:10 205:14
final 113:16 126:25	floor 150:4	196:2	further 115:25	Generator 89:20
158:14 217:23	flow 129:13 156:25	found 160:14,20	133:25 145:15	90:7,16 91:4,21
finalize 158:22	157:2 216:5	216:1	164:3 178:25	geographic 106:18
finalized 101:13	flow-through 95:24	four 175:18 176:23	195:21,21 212:17	geographically
146:1,2	96:6 208:16,17,17	212:6 223:21	212:17 213:10	138:24
finally 107:3	209:6 210:3	four-unit 169:22	214:6,9	Georgia 206:13
126:19	fluctuation 156:12	Fourth 83:22	future 93:18 106:6	207:16 208:6,14
financial 108:7	flushes 106:25	framework 128:10	112:19 119:18	getting 117:15,16
financing 106:4	focused 120:14	131:15,24 132:25	122:9 133:19	186:24 189:14
find 182:22	165:6 192:10	138:14 139:6	169:19 174:17,23	209:23 210:4
fine 101:22 110:8	219:8	164:3 181:1	174:25 181:9	Gibson 99:25
185:8 203:13,19	folks 134:18	frankly 189:11	207:14 209:2	give 103:15 108:3
204:20	follow 116:21 118:7	216:17	210:6 212:24	113:20 117:8
finish 142:17,21	219:11 224:23	front 115:1 124:16	217:21 218:4,5	119:1 126:24
finished 197:1	follow-up 111:25	182:20 194:22	219:14 220:18	179:14
214:11	112:5 119:13	197:12		given 154:11
finishes 132:9	137:4 150:6	Fruit 92:19	G	212:13
Fire 96:15	180:11 201:23	fuel 161:6	G 99:4	gives 138:22 163:21
firm 99:25	224:11	fulfill 161:25	gain 114:21 119:8	163:25 189:2
first 104:12 105:9	following 155:13,13	full 135:5	gap 146:6,9	giving 112:4
111:5,25 112:2,4	forecast 94:3 115:6	Fuller 85:22 203:9	garbled 207:1	glad 192:22
116:23 117:15,16	115:19 122:9,10	203:20,21,24	Garlinghouse	go 103:22 120:15
117:16 118:21	143:10 156:4,7	204:4,4,9,11,12	83:21 227:6,13	122:12,13 132:23
121:14 131:11	forecasting 118:22	204:17,23 205:3	gas 89:3 91:17	136:2 139:8 143:3
133:23,25 144:23	forecasts 89:3	205:17,19,25	138:11	155:22 157:19
160:15 163:18	122:8	206:6,7,14,19,25	gather 119:7	170:21 179:12
169:10,20,21	foregoing 227:8	207:3,8,15 208:19	general 84:11,16	186:8 189:17
180:9 184:21	fork 113:9	209:3,21,25 211:9	99:17 100:6,13	192:24 201:2
206:6,21 215:5,24	forma 105:10 113:9	Fuller's 203:15	102:24 104:4,12	202:13 208:3
fit 112:23 143:21	120:2,19 122:22	fully 117:25 118:1	112:4 119:14	213:2,14 215:2,23
fits 132:20	144:3 200:2,5,18	118:3 125:19	121:10 132:20	goal 114:9
five 104:13 125:7	200:19,21,23	135:13 138:19	154:22 155:4	goals 196:21
174:4 176:23	201:8	139:2 141:22	178:1 179:22	goes 135:2 136:5
190:13 213:2	formerly 128:20	144:11,16 145:9	189:8 190:24	139:20 193:2,9
five-year 208:3	formula 167:23	146:9 159:3	191:5,22 192:1	217:8 222:11
flat 149:5	168:3,7	169:12,12 173:6	211:18 213:23	going 103:2 121:11
Flats 89:15,16,18	forth 167:5	175:10 184:8	generally 121:15	122:17 124:19
L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1010
127:7 128:9,10,21	163:25	hard 104:11 196:13	Honor 99:21	134:3
133:3,6,8,12,16	grid 113:8 116:11	head 154:20 210:11	101:20 102:4	implementation
133:17,20 135:9	116:12 118:10	224:14	215:7 218:16	160:17
136:9,21 143:23	143:9,11,14 144:5	hear 103:6,19	219:3 221:1 225:5	implemented
146:16 148:6	144:10,16 145:10	112:14 136:23	hope 141:6 187:22	105:19 116:25
149:11 150:13	145:20,21 146:6	182:13,14 185:11	horse 201:17	191:9
152:8 153:2	149:14,18,20	192:22 205:18	host 129:24	implementing
159:18 162:21	Gromore 92:18	207:1 215:5	hour 180:2 199:4	115:13 149:23
165:12 166:6	gross 206:22 207:3	218:10 224:19	hours 186:19	implements 155:24
171:4 174:6	ground 174:12	heard 118:8 131:1	Hub 89:3	implied 123:23
175:22,23 178:9	group 87:18 107:5	131:4,15 198:5	hypothetically	imply 129:1
179:14,24 180:2	groups 192:8,11	215:1 225:17,18	169:10	important 123:22
192:17 193:5	193:22 196:9	hearing 83:11		128:21 133:7
194:7 195:11,11	222:13	99:14 100:8,15	I	135:12,21,22
197:21 199:9	Growth 87:19	101:22,23 102:9	Idaho 92:9 108:16	136:3 159:17
200:20 202:16	guess 118:14	102:18 103:2	125:17,20 129:8	190:15 197:12
203:22 204:17	131:11 141:14	122:25 136:25	129:16 211:13,17	222:21
214:17 216:10	147:17 154:2	148:8,9 202:13	211:19 212:3,18	impossibility
219:13 220:18	160:15 162:8	220:24 222:3	223:18	136:11
224:18 225:6	164:13 166:7	224:15,17,24	idea 194:13	improve 149:15
good 99:7 100:18	172:23 180:16,17	225:22	ideas 138:17	improvement
100:23 101:2	181:16 188:20	held 108:13 150:18	192:24	187:11
103:24 104:5	191:10 207:25	help 119:8 121:24	identified 120:20	improvements
108:6 111:20,23	208:9 213:16	128:21 138:8,22	123:2,3 130:2	92:11 107:8
116:3 119:12		223:5	149:8 166:16	improves 160:12
120:7,8 121:8,8	H	helpful 138:11	193:21 194:22	in-house 115:8
123:12 130:22,24	half 124:1 139:15	143:16 145:14	195:8	In-Service 91:24
130:25 146:14	140:11,13,18	147:11,14,18	identifies 194:3	inaudible 109:17
171:17 179:3	141:1,5,9,17	150:16 196:9	identify 130:18	121:4,6 139:9
180:10 192:16	149:17	220:11 221:7,9	146:18 166:11,16	149:20 155:8
204:7,10 211:2	hand 110:15	Henry 89:3	166:21 175:23	167:15 209:10
212:19 222:12	119:22 135:25	Hi 204:12	178:4 186:1 193:6	223:2
Goose 92:13	185:23	high 85:4 141:22	201:2,2,3	incentives 189:3
Goshen-Sugarmi	happen 129:20	196:25 205:12	identifying 147:12	incentivizing 190:4
92:16	197:24 210:12	higher 122:3 187:4	147:14	include 105:1
gotten 221:3	happened 122:3,11	Highly 98:3	impact 88:15 94:25	115:20 129:6
224:24	126:4 171:1	historic 164:8	95:24 96:6 153:15	149:14,15 177:1,2
grab 121:22	happening 146:4	historical 150:21	154:20 157:15	178:4 184:22
granted 101:10	176:22 219:18	historically 125:12	158:24 181:12	202:10
GRC 97:7	happens 139:1	126:8 137:17	184:11 191:8	included 93:24
great 157:20 174:5	175:13 215:11	146:7,22 171:2	impacted 157:16	95:6 104:13
189:13 194:12	happy 113:3	176:1 189:10	impacts 189:12	105:11 106:19
196:8 199:1	115:22,24 119:21	198:1	194:23 196:5	112:12 121:17
211:21	195:18 218:19	history 156:6 189:8	215:15,17,18	122:23 123:2,5,6
greater 138:9 141:9	224:8	hitting 151:6	implement 114:19	132:14 137:15,20
154:5 156:9	Harbor 85:9	hole 133:1	114:25 115:1	138:1,2 143:8
15 1.5 150.7		1010 100.1		150.1,2 175.0

				1 ago 200
144:15 146:20	218:2	151:19 195:10	105:11,15	January 105:7
147:9 149:7 159:7	incurring 187:7	intention 161:21	invite 102:11 108:3	108:21 116:25
160:3,13 166:4,18	independent 135:6	inter 217:5	112:25 214:14	122:12,12,20
168:24 176:24,25	INDEX 86:1 88:1	Inter-Jurisdictio	involved 104:15	123:5,6 159:14
177:9,10,12,21	89:1 90:1 91:1	86:23 87:4	108:15 220:9	Jason 85:18 111:2
178:1 188:23	92:1 93:1 94:1	interact 136:20	involving 108:14	121:9 134:20
191:20 193:5	95:1 96:1 97:1	215:10	IOUs 197:25	144:10 145:17
197:20 200:24	98:1	interactions 185:17	IRP 97:5 169:24	162:18 163:17
201:11,14 205:24	indicate 110:11	interacts 143:14	171:5	175:5 178:20
211:24 217:22	indicated 191:3	interconnected	irrigation 94:8	184:8 196:22
218:2 219:17	195:16,17 197:9	166:5	95:11 188:12	210:21 220:7
includes 117:6,6	indication 147:21	Interconnection	IRS 159:20	JAY 84:4
122:13 126:1,2	indirect 91:13	89:20 90:7,16	Island 85:5	Jennifer 84:10
127:5 144:11,12	126:12 220:4	91:4	ISO 114:25	100:5
169:7	222:24	interest 104:19	issue 104:2 105:9	jennifer.cameron
including 105:21	indirectly 216:6	108:18 169:17	105:12 107:21	84:13
106:18 114:15	individuals 194:21	170:8,12,19	109:18 120:1,21	Jim 97:10,12,13,23
116:10 134:13	Industry 88:9	171:18 191:4	122:22 123:10	97:25 129:10,20
137:9 187:18	information 109:15	202:18,20 203:2	138:15 152:7,9,10	137:15 167:24
220:3	115:17 121:16,19	204:14 221:3,12	153:22 155:16	168:6 169:1,7,21
inclusion 106:14	124:2,14,16	221:18	157:5 159:9,10,11	169:22 170:13
189:23 190:21	125:13 135:24	interested 194:23	159:20 160:4,5	171:24 173:7
income 94:7 95:9	136:8 157:21	interference 142:15	175:5,23 187:19	174:13 216:11
96:3 105:22 107:5	158:20,20 194:11	205:13,16 206:22	201:5 202:16	217:13
107:6 192:11	199:9 221:4	209:18,23	211:22 217:1,2	JJS-10 97:11
193:4 194:3,21	initial 107:23 109:5	interjurisdictional	218:3 225:13,20	JJS-11 97:13
196:6 207:4	initially 121:16	106:8 217:3	issues 102:22,24	JJS-1T 97:15
incorporated 127:2	initiate 150:12,13	interplay 156:22	104:14 106:22	JJS-2 97:16
127:14 144:8	innovating 107:2	157:3	107:19 112:12,12	JJS-3 97:18
incorporates	input 134:13	interpretation	120:10,16 128:10	JJS-4 97:19
102:25 125:10	inputs 135:14,20	212:13 219:12	131:16,24,25	JJS-5T 97:21
127:13	inside 184:17	interpreted 215:25	136:18 138:14	JJS-6 97:22
incorporating	insight 195:21	interpreting 193:14	139:6 142:3,24	JJS-7 97:24
128:2 191:6	insofar 120:11	193:15	152:2,8,22 164:20	JJS-8T 97:8
incorrect 129:2	instance 112:18	interrupt 185:22	178:5 179:9 180:4	JJS-9 97:9
increase 93:20	129:7 164:6	interrupted 132:23	181:1 191:1	job 119:12
94:25 154:23	165:10 171:9	introduce 110:18	218:15,22 219:23	Jobs 105:21
155:3,4 207:13,24	192:11	intuitively 210:11	220:23 221:2	John 97:16 108:23
209:2 210:5	intangible 216:8	investigate 133:25	222:2	join 191:2
increased 107:4	integer 136:5	155:3	issuing 225:20	joined 99:13 102:9
222:17,18	integral 224:7	investigating 139:7	it'll 182:21	103:11
increases 154:14	intend 103:3 151:3	investigation 177:7	items 117:13	joint 86:11,17
incredibly 135:11	intended 120:25	177:8	152:11 186:23	109:9 143:5
incremental 137:21	151:24 178:17	investment 106:4		181:23 220:11
137:25 167:19	194:4	106:19	<u>J</u>	JT-1 86:17
incurred 173:11	intent 116:8,9	investments 104:23	J 97:16	JT-1r 86:11
	•	•	•	•

