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| 1 | LACEY, WASHINGTON; AUGUST 24, 2020 | 1 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Walmart? |
| 2 | 9:30 A.M. | 2 | MS. BALDWIN: Good morning. This is Vicki |
| 3 | --000-- | 3 | Baldwin, appearing on behalf of Walmart. |
| 4 | PROCEEDINGS | 4 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. |
| 5 |  | 5 | The parties have stipulated to the admission |
| 6 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be on the record. | 6 | of all the prefiled testimony and exhibits and no party |
| 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 | in this matter along with the Commissioners who have | 12 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: We will -- or I will |
| 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 | depreciation petition. | 18 | does Public Counsel need to compile any public comments |
| 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 |
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| 1 | call, only I will be appearing. | 1 | be acceptable. So we will designate that as Bench |
| 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. |
| 4 | MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Appearing on -- | 4 | MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 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 | for the purposes of the settlement hearing today, it | 8 | 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 |
| 11 | And for Public Counsel. | 11 | invite a presenter from the settling parties to present |
| 12 | MS. SUETAKE: For Public Counsel, I am Nina | 12 | its opening statement in support of the settlement. At |
| 13 | Suetake, Assistant Attorney General, for -- and we also | 13 | 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 |
| 16 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. | 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 | And for The Energy Project. | 22 | settlement documents. One resolves all disputed issues |
| 23 | MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Commissioners. | 23 | at PacifiCorp's depreciation filing, Docket UE-180778. |
| 24 | This is Simon ffitch, appearing on behalf of The Energy | 24 | The other resolves all disputed issues in the general |
| 25 | Project. | 25 | rate case and the remaining documents and incorporates |
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| 1 | the depreciation settlement. So for purposes of this |  | include the rate stability as mentioned, the overall |
| 2 | hearing, we are going to address the settlements at the | 2 | result of the stipulation of a rate decrease of |
| 3 | same time, and we intend to ask questions regarding the | 3 | approximately . 06 percent, which is approximately 55 |
| 4 | depreciation settlement while we have all witnesses on | 4 | cents per month for the average residential customer. |
| 5 | the panel. | 5 | Additionally, as part of this stipulation, |
| 6 | Last, we will hear any last comments from | 6 | the Company will not file a rate case that would have a |
| 7 | the parties and address any outstanding procedural | 7 | rate effective date before January 1 of 2024; however, |
| 8 | matters. | 8 | this stipulation does require two proceedings next year. |
| 9 | Are there any other questions before we get | 9 | The first is a limited issue rate filing to |
| 10 | started? Okay. Seeing none, Chair Danner, Commissioner | 10 | review certain pro forma generation and transmission |
| 11 | Rendahl, and Commissioner Balasbas have joined us, and | 11 | investments that are included in rates subject to refund |
| 12 | now we have an opportunity for opening statements on | 12 | as far as the stipulation. This limited issue rate |
| 13 | behalf of the settling parties. And l'd like to ask | 13 | filing will provide the opportunity for stakeholders and |
| 14 | that Mr. Wilding and Ms. Kopliha turn on their video and | 14 | the Commission to review the actual costs of these |
| 15 | we will give the stage to them to present their opening | 15 | investments. |
| 16 | statement. | 16 | Second, is a power cost only rate case that |
| 17 | And one other thing, Ms. -- Ms. Karen | 17 | updates the net power cost baseline to reflect the |
| 18 | Schubert, can you please turn off your video? | 18 | changes to day ahead scheduling that are currently being |
| 19 | Ms. Schubert, one more time if you can hear me, will you | 19 | implemented by the Company. This stipulation also |
| 20 | please turn off your video by selecting the turn camera | 20 | provides for the return of all tax benefits from the Tax |
| 21 | off button on the popup menu when you move your mouse? | 21 | Cuts and Jobs Act including the 2020 deferred current |
| 22 | Okay. Let's -- let's go ahead and proceed. | 22 | tax benefits, the nonprotected excess deferred income |
| 23 | Mr. Wilding, I will turn it over to you. | 23 | taxes, or EDIT, and protected EDIT through the end of |
| 24 | MR. WILDING: Thank you. Good morning. My | 24 | 2020. |
| 25 | name is Mike Wilding. I am the director of net power | 25 | Additionally, the stipulation maintains |
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| 1 | costs and regulatory policy for PacifiCorp and | 1 | PacifiCorp's existing capital structure and cost of |
| 2 | appreciate the time to present a -- all issue, all party | 2 | equity, which strikes a balance between rate stability |
| 3 | settlement in the Washington -- in PacifiCorp's | 3 | for customers and provides the Company with the access |
| 4 | Washington general rate case. | 4 | to financing to support the continued capital investment |
| 5 | Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner | 5 | that is necessary for PacifiCorp's transition to a |
| 6 | Rendahl, Commissioner Balasbas. Appreciate this time | 6 | cleaner energy future. |
| 7 | this morning, again, to present this settlement -- | 7 | Additionally, a part of this stipulation is |
| 8 | summary of our settlement. | 8 | the approval of the Washington Interjurisdictional Cost |
| 9 | I would like to start off by saying that | 9 | Allocation Methodology, which we refer to as WIJAM, and |
| 10 | PacifiCorp is very appreciative of the engagement and | 10 | also the 2020 protocol which dictates the cost |
| 11 | hard work done by parties to reach this stipulation. | 11 | allocations among PacifiCorp's service territory. |
| 12 | This is PacifiCorp's first general rate case in | 12 | The WIJAM was the result of two years of |
| 13 | approximately five years, and it included a number of | 13 | work with Staff, Public Counsel, and Packaging |
| 14 | very complex and difficult issues. However, through the | 14 | Corporation of America and provides for the inclusion of |
| 15 | diligence of all parties involved, we feel we've been | 15 | cost and benefits of all of PacifiCorp's nonemitting |
| 16 | able to come to a settlement that is beneficial to | 16 | resources in the rates for Washington customers. This |
| 17 | PacifiCorp's customers in Washington. | 17 | allows Washington customers the benefits of PacifiCorp's |
| 18 | Parties believe that this stipulation is in | 18 | geographic diversity and including the significant |
| 19 | the public interest and we request that the Commission | 19 | investment in wind generation included in this case. |
| 20 | approve it. This stipulation provides for continued | 20 | PacifiCorp looks forward to continuing to work with |
| 21 | rate stability for customers over the next three years | 21 | these parties through our multistate process for |
| 22 | and update PacifiCorp's revenue requirements to reflect | 22 | continuing to resolve cost allocation issues. |
| 23 | the Company's operations and the significant investments | 23 | The stipulation also settles the rate spread |
| 24 | in renewable energy. | 24 | and rate design. It maintains PacifiCorp's current |
| 25 | The main provisions of this stipulation | 25 | basic charge and flushes the tiered energy rates by 25 |
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| 1 | percent for residential customers to provide for a | 1 | Staff, Public Counsel, and the Packaging Corporation of |
| 2 | number of innovating pricing pilots. | 2 | America. The stipulating parties agree that the |
| 3 | Finally, the stipulation requires an | 3 | depreciation study should be approved and results in a |
| 4 | increased reporting for customer disconnections and | 4 | reduction of approximately 1.48 million to Washington |
| 5 | creates a low income advisory group to examine the low | 5 | allocated depreciation rates relative to the initial |
| 6 | income bill assistance with dates set for which that | 6 | filing. |
| 7 | committee will report back on proposed updates and | 7 | Parties have agreed to a number of changes |
| 8 | improvements. | 8 | to certain generation, transmission, and distribution |
| 9 | Overall, this stipulation strikes a fair | 9 | accounts, which are specified in my joint testimony and |
| 10 | balance and provides rate stability for customers, and | 10 | the stipulation. Additionally, as PacifiCorp develops |
| 11 | over the next three years, the parties recommend that | 11 | or requires new solar and/or battery storage assets |
| 12 | the Commission approve this stipulation. | 12 | before the Company files its next depreciation study, |
| 13 | And thank you for your time today. | 13 | the Company will use a 25 -year life span for solar |
| 14 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Wilding, before you | 14 | facilities with corresponding depreciation rates. And |
| 15 | turn off your camera, can you clarify for us that the | 15 | PacifiCorp has agreed to provide additional information |
| 16 | accounting petitions from Dockets UE-190750, 190929, and | 16 | and collect additional data on the FERC Account 390 |
| 17 | 190981 that those are resolved by the settlement? | 17 | [inaudible] in Utah. |
| 18 | MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct. This | 18 | Respectfully, I ask the Commission to issue |
| 19 | is -- all -- all issues are resolved in this settlement. | 19 | an order approving, one, the terms and commission -- |
| 20 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And when the | 20 | excuse me, the terms and conditions of the stipulation; |
| 21 | parties say that the settlement resolves every issue in | 21 | and two, the depreciation rates submitted in attachment |
| 22 | dispute in the consolidated dockets, does this mean that | 22 | three to the stipulation on July 17th, 2020. Thank you. |
| 23 | the Company's position in its initial filing for the | 23 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. |
| 24 | three accounting petitions is accepted or otherwise | 24 | Let's at this time ask that all the |
| 25 | unchallenged? | 25 | settlement panel witnesses turn on their video. |
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| 1 | MR. WILDING: Yes, that's correct. | 1 | And, Mr. Wilding, you can rejoin the video. |
| 2 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. | 2 | MS. KOPLIHA: Can I actually note, so |
| 3 | I'd like to invite Ms. Kopliha to give her | 3 | Mr. Wilding and I are actually in the same room since I |
| 4 | opening statement for the settlement in the depreciation | 4 | don't have a camera on my computer, so I can flip it |
| 5 | Docket UE-180778. | 5 | back to him. We're, of course, trying to stay six feet |
| 6 | MS. KOPLIHA: All right. Good morning. So | 6 | apart, and we won't both necessarily be on the camera at |
| 7 | I'm Nikki Kopliha. I'm the chief financial officer for | 7 | the same time. |
| 8 | PacifiCorp, and I was part of not only the rate case but | 8 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: That will be fine and we |
| 9 | the depreciation case. So my summary provides an | 9 | will direct our questions or -- or if we ask a question |
| 10 | overview of the key terms of the depreciation settlement | 10 | that is better answered by one of you than the other, |
| 11 | stipulation that's before the Commission today. | 11 | please indicate that to us and we can take a moment for |
| 12 | The stipulation is the result of many | 12 | you to switch the camera. |
| 13 | meetings held between February of 2019 and June of 2020 | 13 | Okay. To all witnesses, I'm waiting to make |
| 14 | involving the parties in this docket. Additionally, | 14 | sure I see everyone and I think I do. Okay. So to all |
| 15 | there were meetings with parties involved in the | 15 | witnesses, will you please raise your right hand? |
| 16 | Company's depreciation proceedings in Utah, Idaho, | 16 | (Witness panel sworn.) |
| 17 | Oregon, and Wyoming, and we believe that this | 17 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. |
| 18 | stipulation is in the public interest. | 18 | Let's have each of the witnesses introduce |
| 19 | On September 13th, 2018, PacifiCorp filed an | 19 | themselves for the record, spelling their last name |
| 20 | application requesting authorization to update | 20 | beginning with PacifiCorp, Mr. Wilding. |
| 21 | depreciation rates effective January 1st, 2021, based on | 21 | MR. WILDING: Yes, my name is Michael |
| 22 | the study that was performed under my direction by | 22 | Wilding, W-i-l-d-i-n-g. |
| 23 | Mr. John Spanos. | 23 | MS. KOPLIHA: I am Nikki Kopliha, N-i-k-k-i, |
| 24 | On July 17th, 2020, the Company submitted a | 24 | K-o-p-l-i-h-a. |
| 25 | settlement stipulation that was signed by PacifiCorp, | 25 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. |
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| 1 | And for Staff? | 1 | representative from the Company. |
| 2 | MR. BALL: This is Jason Ball with | 2 | MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. Yes, l'd be |
| 3 | Commission Staff, B-a-l-I. | 3 | happy to start. So there's a lot there to -- a lot of |
| 4 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: And for Public Counsel? | 4 | questions you asked there, and so l'll -- l'll start |
| 5 | MR. DAHL: This is Corey Dahl. First name | 5 | with the -- the net power cost proceeding in this case, |
| 6 | is C-o-r-e-y, last name D-a-h-l. | 6 | and then what it will look like next year with the power |
| 7 | MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle for Public | 7 | cost only rate case. |
| 8 | Counsel. Last name is spelled $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{l}-\mathrm{e}$. | 8 | This year at PacifiCorp, we used our grid |
| 9 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. | 9 | model to fork out pro forma net power costs for 2021 and |
| 10 | And for Packaging Corporation of America? | 10 | then those are allocated to Washington customers under |
| 11 | MR. KAUFMAN: This is Lance Kaufman for | 11 | the WIJAM methodology. Those costs were updated using a |
| 12 | Packaging Corporation of America. My last name is | 12 | December 31st of 2019 official forward price curve, and |
| 13 | K-a-u-f-m-a-n. | 13 | that's just because of the timing and setting and filing |
| 14 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. | 14 | of the rate case. |
| 15 | And for The Energy Project. | 15 | So we've now agreed that we will update |
| 16 | MR. COLLINS: Shawn Collins, S-h-a-w-n, | 16 | those costs, that power cost baseline, for a final |
| 17 | C-o--I-I--n-s. | 17 | update in October of -- October 15th of 2020, and we |
| 18 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you. | 18 | will use the September 30th official forward price curve |
| 19 | And for Walmart. | 19 | that will obviously come out the two weeks before that |
| 20 | MR. KRONAUER: Good morning. Alex Kronauer, | 20 | update. So that will give us the most up-to-date market |
| 21 | K-r-o-n, as in Nancy, a-u-e-r. I'm the senior manager | 21 | conditions that we have for those -- for the net power |
| 22 | on the energy servicing in Walmart. | 22 | cost baseline in 2021. |
| 23 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Good morning to you | 23 | And then in 2021, we've agreed to do an |
| 24 | all. Thank you. Okay. I will start us off with the | 24 | additional update to our net power cost baseline. So as |
| 25 | first question. We will ask specific follow-up | 25 | part of the MSD process in the 2020 protocol and the |
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| 1 | questions in our effort to understand the settlement, | 1 | WIJAM, the Company agreed that we would move to a nodal |
| 2 | but first, the bench needs more clarity from the parties | 2 | pricing model for purposes of allocating cost to the |
| 3 | on the content and workings of the settlement in | 3 | different states. |
| 4 | general. And we are giving you the opportunity first | 4 | And the reason why we've -- we've gone down |
| 5 | before we get into our very detailed follow-up questions | 5 | the path is because under the current 2020 protocol, we |
| 6 | to better explain how the various elements of the | 6 | still share amongst all of our six states a dynamic |
| 7 | settlement work together, power costs, the nodal pricing | 7 | resource portfolio where all resources are -- are shared |
| 8 | method, the agreed reductions to power cost, and the | 8 | amongst all states. But moving forward, once that |
| 9 | October 2020 update. | 9 | protocol expires, the goal is to get to a place where |
| 10 | Please explain what the parties envision as | 10 | each state will have its own unique resource portfolio |
| 11 | part of the limited proceedings and the PCORC in 2021 | 11 | that serves loads based on that state's energy policy |
| 12 | which issues will be included and what issues will be | 12 | and the resources that it wants to serve. |
| 13 | excluded. | 13 | And so in order to get to the place where we |
| 14 | Also we want to hear more from what ways | 14 | can have state-specific energy portfolios, the parties |
| 15 | this settlement sets rates using the WIJAM and the 2020 | 15 | at -- in MSD and as to the 2020 protocol including |
| 16 | protocol and what is the Commission being asked to | 16 | Washington Staff, Public Counsel, and Packaging |
| 17 | accept with regard to the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol. | 17 | Corporation all agreed to the nodal pricing MOU. And so |
| 18 | For instance, how would our acceptance of the WIJAM and | 18 | what that nodal pricing does is it agrees that we should |
| 19 | 2020 protocol affect future Commission decision-making. | 19 | implement that nodal pricing on a dispatch basis, or a |
| 20 | So let's start back at the beginning of my | 20 | day ahead scheduling basis rather, next year in 2021 so |
| 21 | question. Please take this opportunity to better | 21 | that we can gain experience and learn how it works and |
| 22 | explain the contents and workings and how different | 22 | really refine -- refine it before we start using it for |
| 23 | elements fit together in the settlement. Who would like | 23 | cost allocation methodology in 2024. |
| 24 | to start? | 24 | And so we're currently working with the |
| 25 | Mr. Wilding, I would like to invite you as a | 25 | California ISO to implement that as part of our actual |
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| 1 | operations and as part of our front office to implement | 1 | and we are on track, the last report I got, and so that |
| 2 | that day ahead dispatch based on a nodal dispatch. | 2 | day ahead dispatch signal from CAISO will be in place in |
| 3 | And so we have agreed that as part of this | 3 | 2021, but the actual cost allocation, that piece, that |
| 4 | case, we would update next year, update our net power | 4 | accounting piece, is not -- is not agreed to until 2024, |
| 5 | cost baseline to capture those changes in the dispatch | 5 | once we move to this new cost allocation methodology |
| 6 | the best we can through our forecast model. And to do | 6 | that also includes -- that includes state-specific |
| 7 | that, we are currently working on moving from our | 7 | portfolios. |
| 8 | in-house brig model that's about 20 years old that we've | 8 | And I say -- I give that term "agreed to" |
| 9 | been using in regulatory proceedings all during that | 9 | loosely because it's agreed to that nodal pricing seems |
| 10 | time to -- to the Aurora model, which will have some -- | 10 | like it should be able to solve the problem that should |
| 11 | entire functionality and different capabilities that | 11 | be able to fairly allocate the net power cost amongst |
| 12 | would allow us to potentially capture that day ahead | 12 | states under that scenario, but there's still lots of |
| 13 | dispatch that we're implementing in our actual | 13 | questions and lots of items that still need to be worked |
| 14 | operations. | 14 | out over the next couple of years, but contracting with |
| 15 | So that is the purpose of that PCORC or that | 15 | CAISO and getting that first dispatch solution, that's |
| 16 | power cost only rate case filing is to update that | 16 | the first step in -- in first getting the data and the |