			İ	ı
JT-2 86:13 205:5	111:11,11 153:11	Kumar 84:20 99:21	110:18 112:20	linear 136:4
judge 84:6 99:6,10	153:14 154:2,18	99:22 218:12	127:17 142:7,11	lines 129:19,21
100:2,10,16,21	keep 153:21 221:10	220:21 221:1,12	142:14 170:23	166:3,8,9,17,19
101:1,4,12,25	kept 149:5	221:24	173:4 174:3	166:24 167:6,19
102:5 107:14,20	key 108:10 125:16		175:13 179:3,17	207:18
108:2 109:23	129:7 190:6 192:5	L	179:20 187:21	list 87:1 91:22
110:8,17,25 111:4	193:21,23 211:14	Lacey 83:19 99:1	202:8 203:20	101:13 147:4,8
111:9,14,18,23	keyed 193:7	lack 118:14	204:8 215:5 225:3	148:6
116:2 118:5	kind 118:14,15	lacked 194:25	Letter 88:13	listing 87:15 147:13
119:11,20 121:10	154:16 158:18	laid 196:21 198:13	level 116:21 140:2	litigated 218:4
127:17 132:6,8,19	178:2 198:17	199:13	140:5 183:21	little 121:13 129:7
133:9 136:14	207:11,21 208:23	Lake 85:14	187:23 195:6	143:20 145:8
142:3,11 146:12	208:25 209:19	Lance 85:20 111:11	199:16 200:12	150:14 153:7,13
146:13 147:11	kinds 175:12	large 89:20 90:7,16	201:24 206:8	162:19 191:16
148:4 179:2,20	knew 198:5	91:4 141:24	levelized 210:14	193:4 219:12
182:12 185:19,21	know 119:24 120:1	153:19 154:14	levels 200:17	222:19
185:25 186:7	128:8 130:19	159:7 208:1 210:5	liabilities 174:4,23	live 193:9
202:8,10 203:20	132:15 134:14	210:8,9	175:18 210:25	lives 91:17 92:6
203:25 204:7	136:7,11 137:7	largely 219:8	liability 172:25	207:19
206:25 209:21	139:24 140:1	larger 152:9 166:19	173:3	LLC 83:22
213:11 214:5,8,11	151:4 152:12,16	167:8 219:7,7,9	liable 172:9 173:9	load 130:11,16
218:8,20,25	160:10,25 161:23	219:16	173:15	144:6 145:1
219:11,21 220:14	164:18 174:15	late 157:17	license 135:6	166:25 187:4,4
221:8,21 224:10	182:18 186:12	latest 225:13	licensing 181:16	190:5
225:8,11	187:4,6 188:15,15	Latimer 85:13	life 109:13 138:1	loads 114:11
judged 192:21	189:5 191:3,5,6,7	law 84:6 85:3 99:10	170:14,14 178:12	located 138:24
judgment 171:16	191:11,12 194:5	99:25 161:23	178:17 205:7	144:1 161:18
July 94:18 108:24	195:6 196:1,14,15	163:5	208:1,3,3	Lockey 138:13
109:22	197:9,11,13,17,19	laws 128:12	Light 83:8 94:11	Lockey's 138:6
jump 132:11	197:23,24 205:12	lead 133:5 151:11	Lighting 95:13	long 101:16,17
133:23 155:8	205:12 207:15,18	209:1 210:11,12	limitation 129:19	196:10
June 92:24 93:9	214:18 215:10,12	learn 114:21	limited 105:9,12	Long-Term 88:12
108:13 157:9	215:13,14,21,23	213:20	112:11 120:1,21	88:15
jurisdiction 126:18	215:24 216:1,9,11	learning 132:9	120:23 122:22	longer 121:21
jurisdictions 118:2	216:15 217:4,14	leaves 158:2 217:18	129:12 138:7,13	122:5 173:8
119:10 125:8	217:18 222:4	led 212:10	138:17 156:18,19	look 113:6 122:18
	223:4,17,19,23,25	left 176:19	156:22 157:5	123:11 145:1
K	knowing 136:2	legacy 129:17	159:9,10,11 160:4	147:3 172:5 195:1
K-a-u-f-m-a-n	155:18 157:2	legal 136:19 137:1	160:5 188:12	196:1
111:13	knowledge 227:9	179:8 180:4	201:5 209:16	looked 129:23
K-o-p-l-i-h-a	known 172:17	214:19 218:15,22	211:22	191:1 197:11
110:24	Kopliha 85:18	219:23 220:23	line 96:15,15	looking 123:1,24
K-r-o-n 111:21	103:14 108:3,6,7	221:2	142:17 149:9	163:13,18 164:17
Karen 103:17	110:2,23,23	legislation 223:5	183:17 185:11,14	181:15 186:16
Katherine 99:24	Kronauer 85:21	let's 99:6,19 102:8	197:24 207:17	191:11,18 199:14
Kaufman 85:20	111:20,20	103:22,22 109:24	line's 167:13	204:19 206:7
	<u> </u>			<u> </u>

220.2 15	130:12	196:14	106.0 112.11	migundowstood
220:2,15 looks 106:20	130:12 Maps 92:9		106:9 113:11 114:23 117:5	misunderstood 206:21
	_	meetings 108:13,15 151:22 152:20	124:24 126:7	
182:13 199:2	market 113:20 119:1 145:3	151:22 152:20		Mitigation 96:16 mix 164:20
Loop 83:19			127:13 128:15	
loosely 117:9	149:12	meets 126:14 163:2	129:2 135:12	mixed 136:4 164:16
loss 140:9 149:9	match 124:22,23	163:7 196:21	143:22 155:9	model 87:19,21,22
lost 146:11	matching 211:2	215:22 216:18	163:2,7 183:14,14	113:9 114:2 115:6
lot 113:3,3 141:25	matter 99:12	megawatt 186:18	184:1,4	115:8,10,18 116:6
154:25 162:23,24	190:24 215:1	199:4	methods 209:19	116:7,11,12,12,13
165:4 175:6	221:22	member 195:2	MGW-1CT 87:3	117:21,21,24
189:10,13 196:16	matters 103:8	memorandum	223:1	118:10,14,21,22
196:18 209:23	180:5	222:9	MGW-2 87:4	124:3,4,6,12,19
223:17,22,23,24	Matthew 99:23	memory 198:11	146:25	126:23 133:3,12
lots 117:12,13	McDowell 99:24,25	mention 217:11	MGW-3 87:6 147:3	133:13,15 134:1,8
139:5	McVee 99:23	mentioned 105:1	147:19,21	134:12,13,22,23
low 94:6 95:9 107:5	mean 107:22 128:7	133:11 140:8,16	MGW-4CT 87:7	135:4,14,23,25
107:5 187:4	130:6 150:19	164:7,21 165:9	MGW-5 87:9	143:9,11,11,14
192:11 193:4	173:2 182:4	207:6	MGW-6 87:10	144:5,10 145:23
194:3,21 196:6	191:21 216:1	menu 103:21	mic's 182:13	146:2,6,10 149:14
lower 88:15 187:4	meaning 160:22	Meredith 85:21	Michael 85:17	149:18,20,22
190:6 210:19	means 155:25	182:19,20 183:4	110:21	180:25 181:7,8
lunch 179:3,13	212:24	185:3,8,10,10,13	microphones	modelers 135:5
luncheon 179:18	meant 126:6,8,10	185:14,20,22,24	102:18	modeling 124:11
7.5	129:12 155:19	186:3,4,8,9	MidC 94:3	139:25 149:7,15
M	166:8 182:3,8	187:17,20 188:11	Mike 103:25	models 119:1
M 186:3	197:2	188:25 195:20,24	133:22	133:19 134:10
M-e-r-e-d-i-t-h	measure 190:2	196:10,13 198:3,8	Milinovich 100:20	139:24
186:6	mechanism 94:12	198:16,25 199:23	million 109:4	modified 143:20
magnitude 153:15	121:24 122:8	199:25	139:15 140:9,11	146:8 186:12
154:17 155:6	157:1 182:2,3,5,7	Meredith's 195:15	140:14,18 141:5	moment 110:11
188:16	182:8 183:20	message 142:2	141:10,17 149:17	173:5 179:14
main 85:13 104:25	184:21 185:18	met 222:13	155:10 161:9	203:22 220:19
124:5 154:21,21	186:11 187:14	method 112:8	204:25 206:1	Monday 99:7 102:3
maintain 121:24	188:24 189:2,24	116:15 118:17	207:3 222:19,19	money 121:22
maintains 105:25	190:7,9,14,22	131:21 133:14	mind 154:3 161:16	210:25
106:24	191:7,20 192:3,5	143:8,12,14,15,18	189:25 205:15	month 105:4 199:4
maintenance	mechanisms	143:25 144:1,17	208:10 220:6	199:4
177:18,23 178:7	123:20 184:24	145:19,20,21,23	222:6	monthly 93:23 95:4
178:11,12,15	195:1	148:18 149:19	Mine 137:17	182:17 183:6,10
major 91:21 177:23	meet 126:10 128:16	166:1 180:12,15	minute 128:20	198:4
178:7,11 191:1	129:25 130:1,11	186:14 206:13	173:13 182:21	months 92:24 93:9
majority 121:11	130:16 152:14	207:12,16 208:6	183:15 194:1	146:4 192:18
making 128:11	160:23 163:7,23	208:14,21,24	minutes 142:6	195:18 196:24
188:2	164:1 165:12,13	209:8,13 210:2,3	180:2 185:9	morning 99:7
manager 111:21	214:23 216:21	210:6,13,14,18,23	191:17	100:18,23 101:2
manner 128:4	meeting 178:2	methodology 87:5	missing 145:14	103:24 104:5,7
			l °	

108:6 111:20,23	name 99:9 103:25	net 87:9,10 97:13	NLK-5C 88:16	159:17 194:19
116:3 120:8,15	110:19,21 111:5,6	103:25 105:17	NLK-6 88:18	202:11
121:8,9 130:22,24	111:8,12 116:11	113:5,9,21,24	NLK-7 88:19	notes 211:16
130:25 142:12,13	186:1,2,3,5 204:1	115:4,19,25	nodal 112:7 114:1	notice 159:20
180:11 211:13	204:2,4,6	116:16,22 117:11	114:17,18,19	November 88:16
motion 101:7,9	Nancy 111:21	117:23 119:9	115:2 116:6,13,21	NPC 87:6
motions 102:5,6	narrow 121:1	120:24 133:1,6,6	117:9,24 118:13	NSP 170:9
motivation 183:23	nation 123:22	143:7,10,19 144:4	124:3,4,6 126:22	number 104:13
motivations 162:9	National 83:24	144:12,18,21	133:2,2,12,14	107:2 109:7
MOU 114:17	86:22	147:4 148:20,22	134:1 135:9	141:10 153:17
148:18 149:24	Natural 89:3	149:6,11 160:3	143:15 145:20,23	154:11,19 187:1
Mountain 84:20	NE 84:21 85:4	161:5 177:10	146:10 148:18	188:7 205:2 206:6
90:20,22,24 91:3	necessarily 110:6	209:1 222:16	149:24 180:12,14	224:3
91:5,6,7 158:2,7	123:7 135:25	network 92:10	180:25 181:7,8	numbers 154:3
158:17	167:3 190:12	166:5	nomenclature	221:9
mourning 142:5	necessary 106:5	new 109:11 115:18	123:21	
mouse 103:21	117:17 143:24	115:20 117:5	Nominal 89:3,6,10	0
move 103:21 114:1	need 101:18 117:13	121:18 122:21,21	Non-Residential	O 99:4
115:22 116:10	146:5 152:22	123:25 124:2,19	95:12	o'clock 179:4
117:5 119:25	163:3 166:16	125:11,13 127:13	nonbase 183:8	O'Connell 84:7
148:4 167:5 170:9	174:17 181:2,4	128:15 129:6	198:22 199:18	99:6,9 100:2,10
187:24 220:21	182:23 184:2	131:20 133:12	nonbased 183:11	100:16,21 101:1,4
moved 212:8	185:19 190:17	143:21 158:12	183:13 198:23	101:12,25 102:5
moving 114:8	194:13 201:1,5	162:5 163:4,5,7	nonemitting	107:14,20 108:2
115:7 116:12	209:22 213:21	163:22,22,24	106:15 144:8	109:23 110:8,17
133:2 139:5	220:19	170:25 171:11	147:1 161:24	110:25 111:4,9,14
160:11,16	needed 127:14	173:21,22,23	163:13,24	111:18,23 116:2
MSD 113:25	129:22 178:12	174:11,22 175:11	nonprotected	118:5 119:11,20
114:15	needs 112:2 151:5	175:14,14,21,22	105:22	127:17 132:8,19
MSN-1T 96:7	214:19	176:9 183:13	nonquantifiable	133:9 136:14
MSN-2 96:9	negative 141:2	185:2 221:17	223:4	142:3,11 146:12
MSN-3 96:10	negotiated 145:24	223:10	nonresidential	146:13 147:11
MSP 116:14 212:7	148:21 171:7	newer 121:16	188:13	148:4 179:2,20
215:12	175:11	newly 161:23	nonweather 183:9	182:12 185:19,21
multiple 164:9	negotiating 220:6	nice 209:12	Nope 214:10	185:25 186:7
205:6	negotiation 125:3	Nikki 85:18 108:7	normal 136:12	202:8,10 203:20
multistate 106:21	170:10,24 171:11	110:23	177:3	203:25 204:7
116:14 152:3	175:14	Nile 96:13	normalization	206:25 209:21
multitude 122:13	negotiations	Nina 84:15 100:12	208:11	213:11 214:5,8,11
Multnomah 84:21	116:15 127:11	ninas@atg.wa.gov	normalized 206:11	218:8,20,25
mute 178:25	135:8 148:22	84:18	207:10,12 208:24	219:11,21 220:14
muted 182:13	149:3 162:21	nine 183:5	209:8,13,19 210:2	221:8,21 224:10
	164:4 165:2,15	NLK-1T 88:10,21	normalizing 208:12	225:8,11
N	170:9,16 175:9	NLK-2 88:12	208:18	O'Connell's 121:10
N 84:1 85:1 99:4	212:11 219:19	NLK-3 88:13	Nos 83:4	132:7
N-i-k-k-i 110:23	Neither 126:4	NLK-4 88:15	note 110:2 124:4	o0o 99:3
			<u> </u>	

]	l	 I	
objections 225:18	168:18 172:7,22	operation 154:25	194:12 195:1	160:12 163:21
objectives 128:22	174:21 176:18	175:19	196:3,19	166:4 167:11
objects 101:7	177:13,16 178:6	operational 181:12	outside 219:18	200:13 223:24
obligation 161:25	179:2,17 181:14	operations 92:23	outstanding 103:7	224:2
163:5	181:20 183:2,19	92:24 93:8,9	131:25 181:3	package 191:4
obligations 130:11	184:16 185:7,11	104:23 115:1,14	overall 105:1 107:9	Packaging 100:17
164:1 165:12	185:25 186:7	125:24 212:3,5	190:6,16 192:16	100:19 106:13
216:18	187:16 188:2	opportunity 103:12	overhaul 178:16	109:1 111:10,12
obviously 113:19	193:25 195:22	105:13 112:4,21	overlooked 218:18	114:16
152:2 177:25	200:10,16 201:7	132:21 136:21	overview 108:10	Packing 161:16
occur 156:14 163:3	201:16 202:7	176:2 180:3	owed 210:25	page 86:2 87:2 88:2
175:12 184:11	203:8,12,17,25	214:17	Owner 91:13	89:2 90:2 91:2
occurred 125:17	204:7 208:7,19	oppose 177:9		92:2 93:2 94:2
occurs 135:15	209:3 213:9 214:4	opposed 151:12,15	P	95:2 96:2 97:2
October 88:9 112:9	214:11 215:7	opposite 199:8	P 84:1,1 85:1,1	98:2 120:18 166:6
113:17,17 121:14	218:8,20,25	opposition 225:18	99:4	166:6 183:1,3
122:3,11 139:13	219:21 220:14	opt-in 194:20	P.C 85:8	Pages 83:12 94:15
139:14,18,19,22	221:21 224:10,14	optimized 144:11	p.m 179:19,24	95:16
140:3 141:1	225:8,22	144:16 145:10	226:2	paid 171:2
146:17 147:16	old 115:8	options 189:7 196:6	Pac 144:12,13	Paisner 100:14
152:21 177:11	Olympia 83:24	order 109:19	166:24,25 167:1	pandemic 157:15
offered 220:17	84:12	114:13 141:22	168:4	157:16
office 84:11,16	once 114:8 117:5	168:23 172:1,4,11	Pacific 83:7 84:20	panel 102:15 103:5
100:7 115:1	146:1 167:9,20	190:17 215:23	96:16	109:25 110:16
officer 108:7	172:16	216:3 220:2 222:5	PacifiCorp 83:7	136:23 179:25
official 113:12,18	one-off 153:22	223:10,15	84:19 86:23 91:16	214:12
offset 140:21	one-time 181:25	ordered 177:1	99:20,22 104:1,10	PaR 89:5,8
153:25 154:4	ones 126:20,21	orders 215:16	106:20 108:8,19	paragraph 150:10
161:11	128:2	222:6,7	108:25 109:10,15	202:3 216:4 220:2
Oh 146:14 205:19	online 157:25 158:1	Oregon 84:21 85:9	110:20 113:8	paragraphs 200:5
208:19	158:5,5,13 159:5	108:17	122:21 125:6,7,8	223:16
okay 100:2,10,16	159:13,15,16	organization 148:5	125:9 126:2,2,3,4	parallel 118:15
100:21 101:4,25	198:5	organized 151:22	126:18 150:19	paraphrase 166:24
102:7 103:10,22	onset 206:20	organizing 151:21	151:2,10,20 155:1	Parsons 85:13
107:20 108:2	open 129:18 138:15	originally 123:17	167:14 179:21	part 101:14 105:5
109:23 110:13,14	153:21 217:19	211:3	186:5 190:14	106:7 108:8
110:17 111:23,24	opened 125:20	outcome 148:21	198:1 204:5	112:11 113:25
119:11 128:19	opening 102:12	149:5	210:17 216:18	114:25 115:1,3
129:23 137:3	103:12,15 108:4	outlined 192:17	PacifiCorp's 86:21	125:18,19 127:11
143:4 146:14	155:8	195:14	99:16 101:7,9	133:24 135:7
148:1 152:6,19,24	operate 129:12	outlines 126:16	102:23 104:3,12	137:11,13,13
153:6 156:17	132:1 165:5	172:13	104:17,22 106:1,5	138:2 140:10,13
157:6 159:25	operated 212:8	output 134:13,25	106:11,15,17,24	148:23,24 149:1
160:7 164:13	operates 213:7	outputs 134:9	130:11 138:23	149:25 156:18,20
165:22 167:18,22	operating 125:7,22	135:20	140:21 144:2	157:4 164:19
167:22 168:2,12	126:18 190:8	outreach 193:6	153:9 154:25	167:16 168:15
	I	I	I	I