| 17 | baseline with the most up-to-date information next year | 17 | experience necessary to answer some of the other |
| 18 | and also with using the new model that the Company is | 18 | questions. |
| 19 | currently working on to forecast its regulatory net | 19 | And so next year when we come in for the |
| 20 | power cost to include that as the new baseline of next | 20 | power cost only rate case, we will switch to the Aurora |
| 21 | year in a power cost only rate case. | 21 | Model, because the Aurora model has the better |
| 22 | So I'm -- I'm happy to move on and -- and | 22 | functionality to capture what we will be doing in the |
| 23 | dive deeper into the 2020 protocol and the WIJAM, but | 23 | dispatch, but the allocation of the net power cost still |
| 24 | I'm also happy to stop there to see if there's any | 24 | will not use that nodal pricing model yet because it's |
| 25 | further questions about net power cost and how all of | 25 | not fully developed and we don't expect the allocation |
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| 1 | those things are -- are related. | 1 | piece to be fully developed until closer to 2024, and as |
| 2 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner Rendahl? | 2 | we work stakeholders in all of our jurisdictions to |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning. So | 3 | fully develop that allocation. |
| 4 | just so I can understand what you've just described, so | 4 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. |
| 5 | when you come in for the update in 2021, you will be | 5 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner? |
| 6 | planning to use the Aurora model, not a nodal pricing | 6 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Thank you. So just |
| 7 | model because you'll be in transition; is that the | 7 | to follow up on that, so, Mr. Wilding, I think what I |
| 8 | intent? | 8 | heard you say is that for purposes -- for setting the |
| 9 | MR. WILDING: Partially. The intent is to | 9 | baseline for power cost, we will continue to use -- or |
| 10 | move -- so right now, and including this case, we -- we | 10 | we -- or the Company will transition from the grid model |
| 11 | use our grid model is what's the name of it, and so | 11 | to Aurora for purposes of dispatch and the cost |
| 12 | we're moving from the grid model to the Aurora model. | 12 | associated with that. At the same time, then, |
| 13 | The nodal pricing model is a cost allocation | 13 | Washington will be -- you will be using the nodal |
| 14 | term that we developed through our MSP, our multistate | 14 | pricing model kind of, I guess for lack of a better |
| 15 | process negotiations, as a method for allocating the -- | 15 | term, as maybe more like a parallel or a shadow kind of |
| 16 | allocating the net power cost, so that does have a piece | 16 | way of deciding what costs -- power costs are and how |
| 17 | of it that is -- so there's that accounting piece that's | 17 | they could be allocated under that method; did I |
| 18 | the allocation, but there's also the dispatch piece | 18 | understand that correctly? |
| 19 | where we are engaging with CAISO and contracting with | 19 | MR. WILDING: I -- I think mostly. I would |
| 20 | CAISO to provide us a day ahead schedule on an -- at a | 20 | just maybe just correct a few -- a few things. |
| 21 | nodal level that we will then follow and then use to | 21 | First, the Aurora model will not be used for |
| 22 | allocate the net power cost to states. | 22 | dispatch. The Aurora model is simply a forecasting tool |
| 23 | That -- so that first piece where we are | 23 | that will be used for regulatory purposes. That |
| 24 | contracting with CAISO, we are working on that right | 24 | dispatch and that day ahead schedule, that's what we're |
| 25 | now, and that is being implemented in January. And -- | 25 | contracting with CAISO to provide us, and CAISO will |
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| 1 | actually use their market models to give us that day | 1 | specific and narrow cases and -- and -- |
| 2 | ahead dispatch. And so Aurora will just be used in a | 2 | CHAIR DANNER: And that was my understanding |
| 3 | ratemaking setting like a rate case or a power cost only | 3 | too. I just want to make sure that we don't have any -- |
| 4 | rate case to set that baseline. | 4 | any scope [inaudible] and just want to make sure that |
| 5 | And then -- and then as far as -- yes, we | 5 | it's your understanding that we can -- we can scope in |
|  | will have that in place with CAISO over the next couple | 6 | this [inaudible]. |
| 7 | of years the -- as you pointed out, to gather the data | 7 | MR. WILDING: Yeah, absolutely. |
| 8 | to gain experience to help us answer the questions on | 8 | MS. BALL: Good morning, Chairman, good |
| 9 | exactly how we can use it that allocate those net power | 9 | morning, Commissioners. Jason Ball with Commission |
| 10 | costs to our different jurisdictions. | 10 | Staff. The -- to address Judge O'Connell's general |
| 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. I think | 11 | questions, I'm going to try not to repeat the majority |
| 12 | you did a pretty good job covering most of the topics I | 12 | of what Mr. Wilding just said, but I do want to add a |
| 13 | asked you, Mr. Wilding. I would like to ask a follow-up | 13 | little bit of color to a couple of pieces. |
| 14 | for the general question to Mr. Ball. | 14 | The first is in October, we're having a |
| 15 | Perhaps you can add some clarity to us about | 15 | power cost update. Generally speaking, that's just to |
| 16 | what the Commission is being asked to accept as far as | 16 | provide newer information than what was initially filed |
| 17 | the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol if we accept the | 17 | in the case or included in the supplemental filing. A |
| 18 | settlement and what effect might that have on future | 18 | component of the stipulation was that if that new |
| 19 | Commission decision-making. | 19 | information comes in and it causes rate -- or it causes |
| 20 | MR. BALL: Thank you, Judge O'Connell. I'm | 20 | a change to rates such that there -- that there is no |
| 21 | happy to do that, but I believe Chairman Danner had his | 21 | longer a refund in the base revenue requirement, the |
| 22 | hand raised. | 22 | parties agreed respectively to grab some money that's |
| 23 | CHAIR DANNER: Yes, thank you. Yeah, you | 23 | already built into the deferral of the power cost |
| 24 | know, I did have a question for Mr. Wilding before we | 24 | mechanism to help maintain this settlement as a rate |
| 25 | move on. I just -- we had a couple of definitions. You | 25 | refund over the next three years. |
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| 1 | know, we're talking about a limited issue filing and | 1 | So we were concerned that if the power cost |
| 2 | that's one where I want to talk about pro forma | 2 | baseline -- or excuse me, the power cost update that |
| 3 | adjustments and then we talk about PCORC. Of course, | 3 | came out in October happened to represent higher power |
| 4 | PCORC was something we did in a -- in a settlement in | 4 | costs than were protected now, then that -- there might |
| 5 | another utilities rate case. | 5 | be -- it might cause the rate refund to no longer be a |
| 6 | And so just to be clear, because I didn't | 6 | refund. |
| 7 | see real good definitions, although your descriptions | 7 | So that was one of the things we built into |
| 8 | were really good this morning, I just want to be -- I | 8 | that mechanism to -- to -- to deal with those forecasts |
| 9 | want to be clear that we don't start bringing in | 9 | and the differences between a forecast in the future and |
| 10 | ancillary issues in that. | 10 | a forecast now. |
| 11 | And insofar as we don't have typed | 11 | So that was what happened in October. Then |
| 12 | definitions, are you -- is it your understanding that | 12 | in January, on January 1, rates from the entire case go |
| 13 | the Commission would be able to scope those proceedings | 13 | into -- would go into effect. That includes a multitude |
| 14 | to make sure that they are focused on what you described | 14 | of different pieces. That's the -- the accounting |
| 15 | this morning and don't go beyond that so to bring in | 15 | petitions, the depreciation rates, the base rates, the |
| 16 | ancillary or unrelated issues? | 16 | tax benefits, all those things were timed so that we can |
| 17 | MR. WILDING: Yes, that is my understanding. | 17 | get them going at the same time to prevent rates from |
| 18 | And, in fact, in the stipulation on page 6 of the | 18 | causing a yo-yo in -- in what customers' bills look |
| 19 | stipulation, when we talk about the pro forma capital | 19 | like. |
| 20 | additions, those are actually identified which assets | 20 | Then sometime after January 1, we see this |
| 21 | would be eligible for this limited issue rate filing, | 21 | new filing from PacifiCorp, and this new filing is a |
| 22 | and so absolutely agree with that, that those -- | 22 | limited issue filing to deal with pro forma plant that |
| 23 | those -- both of those proceedings, the limited rate | 23 | was brought to our attention included in the rate, but |
| 24 | filing for those certain assets and the net power cost | 24 | we didn't feel like we could review it in sufficient |
| 25 | resetting of the baseline are intended to be very | 25 | time for a hearing of -- or for the rate effective |
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| 1 | period. And that is looking at very specific plant, as | 1 | costs. |
| 2 | Mr. Wilding identified, it was included in the | 2 | Then the question was about the WIJAM and |
| 3 | stipulation and identified what plant would be subject | 3 | the 2020 protocol. So the WIJAM was a negotiation |
| 4 | to that filing. And that that plant also, because it | 4 | between Staff, the Company, PCA, and Public Counsel to |
| 5 | was included in the rates set in January 1, the revenue | 5 | examine the existing allocations of rates to Washington |
| 6 | requirement was included in January 1, but the prudency | 6 | by PacifiCorp. The WIJAM is not an agreement between |
| 7 | determination wasn't necessarily. Those rates were | 7 | PacifiCorp, Washington, and the other five operating |
| 8 | then -- that revenue associated with those plants were | 8 | jurisdictions that PacifiCorp works in, it's only an |
| 9 | then subject to refund. | 9 | agreement between Washington and PacifiCorp. |
| 10 | Assuming that there is no issue and that the | 10 | And what it does is it incorporates a |
| 11 | case comes in and all the parties have a chance to look | 11 | variety of new elements and changes a few things that |
| 12 | at it and they all say yes, we think this is all good, | 12 | historically have been allocated to Washington based |
| 13 | nothing changes to rates after that filing. | 13 | upon new information that's available to us as well as a |
| 14 | Then sometime later in the year, we have | 14 | better understanding of the cost causation that these |
| 15 | what we call the PCORC, which is a power cost only rate | 15 | assets provide. |
| 16 | case. Power cost only rate cases, as the Chairman | 16 | Another big key of the -- to the WIJAM was |
| 17 | alluded to, were originally designed as a settlement for | 17 | the Idaho Asset Exchange that occurred back in 2015 and |
| 18 | PSE back I believe in the early 2000s. PCORCs had | 18 | was a part of the 2015 rate case, pieces of it were, |
| 19 | different components to them that were specific to PSE | 19 | that are now being fully resolved as a part of this |
| 20 | based upon how their power cost mechanisms work. | 20 | settlement. The Idaho Asset Exchange opened up some |
| 21 | However, the nomenclature, the -- the power | 21 | transmission capability between the Company's east and |
| 22 | cost only rate case as a nation, was really important | 22 | western operating areas, which is one of the reasons why |
| 23 | for us because what it implied was that we're only | 23 | we believe this WIJAM now better reflects the actual |
| 24 | looking at power costs. | 24 | operations the Company engages in on a dispatch basis. |
| 25 | So that new filing that comes into play in | 25 | The WIJAM has an effect on cost allocations. |
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| 1 | the later half of next year is just about resetting the | 1 | It includes all of transmission plant across both |
| 2 | baseline using the new information available to us from | 2 | PacifiCorp East and PacifiCorp West. It includes all of |
| 3 | the nodal pricing model. | 3 | renewable resources both of PacifiCorp East and |
| 4 | On that note, so the nodal pricing model, | 4 | PacifiCorp West. Neither of those things have happened |
| 5 | the reason why -- one of the main reasons why Staff | 5 | before. |
| 6 | supported the nodal pricing model and continues to | 6 | The WIJAM is meant to be a permanent change |
| 7 | support it is because we believe it is both a far more | 7 | to the western control area methodology that we have |
| 8 | transparent and effective just examination of the | 8 | historically used in Washington. It's meant to be a |
| 9 | Company's power costs as well as we believe it will -- | 9 | standalone agreement between Washington and the Company |
| 10 | both the dispatch that they are engaging in through | 10 | on how to assign cost, and it is also meant to meet the |
| 11 | CAISO and the modeling of that dispatch through the | 11 | Commission's test, which is whether or not resources |
| 12 | Aurora model will result in a reduction of the power | 12 | provide quantifiable, direct, or indirect benefits to |
| 13 | costs. That's what we believe right now based on the | 13 | Washington ratepayers commensurate with their costs. We |
| 14 | information that we have. We can't be absolutely | 14 | believe that the WIJAM meets that test. |
| 15 | certain about it because we don't have it physically in | 15 | The 2020 protocol is a slightly different |
| 16 | front of us, but based on the information we have, | 16 | animal. What it does is it outlines specific cost |
| 17 | that's what we believe. | 17 | allocations that are agreed to by all of Washington -- |
| 18 | So we wanted to get the Company onto that | 18 | of PacifiCorp operating jurisdiction, not just |
| 19 | new model now, especially because they were going to | 19 | Washington, but it doesn't finally resolve them. What |
| 20 | start -- they are working with CAISO to switch over | 20 | it says is here are the ones we've agreed to, here are |
| 21 | their dispatch, and that way the power costs in 2022 | 21 | the ones we're still working on, one of them which is |
| 22 | will match the way they are actually adjusting -- or | 22 | the assignment of power costs using the nodal pricing |
| 23 | excuse me, match the way they are actually dispatching | 23 | model, which is what Mr. Wilding was just talking about, |
| 24 | their power under the CAISO dispatch methodology. So | 24 | and it says we're still working on those, give us three |
| 25 | that's all the proceedings in the plant and the power | 25 | years, and then we'll have a final version. We'll |
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| 1 | figure -- we'll have this all figured out. | 1 | that way, because that would imply that the previous |
| 2 | The WIJAM is incorporated into that as by | 2 | methodology was incorrect and that's not what we're |
| 3 | ref- -- by -- as an appendix. And it basically says | 3 | saying. |
| 4 | this is the way Washington's doing it, but the WIJAM is | 4 | What we're saying is that the circumstances |
| 5 | also separate in that it includes a provision if the | 5 | changed, and because those circumstances have changed, |
| 6 | 2020 protocol gets to 2024 and the states can't agree on | 6 | we can now include these new assets into rates. For |
| 7 | anything, then we just continue going forward with the | 7 | instance, or to provide a little color, one of the key |
| 8 | WIJAM. It can stand alone. | 8 | pieces of this was the Idaho Asset Exchange. Prior to |
| 9 | If, however, we get to 2024 and the -- all | 9 | that exchange, the transmission assets that connected |
| 10 | the states have agreed on something and Washington's | 10 | Jim Bridger to the western control area, physically |
| 11 | been a part of those negotiations and we've agreed to | 11 | connected us to the western control area, were very |
| 12 | something as well, we would come to this Commission with | 12 | limited in how they could operate. And it meant that |
| 13 | a new allocation methodology that incorporates what | 13 | power really could not physically flow very often from |
| 14 | components of the WIJAM needed to be incorporated and | 14 | the eastern control area to the western control area |
| 15 | what pieces don't. | 15 | except under specific conditions. |
| 16 | So -- | 16 | That change, when the Idaho Asset Exchange |
| 17 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Ball, let's take a | 17 | updated those agreements and turned them from legacy |
| 18 | pause right there for some questions. | 18 | contracts into FERC open access tariffs, now there was |
| 19 | CHAIR DANNER: This is Dave Danner. | 19 | not the limitation that these transmission lines be |
| 20 | just -- thank you for the discussion. Can you just | 20 | solely used by Jim Bridger, it was now what could happen |
| 21 | clarify for me what -- is Washington -- did we sign onto | 21 | is those transmission lines could be used however they |
| 22 | all of the 2020 protocol or just certain components of | 22 | needed to be used. |
| 23 | it? | 23 | So we looked at that and we said okay, we |
| 24 | MR. BALL: Staff signed onto all of 2020 | 24 | now have access to a whole host of resources. Which of |
| 25 | protocol and all of the WIJAM. However, the 2020 | 25 | those resources can meet our used and useful test, which |
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| 1 | protocol is very explicit in which sections apply to | 1 | of those resources can meet the benefit commensurate |
| 2 | Washington and which ones don't. And by incorporating | 2 | cost test, and that's what we identified in the WIJAM as |
| 3 | the WIJAM, we basically said this is the way we're doing | 3 | the renewable resources, the transmission assets because |
| 4 | it and these other sections, they apply in the manner in | 4 | those resources are all commensurate with the cost. |
| 5 | which they can be applied. | 5 | CHAIR DANNER: And when you say the words |
| 6 | Does that make sense? | 6 | "can be used," do you mean will be used or is there some |
| 7 | CHAIR DANNER: Well, yeah. I mean, I was | 7 | uncertainty about that? |
| 8 | thinking about, you know, what we had agreed to in the | 8 | MR. BALL: Well, there's only so much un- -- |
| 9 | 2020 protocol is we were going to continue to work on | 9 | the uncertainty that I referred to is you can't |
| 10 | the framework issues, I think we're going to work on the | 10 | color-code electrons. The -- the assets will be |
| 11 | bringing out the coal and making sure that we're in | 11 | dispatched to meet PacifiCorp's load obligations, and |
| 12 | compliance with state laws there. | 12 | they will continue to do that in a manner that they |
| 13 | So -- so let me just ask this question since | 13 | believe -- that is least cost and is under the rules of |
| 14 | I have -- I have you here. Is -- is it -- are you | 14 | economic dispatch. |
| 15 | confident that under this new methodology that only | 15 | So to the extent that you can say a Wyoming |
| 16 | resources that would meet the used and useful test are | 16 | wind plant is being used to meet Washington load, it's |
| 17 | being brought into Washington rates? | 17 | not as -- it's not that we can suddenly specifically |
| 18 | MR. BALL: Yes. | 18 | identify those assets as providing direct power to |
| 19 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So things that were | 19 | Washington, it's that we now know that they have the |
| 20 | formerly excluded now you're saying well, wait a minute, | 20 | ability to do it whereas before we were almost certain |
| 21 | that's -- that's important because that is going to help | 21 | they didn't. |
| 22 | us achieve our CETA objectives or CETA just -- it's a | 22 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So good morning, |
| 23 | recognition that what in the past we had excluded was in | 23 | Mr. Ball. |
| 24 | fact benefitting Washington? | 24 | MR. BALL: Good morning. |
| 25 | MR. BALL: Not -- I wouldn't quite put it | 25 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Good morning. So |
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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.