171:11 175:11	215:3	194:4 221:13,20	95:12 184:12,17	play 123:25 146:2
178:2 181:10	parts 131:9 158:11	percentage 144:24	184:20,23 185:2	184:12
187:2 192:2,4	party 101:6 104:2	percentages 145:7	187:18 188:9,12	plays 200:20
195:2 199:5 200:8	146:18 151:25	perfectly 212:21	188:13,19,22	please 103:18,20
200:9,25 205:18	163:10 165:21	Performance 88:24	190:2,22 191:1,7	110:11,15 112:10
224:7	175:8 177:7	performed 108:22	191:19 192:16	112:21 148:14
partially 116:9	214:15	period 92:23 93:8	193:1 194:24	155:22 185:23
159:23	pass 203:17	123:1 137:23	195:14 196:21	186:1,2 204:1
participate 189:4	passed 156:4	146:5 168:19	213:14,15,17,21	214:15 215:6
participated	161:23 204:16	186:17,19 187:9	213:22,25	221:9
215:12	path 114:5 157:3	188:5 199:3 203:3	piloting 197:16	plus 181:17
participation	pause 127:18 132:9	205:10	pilots 107:2 185:17	PO 84:11
187:23	173:13 179:14	periods 187:25	186:12,14 187:1	point 133:3 134:7
particular 214:21	224:18	permanent 126:6	188:22 189:6	137:12 140:23
215:1	pay 168:3,6 169:17	Permit 89:23 90:10	192:25 197:11,24	148:22 149:2
particularly 136:7	170:19	90:19 91:7	213:19	169:21 171:16
136:10 191:19	paying 168:5	perspective 136:22	pitfalls 152:17	179:3 180:21,25
193:3 216:13,16	payment 213:14	141:21 163:19	place 114:9,13	188:24 214:6
parties 101:5 102:7	pays 167:23	164:23 190:1	117:2 119:6 147:3	218:2
102:11 103:7,13	PCA 85:7 125:4	197:2,10 211:2	150:16 157:1	pointed 119:7
104:11,15,18	217:24 223:20	pertains 136:19	189:10	144:10 167:6
106:21 107:11,21	PCAM 140:4,21	petition 99:18	plan 89:15,24	points 139:21
108:14,15 109:2,7	141:18,21,23	179:23 191:2	90:11,22 158:12	214:20 215:8
112:2,10 114:14	149:18 176:25	petitions 99:17	165:12,13 178:4	218:6
121:22 123:11	177:1	107:16,24 122:15	179:3 196:3,11,15	policies 138:25
131:19 132:16	PCORC 112:11	179:22	225:19	policy 104:1 114:11
133:16,17,18	115:15 120:3,4	phone 142:14	planned 178:15,16	Pollution 88:18
134:12,14,15	123:15 133:2	205:13,16 206:22	212:10	populations 192:10
135:10 141:15	146:3 152:14	209:18	planning 116:6	193:20 197:17
148:5,7,8,13	176:20 177:12,19	physically 124:15	194:12	popup 103:21
149:3 150:11,14	177:21,25 178:8	129:10,13 216:11	plans 196:19	portfolio 114:7,10
151:3,10,11,17	181:11	piece 116:16,17,18	plant 91:16 97:20	163:19 164:12,16
152:3,12,15	PCORCs 123:18	116:23 117:3,4	122:22 123:1,3,4	164:20,24 165:8
155:21 160:10	PCRB 88:18	118:1 137:24,25	124:25 126:1	170:8
162:24 164:16,21	peak 93:18 187:25	139:4 145:14	130:16 137:16	portfolios 114:14
172:18 177:20	190:5	165:8 166:11	138:8,11 163:22	117:7
178:3,19 179:6,11	people 151:8	170:1 190:15	163:25 169:22	portion 137:21
180:13 181:5,5,23	162:24 188:8	202:9	170:13 171:13	159:3,4 184:10
182:3 195:12,17	Pepple 85:8 100:18	pieces 121:13	173:20,20 174:13	Portland 84:21
196:17 197:9	100:19 136:15	122:14 125:18	175:19,20 178:13	85:9
200:3 210:16	214:25 215:5,7	127:15 129:8	plants 123:8 158:13	pose 179:6 191:16
211:11 217:20	218:9 219:4,15,25	139:5 165:11	159:5,12 169:10	210:16
220:11 223:11	221:25	181:2 199:11	169:18 170:18	position 107:23
224:25 225:4,17	percent 105:3	208:11 211:23	171:3,9,9 172:10	160:12 161:3
225:19,23	107:1 159:24	pile 174:12	174:20 175:25	186:1 204:1
parties' 149:10	167:24 168:3,5,10	pilot 94:5,8 95:8,11	202:3 218:1	217:20 219:14

	1		1	1
positions 164:2	186:20 199:21	primarily 164:20	program 136:4,5	106:10 112:16,17
possible 135:24	Preferred 88:19	164:24 209:16	190:18 192:14,15	112:19 113:25
140:25 154:17	prefiled 101:6,11	primary 162:8	192:20 193:19	114:5,9,15 115:23
174:22 223:3	prefiling 178:2	190:1	194:7,20 195:14	119:17 125:3
possibly 223:5	Premium 87:24	principles 212:23	197:1,3,12,21	126:15 127:6,22
post 175:18	preparing 152:21	213:4,8	programs 184:12	127:25 128:1,9
pot 217:8	present 94:6	prior 129:8 140:17	185:2 188:19	131:3,9,16 133:24
potential 90:23	102:11 103:15	143:18,25 163:2	progress 195:19	136:20 138:14
155:15,19 162:22	104:2,7	165:3 175:19	project 85:2 89:18	139:6 148:17
163:22 172:5	Presentation 94:17	192:23,24	90:5,14 91:3,24	151:21 164:4,6
184:11 189:13	96:17	pro 105:10 113:9	92:12,13,15,16,18	165:11,16 170:25
190:3,3 196:8	presented 171:12	120:2,19 122:22	92:19 100:22,25	171:8,12,25 172:3
potentially 115:12	presenter 102:11	144:3 200:2,5,18	111:15 192:16	175:7,8,11,14,21
138:21 139:5	presenters 102:14	200:19,21,23	194:18 196:1	175:22 176:10
158:16	presenting 166:1	201:8	214:2	181:2 214:22
power 83:8 84:20	presents 183:4	probably 185:2,6	Project's 218:13	215:11,14,24
84:20 87:9,10	preserve 140:24	196:14 198:5	Project-Wide 89:4	219:8,16,19 224:7
92:3 96:16 103:25	presiding 99:11	205:12,15	89:6	protocols 192:19
105:16,17 112:7,8	pretty 119:12	problem 117:10	projected 87:21	193:17 194:6
113:5,6,9,16,21	141:22 196:15	204:22	159:8	196:4 197:1
113:24 115:4,16	prevent 122:17	procedural 103:7	projects 89:8,10	215:10
115:20,21,25	previous 129:1	180:5	91:22 154:13	provide 101:13
116:16,22 117:11	140:17	Procedure 93:3	157:14,15,19,23	105:13 107:1
117:20,23 118:9	previously 160:14	proceed 103:22	193:24	109:15 116:20
118:16 119:3,9	161:18,19 168:15	proceeding 101:19	Property 93:3	118:25 121:16
120:24 121:15,23	211:16	102:20 113:5	proposals 138:17	125:15 126:12
122:1,2,3 123:15	price 89:3 94:3	134:16 137:2	propose 131:20	129:7 133:13
123:16,20,21,24	113:12,18 139:23	146:3 181:9	proposed 92:6	134:5 147:7,25
124:9,12,21,24,25	180:17 186:17	192:24 211:23	93:20,21 94:5,6,8	180:3 202:5
126:22 129:13	190:3,3,7,16	proceedings 105:8	94:9,14,25 107:7	214:18 216:15
130:18 133:1,6	192:7 199:3	108:16 112:11	143:15 157:8	220:12 221:6
135:5 137:9,13	prices 94:5,8,10,14	115:9 120:13,23	168:13 171:23	222:23
139:13,16 140:1	95:8,11,15 149:12	124:25	178:8 181:24	provided 161:10
141:24 142:24	pricing 87:22 93:21	process 106:21	183:4 195:14	provides 104:20
143:5,7,10,19	95:3 107:2 112:7	113:25 116:15	199:16 207:12	105:20 106:3,14
144:4,12,18,21,22	114:2,17,18,19	152:3 172:4 212:7	211:17 223:12	107:10 108:9
146:15,17,21	116:6,13 117:9,24	215:12 220:9	proposes 140:20	167:4,11 177:22
147:4,15,22 148:3	118:14 124:3,4,6	produce 156:3	proposing 184:5,22	220:4
148:16,20,22	126:22 133:3,12	produced 156:1	186:22	providing 130:18
149:6,11 152:13	133:14 134:1	producing 210:18	proprietary 133:15	163:15
160:3 161:5,7	135:9 143:15	production 89:17	134:8,23 135:16	provision 127:5
171:6 177:10	145:20 146:10	90:3 97:13,20	protected 86:13	135:19 206:10
212:9 216:5	148:18 149:24	153:7 154:21	105:23 122:4	208:16
222:16	180:12,15,25	155:24 156:20	161:2 204:25	provisions 104:25
preapprove 162:13	181:7,8 186:4	158:24 159:1,6,18	205:23	134:4 164:14,17
precise 184:4	189:13	161:8	protocol 86:23	Proxy 87:18
L	-	-	-	-

prudence 172:19	155:17 213:21	215:9 217:19	115:21 117:20	155:17 156:9,14
173:16 175:1	220:22	questioning 142:17	119:3,4 120:5,21	156:24 159:7
prudency 123:6	putting 189:1	questions 102:16	120:23 121:19,24	166:4,18 167:20
159:12 175:17	PVRR(d) 89:8	103:3,9 110:9	120:23 121:17,24	168:13 169:2,14
Pryor 90:20,22,23	PVRR(d)(Benefit)/	112:1,5 113:4	123:15,16,22	169:25 170:3,5
91:3,5,6,7 158:2,7	89:7	115:25 117:13,18	125:13,10,22	173:9,21 175:20
158:17	PVRR(d)(Benefi	119:8 121:11	144:4 146:5	175.9,21 175.20
PSE 123:18,19	89:5,10	127:18 132:22	153:22 154:15	178:1 200:7,8,9
213:15	69.5,10	137:4,7 141:25	155:3,4,4 156:5	200:19,25 202:18
PTC 154:1 155:10	Q	142:14,20,23	156:15,18,19,22	200:19,23 202:18
	Q4 157:18	, ,	, , ,	
155:24 156:1,14	Qualifications	148:3 151:5,7	159:14 160:4	205:1,25 207:14
157:1,4 159:24	97:16	155:13 164:25	172:15 176:22	207:24 210:3,5
PTCs 153:9 154:6,9	qualifies 160:23	169:9 177:18	177:2 178:1	217:17 218:3
154:11,14,22	qualify 159:23	178:25 179:5,7,12	179:22 185:1	220:3
155:6,13,15,16,17	161:22	179:25 180:1	186:17,18 189:7	Rating 88:15
155:20 156:4,12	quantifiable 126:12	181:3 182:11	191:8 197:16	Ratings 88:16
159:21 222:17	220:4 222:23	184:17 185:1	199:3,4,6,7	RAV-1T 92:7
public 84:14 88:13	223:2	193:7,11,13 200:2	200:12,12,17,19	RAV-2 92:9
100:11,12 101:17	quantifies 222:14	202:17 203:11,14	200:22,24 201:2,5	RAV-3 92:10
101:18,18,21	quantify 223:3	206:10 211:8,11	201:12,24 203:3	RAV-4 92:12
104:19 106:13		213:10 214:6,12	209:1,17 211:18	RAV-5 92:13
108:18 109:1	quarterly 221:17	214:20 224:8,12	213:23 221:3,12	RAV-6 92:15
111:4,7 114:16	query 194:14	quit 173:20	221:14,15,17,18	RAV-7 92:16
125:4 132:24	question 110:9 111:25 112:21	quite 128:25	221:20	RAV-8 92:18
135:18 161:15	· -	189:11 215:13	rate-making	RAV-9 92:19
169:16 170:7,12	119:14,24 125:2	quoting 216:3	208:25	re-examine 135:8
170:19 171:18	128:13 132:7,21	R	ratemaking 119:3	reach 104:11 151:3
178:23 189:22	136:19 138:6		209:14	reached 134:2
190:20 191:4	139:12 141:20	R 84:1 85:1 99:4	ratepayers 126:13	reaching 134:1
195:25 197:10	143:1 148:12	227:1	174:7 210:17,25	read 183:16 189:25
219:1,6,13 223:19	150:6,7,11 154:7	Rackner 99:25	216:2,4 222:24	ready 142:19
224:21	155:6 157:20	radio 166:3,8,9	rates 86:21 96:24	real 120:7 196:8
publish 225:16	160:1,10,15,19	raise 110:15 185:23	97:5,6,10,22,24	216:14,16,20
published 221:15	165:24 169:9	raised 119:22	105:11 106:16,25	realignment 138:7
221:17	180:9,11,18	141:25 179:9	108:21 109:5,14	138:13,18 170:10
pullout 137:23	181:21 182:24	180:5 214:20	109:21 112:15	170:17 172:6
purchase 181:25	184:22 185:15	218:15 220:23	121:20 122:12,15	really 114:22 120:8
purchases 145:3	186:10 188:20	range 205:12,20	122:15,17 123:5,7	123:22 129:13
purpose 115:15	189:1,17,21	rate 88:18 93:14,15	123:13 125:5	164:19 190:15
166:17,20 167:7	190:20 191:15,22	94:17,21 99:17	128:17 129:6	196:1,19 200:17
167:13 190:2	194:9 198:3 199:1	102:25 104:4,12	133:8,8 135:1,2	213:17 215:18,20
purposes 100:8,14	201:23 203:18	104:21 105:1,2,6	135:13 137:20,23	216:25 217:1,7
103:1 114:2 118:8	204:9 206:21	105:7,9,12,16	138:1,2,19 143:9	Realtime 83:22
118:11,23 147:11	208:20,23 210:4	106:2,23,24	144:3,9,16,25	reason 114:4 124:5
152:3	210:16 211:21	107:10 108:8	147:9 149:5	138:21 162:2
put 128:25 138:18	213:13,16,25	113:7,14 115:16	150:23 153:20	217:2
l l			l	l