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
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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 l 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
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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
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nodal pricing model and to start reaching out to CAISO -- or we had already reached out, but to begin 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
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| 1 | actually did. When it comes to setting rates and | 1 | representative to make comment or explain some legal |
| 2 | setting the baseline rates and determining what goes | 2 | aspects that we touched on in this proceeding. |
| 3 | into the -- the baseline revenue requirement, that will | 3 | Okay. So with that, let me turn over to the |
| 4 | be based right now off the Aurora model, which we have | 4 | Commissioners for any more follow-up questions on this |
| 5 | full access to. We have Aurora power cost modelers | 5 | topic. Chair? |
| 6 | staff and we have our own independent license. | 6 | CHAIR DANNER: So I have a few discreet |
| 7 | If in 2024 -- or as part of 2020 | 7 | questions. I -- Mr. Wilding, I wanted to know, the |
| 8 | negotiations as we re-examine -- or as we examine how to | 8 | Bridger Coal Company Reclamation Trust Fund is something |
| 9 | do nodal pricing going forward, I can't speak for the | 9 | you're including in power costs and I was wondering if |
| 10 | other parties, but at least for Washington, that will be | 10 | you could explain that. |
| 11 | a -- Washington Staff, that will be an incredibly | 11 | MR. WILDING: Yes. Yeah, part of the -- the |
| 12 | important component of whatever methodology is used to | 12 | stipulation, we wanted to point out what we've already |
| 13 | assign baseline rates, that it be fully transparent, | 13 | recovered as part of the -- as part of power costs. So |
| 14 | that we can examine the model and all of its inputs | 14 | that's -- if those funds, those reclamation funds, have |
| 15 | regardless of how actual dispatch occurs on the back end | 15 | always been included in the coal cost of the Jim Bridger |
| 16 | using the CAISO proprietary version. | 16 | plant, which, of course, comes from the Bridger Coal |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. | 17 | Mine, and so that's historically how it's been -- been |
| 18 | MR. EARLE: This is Robert Earle for Public | 18 | done |
| 19 | Counsel, if I can add that I think that provision of the | 19 | And so in this case, we've -- we've |
| 20 | inputs and the outputs, the ability Staff has to run | 20 | recognized what's been included thus far in rates, and |
| 21 | Aurora is important. I think thinking forward to 2024, | 21 | then there's an incremental portion that we will have to |
| 22 | it will be important to think about transparency of | 22 | collect from Washington customers over a shorter time |
| 23 | assumptions and exactly how -- how the model works. And | 23 | period as they will be -- have pullout of rates. And |
| 24 | I think that sort of information is possible to get | 24 | so -- and I apologize, I -- and so that piece, that |
| 25 | without necessarily having CAISO's model in -- in hand. | 25 | incremental piece that is associated with -- with the |
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| 1 | These things work in fairly standard ways, | 1 | shorter life is included in base rates, but then is -- |
| 2 | and knowing what the assumptions are that go into it is | 2 | so included in base rates, but not as part of coal |
| 3 | often much more important than understanding well, | 3 | costs. And then that is amortized over ten years, |
| 4 | what's behind the linear program or the -- or the mixed | 4 | consistent with the stipulation. |
| 5 | integer program that goes into this -- into the specific | 5 | CHAIR DANNER: And then -- thank you. |
| 6 | dispatch. | 6 | Another question is, in Ms. Lockey's testimony, she said |
| 7 | So I think, you know, particularly for 2024, | 7 | that the limited realignment may allocate to Washington |
| 8 | we'll want to think about the types of information, | 8 | Chehalis plant because that would help with CETA, |
| 9 | being assured that that's going to be available. But I | 9 | greater flexibility in CETA compliance, and I was |
| 10 | don't feel particularly concerned that that's an | 10 | wondering if you could expand on that, tell me why that |
| 11 | impossibility. I think that, you know, that is sort of | 11 | Chehalis gas plant would be helpful for CETA compliance. |
| 12 | more fairly normal and that can be dealt with in due | 12 | MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. So what |
| 13 | course. | 13 | Ms. Lockey is referring to, that limited realignment is |
| 14 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Earle. | 14 | one of the framework issues of the 2020 protocol, and so |
| 15 | Mr. Pepple, I-- I saw that you wanted to be | 15 | that's an open issue that's currently being worked on by |
| 16 | recognized, and I have seen your explanation of why you | 16 | stakeholders from all six of our service territories. |
| 17 | were wanting to be recognized in the chat. We'd like to | 17 | And one of the ideas, one of the proposals is a limited |
| 18 | use that for technical issues only, but to answer your | 18 | realignment of resources that would put Chehalis and |
| 19 | question, as far as it pertains to any legal components | 19 | Washington rates, fully allocate Chehalis to Washington |
| 20 | of how the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol will interact | 20 | customers. |
| 21 | with the settlement, we are going to have an opportunity | 21 | And the reason why that would potentially |
| 22 | for the attorneys to explain that perspective after we | 22 | help with CETA compliance is that it gives Washington |
| 23 | hear from the settlement panel. And that will be one of | 23 | control over the single thermal unit in PacifiCorp's |
| 24 | the things that can be addressed by the attorneys when | 24 | fleet that is within -- geographically located within |
| 25 | we come to the end of the hearing and allow for each | 25 | Washington. And so -- and then other states' policies |
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| 1 | would not affect what happens at Chehalis because it | 1 | if October comes around and it's at ten and a half or |
| 2 | would be fully allocated to Washington customers at the | 2 | it's at negative 11, we don't have to. |
| 3 | time. | 3 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So the -- so |
| 4 | But, again, this is one piece of what | 4 | effectively, then, everyone is expecting that it will be |
| 5 | potentially could be lots of moving pieces in the 2020 | 5 | at least ten and a half million dollar reduction, at |
| 6 | protocol. As we try to resolve those framework issues, | 6 | least that is the hope? |
| 7 | that -- that is something that we are investigating and | 7 | MR. BALL: Correct. |
| 8 | that we are researching and analyzing as we go forward | 8 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then |
| 9 | over the next [inaudible]. | 9 | so if that -- if it's greater than ten and a half |
| 10 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. | 10 | million dollars, then it will be whatever that number |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So | 11 | is? |
| 12 | this -- this question is for either Mr. Wilding or maybe | 12 | MR. BALL: Correct. |
| 13 | Mr. Ball. It has to do with power costs and the October | 13 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And, I |
| 14 | baseline -- or October 2020 update. So what I want to | 14 | guess, is there any -- is there any concern or maybe -- |
| 15 | understand is, is the ten and a half million dollar | 15 | or worry among any of the parties that -- that the |
| 16 | adjustment to the power cost baseline in the settlement, | 16 | baseline adjustment estimate will be so much less than |
| 17 | is that effectively what is assumed to be already in the | 17 | ten and a half million that it will exceed whatever is |
| 18 | baseline when the October 2020 update arrives or is that | 18 | in the PCAM deferral balance? |
| 19 | an estimate of what the October 2020 update will be? | 19 | MR. BALL: I -- I -- I will ask Mr. Wilding |
| 20 | MR. WILDING: This goes back to one of the | 20 | to answer that question after me, but from Staff's |
| 21 | clarifying points that Mr. Ball made earlier. That's an | 21 | perspective, no. The PCAM balance that exists right now |
| 22 | estimate of what we think the October baseline will be. | 22 | is pretty high. So in order for it to fully exhaust and |
| 23 | Of course, until we get the September price curve and we | 23 | then some, that PCAM deferral balance, it would have to |
| 24 | run the models, we won't exactly know. And then we have | 24 | cause a very large swing in power costs sufficient that |
| 25 | a few other modeling adjustments that we already agreed | 25 | there would be a lot of other questions raised. |
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| 1 | to that we know will upgrade that power cost up, down. | 1 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So this is |
| 2 | And then if it's not at that -- that level at the | 2 | Commissioner Rendahl, and I just got a message from |
| 3 | September baseline, then -- or in the October update, | 3 | Judge O'Connell. He is having technical issues and |
| 4 | sorry, then as Mr. Ball stated, we will use the PCAM | 4 | actually has dropped off, so he's asked that we take our |
| 5 | balance to bring it down to that level agreed to in this | 5 | mourning break right now, and I would say that would |
| 6 | stipulation. | 6 | be -- I would assume is ten minutes sufficient? Come |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So is the -- so is | 7 | back at -- what time is it? Let's say 10:55 we'll come |
| 8 | the other things that have been mentioned such as the | 8 | back on the record. So we'll be off the record. |
| 9 | 1.4 million of black box adjustments, time loss savings, | 9 | (A break was taken from |
| 10 | and reliability cost savings, are those part of the ten | 10 | 10:44 a.m. to 10:56 a.m.) |
| 11 | and a half million dollar estimate or are they in | 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's be back on the |
| 12 | addition to that? | 12 | record. We're back on the record after our morning |
| 13 | MR. WILDING: As part of the ten and a half | 13 | break. It is approximately 10:55 in the morning. |
| 14 | million dollars. | 14 | Let's have questions -- [phone |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And | 15 | interference]. |
| 16 | then, I think, Mr. Ball, you mentioned earlier in your | 16 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Commissioner |
| 17 | prior -- in your previous comments that in the event | 17 | Balasbas, did you finish your line of questioning? |
| 18 | that that ten and a half million dollar estimate is | 18 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I believe I did. I |
| 19 | perhaps less than what it is, then the settlement, my | 19 | think I have one more and then I'm ready to turn it back |
| 20 | understanding, proposes to use what is currently in | 20 | to my colleagues for other questions. |
| 21 | PacifiCorp's PCAM deferral balance to -- to offset that | 21 | So just to finish on the -- actually, no, I |
| 22 | amount? | 22 | think I am done for now and then I will have more later. |
| 23 | MR. BALL: Correct. That's -- the point was | 23 | So I will turn it to my colleagues for other questions |
| 24 | to try and preserve the base rate reduction to the | 24 | on power costs or any other issues. |
| 25 | extent possible by dipping into those funds, but if -- | 25 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you |
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| 1 | have a question? Because I have one, but if you have | 1 | energy, to Washington, and then we look at the load and |
| 2 | one, I'll defer to you. | 2 | resource balance for Washington based on that allocation |
| 3 | CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead, Commissioner. | 3 | and then we make an adjustment to the market purchases |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So related to | 4 | and sales that balance that out. We either -- if |
| 5 | the -- this is still on power costs. In the joint | 5 | Washington has -- has excess energy based on all of its |
| 6 | testimony and in Mr. Wilding's testimony, there are | 6 | resources, then the system sales are adjusted -- or no, |
| 7 | references to net power costs being allocated using a | 7 | excuse me, the system percentages are adjusted, and if |
| 8 | spreadsheet method that reflects assets included in | 8 | too little energy, the system sales are adjusted. |
| 9 | Washington rates, and it also references the grid model | 9 | So we can still tie it back to that fully |
| 10 | to forecast net power costs. So just to clarify terms, | 10 | optimized grid run, but then to do the allocations, we |
| 11 | we've now got the grid model and the Aurora model and | 11 | have to make some adjustments to get to Washington. And |
| 12 | now the spreadsheet method. | 12 | that's the spreadsheet. |
| 13 | So can you explain what is the spreadsheet | 13 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. That is |
| 14 | method and how it interacts with the grid model or | 14 | a -- that's a helpful missing piece. |
| 15 | Aurora and the proposed nodal pricing method? Clearing | 15 | Any -- any further comments from any other |
| 16 | that up would be very helpful. | 16 | witness? |
| 17 | MR. WILDING: Thank you. The spreadsheet | 17 | MR. BALL: This is Jason Ball with |
| 18 | method is -- it existed prior to this case and it was | 18 | Commission Staff. I just want to make sure it's |
| 19 | the way that we allocated our actual net power costs to | 19 | abundantly clear why we have spreadsheet method versus |
| 20 | Washington. And so we -- we modified that a little bit | 20 | nodal pricing method versus grid and all that. So the |
| 21 | and now fit in with the new WIJAM allocation | 21 | grid and spreadsheet method exists because we have to do |
| 22 | methodology, and so maybe -- maybe easiest to explain | 22 | something for 2021. We don't have access right now to |
| 23 | how it was before and then going forward why the change | 23 | the Aurora nodal model and the CAISO dispatch method and |
| 24 | was necessary. | 24 | all that is still being worked out and negotiated with |
| 25 | So prior to using the WIJAM method under the | 25 | the Company. |
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| 1 | WTA method, only -- only the generation assets located | 1 | So once they get that finalized and the |
| 2 | in PacifiCorp's west balance area authority were | 2 | Aurora model finalized, that's -- will come into play in |
| 3 | recognized in Washington rates. And so for pro forma | 3 | the PCORC proceeding next year, but we're not |
| 4 | net power costs in a rate case, what we would do is we | 4 | anticipating that happening until six or eight months |
| 5 | would run the grid model of just the west side of our | 5 | into the rate effective period. So we need something to |
| 6 | system and the west side load. | 6 | fill that gap and the grid and the spreadsheet model are |
| 7 | Now, with the change to WIJAM, we've | 7 | what we have historically used as Mr. Wilding just |
| 8 | incorporated all nonemitting resources into Washington | 8 | stated, modified for the changes under the WIJAM and |
| 9 | rates, and -- and all of the transmission assets as | 9 | that will be used to fill that gap until we can fully |
| 10 | Jason pointed out as well. So now that grid model | 10 | transition to the nodal pricing model. |
| 11 | includes a fully optimized system run of the Company's | 11 | CHAIR DANNER: I think we may have lost |
| 12 | net power cost. And so -- so includes both Pac West and | 12 | Judge O'Connell again. |
| 13 | Pac East balancing area authorities. | 13 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: I'm -- I'm here. |
| 14 | And then we start -- we -- but because of | 14 | CHAIR DANNER: Oh, good, okay. |
| 15 | the WIJAM, not all assets are included in Washington | 15 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So more on power |
| 16 | rates, we take that fully optimized system run from grid | 16 | costs, so for us to figure out exactly what is going on |
| 17 | and then -- then we use the spreadsheet method to | 17 | with power costs before we get to the October update, |
| 18 | allocate it to allocate the net power cost to | 18 | maybe, Mr. Wilding, or any other party, can you identify |
| 19 | Washington. | 19 | where in the settlement or the documents what resources |
| 20 | So this is very similar to the way we used | 20 | are being included in the settlement's calculation of |
| 21 | to start off in actuals with our actual net power cost, | 21 | power cost and if -- and were those the resources that |
| 22 | solar companies power cost to allocate it to Washington. | 22 | were historically allocated to Washington? |
| 23 | And the way that works is we first take the allocation | 23 | MR. WILDING: Yes, one second. I believe |
| 24 | percentage of all the assets that are in Washington | 24 | the -- my testimony -- and I'm just verifying the |
| 25 | rates and allocate those, both the dollars and the | 25 | exhibit. My Exhibit 2, MGW-2, is the WIJAM and that |
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| 1 | specifies that nonemitting resources are system | 1 | as part of our filing in April. |
| 2 | allocated to Washington and then perhaps -- well, the | 2 | So that was the -- the starting point for |
| 3 | other place to look is my MGW-3, which is the Washington | 3 | the negotiations, and then as we -- as the parties |
| 4 | allocated net power cost, and you can see the list of | 4 | worked through the settlement in arriving at that |
| 5 | all resources there. And if there are dollar amounts, | 5 | balance outcome that kept rates flat, and then the -- is |
| 6 | those are allocated to Washington; however, maybe the | 6 | how we got to the baseline for net power cost. So that |