	Ī	Ī	Ī	1
reasoning 183:23	203:15 205:5	rejoin 110:1	165:17,21 166:23	86:7,8 104:19
reasons 124:5	220:7	related 116:1 143:4	167:18,22 168:2	147:12 185:5
125:22 161:13	referenced 222:7,8	152:20,21 153:15	168:12,18 177:17	202:11 204:18
reassigned 169:11	222:9	155:13,16 169:9	178:6,18,24 180:8	220:15,18,19
169:18	references 143:7,9	172:10 175:19	180:10 181:14,20	224:5,22
reassignment	222:4	186:24 200:18	182:9 192:22	requested 209:7
170:10 172:6	referred 130:9	216:24	193:25 194:18	requesting 108:20
Rebuild 96:15	180:16	relates 191:22	195:9,22,23 200:1	requests 102:6
REC 181:25	referring 138:13	relation 184:21	200:10,16 201:7	148:6,9 155:1
receive 156:1,12	147:19 154:10	192:7 208:21	201:16,23 211:10	202:6,9 204:22
170:20	203:5,7 204:23	relationship 212:3	212:15 213:9	224:23 225:1,2,4
received 101:19	221:10	213:7	214:8,10 216:23	225:13,21
183:22	refine 114:22,22	relative 109:5	225:9	require 105:8 185:6
receives 134:9	reflect 104:22	release 156:2	renewable 92:6	197:21
receiving 217:25	105:17 168:13	relevancy 216:14	93:18 104:24	required 163:22
reclamation 137:8	188:4	relevant 215:21	126:3 130:3 163:5	170:2
137:14 150:8,24	reflected 150:23	216:13	163:13 181:22	requirement 89:7
152:10,18	168:16 176:15	reliability 140:10	repeat 121:11	89:10 93:20
recognition 128:23	177:5,6	remain 172:8	204:9 206:6	121:21 123:6
recognized 136:16	Reflecting 97:5,6	remaining 102:25	208:23 209:22	135:3 151:15
136:17 137:20	reflects 125:23	150:24 204:25	221:9	154:8 161:12
144:3	143:8 224:3	207:18	rephrase 185:16	200:25 201:3
recommend 107:11	refund 105:11	remains 188:21	report 107:7 117:1	202:2 205:24
213:5	121:21,25 122:5,6	remediation 172:9	195:19	210:19 222:20
reconvene 179:4	123:9 155:19	172:25 173:10	REPORTED 83:21	requirements
record 89:23 90:10	159:10,15 167:19	174:8 175:18,24	reporter 101:14	104:22 163:14
90:17,19 91:6,7	200:7 201:24	176:5 217:13	205:17 206:23,24	165:14 173:22,24
99:6,19 101:15	regard 112:17	removal 154:6	227:7	173:25 216:24
110:19 142:8,8,12	regard- 132:17	remove 170:4	reporting 83:22	requires 107:3
142:12 179:12,17	regarding 101:19	174:12	107:4 192:25	109:11 170:3
179:21,21 204:3	103:3 132:20	removed 173:21	Repowered 92:3	Research 88:9
221:6 223:7	180:4 185:1	217:16	repowering 89:4,6	researching 139:8
225:25	206:11 208:16	removing 186:23	91:22,24 154:12	reserve 171:10
recovered 137:13	211:19 214:19	Rendahl 83:13 84:3	158:4	resetting 120:25
154:15	220:8	103:11 104:6	represent 122:3	124:1
recruitment 195:1	regardless 135:15	116:2,3 118:4	224:1	residen- 188:8
RECs 181:24	176:4	133:11 134:17	representation	residential 93:25
reduces 190:5	regards 190:10	135:17 142:1,2,16	213:6	94:5 95:6,7 105:4
reduction 109:4	192:6 223:7	142:25 143:4	representative	107:1 188:8 192:9
124:12 140:24	regulation 174:11	145:13 146:15	113:1 137:1	resolution 176:20
141:5 156:5	regulatory 88:6	147:10 148:1	214:15 218:13	resolve 106:22
177:12 216:6	104:1 115:9,19	150:5 151:18	representatives	126:19 139:6
reductions 112:8	118:23 134:15	152:6,19,24	215:3	resolved 107:17,19
reevaluated 172:14	206:16 207:2,18	157:13 158:23	represented 151:19	125:19 152:22
ref- 127:3	208:1	159:25 160:7	reprieve 155:2	resolves 102:22,24
refer 106:9 192:23	rejected 215:24	163:9 164:13	request 86:3,4,5,6	107:21
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	•
resource 89:17 90:3	Retirement 91:16	110:15 116:10,24	RMM-23 94:23	203:24 204:4
90:4 114:7,10	return 105:20	124:13 127:18	RMM-24 94:25	
145:2 163:13	171:15 208:12	131:14 132:3	RMM-25 95:3	S
164:15,16,20,20	221:20	135:4 139:10,11	RMM-26 95:4	S 84:1 85:1 99:4
164:24 165:8,10	returning 203:4	140:15 141:8,13	RMM-27 95:6	S-h-a-w-n 111:16
167:8,14 216:5	206:4	141:21 142:5	RMM-28 95:7	S&P 88:9,16
220:3	revenue 88:18 89:7	145:22 148:11	RMM-29 95:9	SAB-1T 86:18
resources 92:6	89:10 93:20	150:1 151:8 153:3	RMM-3 93:15	sake 173:8
106:16 114:7,12	104:22 121:21	155:11,12 157:6	RMM-30 95:10	sales 145:4,6,8
126:3,11 128:16	123:5,8 135:3	157:12 160:19	RMM-31 95:12	Salt 85:14
129:24,25 130:1,3	154:8 161:11	162:12,17 169:6	RMM-32 95:13	Salvage 97:13
130:4 138:18	183:7,8,10,21	169:15 171:19	RMM-33 95:15	savings 140:9,10
144:8 145:6	184:4,13,14	175:3 176:11,13	RMM-34 95:16	saw 136:15
146:19,21 147:1,5	186:15,15,21,23	181:20 182:9,16	RMM-4 93:17	saying 104:9
158:25 160:13	186:24,25 187:3	184:6,19 185:23	RMM-5 93:18	128:20 129:3,4
161:24 162:5	188:1,3,4,17	186:16 187:12,15	RMM-6 93:20	131:1 153:24
163:24 166:3	189:12 198:21	189:2,16 190:19	RMM-7 93:21	162:7 189:4
216:10,15,19	199:5,10,15,17	191:14 198:2,11	RMM-8 93:23	says 126:20,24
respect 205:8	200:24 201:3	198:15,25,25	RMM-9 93:24	127:3 161:24
209:14 210:7	202:1 205:24	199:1,24 201:7,16	road 85:4 213:1,2	171:5
219:20	210:19 222:20	201:20 202:7,14	Robert 85:19,21	Scalars 94:4
Respectfully	revenues 161:10	202:16 204:13	111:7 132:24	scale 191:10 206:4
109:18	183:22 222:18	205:22,25 206:5,9	135:18 178:22	Scarsela 99:24
respective 179:10	reverse 156:6	206:15 207:8,9	185:3,10,24 186:3	scenario 97:23,25
202:18 204:14	206:13 207:16	208:8 209:3	robust 196:15,19	117:12 159:4
respectively 121:22	208:14	210:15 211:5,7	Rocky 84:20	207:12 208:23
respond 131:5	review 90:4 96:9	221:6 225:25	rolling 168:14	209:1
185:4 215:8 225:4	105:10,14 122:24	Rights 91:6	rolls 190:13	schedule 89:18
Respondent 83:9	153:21 159:11	Rights-of-Way	room 110:3 203:9	90:5,14 91:3
response 86:3,4,5,6	172:18,19 173:17	90:17	203:21	93:11 94:5,6,8,9
86:7,8 132:12	175:1,17 176:2	Risk 87:24 88:6	roughly 205:8	94:21 95:7,9,12
187:12 192:6	178:8 194:5	RMM-10C 94:3	routine 178:11,14	96:9 102:8,10
225:16	reviewing 161:23	RMM-11 94:5	178:17	116:20 118:24
responses 225:2	revised 94:15	RMM-12 94:6	RSGM 95:22	158:13,22 171:4
responsible 173:23	215:24	RMM-13 94:8	RTL-1CT 88:22	181:13 182:4,7
173:24 174:19	revisit 213:24	RMM-14 94:9	RTL-2C 88:24	199:5 200:8
restate 209:5	RF-1T 95:18	RMM-15 94:11	RTL-3C 89:3	Schedule- 93:14,15
result 105:2 106:12	204:24	RMM-16 94:12	RTL-4 89:4	scheduled 95:10
108:12 124:12	RF-2 95:19	RMM-17 94:14	RTL-5 89:6	151:11 183:13
187:6 207:13	RF-3 95:21	RMM-18 94:15	RTL-6 89:8	schedules 93:4
results 87:16 92:22	RF-4 95:22 205:5	RMM-19 94:17	RTL-7 89:10	183:9,11 184:23
92:24 93:7,9	RF-5 95:24	RMM-1T 93:12	rules 130:13	186:18 198:22
94:22,23 109:3	RF-6 96:3	RMM-2 93:14	run 135:20 139:24	scheduling 105:18
210:3	RF-7 96:4	RMM-20T 94:19	144:5,11,16	114:20 134:4
resume 87:13	RF-8 96:6	RMM-21 94:20	145:10 157:23	149:23 181:15
179:24	right 101:24 108:6	RMM-22 94:22	Ryan 85:22 203:8	School 85:4
177.21	1191101.21100.0	1.22	11,411 03.22 203.0	