| 7 | easier thing to do might be for the Company to provide a | 7 | included certain modeling adjustments that are in -- |
| 8 | list to the Commission of all the assets that are | 8 | that are identified in the stipulation for the black box |
| 9 | included in Washington rates under the WIJAM. | 9 | settlement and the line loss statements. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think that might be | 10 | Of those, it was based on certain parties' |
| 11 | helpful, and so, Judge O'Connell, for our purposes, I | 11 | analysis of where they think net power costs are going |
| 12 | think a bench -- bench request identifying a specific | 12 | as far as what market prices have been -- have been |
| 13 | listing of the assets in addition to what is in | 13 | doing since the time that we filed the case. And -- and |
| 14 | Mr. Wilding's exhibits would be helpful for identifying | 14 | so the update will include -- useful and used grid model |
| 15 | what is -- what is in power costs as a base before we | 15 | will include those modeling adjustments will improve the |
| 16 | get to the October update. | 16 | black box settlement. And then if it does not get to |
| 17 | And so those -- those were the -- so I guess | 17 | that ten and a half million, that's when we'll use the |
| 18 | what would also be helpful, then, is to update your | 18 | PCAM. And then the grid model will become the basis for |
| 19 | exhibit, and I think you were referring to MGW-3. If | 19 | that, which will then use the spreadsheet method to get |
| 20 | there's anything in the settlement that updates what was | 20 | to the Washington [inaudible] up from the grid model. |
| 21 | in MGW-3 so that we have a clear indication of what | 21 | And then next year we will use the Aurora |
| 22 | might have changed in the settlement for the power | 22 | model that will take into account the CAISO day ahead |
| 23 | costs; does that make sense, Mr. Wilding? | 23 | scheduling that we're currently implementing at the |
| 24 | MR. WILDING: Yes. Yes, we can -- we can | 24 | conclusion that was agreed to in the nodal pricing MOU |
| 25 | provide that. | 25 | as part of 2020. |
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| 1 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. | 1 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank |
| 2 | And I will defer to my colleagues if they | 2 | you. |
| 3 | have other power cost or other questions. | 3 | If anyone has anything to add, if not, I |
| 4 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Before we move on, for the | 4 | will turn the floor back to my colleagues. |
| 5 | benefit of the parties and for our organization, l'm | 5 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you |
| 6 | going to send any -- a list of any bench requests that | 6 | have a question? Because I have a follow-up, not -- to |
| 7 | we make via email to the parties at the conclusion of | 7 | an earlier question that Chair Danner asked about the |
| 8 | this hearing so that the parties are very clear about | 8 | Bridger Coal Company Reclamation Trust Fund. |
| 9 | any bench requests that we ask for during this hearing. | 9 | There's a workshop that is discussed in the |
| 10 | Thank you. | 10 | settlement stipulation at paragraph 27, and just a |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank | 11 | question whether that is a workshop that the parties |
| 12 | you. So maybe this -- I'll start this question to | 12 | expect the Commission will initiate. If not, who's |
| 13 | Mr. Wilding and if Mr. Ball or other parties have any | 13 | going to initiate, what's the -- is it just for the |
| 14 | other comments, please add them. | 14 | parties? A little more detail about that workshop and |
| 15 | So if you could just briefly explain how the | 15 | what's expected from that workshop and when it might |
| 16 | power cost baseline was derived in this settlement and | 16 | take place would be helpful. Thank you. |
| 17 | how that is connected or aligned with the 2020 protocol, | 17 | MR. WILDING: Yeah, thank you. The workshop |
| 18 | the WIJAM, and the nodal pricing method MOU. | 18 | is anticipated to be held in the fall of 2020 for the |
| 19 | MR. WILDING: Yes, thank you. The baseline | 19 | stipulation, and I think PacifiCorp envisions -- I mean, |
| 20 | settlement in this -- sorry, the baseline net power cost | 20 | there's certain things here that -- in the stipulation |
| 21 | in the settlement was a negotiated outcome. The | 21 | that will be addressed about historical contribution to |
| 22 | starting point for those negotiations was the net power | 22 | Bridger Coal Company costs, although their costs are |
| 23 | cost that the Company filed as part of -- of -- we filed | 23 | reflected in rates and in what amount, and the estimated |
| 24 | as part of our direct filing in December and then we had | 24 | remaining of the reclamation costs for Washington |
| 25 | an update with some corrections and some updates in -- | 25 | customers. |
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| 1 | And so those are all things that we -- we've | 1 | Mr. Wilding, these are meetings that you -- your company |
| 2 | already stipulated to -- to cover. I think PacifiCorp, | 2 | is going to convene, this is not a Commission workshop, |
| 3 | we intend to reach out to parties as it gets closer and, | 3 | right? |
| 4 | you know, collaboratively work on the scope of that | 4 | MR. WILDING: That is correct. Unless |
| 5 | workshop, what needs to be -- what questions they have. | 5 | directed otherwise. |
| 6 | We want to make sure that as we're hitting on these | 6 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So I want to change |
| 7 | topics, that we are answering the specific questions, | 7 | the subject a little bit to talk about the production |
| 8 | that we have the right people at the workshop. | 8 | tax credits. |
| 9 | I think the -- the stipulation does agree | 9 | PacifiCorp's testimony talks about PTCs as a |
| 10 | that the workshop is with parties, and so PacifiCorp | 10 | benefit -- as one of the benefits of the WIJAM, but, |
| 11 | could take the lead to get that scheduled with parties; | 11 | Mr. Kaufman, you stated some concerns about the |
| 12 | however, I don't think we would be opposed if that's | 12 | expiration of these. I was wondering if you can expand |
| 13 | something that the Commission wanted to attend and turn | 13 | on that a little bit. |
| 14 | into a Commissioner workshop. The Company would not be | 14 | MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, the -- the concern is -- |
| 15 | opposed to that, but absent that requirement, it would | 15 | is just related to the -- the magnitude of the impact of |
| 16 | be something that the Company would work with the | 16 | the expiration, and in addition to that, there is a |
| 17 | parties to facilitate and to accomplish this. | 17 | number -- other components associated with the cost, but |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And -- and is the -- | 18 | I expect that to change substantially over the next few |
| 19 | the intent to have all six states represented or is this | 19 | years. For example, the large depreciation expense will |
| 20 | just a Washington-specific workshop that PacifiCorp will | 20 | be drawing down rates substantially, and so we just |
| 21 | be organizing similar to maybe some of the protocol | 21 | wanted to keep the door open to carefully review the |
| 22 | meetings that it has organized? | 22 | issue and assure that one-off type of rate treatment is |
| 23 | MR. WILDING: Yes, it will be a Washington | 23 | appropriate there. |
| 24 | only workshop. This is not intended to be an all | 24 | CHAIR DANNER: But you're not saying this is |
| 25 | six-state party workshop. This is just for Washington. | 25 | so substantial that it would offset the benefits of the |
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| 1 | And not that these won't be addressed based on these | 1 | PTC? |
| 2 | same issues, will obviously be discussed in the | 2 | MR. KAUFMAN: I don't have a -- I guess a |
| 3 | multistate process with parties, but for purposes of | 3 | specific -- specific numbers in mind or whether -- |
| 4 | this stipulation, there will be a Washington only | 4 | whether there's an offset one way or the other, which |
| 5 | workshop on this. | 5 | one would be greater in terms of change of cost and then |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And this is | 6 | the removal of the PTCs. I'm not sure if I totally |
| 7 | just for this one specific issue, there are no other | 7 | understand your question, whether you're asking about |
| 8 | issues in the settlement that are also going to be | 8 | the changes in the revenue requirement that time or the |
| 9 | discussed or is it a larger issue than just the | 9 | benefits of the PTCs currently. |
| 10 | reclamation issue? | 10 | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I was just referring to |
| 11 | MR. WILDING: There are other items where we | 11 | your testimony where you said given the number of PTCs |
| 12 | have agreed to, you know, work with parties | 12 | acquired, both the repowering and through the EP 2020 |
| 13 | collaboratively to -- such as power costs. And before | 13 | projects, the costs are likely to be substantial. And |
| 14 | we filed the -- the PCORC, that we would meet with | 14 | cost increases attributed to the large amount of PTCs |
| 15 | parties to work collaboratively, fair, and things that | 15 | expiring in ten years should be recovered in a rate |
| 16 | we've talked about, you know, trading and transparency | 16 | case. And I'm just trying to figure out what kind of |
| 17 | and data pitfalls. But this is just specifically for | 17 | magnitude possible we're talking about here. |
| 18 | the Bridge Coal Reclamation cost, this workshop. | 18 | MR. KAUFMAN: Chairman, I would have to |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But there will | 19 | apologize, I don't have the -- the number off the top of |
| 20 | be other workshops related to -- or other meetings | 20 | my head as -- as to the annual dollar impact that the |
| 21 | related to preparing for the October update and other | 21 | production tax credit. The main -- the main -- or the |
| 22 | issues in the settlement that still need to be resolved? | 22 | general concern is, is that when the PTCs expire, there |
| 23 | MR. WILDING: Yes. | 23 | may be an associated cost increase associated with those |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. | 24 | expirations, but at that time, there will also have been |
| 25 | CHAIR DANNER: And -- and just to be clear, | 25 | a lot of other changes to PacifiCorp's operation. |
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| 1 | And to the extent that PacifiCorp requests a | 1 | mechanism in place now, the PTC tracker, for those |
| 2 | reprieve associated with the expiration, it would be | 2 | benefits to flow through. So as far as knowing there's |
| 3 | appropriate to apply that rate increase or investigate | 3 | a path into the cost of benefits, there is an interplay, |
| 4 | that rate increase within the context of a general rate | 4 | but I don't expect the PTC tracker to be a big part of |
| 5 | case. And I can get back to you if you want on the | 5 | that limited issue. |
| 6 | question of magnitude for the expiration of the PTCs. | 6 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. All right. |
| 7 | MR. WILDING: Chair Danner, perhaps I can | 7 | Thank you. And then just to -- just to clarify that, |
| 8 | jump in. [Inaudible] opening testimony shows that on | 8 | the -- there is -- the proposed tracker would be an |
| 9 | the WIJAM allocation methodology of Washington customers | 9 | annual true-up on June 15th of each year; is that |
| 10 | are -- are allocated to $\$ 119$ million of PTC benefits. | 10 | correct? |
| 11 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thanks. | 11 | MR. WILDING: Yes, that is correct. |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So | 12 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. |
| 13 | following -- following up on questions related to PTCs, | 13 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So just concerning |
| 14 | the settlement agreement talks about surcharges, | 14 | the energy vision 2020 projects and the -- the COVID-19 |
| 15 | potential surcharges of PTCs. Is this more of a timing | 15 | pandemic, has there been any impact on the projects that |
| 16 | issue related to the fact that the PTCs -- the benefits | 16 | are not already in service? Has the pandemic impacted |
| 17 | of the PTCs are being put into rates in advance of | 17 | the expected late 2020 completion dates? And if so, to |
| 18 | knowing and because some of this is hardly subject to | 18 | what extent beyond the Q4 completion dates are we |
| 19 | refund? Is that what is meant by potential surcharge of | 19 | anticipating these projects to go into service? |
| 20 | PTCs? And I will maybe start with Mr. Wilding and if | 20 | MR. WILDING: Yeah, that's a great question, |
| 21 | Mr. Ball or any of the other parties want to comment on | 21 | and that information is being constantly updated and |
| 22 | that, please go ahead. | 22 | being updated every day. We have -- so maybe I will |
| 23 | MR. WILDING: Thank you. The -- the | 23 | just run through the projects. |
| 24 | settlement implements a PTC tracker, a production tax | 24 | Cedar Springs turned out expected to be |
| 25 | credit tracker, and so what that means is that customers | 25 | online as anticipated at the end of the year. Ekola is |
|  | Page 156 |  | Page 158 |
| 1 | will receive the actual PTC benefits that are produced | 1 | also expected to be online as well as TB Flats 1. And |
| 2 | by the wind release. So if the wind is -- is favorable | 2 | that now leaves TB Flats 2 and then Pryor Mountain. |
| 3 | in a -- in a certain area or we produce more than what | 3 | And -- and l'll just -- before I talk about those two, |
| 4 | we forecast in this case, those PTCs will be passed back | 4 | I'll get back to all of the repowering is also either |
| 5 | to customers as a reduction to their rate. And if the | 5 | already online or expected to be online by the end of |
| 6 | wind in the reverse history is still symmetrical, so if | 6 | the year. |
| 7 | the wind is less than what we forecast, those -- there | 7 | So TB Flats 2 and Pryor Mountain, we did |
| 8 | would be a surcharge to -- to customers based on the | 8 | experience some delays with asbestos and the |
| 9 | fact that benefits and base rates are greater than the | 9 | components -- delivery of the components of the wind |
| 10 | actual benefits. | 10 | turbine. We've worked through those where we will have |
| 11 | And this -- so this allows for customers to | 11 | all of the parts, and now we are working with our -- our |
| 12 | receive the actual PTCs based on the actual fluctuation | 12 | balance of plan contractor to come up with a new |
| 13 | in the generation from the wind and then also allows to | 13 | schedule to get those plants online. |
| 14 | capture any changes in the PTC rates that may occur | 14 | And so we don't have final estimates yet as |
| 15 | between rate cases. | 15 | we're continuing to work with that contractor, but we |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And so does the -- | 16 | are estimating that there could potentially be some |
| 17 | okay. So then do you expect this to be addressed as | 17 | delays into 2021 for Pryor Mountain and TB Flats 2. |
| 18 | part of the limited rate filing? | 18 | But like I said, that's kind of evolving |
| 19 | MR. WILDING: The limited rate filing -- the | 19 | daily and -- and so as -- they'll have all of the |
| 20 | production tax credit tracker is part of this | 20 | information. We don't have all of the information yet |
| 21 | stipulation; however, there -- there could be some | 21 | as we're continuing to work with contractors and -- and |
| 22 | interplay with the limited rate filing if one of the | 22 | finalize a schedule. |
| 23 | wind assets -- or if there's any change to what is | 23 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So would then that |
| 24 | allowed in the rates, then the cost and benefits and | 24 | have an impact on the production credits associated with |
| 25 | those benefits would -- could flow through. We have the | 25 | those resources? |
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| 1 | our concern with establishing a cost allocation | 1 | we've been -- at the time, they were still -- there was |
| 2 | methodology that meets the Commission's prior standards | 2 | I believe when we were doing these negotiations that was |
| 3 | for how cost allocations need to occur in Washington. | 3 | prior to some Commission workshops on equity, so there |
| 4 | So it wasn't just about here's this new | 4 | was a lot of uncertainty around how that would work and |
| 5 | renewable obligation, this new law we have to comply | 5 | how that would operate. |
| 6 | with, it was also we have an existing standard that the | 6 | So we weren't -- we weren't focused in on |
| 7 | WCA meets, this new methodology has to continue to meet | 7 | that component so much as just the -- just the |
| 8 | that standard. | 8 | generation and the resource portfolio piece, but there |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Mr. Ball and | 9 | was -- as you mentioned, there are other aspects of |
| 10 | Mr. Wilding, when -- and any other party who wishes to | 10 | CETA, for instance, resource adequacy and viability, and |
| 11 | weigh in, as you were constructing the settlement and | 11 | one of the big pieces of the 2020 protocol is how the |
| 12 | talking about the CETA benefits, were you just simply | 12 | Company is going to plan to meet those obligations and |
| 13 | looking at the renewable nonemitting resource | 13 | what steps it takes to plan to meet state specific |
| 14 | requirements or were there other elements of CETA that | 14 | requirements. And we believe that the WIJAM was an |
| 15 | you were also contemplating as providing benefits to | 15 | enabling factor to continue those negotiations under the |
| 16 | Washington from -- from this settlement? | 16 | 2020 protocol. |
| 17 | MR. BALL: This is Jason again. I will take | 17 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. |
| 18 | a first whack at that. We were looking at it from a | 18 | Mr. Wilding, do you have anything to add? |
| 19 | total portfolio perspective, which is that the | 19 | MR. WILDING: No, no, I -- I agree with what |
| 20 | combination of transmission access across all | 20 | Mr. Ball has stated there and he summarized it well. |
| 21 | PacifiCorp's service territory gives us access to | 21 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And any other party |
| 22 | potential new sites for a new plant if that is required | 22 | have any other thoughts on this topic? Okay. Thank |
| 23 | to meet Washington compliance. | 23 | you. |
| 24 | The new assignment of nonemitting resources | 24 | So I have a question about the discussion of |
| 25 | gives us a greater share of plant that we believe could | 25 | the transmission allocation and specifically the |
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| 1 | meet compliance obligations under CETA. And the WIJAM | 1 | testimony talking about the Company presenting a method |
| 2 | sets up a -- a -- or positions the cost allocation | 2 | for excluding the cost and benefits of all transmission |
| 3 | framework in such a way that it can enable further | 3 | voltage radio lines connecting resources not otherwise |
| 4 | negotiations under the 2020 protocol, whereas if we had | 4 | included in Washington rates to PacifiCorp's |
| 5 | continued with the WCA allocation, certain components of | 5 | interconnected network transmission system. It was |
| 6 | the 2020 protocol, for instance, I believe the Chairman | 6 | at -- starting at page 17 and going to page 18. |
| 7 | mentioned the Chehalis transfer, would have been much | 7 | So, I guess, Mr. Wilding, can you explain to |
| 8 | more difficult under the historic WCA allocations. | 8 | us what -- what is meant by the radio lines? What do |
| 9 | So it was the combination of multiple | 9 | you -- how do you define "radio lines"? |
| 10 | factors, and they were all -- I would argue not any one | 10 | MR. WILDING: Yes, thank you. And in this |
| 11 | was weighted more than the other, it was a truly | 11 | piece of the WIJAM, what we're trying to identify there |
| 12 | portfolio approach. | 12 | is there are still certain generation assets that are |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I guess | 13 | not in Washington, like our thermal fleet on -- it seems |
| 14 | I will ask specifically, there are other provisions with | 14 | like our thermal fleet on the east side of our service. |
| 15 | CETA that are unrelated to resource acquisition or -- or | 15 | However, transmission costs are system |
| 16 | resource mixed portfolio, and so were the parties | 16 | allocated, but we've identified or we need to identify |
| 17 | looking at all at the provisions of Subsection 040, sub | 17 | any lines that -- whose sole purpose is to connect that |
| 18 | 8 , which are the, you know, equitable distribution of | 18 | thermal unit that is not included in Washington rates to |
| 19 | benefits, was -- was that a part of it or was it really | 19 | the larger transmission system. And if there are lines |
| 20 | primarily the resource mix, resource portfolio issues | 20 | that that is their sole purpose. That is what we're |
| 21 | that the parties were discussing when they mentioned | 21 | trying to identify here, and that's what we're -- what |
| 22 | CETA benefits and CETA compliance? | 22 | we're talking about. |
| 23 | MR. BALL: From Staff's perspective, I | 23 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So if I can |
| 24 | believe it was primarily the portfolio and the resource | 24 | paraphrase, maybe this is -- these are lines in the Pac |
| 25 | components. The equity -- the questions around equity, | 25 | East balancing area that serve the Pac East load, but |
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| 1 | don't contribute to transfer capability of the Pac East | 1 | in your direct testimony that the Jim Bridger and |
| 2 | system; is that another way to describe it? | 2 | Colstrip depreciation rates will be allocated to |
| 3 | MR. WILDING: No, not necessarily, because | 3 | Washington customers and will continue to be allocated |
| 4 | the transmission system provides benefits for the entire | 4 | on a WCA basis; is that correct? |
| 5 | system, allows us to move energy back and forth that, as | 5 | MR. WILDING: That is correct. |
| 6 | you pointed out, but there are certain lines that, for | 6 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And in |
| 7 | example, may -- their sole purpose may just be to | 7 | the settlement, it has -- includes Jim Bridger and |
| 8 | connect that generating resource to the larger | 8 | Colstrip depreciation accelerated to December 31, 2023. |
| 9 | transmission system. And then once it gets on that | 9 | And my question -- couple of questions related to that. |
| 10 | transmission system, then we say that transmission | 10 | First, hypothetically, if those two plants are |
| 11 | system provides benefits to the entirety of PacifiCorp's | 11 | reassigned to other states after the Washington share is |
| 12 | system. | 12 | fully depreciated, are we talking about just fully |
| 13 | But to the extent that a line's sole purpose | 13 | depreciating Washington share of those assets? |
| 14 | is to connect a thermal resource and PacifiCorp be | 14 | MR. WILDING: In Washington rates, yes. |
| 15 | [inaudible] to the transmission, then that's -- that's | 15 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So -- so |
| 16 | what we're describing here in this part of the WIJAM and | 16 | could you maybe talk about, then, how it's in the public |
| 17 | in this testimony. | 17 | interest for Washington customers to pay accelerated |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So -- so will | 18 | depreciation if those plants are reassigned to other |
| 19 | the incremental cost of those lines be subject to refund | 19 | states in the future? |
| 20 | in Washington rates once this is all sorted out? | 20 | MR. WILDING: Well, l'll say first -- couple |
| 21 | MR. WILDING: Yes. | 21 | things, but first I want to point out Jim Bridger is a |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Okay. So | 22 | four-unit coal plant. Jim Bridger 1 will be closing |
| 23 | currently under the WCA formula, Washington pays about | 23 | December 31, 2023. That's the current date anticipated |
| 24 | 22 percent of the costs of the Jim Bridger transmission | 24 | in the 2019 IRP. And so that aligns well with what we |
| 25 | assets, correct? | 25 | have in Washington rates. |
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| 1 | MR. WILDING: That's correct. | 1 | And then as far as the 2023, the other piece |
| 2 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So under the | 2 | of that is, it is two years earlier than required by |
| 3 | WIJAM formula, it appears Washington will pay 8 percent | 3 | CETA, which requires coal to be out of Washington rates |
| 4 | of the total Pac East transmission costs. So under the | 4 | by December 31, 2025. And so we, of course, will remove |
| 5 | settlement, is Washington still paying 22 percent of the | 5 | those out of Washington rates no later than that date as |
| 6 | Jim Bridger transmission costs or will it pay based on | 6 | stated by CETA. |
| 7 | the WIJAM formula? | 7 | And then as far as it being in the public |
| 8 | MR. WILDING: So based on the WIJAM. So all | 8 | interest, this allows flexibility with the portfolio as |
| 9 | transmission is now system allocated, so it's | 9 | we move forward in the NSP negotiations and on |
| 10 | approximately 8 percent of all transmission costs are | 10 | negotiation reassignment and realignment of the other |
| 11 | allocated to Washington. | 11 | cases -- or with the other states, excuse me. And it's |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So then the | 12 | in the public interest because Washington customers have |
| 13 | rates proposed in this settlement reflect that cost | 13 | benefitted from the Jim Bridger and Colstrip plant over |
| 14 | of -- of rolling in the transmission costs in the | 14 | its useful life. The useful life for Washington, it |
| 15 | eastern part of the system that previously hadn't been | 15 | will be no later than 2025 or perhaps 2023 depending on |
| 16 | reflected in the WCA, correct? | 16 | how things shake out in -- in negotiations and with |
| 17 | MR. WILDING: That is correct. | 17 | realignment there, but it is -- yeah, Washington |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So over the | 18 | customers have benefitted from these plants, and it is |
| 19 | three-year period of the settlement -- l'll stop. I'll | 19 | in the public interest that they -- they pay the cost |
| 20 | stop there for now. | 20 | and as they receive those benefits forward. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I'd like to -- I'd | 21 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Go ahead, Mr. Ball. |
| 22 | like to switch topics here and talk about the | 22 | MR. BALL: Thank you. I would just like to |
| 23 | accelerated depreciation and the exit order components | 23 | add that it -- let's assume that we get to 2023 and we |
| 24 | that are included in the settlement. | 24 | don't have a negotiation -- but we don't have an |
| 25 | So, Mr. Wilding, I just want to confirm that | 25 | agreement about a new protocol. Well, then what has |
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| 1 | happened is Washington has just -- Washington customers | 1 | MR. WILDING: I -- I wonder if you can |
| 2 | have paid for their -- historically their allocated | 2 | clarify for me exactly what you mean by -- by |
| 3 | share of those plants and they're two years ahead of | 3 | "liability." I just want to make sure I understand. |
| 4 | schedule. And either the Company's going to close them | 4 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Well, so -- so let's |
| 5 | down because that's what their IRP says to do or they -- | 5 | assume for the moment that that -- the December 31, 2023 |
| 6 | we wait two years and we get undepreciated power. | 6 | date is when Washington customers would fully depreciate |
| 7 | If, however, we have negotiated through | 7 | their value and share of Jim Bridger and Colstrip, and |
| 8 | in -- through that 2020 protocol something to do with | 8 | those are then, for sake of argument, here no longer in |
| 9 | those plants, for instance, transferring those plants to | 9 | Washington rates. So are customers then liable for any |
| 10 | another state, the depreciation reserve is absolutely | 10 | decommissioning and remediation costs that would be |
| 11 | part of that negotiation. And so whatever new | 11 | incurred after that date? |
| 12 | allocation protocol is presented to the Commission for | 12 | MR. WILDING: And I'm sorry to -- to think |
| 13 | approval, it will discuss here's the plant value we | 13 | about this and to pause a minute. I just want to -- |
| 14 | transferred and here's the depreciation value | 14 | maybe I can answer it this way. The Washington |
| 15 | transferred and here's what we got in return. And you | 15 | customers will be liable for any decommissioning costs, |
| 16 | will absolutely be able to make a judgment at that point | 16 | for actual decommissioning costs subject to a prudence |
| 17 | whether thought -- whether you think we got a good deal | 17 | review. |
| 18 | and whether that deal is in the public interest. | 18 | Maybe the best example I could -- could |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank | 19 | think of is, is maybe after -- after Washington |
| 20 | you. Thank you for that. I appreciate that | 20 | customers quit using that plant and that plant is |
| 21 | clarification. | 21 | removed from Washington rates, maybe there's new costs |
| 22 | So, Mr. Wilding, just to confirm, that if | 22 | that -- new requirements and no, Washington customers |
| 23 | the Commission approves the settlement and the proposed | 23 | would not be responsible for those -- for those new |
| 24 | accelerated depreciation dates for Jim Bridger and | 24 | requirements. They would only be responsible for the |
| 25 | Colstrip, that would constitute under the 2020 protocol | 25 | actual requirements at the time that they -- based on |
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| 1 | an exit order by this Commission; is that correct? | 1 | benefits. |
| 2 | MR. WILDING: Yes, approval of this | 2 | CHAIR DANNER: So -- so this is Dave Danner. |
| 3 | settlement would approve the 2020 protocol, which then | 3 | Just to be clear, so if there -- let's say there are |
| 4 | establishes an exit order and starts the process for | 4 | unknown liabilities that become apparent five years |
| 5 | other states to look at and consider any potential | 5 | after 2023 and those are so great that they exceed |
| 6 | reassignment or realignment of the stipulation. | 6 | what's available in the trust fund, are you going to be |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So then does | 7 | coming back to Washington ratepayers to fund that |
| 8 | Washington -- or do Washington customers then remain | 8 | remediation that's unknown to us at this time? |
| 9 | liable for any decommissioning and remediation costs | 9 | MR. WILDING: I think it depends on the why |
| 10 | related to the generation from those plants after that | 10 | those were unknown. Were they unknown because it's a |
| 11 | exit order date? | 11 | new regulation or is it -- was that unknown because when |
| 12 | MR. WILDING: My -- the settlement and my | 12 | we dug into the ground to remove the coal pile of the |
| 13 | testimony outlines the balancing account for which the | 13 | Jim Bridger plant, we had to dig three feet deeper than |
| 14 | decommissioning costs will be tracked and reevaluated at | 14 | we had anticipated before. So I think the answer is I |
| 15 | each rate case, will be updated for actual | 15 | don't know. It depends on -- on maybe why those were |
| 16 | decommissioning costs. And then once those actual | 16 | unknown and -- and that would be a -- something that we |
| 17 | decommissioning costs are -- are known, then Staff and | 17 | would need to -- to evaluate in the future. |
| 18 | parties will be able to review those, Commission will be | 18 | But the WIJAM and my understanding in CETA |
| 19 | able to review those for prudence at that time, but we | 19 | is that Washington customers would be responsible for |
| 20 | will -- we will establish a balancing account to track | 20 | the actual closure costs of coal plants. |
| 21 | those. | 21 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So I take that answer |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. I understand | 22 | as yes, it's possible that there could be new |
| 23 | that. But I guess what I'm asking is, what is | 23 | liabilities in the future that you would come back to |
| 24 | Washington -- or what is Washington's cutoff date for | 24 | us? |
| 25 | liability for decommissioning and remediation costs? | 25 | MR. WILDING: Yes, in a future date and, of |
|  |  |  | 23 (Pages 171 to 174) |
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| 1 | CHAIR DANNER: Turn to page 63 if you would. | 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 | CHAIR DANNER: And you'll see on this page, | 3 | 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 | changed to step eight and step nine for calculating the | 5 | 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 | So why is it appropriate or why are you | 12 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yes, I can. Thank |
| 13 | adjusting for nonbased adjustments scheduled in the new | 13 | you, Mr. Meredith. |
| 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 Ithink your question -- maybe you |
| 16 | want to read this. | 16 | can rephrase that again. It was around just the |
| 17 | CHAIR DANNER: Sure, it's line 16 through | 17 | interactions between the time of use pilots and the |
| 18 | 18. | 18 | decoupling mechanism; is that -- |
| 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 | get to the correct level of revenue to account for the | 21 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, thank you. |
| 22 | actual revenues received by the Company. And so | 22 | Sorry, let me interrupt you, Mr. Meredith. |
| 23 | that's -- that's the motivation and the reasoning for | 23 | Will you please raise your right hand wherever you are? |
| 24 | the changes here. | 24 | (Robert Meredith sworn.) |
| 25 | CHAIR DANNER: So the current -- the current | 25 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. And would you |
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| 1 | methodology does not capture that and -- and so do | 1 | please identify yourself, your name, position, who you |
| 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 |
| 5 | what we are -- are proposing in this settlement. | 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. |
| 7 | want to weigh in on that? | 7 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you very |
| 8 | MR. BALL: This is Jason. I -- I fully | 8 | 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 | potential impact that could occur from any one of the | 11 | wondering why we wanted to have the decoupling mechanism |
| 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 | we're just trying to make sure that the revenue that is | 13 | 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 |
| 16 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, yeah, I think we | 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 | question is, why is the Company proposing to include the | 22 | proposing instead is to actually get that actual |
| 23 | time of use pilot schedules in the decoupling | 23 | revenue. And that's why we're removing those items that |
| 24 | mechanisms? | 24 | are not related to actual revenue and getting to that |
| 25 | MR. WILDING: Some of these more technical | 25 | actual base revenue, so that way it corrects for a |
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| 1 | number of things. Not only the time of use pilots or | 1 | fair question. I think that putting them in the |