	-	i		
Schubert 103:18,19	138:16 157:16,19	217:18,23 219:9	Simon 85:3 100:24	speak 102:19
scope 120:13 121:4	163:21 166:14	219:13	simon@ffitchlaw	132:23 135:9
121:5 151:4 195:6	186:5 212:1	settlement's 146:20	85:6	193:13 195:4
se 189:5	216:12,13	settlements 103:2	simpler 210:23	speaking 121:15
Seattle 83:23,23	Services 94:17	settles 106:23	simply 118:22	132:10
84:17	servicing 111:22	settling 86:14	163:12	specific 111:25
second 105:16	set 107:6 119:4	102:11 103:13	single 138:23	121:1 123:1,19
146:23 224:19	123:5 160:22	132:16 193:23	Site 89:15,24 90:11	126:16 129:15
sections 128:1,4	187:9 193:16	Seven 225:11	90:22	132:22 136:5
see 110:14 115:24	212:23 213:4,8	shadow 118:15	sites 163:22	147:12 151:7
120:7 122:20	sets 112:15 164:2	180:17	six 110:5 114:6	152:7 154:3,3
134:25,25 147:4	setting 113:13	shake 170:16	131:17 138:16	165:13 194:24,25
178:4 183:3	118:8 119:3 135:1	shaking 224:14	146:4 151:19	196:23 202:3,4
187:25 194:23	135:2 192:25	shape 207:19	six-state 151:25	210:19
216:18 224:14	settlement 83:11	share 114:6 134:10	skill 227:9	specifically 130:17
seeing 103:10	86:9,9,11,14,17	134:11,12 163:25	slightly 126:15	131:10 152:17
224:17	99:14 100:8	169:11,13 171:3	small 191:12	164:14 165:25
seen 136:16	102:12,15,22	173:7 181:16,18	Snow 92:13	184:20 186:16
segment 102:17	103:1,4 104:3,7,8	193:17 195:5	solar 109:11,13	190:25 192:2
selecting 103:20	104:16 107:17,19	shared 114:7	144:22	195:7 198:9,12,18
Selection 87:18	107:21 108:4,10	134:11,15 175:24	sole 166:17,20	202:25 207:10
SEM-1T 92:21	108:25 109:25	193:10	167:7,13	220:2 222:6,13,15
SEM-2 92:22	112:1,3,7,15,23	Shawn 85:20	solely 129:20	223:9,15,19
SEM-3C 92:24	119:18 120:4	111:16 194:1,18	solution 117:15	specifics 195:10
SEM-4C 93:3	121:24 123:17	short 99:19	solve 117:10	specified 109:9
SEM-5 93:4	125:20 131:8	shorter 137:22	sorry 132:19,22	specifies 147:1
SEM-6T 93:6	134:5 136:21,23	138:1	134:11 140:4	specify 196:23
SEM-7 93:7	139:16 140:19	Shorthand 227:6	148:20 159:10	spell 186:2 204:2
SEM-8C 93:9	146:19 147:20,22	show 161:4 198:16	173:12 178:24	spelled 111:8 186:5
SEM-9 93:11	148:16,20,21	223:10	179:1 183:15	204:6
send 148:6 224:24	149:4,9,16 150:10	shows 155:8	185:22 189:17	spelling 110:19
senior 111:21 204:5	152:8,22 155:14	side 144:5,6 161:18	200:22 203:1	spent 212:6 223:22
sense 128:6 147:23	155:24 160:3	161:19 166:14	204:19 205:5,19	spikes 209:14
separate 127:5	162:14 163:11,16	216:10	sort 135:24 136:11	spirit 197:7
200:7 206:2,4	168:5,13,19,24	sign 127:21	180:16 181:15	spoken 101:21
221:11	169:7 171:23	signal 117:2 190:7	215:9,22 216:10	spread 106:23
September 108:19	172:3,12 176:16	190:16 192:7	216:23 217:21	spreadsheet 143:8
113:18 139:23	177:22 180:13	signals 190:3	222:1 224:7	143:12,13,17
140:3	184:5 188:7	signed 108:25	sorted 167:20	144:17 145:12,19
serve 114:12	190:25 191:2,3,12	127:24 219:7	sounds 193:1	145:21 146:6
166:25	193:4,22 194:2,8	significant 104:23	South 85:13 206:13	149:19
serves 114:11	195:6 200:4,11,13	106:18 207:13	207:16 208:6,14	Springs 90:11,13
198:11	200:17 201:25	209:1 210:9	Southeast 83:19	90:14,16,17,19
service 88:13 93:14	202:19 204:15	222:16,16 223:6	span 109:13	157:24
93:15,17 94:20,22	205:24 206:11	similar 144:20	Spanos 97:16	Square 83:19
94:24 106:11	208:15 209:11	151:21 195:5	108:23	SRM-1T 96:22
	l	l	I	I

SDM 206 24	155 20 100 21	105 2 5 0 12 10	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 5	156.0
SRM-2 96:24	155:20 180:21	105:2,5,8,12,19	substantial 153:25	156:8
SRM-3T 97:3	215:2	105:25 106:7,23	154:13 161:5,8,12	surcharges 155:14
SRM-4 97:4	started 103:10	107:3,9,12 108:11	substantially	155:15
SRM-5 97:6	197:1	108:12,18,25	153:18,20	sure 110:14 120:14
SRM-6T 96:18	starting 99:20	109:10,20,22	substantively	121:3,4 128:11
SRM-7 96:19	148:22 149:2	120:18,19 121:18	215:15	131:1,5 132:10
SRM-8 96:21	166:6	123:3 137:12	subtracting 183:8	145:18 151:6
stability 104:21	starts 172:4	138:4 140:6 149:8	198:21	154:6 160:18
105:1 106:2	state 96:3 114:10	150:10,19,20	successful 196:20	173:3 176:14
107:10 133:8	128:12 131:11	151:9 152:4	sudden 207:24	183:17 184:13
Stadelman 92:19	165:13 171:10	156:21 172:6	suddenly 130:17	186:3,9,10 188:2
staff 84:9 100:3,5	181:23 204:1	181:10,23 192:17	Suetake 84:15	188:25 190:17
106:13 109:1	227:3,7	195:13 196:21,23	100:12,13 101:16	191:21 196:4
111:1,3 114:16	state's 114:11	197:7 200:4 209:5	101:20 102:4	197:19 201:10
121:10 124:5	state-specific	209:11 224:6	218:11 219:1,3,11	203:2 204:10
125:4 127:24	114:14 117:6	Stock 88:19	219:15	208:8 218:17
134:20 135:6,11	stated 140:4 146:8	stop 115:24 168:19	sufficient 122:24	221:10
135:20 145:18	153:11 165:20	168:20 209:21	141:24 142:6	SW 85:9
161:15 172:17	170:6 219:25	stopped 175:20	225:3,15	swear 185:20
175:8 187:10,13	statement 102:12	stopping 179:3	suggest 225:6	203:22
192:17 193:15,21	103:16 108:4	storage 109:11	Suite 83:22 84:16	swing 141:24
194:9 195:25	191:5	straight 207:17,21	84:21 85:4,9,13	switch 110:12
196:24 210:21	statements 103:12	straightforward	Summaries 93:14	117:20 124:20
219:22 220:5,8	149:9	210:24	94:20	168:22 208:21
223:19	states 114:3,6,8	Street 84:21 85:13	summarize 131:4	switching 208:24
Staff's 141:20	116:22 117:12	94:11 95:13	summarized	210:17
164:23 178:21	127:6,10 131:18	strikes 106:2 107:9	165:20	sworn 110:16
190:1 197:2	151:19 169:11,19	strong 212:1	summary 87:16	185:24 203:24
211:14	170:11 172:5	structure 88:7	90:20 92:22 93:7	symmetrical 156:6
stage 103:15	175:6,25 181:5	106:1 194:6	96:3 104:8 108:9	system 134:24
stakeholders	215:18	stuck 175:15	supplemental	144:6,11,16 145:6
105:13 118:2	states' 138:25	Studies 91:10	86:24 87:7 91:9	145:7,8 147:1
138:16 194:10	Status 89:23 90:10	study 93:17 94:11	93:6 94:19 96:4	161:7,19 166:5,15
196:3 197:14,22	90:19 91:7	94:24 95:14 97:18	96:18 97:3,8,21	166:19 167:2,4,5
stand 127:8	stay 110:5	108:22 109:3,12	98:3 121:17	167:9,10,11,12
standalone 126:9	Steam 91:17 97:19	205:10	200:14 201:9,12	168:9,15 176:3
standard 136:1	step 117:16 183:5,5	sub 164:17	201:15 220:12	190:6 199:19
163:6,8 214:24	183:7	subject 105:11	support 86:11,17	212:8,10 213:7
215:22 216:1,21	steps 165:13 198:13	123:3,9 153:7	102:12 106:4	223:23,24
220:1	198:18	155:18 159:10,15	124:7 195:14	
standards 163:2	stipulated 101:5	167:19 173:16	211:14	<u>T</u>
start 104:9 111:24	151:2	175:1 200:7	supported 124:6	T 227:1,1
112:20,24 113:3,4	stipulating 109:2	201:24 218:5	supporting 189:23	take 99:19 110:11
114:22 120:9	stipulation 86:9,12	submitted 108:24	190:21	112:21 127:17
124:20 134:1	86:14,17 104:11	109:21	supports 181:24	142:4 144:16,23
144:14,21 148:12	104:18,20,25	Subsection 164:17	surcharge 155:19	149:22 150:16
	I	I	I	I