| 2 | anything could be part of it, but just how actual | 2 | decoupling mechanism gives the Company the right |
| 3 | revenue may vary within an actual year. This could be, | 3 | incentives to encourage them and get customers to |
| 4 | you know, higher load factor or low -- lower load | 4 | participate without having to take -- and I'm not saying |
| 5 | factor, a commercial customer, for example, or it could | 5 | that we would take this per se, but, you know, being |
| 6 | be, you know, just a result of different types of | 6 | more threatened by time of use pilots or time bearing |
| 7 | customers using energy differently and incurring actual | 7 | rate options. |
| 8 | charges that are different than what the actual was that | 8 | I think just in general across this history, |
| 9 | was set in the base period. | 9 | I think that if there isn't something like this in |
| 10 | And from the discussions with Staff, this is | 10 | place, I think a lot of utilities just historically have |
| 11 | my understanding is that this would be an improvement to | 11 | been very conservative and very, quite frankly, |
| 12 | what we're doing right now, and so it is in response to | 12 | concerned about the revenue impacts of time of use |
| 13 | discussions that l've had with Staff in the past about | 13 | pricing. And I think there's a lot of great potential |
| 14 | ways to make the decoupling mechanism more accurate than | 14 | with -- with time of use and with getting customer |
| 15 | it is right now. | 15 | behavioral changes. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So I | 16 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. So I |
| 17 | understand all that, Mr. Meredith, and thank you for | 17 | want to address the question -- I'm sorry, go ahead. |
| 18 | that. But how does including the time of use pilot | 18 | MR. BALL: I was just wondering if I |
| 19 | address that issue you just talked about? | 19 | could -- |
| 20 | MR. MEREDITH: Yeah, so I think, then, if | 20 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Well, Mr. Ball, I |
| 21 | there are -- let's say that we do have a bunch of | 21 | was actually about to address the same question to you |
| 22 | customers adopt time of use, which is -- is our hope, | 22 | and also to either Mr. Dahl or Mr. Earle from Public |
| 23 | is that it does have a decent level of participation and | 23 | Counsel why you are supporting inclusion of time of use |
| 24 | customers are able to move their energy consumption to | 24 | as a decoupling mechanism. |
| 25 | off peak periods. What we would see then is that that | 25 | MR. BALL: I read your mind. |
|  | Page 188 |  | Page 190 |
| 1 | actual revenue would be -- would be -- would be less, | 1 | So from Staff's perspective, the primary |
| 2 | okay? And so making sure that the -- it's truly | 2 | purpose of the time of use pilot is to measure the |
| 3 | capturing the actual revenue, it would more accurately | 3 | potential price that -- the potential that price signals |
| 4 | reflect what the Company's revenue collected was during | 4 | have for encouraging and incentivizing consumer behavior |
| 5 | the decoupling period. | 5 | that reduces peak and contributes to better load curves |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So I -- but my | 6 | and lower overall system costs. A key component of that |
| 7 | understanding of the settlement is that the number of | 7 | price signal is a decoupling mechanism because we're |
| 8 | people in the residen- -- at least in the residential | 8 | operating under the assumption that the decoupling |
| 9 | time of use pilot is capped, I believe, at 500 | 9 | mechanism will continue. |
| 10 | customers; is that correct? | 10 | And in regards of whether we have 500 |
| 11 | MR. MEREDITH: It is. So that is a fairly | 11 | customers or 5,000 or 50,000 customers, that's not |
| 12 | limited amount, but we also have an irrigation pilot. | 12 | necessarily true. It could be that ten years from now |
| 13 | We also have a nonresidential pilot as well. And so | 13 | or five years from now the Commission rolls back the |
| 14 | there is -- there are caps, but I think there's still -- | 14 | decoupling mechanism for PacifiCorp. But in the event |
| 15 | you know, that's only -- and I don't know what the | 15 | that it doesn't, that piece is still a really important |
| 16 | magnitude of this is, but it -- it would affect the | 16 | component of the overall price signal that those |
| 17 | Company's revenue. | 17 | customers need to have in order to make sure that we |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So -- so I | 18 | understand how effective the program is. |
| 19 | understand that all three time of use pilot programs | 19 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Then I |
| 20 | have a cap in them, but I guess my -- my -- my question | 20 | will ask the same question of Public Counsel, why -- why |
| 21 | still remains is, why not -- why not exclude the time of | 21 | you are supporting inclusion of time of use -- the time |
| 22 | use pilot until those pilots are concluded and then we | 22 | of use pilot in the decoupling mechanism. |
| 23 | can talk about whether they should be included in the | 23 | MR. DAHL: Yeah, this is Corey Dahl. I |
| 24 | decoupling mechanism at that point instead of now? | 24 | would say as a general matter, the decoupling component |
| 25 | MR. MEREDITH: Sure. I think that's a very | 25 | of the settlement and more specifically the time of use |
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| 1 | pilot was not one of the major issues that we looked at | 1 | sounds like the details for this pilot will be fleshed |
| 2 | in terms of our petition to join the settlement. As I | 2 | out as time goes on. |
| 3 | indicated in testimony, you know, we view the settlement | 3 | But it seems particularly there's very |
|  | as a complete package and in the public interest. So | 4 | little there in the settlement about how many low income |
| 5 | that's -- that's just as, you know, a general statement. | 5 | or vulnerable customers are going to be included, how to |
| 6 | And, you know, the incorporating time of use | 6 | identify, what the outreach is, all of those various |
| 7 | pilot in the decoupling mechanism, you know, we want to | 7 | questions, which you have keyed up before. |
| 8 | understand more about the impact of that type of rate | 8 | So maybe you can -- is it the expectation |
| 9 | design on customer behavior before it's implemented on a | 9 | that that will all be developed before this goes live |
| 10 | broader scale. But I guess the bigger takeaway from the | 10 | and will that be shared with the Commission? So those |
| 11 | answer is just, you know, our view is looking at the | 11 | are some of the questions I have. |
| 12 | settlement as a whole versus, you know, one -- one small | 12 | MR. BALL: I think these are excellent |
| 13 | component. | 13 | questions and -- and I can't speak for the Company in |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank | 14 | terms of what they were -- how they were interpreting |
| 15 | you. And then one last question on this and maybe l'll | 15 | this, but the way Staff was interpreting it was we would |
| 16 | pose this one to Mr. Ball. You touched on this a little | 16 | work with the Company to set up those evaluation |
| 17 | bit in your answer just a few minutes ago. But l'm | 17 | protocols ahead of time, and we would absolutely share |
| 18 | wondering, what other factors should we be looking at as | 18 | them with the Commission and say this is the way we |
| 19 | we evaluate the time of use pilot particularly if it is | 19 | believe this program should be evaluated. |
| 20 | included in the decoupling mechanism? | 20 | And vulnerable populations was absolutely a |
| 21 | MR. BALL: Do you mean -- let me make sure I | 21 | key element of that and was identified not just by Staff |
| 22 | understand your question -- in general or as it relates | 22 | but by other groups in the settlement discussion as a |
| 23 | to decoupling? | 23 | key component of approving the time of use -- settling |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: I would -- I would | 24 | on the time of use projects. |
| 25 | say both. If you could talk about what factors we | 25 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. But not |
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| 1 | should be evaluating both in general and also | 1 | just -- and I will get to you, Shawn, in just a minute, |
| 2 | specifically as if it's part of the decoupling | 2 | Mr. Collins. But it doesn't appear that the settlement |
| 3 | mechanism. | 3 | identifies how many low income or vulnerable customers |
| 4 | MR. BALL: If it's part of the decoupling | 4 | are intended to be targeted, what percent of the 500. |
| 5 | mechanism, I think one of the key components to examine | 5 | So not just the evaluation and, you know, review |
| 6 | with regards to the time of use is what the response was | 6 | protocols, but what are -- what is the actual structure |
| 7 | in relation to the price signal and what the effect it | 7 | of the program going forward? There's not very much in |
| 8 | was on the different types of -- of customer groups. | 8 | the settlement. |
| 9 | Especially when it comes to residential, we want to be | 9 | So that question is not only for Staff and |
| 10 | especially focused on vulnerable populations and, for | 10 | the other stakeholders but also the Company in terms of |
| 11 | instance, low income groups to understand how time of | 11 | whether that information will be forthcoming in terms of |
| 12 | use is benefitting them and whether or not it's | 12 | what the outreach planning is. It's clear it's a great |
| 13 | benefitting them. | 13 | idea, but we need more than that. And so that's my |
| 14 | And so it's a combination of both program | 14 | query to all of you. |
| 15 | design and program evaluation that yields this -- yields | 15 | And, Mr. Collins, you were about to say |
| 16 | a good overall pilot project, and I believe the | 16 | something. |
| 17 | stipulation actually outlined that Staff is going to | 17 | MR. COLLINS: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner |
| 18 | work with the Company over the next few months to come | 18 | Rendahl. Shawn Collins with The Energy Project here. I |
| 19 | up with certain evaluation protocols so that there would | 19 | just want to make a note that as we understand it, this |
| 20 | be more certainty about how the program was ultimately | 20 | will be an opt-in program for time of use, and it was a |
| 21 | judged. | 21 | concern for us that low income individuals and other |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm glad to hear | 22 | vulnerable communities were identified up front because |
| 23 | you refer to that because in prior testimony in the | 23 | we do -- we're interested to see how it impacts those |
| 24 | prior proceeding, you had some ideas about how to go | 24 | specific customers and agree that the -- the pilot |
| 25 | forward with setting up pilots and reporting, and so it | 25 | lacked clarity in terms of what all of those specific |
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| 1 | outreach mechanisms and recruitment will look like. And | 1 | protocols were not finished before the program started. |
| 2 | I expect that as part of a advisory committee member, | 2 | So at least from Staff's perspective, the way we meant |
| 3 | that will be consulted with that as it's developed. But | 3 | it was we would work with them before the tariff program |
| 4 | certainly don't want to speak for the Company there, but | 4 | began. |
| 5 | just share that we have similar concerns and also, you | 5 | MR. WILDING: I think the Company is also |
| 6 | know, within the scope of the settlement, comfort level | 6 | comfortable with that as well. I think that's in the |
| 7 | that those customer types will -- will be specifically | 7 | spirit of the stipulation. |
| 8 | identified. | 8 | MR. DAHL: This is Corey Dahl. I'll just, |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So maybe, | 9 | you know, echo what the other parties have indicated, |
| 10 | Mr. Wilding, you can talk to the specifics or the intent | 10 | but from Public Counsel's perspective, in the way we've |
| 11 | and how this is going to be developed going forward and | 11 | looked at time of use pilots in the past, you know, the |
| 12 | then if there are any other parties who wish to comment. | 12 | program design up front is just as important as the |
| 13 | MR. WILDING: Yes, the stipulation does | 13 | criteria used in the evaluation. And we know the -- the |
| 14 | support the Company's proposed pilot program as outlined | 14 | discussion that we've been having amongst stakeholders |
| 15 | in Mr. Meredith's testimony; however, as Mr. Ball | 15 | for many years about whether or not time of use is a |
| 16 | indicated, we have agreed to work collaboratively with | 16 | rate design that's worth exploring and piloting, you |
| 17 | parties, and as Mr. Collins indicated as well, over the | 17 | know, the same concerns about vulnerable populations |
| 18 | next two months. And that is something that we're happy | 18 | have come up. |
| 19 | to report back to the Commission as we make progress, | 19 | So, you know, we'll want to be sure that |
| 20 | but I also would let -- maybe Mr. Meredith might have | 20 | those considerations are not only included in the |
| 21 | further insight or further commentary on that if that's | 21 | evaluation of program design that's going to require the |
| 22 | okay with you, Commissioner Rendahl. | 22 | Company to work collaboratively with stakeholders, |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. | 23 | which, you know, we have every expectation it will |
| 24 | MR. MEREDITH: Yes, I agree with everything | 24 | happen, you know, in line with the way that pilots have |
| 25 | said by -- by Staff and by Public Counsel and by The | 25 | been conducted among other IOUs and -- and with |
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| 1 | Energy Project. I think -- you know, I really look | 1 | PacifiCorp historically. |
| 2 | forward to working with -- with all the different | 2 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. |
| 3 | stakeholders to develop an appropriate outreach plan, I | 3 | So, Mr. Meredith, I asked a question about |
| 4 | think, and also just evaluation protocols to make sure | 4 | the monthly decoupling deferral calculation before I |
| 5 | that we're understanding those impacts and how the time | 5 | knew you were online and available. You probably heard |
| 6 | of use options would be able to benefit low income | 6 | that -- that testimony from Mr. Wilding and Mr. Ball, do |
| 7 | communities and -- and disadvantaged communities. I | 7 | you have anything to add? |
| 8 | think there's a real great potential here for them to be | 8 | MR. MEREDITH: No, I think we covered it. I |
| 9 | helpful for them, for those groups. | 9 | think you were specifically asking about my testimony |
| 10 | CHAIR DANNER: And, Mr. Meredith, how long | 10 | and how it would be calculated, and I think you were -- |
| 11 | do you think it would be before such a plan would be | 11 | memory serves me right, you were asking about |
| 12 | developed? | 12 | specifically in the tariff where some of those -- I |
| 13 | MR. MEREDITH: That's hard to say. You | 13 | think there's different steps that are laid out in the |
| 14 | know, I think probably with a meeting or two, I think a | 14 | decoupling tariffs and -- |
| 15 | pretty robust plan could be developed, you know, just | 15 | CHAIR DANNER: Right. |
| 16 | basing that off of how well I think a lot of these | 16 | MR. MEREDITH: -- show exactly how we would |
| 17 | parties work together and are able to collaborate. I | 17 | calculate it, and you were kind of curious about one of |
| 18 | have a lot of faith in being able to come up with some | 18 | these steps, I think, and why specifically we asked for |
| 19 | really robust plans for outreach, for evaluation, to be | 19 | that; is that -- |
| 20 | able to ensure that this is a successful time of use | 20 | CHAIR DANNER: You changed -- you changed |
| 21 | pilot that meets the goals laid out in the stipulation. | 21 | the calculation so that you are now subtracting revenue |
| 22 | MR. BALL: Chairman, this is Jason. The | 22 | from nonbase adjustment schedules, and the current |
| 23 | stipulation didn't specify a specific date, it just said | 23 | tariff doesn't adjust for nonbased, and I was just |
| 24 | over the next several months. I -- I think Staff would | 24 | wondering what the -- why -- |
| 25 | have a high -- would be far more uncomfortable if those | 25 | MR. MEREDITH: Right, right. I think that's |
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| 1 | a great question. I think right now what it does is | 1 | any adjustments that need to be made, we will be able to |
| 2 | it -- it looks at the actual base that is within the | 2 | go back and identify -- so we can identify the rate base |
| 3 | rate case period. So what is the average price that we | 3 | and we can identify the revenue requirement associated |
| 4 | had month by month per megawatt hour for each rate | 4 | with these capital additions, and so if cost of that |
| 5 | schedule that was part of base revenue. And so that's | 5 | limited issue rate filing adjustments need to be made, |
| 6 | already what is built into the rate case and what's | 6 | we will be able to. |
| 7 | established by the rate case. | 7 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right. |
| 8 | And so we're taking the opposite approach, | 8 | So -- so the pro forma capital additions are not in the |
| 9 | which is going to the Company's accounting information | 9 | amount that was in the Company's supplemental filing? |
| 10 | so the actual revenue that was booked and then taking | 10 | I'm just trying to make sure we have this all clear. So |
| 11 | out those pieces that are not base to get to the base. | 11 | these are an addition or they -- what was included in |
| 12 | And so that's -- that's the difference and that's -- we | 12 | the base -- in the rate base for the supplemental |