151:11 161:1	221:4,5,13 222:13	testified 160:11	171:19,20 175:3	174:14 177:24
163:17 174:21	taxes 105:23	211:13	176:11 177:16	179:2 184:10,16
179:3,13,16 180:1	201:21 202:16	testimony 86:11,17	180:23 182:9,15	185:3,15 186:10
181:11 182:21	203:10,11 206:12	86:18,20,24 87:3	182:16 184:18	187:20 188:14,25
189:4,5 217:20	207:4 208:22,25	87:7,12,15 88:10	185:12,21 186:7	189:1,8,9,10,13
219:14 224:19	209:17 210:18	88:21,22 89:12	187:17 191:14	192:5 193:12
takeaway 191:10	211:8	91:9,15,19 92:4,7	194:17 195:23	196:1,4,8,11,14
taken 142:9 179:18	Tayler 83:21 227:6	92:21 93:6,12	198:2 199:24	196:14,16,24
216:12,12	227:13	94:19 95:18 96:4	201:17 202:8,14	197:5,6 198:8,9
takes 165:13	TB 89:24 90:3,5,7,8	96:7,12,18,22	203:25 206:9	198:10,13,18,25
talk 101:16 102:8	90:10 158:1,2,7	97:3,8,15,21 98:3	209:3 211:9 213:9	199:1 201:17
120:2,3,19 153:7	158:17	101:6,8 109:9	214:4,10,13 215:7	202:8 204:17
158:3 168:22	TCJA 93:4,11	138:6 143:6,6	218:8,25 219:21	206:19 207:23
169:16 185:4	95:19	146:24 153:9	221:21 223:19	208:4,5,10 210:10
188:23 191:25	tcp@dvclaw.com	154:11 155:8	224:10 225:23	210:21 211:7,10
195:10 204:24	85:10	161:4 166:1	226:1	212:20,22 213:22
225:3	technical 136:18	167:17 169:1	Thanks 155:11	214:21 216:14,20
talked 152:16	142:3 184:25	172:13 181:23	201:17	216:20,22,25
187:19	185:6	182:19 191:3	thermal 138:23	217:4,5 218:6
talking 120:1	technology 224:19	192:23 195:15	166:13,14,18	219:3 220:17
126:23 154:17	TELEPHONIC	198:6,9 203:15	167:14	222:11 223:6,9,17
163:12 166:1,22	83:11	204:24,24 211:15	thing 103:17 147:7	224:15
169:12 208:8,11	tell 138:10	220:7,12,16	209:12 210:12	thinking 128:8
225:10	temporary 209:9	222:10 223:1,1	216:22 217:11	135:21 178:10
talks 153:9 155:14	209:15,16,17	225:24	things 116:1 118:20	220:16
tangible 216:8,17	ten 138:3 139:15	text 222:8	122:7,16 125:11	thought 171:17
targeted 194:4	140:10,13,18	thank 99:21 100:2	126:4 128:19	thoughts 165:22
targets 160:22,23	141:1,5,9,17	100:10,16,21	131:16 133:25	209:23 225:25
tariff 94:15 95:16	142:6 149:17	101:4,20 102:4,7	136:1,24 140:8	threatened 189:6
183:6,10 197:3	154:15 190:12	103:24 107:13	150:20 151:1	three 104:21
198:12,23 199:15	term 116:14 117:8	108:2 109:22,23	152:15 169:21	107:11,24 109:22
200:7	118:15	110:17,25 111:9	170:16 187:1	121:25 126:24
tariffs 129:18 183:4	terms 108:10	111:14,18,24	213:19 214:21	174:13 182:2
198:14	109:19,20 143:10	113:2 118:4,6	215:16,18 223:25	188:19 213:1
tax 93:3 94:14	154:5 175:10	119:11,20,23	think 101:23,25	three-year 168:19
95:15,19 96:3	191:2 193:14	127:20 132:3,8,12	110:14 118:7,19	214:1,2
105:20,20,22	194:10,11,25	133:9 134:17	119:11 123:12	threshold 180:18
122:16 153:8	215:21 222:17	135:17 136:14	128:10 131:4,5,15	THURSTON 227:4
154:21 155:24	territories 138:16	138:5,12 139:10	135:19,21,22,24	tie 145:9
156:20 159:1,6,19	territory 106:11	143:17 145:13	136:7,8,11 139:22	tiered 106:25
161:8 202:20,25	163:21	148:1,10,11,19	140:16 142:19,22	time 94:3,5,8 95:8
203:4 204:5,15	test 92:23 93:8	150:1,16,17	146:11 147:10,12	95:11,12 99:8
206:12 207:11,11	126:11,14 128:16	152:24 155:23	147:19 149:11	102:13 103:3,19
208:17 209:7,8,9	129:25 130:2	157:7 159:25	150:19 151:2,9,12	104:2,6 107:13
209:15,16,18	186:17 220:3	160:7 165:17,22	160:1 171:17	109:24 110:7
210.7 0 0 211.2	222.22	166.10 170.00	172.10 10 174.0	115,10 110.10
210:7,8,9 211:3	222:22	166:10 170:22	173:12,19 174:9	115:10 118:12

			l .	<u> </u>
122:17,25 132:21	168:22	177:23 181:24	U	96:3,5,6,8,9,11,12
137:22 139:3	total 163:19 168:4	207:11 208:25	UE-050 216:3	96:14,15,17,18,20
140:9 142:7	183:9 200:12	true 175:16 190:12	UE-050684 220:1	96:21 97:8,10,12
149:13 154:8,24	totaling 222:18	227:8	UE-130043 223:15	97:13 98:3 99:15
165:1 172:19	totally 154:6	true-up 157:9	UE-171219 95:21	ultimately 192:20
173:25 174:8	touched 137:2	161:9 182:1	UE-180778 83:5	212:10
178:16 179:7,23	191:16	truly 164:11 188:2	86:15,15,17 88:21	un- 130:8
180:14 181:6	track 117:1 172:20	trust 137:8 150:8	91:15,17,18 92:5	uncertainty 130:7
184:20,23 185:1	204:18	174:6	92:6 96:23,24	130:9 165:4
185:17 186:12,13	tracked 172:14	try 121:11 139:6	97:3,5,6,15,17,18	unchallenged
187:1,18,22 188:9	175:2 182:1	140:24 210:1	97:20,21,23,25	107:25
188:19,21 189:6,6	tracker 155:24,25	213:20	99:16 102:23	uncomfortable
189:12,14,23	156:20 157:1,4,8	trying 110:5 154:16	108:5	196:25
190:2,21,21,25	182:4	166:11,21 184:13	UE-190750 83:4	undepreciated
191:6,19 192:6,11	tracts 175:12	201:10 213:18	99:15 107:16	171:6
193:2,17,23,24	trading 152:16	Tuesday 225:15,16	UE-190929 83:4	understand 112:1
194:20 196:5,20	training 134:5	turbine 92:3	99:15	116:4 118:18
197:11,15 207:25	trans- 175:25	158:10	UE-190981 83:5	131:11 133:20
208:13,14 218:16	transcript 227:8	turn 102:17 103:14	99:16	139:15 154:7
218:18,24 223:22	transfer 164:7	103:18,20,20,23	UE-191024 83:4	160:19 172:22
225:6,15	167:1	107:15 109:25	86:9,19,20,22,23	173:3 186:10
timed 122:16	transferred 171:14	137:3 142:19,23	86:25 87:3,5,6,8,9	187:17 188:19
timeframe 213:21	171:15 175:25	150:4 151:13	87:11,12,14,15,17	190:18 191:8,22
213:23	176:1	160:8 180:7	87:18,20,21,23,24	192:11 194:19
timely 203:16	transferring 171:9	181:21 182:10	88:3,5,6,8,9,11,12	203:2 208:13,15
timing 113:13	transition 106:5	183:1 184:20	88:14,15,17,18,20	210:23 212:7
155:15 225:3	116:7 118:10	201:21,21 214:15	88:23,24 89:3,5,7	understanding
TJH-1CT 91:19	146:10	214:16 218:12	89:9,10,12,14,15	120:12,17 121:2,5
TJH-1T 92:4	transmission	turned 102:14	89:17,19,20,22,23	125:14 136:3
TJH-2 91:21 92:6	105:10 109:8	129:17 157:24	89:25 90:3,6,7,9	140:20 162:4
TJH-3 91:22	125:21 126:1	Twelve 92:24	90:10,12,13,15,16	174:18 177:14,20
TJH-4C 91:24	129:9,19,21 130:3	two 102:21 105:8	90:18,19,21,22,24	178:9,15,19,21,23
TJH-5 92:3	144:9 163:20	106:12 109:21	91:3,5,6,8,9,11,12	187:11 188:7
today 99:14 100:8	165:25 166:2,5,15	113:19 158:3	91:14,20,21,23,24	196:5 212:2,12,18
107:13 108:11	166:19 167:4,9,10	169:10 170:2	92:3,8,9,11,12,14	222:9 224:2
220:8,17 223:18	167:10,15,24	171:3,6 175:12,12	92:15,17,18,20,21	understood 131:6
224:25	168:4,6,9,10,14	195:18 196:14	92:23,24 93:3,5,6	208:13
today's 102:8	205:13	208:10 221:1,22	93:8,9,11,13,14	Unfortunately
220:24	transparency	223:20	93:16,17,19,20,22	160:25
tomorrow 224:25	133:13,21 135:22	Tyler 85:8 100:19	93:23,25 94:3,5,7	unique 114:10
225:13	152:16	type 153:22 191:8	94:8,10,11,13,14	unit 138:23 166:18
tool 118:22 180:20	transparent 124:8	typed 120:11	94:16,17,19,21,22	177:24 178:7
top 154:19 210:10	135:13	types 136:8 187:6	94:24 95:3,5,6,8,9	205:11
topic 137:5 165:22	Transportation	192:8 195:7	95:11,12,14,15,17	units 217:16
178:25	83:2,4,18 99:11	216:19	95:18,20,21,23,24	unknown 174:4,8
topics 119:12 151:7	treatment 153:22	typical 207:19		174:10,10,11,16
			1	1

4 100 10	106 6 20 107 11	00 12 02 10	215 0 217 11	224 4 227 2 7
unmute 102:18	196:6,20 197:11	vision 89:13 92:10	215:8 217:11	224:4 227:3,7
unopposed 102:21	197:15 209:7	157:14	218:6	Washington's
unrelated 120:16	212:23 221:16	voice 209:25	wanting 136:17	127:4,10 172:24
164:15	useful 128:16	voltage 166:3	215:1	Washington-Allo
up-to-date 113:20	129:25 149:14	VOLUME 83:11	wants 114:12 177:7	87:9 96:24 97:4,6
115:17	159:13 170:14,14	vs 83:6	200:3	Washington-spec
update 87:10	214:23 215:22,25	vulnerable 192:10	Washington 83:1,4	151:20
104:22 108:20	216:21 222:2	193:5,20 194:3,22	83:18,19,23 84:12	wasn't 123:7 163:4
112:9 113:15,17	224:4	197:17	84:17 85:5 86:21	186:20
113:20,24 115:4,4	uses 204:15	$\overline{\mathbf{w}}$	87:4,6 92:22 93:7	way 85:9 91:6
115:16 116:5	Utah 85:14 108:16		96:21 97:19 99:1	118:16 124:21,22
121:15 122:2	109:17	W-i-l-d-i-n-g	99:10 104:3,4,17	124:23 127:4
139:14,18,19	utilities 83:2,4,18	110:22	106:8,16,17 109:4	128:3 129:1
140:3 146:17	88:9 99:10 120:5	wait 128:20 171:6	113:10 114:16	143:19 144:20,23
147:16,18 148:25	189:10	203:22	118:13 125:5,7,9	154:4 162:13
149:14 152:21	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	waiting 110:13	125:12 126:8,9,13	164:3 167:2
177:6,11	-	walking 223:23	126:17,19 127:21	173:14 184:9
updated 93:9,11	V 83:11	Wallula-McNary	128:2,17,24	186:20,25 193:15
94:20,22,23 95:3	value 171:13,14	92:12	130:16,19 131:10	193:18 197:2,10
95:4,6,9,10,12,13	173:7	Walmart 85:11	135:10,11 137:22	197:24 199:17
95:15,16 96:6	Van 85:8	101:1,3 111:19,22	138:7,19,19,22,25	205:8 211:2 212:4
97:9,11,13,22,24	Vantage-Pomona	218:23	139:2 143:9,20	212:5,19,21
113:11 129:17	92:15	want 101:16 112:14	144:3,8,15,19,22	215:25
157:21,22 172:15	variability 210:3	120:2,8,9 121:3,4	144:24 145:1,2,5	ways 112:14 136:1
221:16	Variable 88:18	121:12 131:3,4	145:11 146:22	187:14
updates 105:17	variety 125:11	134:19,21 136:8	147:2,3,6,9	WCA 163:7 164:5
107:7 147:20	various 112:6	139:14 145:18	149:20 150:24	164:8 167:23
148:25	193:6	151:6 153:6 155:5	151:23,25 152:4	168:16 169:4
upgrade 140:1	vary 187:3	155:21 160:8,9,18	155:9 160:14,20	176:7 211:17
use 94:3,5,8 95:8	vbaldwin@parso	168:25 169:21	160:24 161:10,20	212:16,24 213:3
95:11,12 109:13	85:15	173:3,13 176:5,14	161:21 162:5	we'll 126:25,25
113:18 116:6,11	verifying 146:24	183:16 184:7,10	163:3,16,23 166:4	127:1 136:8 142:7
116:21 117:24	version 126:25	184:20 189:17	166:13,18 167:20	142:8 149:17
118:9 119:1,9	135:16	191:7 192:9	167:23 168:3,5,11	159:4 197:19
131:8 133:5	versus 145:19,20	194:19 195:4	169:3,11,13,14,17	220:14
136:18 140:4,20	191:12 208:18	197:19 200:6	169:25 170:3,5,12	we're 110:5 114:24
144:17 149:17,19	viability 165:10	201:20,21 203:1	170:14,17 171:1,1	115:13 116:12
149:21 180:15	Vicki 85:12 101:2	211:6 213:14	172:8,8,24 173:6	118:24 120:1
184:20,23 185:1	video 99:13 102:9	217:21 223:19	173:9,14,19,21,22	121:14 123:23
185:17 186:12,13	102:14,17 103:14	225:17	174:7,19 175:7,8	126:21,24 128:3
187:1,18,22 188:9	103:18,20 109:25	wanted 124:18	175:20 181:4,18	128:10,11 129:2,4
188:19,22 189:6	110:1 179:15	132:25 136:15	213:7 215:15,19	131:7 142:12
189:12,14,23	185:15 203:21,23	137:7,12 151:13	215:21 216:2,4,7	146:3 149:23
190:2,21,22,25	214:16,16	153:21 175:5	216:11,16,20	151:6 154:17
191:6,19 192:6,12	view 133:3 191:3	182:17 186:11	217:4,8,14 219:16	158:15,21 166:11
193:23,24 194:20	191:11	212:25 213:2	220:5 222:17,24	166:20,21,22
		l	l	I