| 13 | laid that out as a -- how we came to that wording was | 13 | filing? |
| 14 | looking at how we would functionally do this to get to | 14 | MR. WILDING: They were included in the |
| 15 | base revenue, and that was how we worded the tariff | 15 | supplemental filing. |
| 16 | in -- in what we proposed to -- to get to that level so | 16 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right. |
| 17 | that way we could get to actual base revenue is by | 17 | Thanks. I think l've now beaten that horse, so thank |
| 18 | taking out those nonbase components to what was booked | 18 | you very much. |
| 19 | in the accounting system. | 19 | MR. WILDING: You're welcome. |
| 20 | CHAIR DANNER: So you agree with the others | 20 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. I want |
| 21 | that this is a more precise calculation than what we | 21 | to turn to -- I want to turn to taxes actually. |
| 22 | currently have? | 22 | Actually, before I do that, I do have one |
| 23 | MR. MEREDITH: Yes. | 23 | follow-up question to Commissioner Rendahl, which is, |
| 24 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. | 24 | what level of rate base is subject to refund under the |
| 25 | MR. MEREDITH: You're welcome. | 25 | settlement? |
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| 1 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a few | 1 | MR. WILDING: It would be the revenue |
| 2 | questions about pro forma capital additions, and this is | 2 | requirement associated with any of these -- any of the |
| 3 | for -- for all parties, whoever wants to weigh in. | 3 | plants in paragraph 14. And if -- I don't have specific |
| 4 | So in the settlement stipulation at | 4 | dollar amounts, but if you'd like specific dollar |
| 5 | paragraphs 14 and 15 , it addresses the pro forma capital | 5 | amounts, we can provide that with the other bench |
| 6 | additions. I just want to clarify that whether the -- | 6 | requests. |
| 7 | the rates subject to refund are in a separate tariff | 7 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. All right. |
| 8 | schedule or are they part of base rates? | 8 | Thank you. I think -- Judge O'Connell, let's maybe add |
| 9 | MR. WILDING: They are part of base rates. | 9 | that piece to our bench requests. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So in | 10 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: I will include that as |
| 11 | addition, the settlement doesn't explicitly define a | 11 | bench request No. 4, and I will also note that 3 and 4 |
| 12 | total rate base. Is the level of the rate base in the | 12 | and any others that we have after the conclusion of this |
| 13 | settlement the same as what was in PacifiCorp's | 13 | hearing. Go ahead, Mr. -- Commissioner Balasbas. |
| 14 | supplemental filing? | 14 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank |
| 15 | MR. WILDING: Yes, that's correct. | 15 | you. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And also the | 16 | All right. So going to the issue of taxes |
| 17 | settlement doesn't really bifurcate the rate base levels | 17 | now, just have a couple of clarifying questions here. |
| 18 | related to the pro forma capital additions, so if the | 18 | What are the respective interest rates that are used in |
| 19 | pro forma capital additions are in base rates not rate | 19 | the settlement? |
| 20 | base, how are we going to figure out how this plays out? | 20 | MR. WILDING: The interest rates for the tax |
| 21 | MR. WILDING: The -- the pro forma capital | 21 | benefits? |
| 22 | additions, the rate base is in -- sorry, the capital | 22 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yes. |
| 23 | cost of those -- of these pro forma capital additions, | 23 | MR. WILDING: Or -- |
| 24 | those are included in rate base and there's a revenue | 24 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: For the -- |
| 25 | requirement in part of base rates. And so if there's | 25 | specifically for the tax benefits. |
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| 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 | what you're referring to? | 5 | I will refer to Exhibit RF-4, and -- so sorry, JT-2. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Yeah, that's what | 6 | But we have basically multiple categories of -- of |
| 7 | I'm referring to. | 7 | 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 |
| 9 | Fuller in the room with me, who is our director of | 9 | to how we determine categories and depreciations. So |
| 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 | that's okay. | 12 | you know, they range from, you know, a high of probably |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: That -- that's fine, | 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 | very timely. | 16 | somewhere in [phone interference]. |
| 17 | MR. WILDING: Okay. So -- so l'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 |
| 20 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Let's have Mr. Fuller | 20 | to just off the cuff it would be 30-plus years range on |
| 21 | appear on video since he's in the room and, Mr. Fuller, | 21 | average for the amortization. |
| 22 | I'm going to, in a moment, swear you in. I will wait | 22 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And how |
| 23 | until you're on the video. | 23 | much of the annual protected EDIT amortization is |
| 24 | (Ryan Fuller sworn.) | 24 | included in the settlement revenue requirement? |
| 25 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. Will | 25 | MR. FULLER: Right. So in the base rates, |
|  | Page 204 |  | Page 206 |
| 1 | you please state your name, position, who you are | 1 | there is $\$ 6.4$ million of EDIT amortization not -- |
| 2 | employed by, and then spell your last name for the | 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. |
| 9 | repeat the question for Mr. Fuller? | 9 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Thank |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Sure. Good | 10 | you. And then a couple of questions about the provision |
| 11 | afternoon, Mr. Fuller. | 11 | in the settlement regarding normalized accounting of the |
| 12 | MR. FULLER: Hi | 12 | tax -- of taxes, and the Company will be using the |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And so I | 13 | reverse South Georgia method; is that correct? |
| 14 | asked what are the respective interest rates that the | 14 | MR. FULLER: That's correct. |
| 15 | settlement uses for the amortization of the tax benefits | 15 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And do |
| 16 | being passed back? | 16 | you have the amount of the regulatory asset associated |
| 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 -- |
| 19 | Sorry, I'm looking at Mr. Wilding here. | 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 | testimony in testimony RF-1T, you talk about the | 24 | reporter. You're breaking up -- |
| 25 | approximately 70.6 million remaining protected EDIT that | 25 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Fuller, we couldn't |
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| 1 | hear you. Your audio is very garbled. The amount for | 1 | scenario could that lead to a significant net rate |
| 2 | the regulatory asset, could you be more clear? | 2 | increase in the future? |
| 3 | MR. FULLER: Yes, so \$70.6 million for gross | 3 | MR. FULLER: Right. Okay. Thank you. And |
| 4 | of -- for income taxes. | 4 | I appreciate the clarification there. So just to be -- |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: And, again, that | 5 | to restate the -- what was adopted in the stipulation |
| 6 | would be the what you mentioned earlier, the | 6 | that the Company had been using flow-through accounting |
| 7 | approximately the average 30 years or so? | 7 | for certain tax differences. And we requested to use a |
| 8 | MR. FULLER: Yeah, right. Yeah, exactly. | 8 | normalized method accounting for all of those tax |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then | 9 | differences -- all temporary tax differences other than |
| 10 | specifically again on the normalized accounting | 10 | [inaudible]. So that was -- that was what was adopted |
| 11 | treatment of tax -- of tax benefits, under what kind of | 11 | in the settlement stipulation. |
| 12 | a scenario would the proposed normalized method of | 12 | So the -- the nice thing about the |
| 13 | accounting result in a significant increase to customer | 13 | normalized method of accounting is it doesn't generate |
| 14 | rates in the future? | 14 | big spikes in ratemaking because it's only with respect |
| 15 | MR. FULLER: I don't -- you know, so under | 15 | to temporary tax differences, and so it doesn't broadly |
| 16 | the reverse South Georgia method, the amortization on | 16 | affect those temporary tax differences primarily limited |
| 17 | the assets become -- is a straight line over the | 17 | to rate base and taxes and so any changes in temporary |
| 18 | remaining regulatory lines. And so it, you know, a | 18 | tax differences. But the [phone interference] so that's |
| 19 | typical shape assuming no change in depreciable lives if | 19 | one of the kind of normalized methods of accounting is |
| 20 | you had decline each per, if you would, each class | 20 | the -- |
| 21 | amortizes off, so more of a straight down kind of even | 21 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Mr. Fuller, let me stop |
| 22 | curve. | 22 | you. I need to ask for you to repeat your last couple |
| 23 | And so I can't think of anything that would | 23 | thoughts because we're getting a lot of interference |
| 24 | generate a sudden increase in customer rates because the | 24 | from your audio, and I apologize. |
| 25 | amount should decline over time. I guess if there was a | 25 | MR. FULLER: Maybe it's my voice. I will |
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| 1 | large extension of a regulatory life that would -- that | 1 | try to be clearer. |
| 2 | could cause a curve to change, so if you had like a | 2 | So normalized method of accounting generally |
| 3 | five-year life and decided to go to 25-year life, then | 3 | results in less variability in rates flow-through method |
| 4 | the amount of amortization would change. But I think | 4 | of accounting. So -- and the question is getting to the |
| 5 | other than that, I can't think of anything that would | 5 | answer is what would generate a large increase in rates |
| 6 | under the South Georgia method. | 6 | in the future as this method of accounting, and it would |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Okay. So just -- | 7 | only be with respect to a tax difference that would have |
| 8 | just to make sure that we're talking about the right -- | 8 | the effect of creating a large deferred tax asset very |
| 9 | I guess the -- and maybe I -- maybe this is not clear in | 9 | significant for tax asset in a large change. |
| 10 | my own mind here, but I think we have maybe two | 10 | So I can't think of anything off the top of |
| 11 | different normalization pieces that we're talking about | 11 | my head that would intuitively lead me to believe or |
| 12 | here. We had the -- we have normalizing the return of | 12 | lead me to say this one thing could cause this to happen |
| 13 | the EDIT over time, and that I understand and understood | 13 | just because the method of accounting in and of itself |
| 14 | is the reverse South Georgia method over time. But if I | 14 | is a more levelized method of accounting. |
| 15 | understand the settlement correctly, there's another | 15 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. And then |
| 16 | provision regarding just the flow-through -- | 16 | I will pose a question to the other parties here about |
| 17 | flow-through accounting -- flow-through of tax benefits | 17 | how ratepayers will benefit from PacifiCorp switching to |
| 18 | versus normalizing -- | 18 | this accounting method for taxes other than producing a |
| 19 | MR. FULLER: Oh, yes, okay. | 19 | lower revenue requirement in this specific circumstances |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: So the last question | 20 | under this case. |
| 21 | I asked was in relation to the switch of method for how | 21 | MR. BALL: This is Jason for Staff. I think |
| 22 | the Company will account for taxes under -- so, again, I | 22 | for us at least one of the chief components of this |
| 23 | will repeat the question is, under what kind of scenario | 23 | method is that it's simpler for us to understand, it's |
| 24 | would switching to this normalized accounting method for | 24 | more straightforward, and also it aligns the |
| 25 | rate-making treatment of taxes, under what kind of a | 25 | liabilities, the money that is owed to ratepayers with |
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| 1 | the assets that they correspond to. So for our | 1 | WIJAM in this case and then three years down the road, |
| 2 | perspective, it was a -- it's a good way of matching the | 2 | five years down the road the Commission wanted to go |
| 3 | benefit with the cost that originally yielded these tax | 3 | back to the WCA, it absolutely could because the WIJAM |
| 4 | deferrals. | 4 | is built on the exact same set of principles. I |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: All right. Anyone | 5 | wouldn't recommend it because I believe that the WIJAM |
| 6 | else want to weigh in on that? | 6 | is a better representation of how the Company works and |
| 7 | All right. If not, then I think I am done | 7 | operates their system in relationship to Washington, but |
| 8 | with my questions on taxes. | 8 | it's still based on the same set of principles. |
| 9 | MR. FULLER: Thank you. | 9 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. I |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think I just | 10 | have no further questions. |
| 11 | have one other questions for the parties. | 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Anything from the Chair or |
| 12 | Actually, Mr. Ball, I believe this is for | 12 | from Commissioner Balasbas? Chair? |
| 13 | you. So this morning, you testified that the Idaho | 13 | CHAIR DANNER: I just have one question. I |
| 14 | Asset Exchange was a key element of Staff's support for | 14 | want to go back to the pilot, the customer payment |
| 15 | the WIJAM in this case. In his direct testimony, | 15 | pilot. This is something that Avista and PSE already |
| 16 | Mr. Wilding notes that the Company had previously | 16 | do. I guess my question for Mr. Wilding and others is, |
| 17 | proposed changes to the WCA based on the Idaho Asset | 17 | is this really a pilot? Does it have a -- it doesn't |
| 18 | Exchange in its 2015 general rate case. | 18 | seem to have an end date on it. I'm just trying to |
| 19 | So what is different regarding the Idaho | 19 | figure out what is it -- pilots are basically things we |
| 20 | Asset Exchange in this case compared to the 2015 case? | 20 | try out to learn, can you -- do you characterize this as |
| 21 | MR. BALL: That's a great question, | 21 | a pilot and if so, do we need to put a timeframe on it? |
| 22 | Commissioner. The 2015 case was a limited issue | 22 | MR. WILDING: Yes, it is a pilot. I think |
| 23 | proceeding. There were several pieces that were not | 23 | the timeframe is the next general rate case when we have |
| 24 | included in that case for -- for -- to be contested. | 24 | the ability to -- to revisit. But so in answer to your |
| 25 | One of them was cost of capital; another one was cost of | 25 | question, yes, it is a pilot. |
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| 1 | service. At -- in 2015, we did not have a strong | 1 | CHAIR DANNER: It's a three-year -- |
| 2 | understanding of all of the components of the Company's | 2 | three-year project? |
| 3 | operations in relationship both to the Idaho Asset | 3 | MR. WILDING: Yes. |
| 4 | Exchange and to the -- just to the way that it was -- | 4 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. |
| 5 | the way it affected their operations. | 5 | COMMISSIONER BALASBAS: Judge O'Connell, at |
| 6 | We spent the next four years working with | 6 | this point, I do not have any further questions. |
| 7 | the Company through the MSP process to understand and | 7 | CHAIR DANNER: Nor do I. |
| 8 | evaluate how they operated their system, how they moved | 8 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Commissioner Rendahl, do |
| 9 | power between the balance area authorities, how they | 9 | you have anything further for these witnesses? |
| 10 | planned and built for their system. That ultimately led | 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Nope, thank you. |
| 11 | to the negotiations that yielded the -- the WIJAM, and | 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Then we've finished |
| 12 | it was just based upon our understanding and our | 12 | the bench's questions for the panel of witnesses. All |
| 13 | interpretation of the facts that we had been given and | 13 | the witnesses are excused. Thank you. |
| 14 | our ability to analyze those facts. | 14 | And l'd like to invite the attorneys, a |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So there might have | 15 | representative from each party to please turn on your |
| 16 | been changes to the WCA in the 2015 case, this -- the | 16 | video. The witnesses can turn off their video. |
| 17 | WIJAM has further changes based on a further | 17 | We're going to afford an opportunity for the |
| 18 | understanding of the Idaho Asset Exchange; is that a -- | 18 | attorneys to provide any, you know, clarity if they feel |
| 19 | is that a good way of describing that? | 19 | that there needs to be any regarding some of the legal |
| 20 | MR. BALL: Yes, I think that's -- that's a | 20 | points that were raised in some of our questions. In |
| 21 | perfectly accurate way of describing it. The WIJAM | 21 | particular, I think one of the things that you might |
| 22 | is -- I think what you could say is that the WIJAM is | 22 | choose to address is the WIJAM and the 2020 protocol and |
| 23 | based on the exact same set of principles that use the | 23 | how do they meet the Commission's used and useful |
| 24 | WCA. And so what that means is if in the future the | 24 | standard. |