167:16 175:9	125:16,23,25	165:18,19 166:7	word 220:23	<u> </u>
180:2 181:9	126:6,14 127:2,4	166:10 167:3,21	worded 199:15	
184:13 186:21,23	127:8,14,25 128:3	168:1,8,17,25	wording 199:13	Y
187:12 190:7	130:2 131:3,9	169:5,14,20	words 130:5	Yardeni 88:9
194:23 195:18	132:1 136:20	171:22 172:2,12	work 104:11	yeah 113:2 119:23
196:5 199:8 203:3	143:21,25 144:7	173:1,12 174:9,25	106:13,20 112:7	121:7 128:7
204:17 208:8,11	144:15 146:8,25	175:16 177:22	118:2 123:20	137:11 138:12
209:23 214:17	147:9 148:18	178:14 180:21,23	128:9,10 136:1	150:17 154:10
220:18	153:10 155:9	181:19 182:6,15	151:4,16 152:12	157:20 170:17
we've 104:15	160:9,11,13,16,20	182:21,25 183:2	152:15 158:15,21	180:23 184:16
113:15,23 114:4,4	162:9,15,15 164:1	183:15,19 184:3,9	165:4 178:3 186:2	185:9 187:20
115:8 126:20	165:14 166:11	184:25 195:10,13	192:18 193:16	190:23 203:6
127:11 137:12,19	167:16 168:3,7,8	197:5 198:6 200:9	195:16 196:17	204:17 206:19
137:19 143:11	174:18 175:15	200:15,21 201:14	197:3,22 223:20	207:8,8 221:24
144:7 151:1	181:18 211:15	201:19 202:1,20	225:7	year 105:8 113:6,8
152:16 158:10	212:11,17,21,22	202:23 203:1,8,17	worked 117:13	114:20 115:4,17
165:1 166:16	213:1,3,5 214:22	204:19 211:16	138:15 145:24	115:21 117:19
177:4 179:2	215:9,16,20,22	213:16,22 214:3	149:4 158:10	123:14 124:1
197:10,14 214:11	216:23 217:3,7	222:10 225:5	181:4	146:3 149:21
224:21 225:17	219:8,17,20 220:6	Wilding's 132:14	working 114:24	157:9,25 158:6
week 101:22 225:3	220:13 222:1,5,8	143:6 147:14	115:7,19 116:24	177:12 181:11
225:12,20	222:13,20,22	162:20 222:25	124:20 126:21,24	187:3
weeks 113:19	223:8,22 224:1,6	wind 88:24 89:4,6	134:3 158:11	years 104:13,21
weigh 163:11 184:7	224:6	89:13,16 90:3,4	161:15 196:2	106:12 107:11
200:3 211:6	Wildfire 96:16	90:13,23 91:21	212:6	115:8 117:14
weighted 162:25	Wilding 85:17	92:10 106:19	workings 112:3,22	119:7 121:25
164:11	103:14,23,24,25	130:16 156:2,2,6	works 114:21 125:8	126:25 138:3
welcome 199:25	107:14,18 108:1	156:7,13,23 158:9	135:23 144:23	153:19 154:15
201:19	110:1,3,20,21,22	216:10	213:6 223:23	170:2 171:3,6
went 223:21	112:25 113:2	wish 179:8 195:12	Worksheet 95:22	174:4 176:23
weren't 165:6,6	116:9 118:7,19	wished 221:22	workshop 150:9,11	182:2 190:12,13
219:19	119:13,24 120:17	wishes 163:10	150:14,15,17	197:15 205:2,13
west 126:2,4 144:2	121:7,12 123:2	witness 110:16	151:5,8,10,14,20	205:20 206:17
144:5,6,12	126:23 133:22,22	145:16 203:10	151:24,25 152:5	207:7 212:6 213:1
western 125:22	134:21 137:7,11	witnesses 85:16	152:18 153:2	213:2 215:13
126:7 129:10,11	138:12 139:12,20	102:16 103:4	workshops 152:20	223:21
129:14	140:13 141:19	109:25 110:13,15	165:3	yielded 211:3
whack 163:18	143:17 146:7,18	110:18 132:14	world 216:16	212:11
wheeling 161:10	146:23 147:23,24	179:25 214:9,12	worry 141:15	yields 192:15,15
222:18	148:13,19 150:17	214:13,16	worst 159:3	yo-yo 122:18
Wholesale 94:3	151:23 152:11,23	wonder 173:1	worth 197:16	7
WIJAM 97:6 106:9	153:1,4 155:7,20	wondering 137:9	wouldn't 128:25	<u>Z</u>
106:12 112:15,17	155:23 156:19	138:10 153:12	213:5	zero 161:6
112:18 113:11	157:11,20 159:1	186:11 189:18	WTA 144:1	0
114:1 115:23	160:6,18 162:11	191:18 198:24	Wyoming 108:17	040 164:17
119:17 125:2,3,6	162:16 163:10	Woodland 83:19	130:15	VTU 107.1/
		ı	ı	1

050684 216:3	96:4,6,7,9,10,12	2019 88:9 92:24	24 83:16 88:9 99:1	500 88:9 188:9
06 105:3	96:13,15,16,18,19	93:9 97:5 108:13	241-7242 85:10	190:10 194:4
	96:21,22,24 97:3	113:12 169:24	24th 99:7 179:24	503 84:22 85:10
1	97:4,6,8,9,11,13	2020 83:16 86:23	25 106:25 222:19	53 205:13
1 86:3,16 97:23	97:15,16,18,19,21	89:13 92:10 97:9	222:19	534-9066 83:24
105:7 122:12,20	97:22,24 98:3	97:11,13 99:1,7	25-year 109:13	536-6918 85:14
123:5,6 158:1	11 141:2	101:8 102:3	208:3	55 105:3
159:14 169:22	11:58 179:19	105:21,24 106:10	27 150:10	5th 84:16
179:4	119 155:10	108:13,24 109:22	287-9066 83:23	3th 04.10
1.4 140:9	11th 101:8 205:4	112:9,15,17,19	29 94:9 95:12	6
1.48 109:4	12 93:9	113:17,25 114:5	2)) 1 .))3.12	6 86:8 120:18
1:00 179:19,23	1325 83:22	114:15 115:23	3	6.310 206:7
10 161:9	13th 108:19	119:17 125:3	3 86:5,16 202:11	6.4 206:1
10:44 142:10	14 96:15 200:5	126:15 127:6,22	30 92:24 93:9 180:2	621 83:19
10:55 142:7,13	202:3	120:13 127:0,22	207:7	63 183:1
10:56 142:10	15 200:5	131:3,9,16 133:24	30-plus 205:20	664-1186 84:12
100 159:21,23	15th 113:17 157:9	135:7 136:20	300 96:9	669-8197 85:5
101 86:3,4,5,6,7,8,9	16 183:17	138:14 139:5,14	300,000 181:25	68 220:2
86:11,13,14,17,18	17 94:6 95:9 166:6	139:18,19 148:17	30th 113:18	
86:20,21,23,24	1750 85:9	149:25 150:18	31 169:8,23 170:4	7
87:3,4,6,7,9,10,12	17th 108:24 109:22	154:12 157:14,17	173:5	7.17 221:19
87:13,15,16,18,19	18 94:18 166:6	159:22 164:4,6	31st 101:24 102:3	70.6 204:25 207:3
87:21,22,24 88:3	183:18	165:11,16 171:8	113:12	
88:4,6,7,9,10,12	1800 84:21 85:13	171:25 172:3	321 85:4	8
88:13,15,16,18,19	19 88:16 95:7 206:3	175:6,11 179:24	3300 83:22	8 164:18 168:3,10
88:21,22,24 89:3	19- 94:5	181:1 214:22	3358 83:21 227:13	800 83:24 84:16
89:4,6,8,10,12,13	190929 107:16	215:10,11,14	360 83:24 84:12	801 85:14
89:15,16,18,20,21	190981 107:17	224:7	383 85:4	813-5161 84:22
89:23,24 90:3,5,7	1st 108:21	2021 108:21 112:11	390 109:16	825 84:21
90:8,10,11,13,14		113:9,22,23		83-227 83:12
90:16,17,19,20,22	2	114:20 116:5	4	84111 85:14
90:23 91:3,4,6,7,9	2 86:4,16 96:15	117:3 145:22	4 86:6 177:18,18,24	846-6989 83:24
91:10,12,13,15,16	102:2 146:25	158:17 159:2,6	178:7 202:11,11	9
91:18,19,21,22,24	158:2,7,17 224:22	177:19 178:8	216:3 220:2	9:30 83:17 99:2
92:3,4,6,7,9,10,12	2:11 226:2	2022 124:21	40 94:8 95:10	9:35 99:8
92:13,15,16,18,19	20 115:8 206:3	2023 169:8,23	40128 84:11	9.33 99.8 92 223:16
92:21,22,24 93:3	2000 84:16	170:1,15,23 173:5	430-2422 84:17	94 223:16
93:4,6,7,9,11,12	2000s 123:18	174:5 176:2	450 85:9	95 182:4,7
93:14,15,17,18,20	201 85:13	2024 105:7 114:23	4Y1 96:13	95 182:4,7 97201 85:9
93:21,23,24 94:3	2013 88:16	117:4 118:1 127:6		97232 84:21
94:5,6,8,9,11,12	2015 125:17,18	127:9 131:18	5	
94:14,15,17,19,20	211:18,20,22	135:7,21 136:7	5 86:7 223:16	98101 83:23 98104 84:17
94:22,23,25 95:3	212:1,16	2025 170:4,15	5,000 190:11	98104 84:17 98110 85:5
95:4,6,7,9,10,12	2017 94:18	206 83:23 84:17	5.4 221:13	98110 83:3 98503 83:19
95:13,15,16,18,19	2018 89:5,7,9,11	85:5	50 216:4	98503 83:19 98504 84:12
95:21,22,24 96:3	108:19 206:3	22 167:24 168:5	50,000 190:11	703U4 04.12
			<u>l</u>	<u> </u>