| 25 | Commission wanted -- if -- if the Commission adopted the | 25 | Mr. Pepple, I'm aware that you -- you in |
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| 1 | particular are wanting to be heard on that matter, so I | 1 | it -- it doesn't really address that issue. And the |
| 2 | would like to start with you and we will go to the other | 2 | reason it doesn't address that issue is because the |
| 3 | parties' attorneys and representatives and we will | 3 | WIJAM is dedicated to interjurisdictional cost |
| 4 | conclude with the Company. | 4 | allocation to Washington. And, you know, when I think |
| 5 | So, Mr. Pepple, let's hear from you first, | 5 | of we inter -- of equitable benefits, I think more of |
| 6 | please. | 6 | the allocation of benefits, cost of benefits among |
| 7 | MR. PEPPLE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. | 7 | customer classes, and the WIJAM is really more about |
| 8 | I had just a couple of points I wanted to respond to. | 8 | here's the pot of dollars that goes to Washington and |
| 9 | One was sort of a question about how the WIJAM and the | 9 | then we figure out -- you figure out how it gets |
| 10 | 2020 protocols interact and, you know, what -- what | 10 | distributed. |
| 11 | happens if the Commission approves the 2020 protocol. | 11 | And the only other thing I wanted to mention |
| 12 | And, you know, I -- I participated in the MSP process | 12 | was Commissioner Balasbas discussed the decommissioning |
| 13 | for quite a while -- you know, a couple years now, and, | 13 | remediation costs for Jim Bridger and Colstrip, I |
| 14 | you know, the -- there is nothing in the 2020 protocol | 14 | believe, and, you know, asked whether Washington |
| 15 | that substantively impacts Washington other than what is | 15 | customers would be allocated decommissioning costs after |
| 16 | in the WIJAM. There's some things like exit orders that | 16 | they were -- these units were removed from customer |
| 17 | would apply to the Commission, but those -- the impacts | 17 | rates. |
| 18 | of those things are really impacts on other states, not | 18 | And, you know, the -- the settlement leaves |
| 19 | on Washington. | 19 | that question open basically. It allows -- it |
| 20 | And so it's really what is in the WIJAM that | 20 | explicitly allows all parties to take any position they |
| 21 | is relevant to Washington. And in terms of, you know, | 21 | want on future decommissioning costs. It does not sort |
| 22 | sort of how the WIJAM meets used and useful standard, | 22 | of establish the estimate that's included in this |
| 23 | you know, if you go back to the Commission's order when | 23 | settlement as the final estimate or anything like that. |
| 24 | it first rejected the revised protocol, you know, the | 24 | We would -- PCA would certainly agree that |
| 25 | way that the Commission interpreted the used and useful | 25 | to the extent that customers are not receiving the |
|  | Page 216 |  | Page 218 |
| 1 | standard, they found it to mean, you know, benefits to | 1 | benefits from these plants, decommissioning costs |
| 2 | ratepayers in Washington either directly -- and so I'm | 2 | incurred after that point should not be included in |
| 3 | quoting from Order 4 in UE-050-- 050684 and this is | 3 | customer rates. But that is an issue that will -- may |
| 4 | paragraph 50, and it benefits ratepayers in Washington | 4 | or may not be litigated in a future case, but it's |
| 5 | either directly, e.g., flow of power from a resource to | 5 | certainly subject to a future case's determination. |
| 6 | customers and/or indirectly, e.g., reduction of costs to | 6 | So I think those are all the points I wanted |
| 7 | Washington customers through exchange contracts or other | 7 | to cover. |
| 8 | tangible or intangible benefits. | 8 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you, |
| 9 | And it's -- so, you know, whether or not the | 9 | Mr. Pepple. |
| 10 | east side wind resources are going to be sort of able to | 10 | So l'd like to hear from Mr. ffitch, |
| 11 | physically deliver to Washington, you know, if Jim | 1 | Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Suetake, Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski, and |
| 12 | Bridger is taken out of service or not taken out of | 12 | then Mr. Kumar. So if I could turn now to The Energy |
| 13 | service to me is not particularly relevant. | 3 | Project's representative, Mr. ffitch. Is there -- are |
| 14 | I think the real relevancy is that, you | 14 | there any comments that you'd like to make based on the |
| 15 | know, the benefits that those resources provide to | 15 | legal issues that were raised? |
| 16 | Washington, particularly in a CETA world, are real, | 16 | MR. FFITCH: Not at this time, Your Honor. |
| 17 | tangible benefits. And it's frankly difficult for me to | 17 | I am just double-checking with my client to make sure |
| 18 | see how PacifiCorp meets its CETA obligations if we | 18 | that I haven't overlooked anything, but at this time, |
| 19 | don't get access to those types of resources. So I | 19 | I'm happy to defer to other counsel. |
| 20 | think -- I think those are real benefits to Washington | 20 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Very well. |
| 21 | that meet the used and useful standard. | 21 | Ms. Baldwin, is there anything you'd like to |
| 22 | And one other thing, I think, Commissioner | 22 | add on the legal issues? |
| 23 | Rendahl, you -- you asked about how the WIJAM sort of | 23 | MS. BALDWIN: No, Walmart does not have |
| 24 | complies with CETA's requirements related to equitable | 24 | anything to add at this time. |
| 25 | benefits, and I think the answer to that really is that | 25 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. |
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|  | Page 219 |  | Page 221 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Ms. Suetake from Public Counsel, is there | 1 | MR. KUMAR: Yes, Your Honor. I have two -- |
| 2 | anything you would like to add? | 2 | before I discuss any of these legal issues, I'd like to |
| 3 | MS. SUETAKE: No, Your Honor. I think | 3 | clarify that we have gotten the interest rate |
| 4 | Mr. Pepple covered all of the assets that we might have | 4 | information on the current tax balance and deferred |
| 5 | had concerns about. | 5 | current tax balance and the deferred EDIT balance. I |
| 6 | But I -- l'd like to clarify that Public | 6 | can provide that clarification in the record right now |
| 7 | Counsel has not signed onto the larger -- the larger | 7 | if it's helpful. |
| 8 | protocol, and we were largely focused on WIJAM and in | 8 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Yes, that would be |
| 9 | this settlement. So we didn't have those larger | 9 | helpful. Can you please repeat it clearly which numbers |
| 10 | concerns. | 10 | you're referring to and just so we make sure we keep it |
| 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: So, Ms. Suetake, to follow | 11 | separate and clear. |
| 12 | up on that just a little bit and your interpretation of | 12 | MR. KUMAR: Yes, the interest rate on the |
| 13 | what is in the settlement is not going to bind Public | 13 | deferred current tax balance is 5.4 percent, which I |
| 14 | Counsel's ability to take position in the future? | 14 | believe is the -- the FERC rate, the -- that's the -- |
| 15 | MS. SUETAKE: As Mr. Pepple had clarified, | 15 | that's the rate published by the -- by FERC used -- they |
| 16 | the aspects of the larger protocol that bind Washington | 16 | use this calculation as an estimate and will be updated |
| 17 | are included in WIJAM. So to the extent that there | 17 | quarterly when the new rate is published by FERC. |
| 18 | might have been other outside activities happening | 18 | And I believe the interest rate on the |
| 19 | within the protocol negotiations, we weren't concerned | 19 | deferred EDIT balance, the E-D-I-T balance, is 7.17 |
| 20 | about it with respect to WIJAM. | 20 | percent, which is the rate of return for the Company. |
| 21 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. | 21 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. And |
| 22 | Ms. Cameron-Rulkowski for Staff, is there | 22 | there was another matter or two that you wished to |
| 23 | anything else you'd like to add on the legal issues? | 23 | address, yes? |
| 24 | MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: I would add that I | 24 | MR. KUMAR: Yeah, I would like to -- in |
| 25 | agree with what Mr. Pepple stated concerning the | 25 | addition to echoing the comments made by Mr. Pepple, I'd |
|  | Page 220 |  | Page 222 |
| 1 | standard, which is from that Docket UE-050684, and I am | 1 | like to address sort of the WIJAM and the used and |
| 2 | looking at specifically Order 4, paragraph 68, which is | 2 | useful issues that were considered by the Commission |
| 3 | the test for including a resource in rates is whether it | 3 | earlier in this hearing. |
| 4 | provides quantifiable, direct, or indirect benefits to | 4 | You know, I would echo the references to the |
| 5 | Washington commensurate with its cost. And Staff had it | 5 | order, and I will say that when we developed the WIJAM, |
| 6 | very much in mind when they were negotiating the WIJAM. | 6 | we specifically had those orders in mind, and we |
| 7 | And I would refer you back to the testimony of Jason | 7 | referenced those orders both in the -- they're |
| 8 | Ball earlier today regarding the benefits that Staff | 8 | referenced in detail in the actual text of the WIJAM |
| 9 | considered when it was involved in the -- this process. | 9 | memorandum of understanding, and they're also referenced |
| 10 | And I would just add that if it would be | 10 | in -- throughout the testimony of Mr. Wilding where |
| 11 | helpful for the Commission, the joint parties could | 11 | he -- he goes through and details in -- in I think a |
| 12 | provide supplemental testimony on the -- on the costs | 12 | good amount of detail how the -- each element of those |
| 13 | and benefits of the WIJAM. | 13 | tax groups met through the WIJAM and specifically |
| 14 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. We will -- we'll | 14 | quantifies in the elements of those costs and benefits. |
| 15 | consider that request, and if we -- in looking more | 15 | Specifically he details how they are |
| 16 | closely and thinking about the testimony that's been | 16 | significant benefits for net power costs, significant |
| 17 | offered today, if we think we would benefit from that, | 17 | benefits in terms of increased PTCs for Washington |
| 18 | we may request that in the future. We're not going to | 18 | customers and increased wheeling revenues totaling |
| 19 | make any request at this moment, but if we need it, we | 19 | almost \$25 million, a little less than \$25 million in |
| 20 | will ask for it. | 20 | revenue requirement benefits from the WIJAM. |
| 21 | Let me move on to Mr. Kumar from the | 21 | And this is important because the -- the |
| 22 | Company. You get the -- the last chance to put in a | 22 | test the Commission has articulated for the WIJAM is |
| 23 | word on any of the legal issues that were raised during | 23 | that it must provide quantifiable and direct and |
| 24 | today's hearing. Do you have anything you'd like to | 24 | indirect benefits to Washington ratepayers commensurate |
| 25 | add? | 25 | with its costs. And so the detail in Mr. Wilding's |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | testimony MGW-1CT through almost his entire testimony | 1 | those bench requests to be addressed. |
| 2 | and [inaudible], both those quantifiable benefits and we | 2 | As far as responses on those bench requests, |
| 3 | quantify them where possible, and we also discuss some | 3 | let's talk about timing. Would one week be sufficient |
| 4 | of the more nonquantifiable benefits and, you know, how | 4 | for the parties to respond to any bench requests? |
| 5 | it could possibly help for CETA legislation. | 5 | MR. WILDING: Your Honor, that's the amount |
| 6 | So I do think that there is a significant | 6 | of time I was going to suggest, so that -- that would |
| 7 | record there to draw upon with regards to the benefits | 7 | work for the Company. |
| 8 | to the WIJAM. | 8 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. |
| 9 | Specifically, I think the other element is | 9 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Just to clarify, are |
| 10 | that in order to show that a new cost allocation change | 10 | we talking business days or calendar days? |
| 11 | should be adopted, parties must demonstrate that any | 11 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Seven calendar days, so |
| 12 | changes proposed must more closely align the allocation | 12 | one week -- so in anticipation that by the end of the |
| 13 | of costs with the allocation of costs based on | 13 | day tomorrow at the latest we issue the bench requests, |
| 14 | causation. And this is again from -- this is actually | 14 | assuming that it would be -- well, I'm asking if it |
| 15 | specifically for Docket UE-130043, I believe it's Order | 15 | would be sufficient amount of time until next Tuesday, |
| 16 | 5. It's in paragraphs 92 to 94. | 16 | close of business next Tuesday to publish any response |
| 17 | And, you know, I think there's been a lot of | 17 | that parties might want to make? And we've heard from |
| 18 | discussion today about the Idaho Asset Exchange, and I | 18 | the Company and I have heard no objections or opposition |
| 19 | want to, you know, specifically thank Staff, Public | 19 | from any of the other parties, so we will plan on |
| 20 | Counsel, and PCA for all the work because it -- two to | 20 | issuing a deadline of one week after we issue the bench |
| 21 | four years of discussion and effort went into developing | 21 | requests. |
| 22 | the WIJAM, and we spent a lot of time discussing how our | 22 | Okay. Hearing nothing else from the |
| 23 | system works, walking them through, you know, a lot of | 23 | parties, we will be adjourned for this afternoon. Thank |
| 24 | analysis and a lot of data on PacifiCorp's system and, | 24 | you all for your attendance and your testimony and your |
| 25 | you know, how -- how things are -- should be allocated. | 25 | thoughts. All right. We will be off the record. We |
|  | Page 224 |  | Page 226 |
| 1 | And so I feel like the WIJAM does represent | 1 | are adjourned. Thank you. |
| 2 | a more deeper understanding of -- of PacifiCorp's cost | 2 | (Adjourned at 2:11 p.m.) |
| 3 | and the cost causation and it reflects a number of | 3 |  |
| 4 | assets that are -- are used and useful for Washington | 4 |  |
| 5 | customers. And so we would request the Commission | 5 |  |
| 6 | approve this stipulation and the WIJAM -- and the WIJAM, | 6 |  |
| 7 | which is sort of an integral part of the 2020 protocol. | 7 |  |
| 8 | And I'm happy to answer any questions that any of the | 8 |  |
| 9 | Commissioners have. | 9 |  |
| 10 | JUDGE O'CONNELL: Okay. Thank you. | 10 |  |
| 11 | Let me ask, are there any follow-up | 11 |  |
| 12 | questions from the Commissioners for any of the | 12 |  |
| 13 | attorneys? | 13 |  |
| 14 | I don't -- okay. I see head shaking. So I | 14 |  |
| 15 | think that brings us to the conclusion of this hearing. | 15 |  |
| 16 | Is there anything else that we should | 16 |  |
| 17 | address before we adjourn? I'm hearing nothing, seeing | 17 |  |
| 18 | nothing. I am going to pause just because sometimes the | 18 |  |
| 19 | technology might take a second, but I don't hear | 19 |  |
| 20 | anything. | 20 |  |
| 21 | Then -- we've already addressed the public | 21 |  |
| 22 | comments will be in bench exhibit bench request 2. I | 22 |  |
| 23 | will follow up with the bench requests that we have not | 23 |  |
| 24 | gotten answers for during this hearing, and I will send | 24 |  |
| 25 | that out today or at least tomorrow to the parties for | 25 |  |

Docket Nos. UE-191024, UE-190750, UE-190929, UE-190981 and UE-180778 (Consolidated) - Vol. V - 8/24/2020


Page 228

| 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 8 |
| 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 | 5:6,9 126 |
| 213:24 219:14 | accurate 133:6 | 108:14 109:10 | adopted 209:5,10 | 131:18,24 155:14 |
| 227:9 | 18:14 212:21 | 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-387:15 | 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 | AEB-587:18 | 193:17 202:13 |
| accelerated 168:23 | 156:1,10,12,12 | adequacy 165:10 | AEB-687:19 | 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-887:22 | 84:22 |
| 119:16,17 | 175:17 183:7,9,22 | adjourned 225:23 | AEB-9 87:24 | al 86 |
| acceptable 102:1 | 184:3 186:15,15 | 226:1,2 | affect 112:19 139: | ALB-1T 96:12 |
| acceptance 112:18 | 186:19,19,21,22 | adjust 183:10 | 188:16 209:16 | ALB-296:13 |
| accepted 107:24 | 186:24,25 187:2,3 | 198:23 | afford 214:17 | ALB-396:15 |
| 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 | administrati | 117:4,8,9 121:22 | 146:22 147:2,4,6 |
| 199:9,19 206:11 | addition 140:12 $147.13153: 16$ | 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 |

Page 229

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168:9,11 169:2, |  | 100:1,4,5,15, |  |  |
| 1:2 176:1,7 |  | 01:3 | 166:2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| allocating 114:2 | 202:4,5 | appendix 86 : | argue 162 | 95:9 107:6 |
| 116:15,16 162:4 | analy |  | 64:10 | Assistant 100 |
| all | 90:13 97:13 | licat | um |  |
| 87:5 93:20 106:9 | 11 | applied 128 | izona $88: 13$ | 123:8 137:25 |
| 14:23 | an | 31:10 | , | 154:23 |
| 16:13,18 117:3,5 | analyzing 139 | apply 128 : | arriving 149 | 8:24 |
|  | ancillary 120:10,16 | 155:3 215:1 | articulated | 181:8 |
| 13:13 131:21 | and/or 109:11 | applying 186:18 | asbestos 158:8 | 1:3 202:2 |
| 144:23 | 216:6 | apportioned 176:3 | aside 206 | 6:1 |
| :2 155:9 163:1 | Andrew | appreciate 104:2,6 | asked 112:16 | assume 133:14 |
| 5 165:25 | animal 12 | 131:2 171:20 | 119:13,16 13 | 2:6 |
| :12 17 | Ann 84:3 | $9: 4$ | 150:7 198:3 | 173:5 |
| 180:20 217:4,6 | 100:14 | apprecia | 198:18 204:14 | assumed 139:17 |
| 223:10,12,13 | annual 15 | 4:10 | 208:21 21 | 10:10 |
| alloca | 157:9 205:23 | approa | 217:14 | 3:2 |
| 125:5,25 126:1 | answer 102:16 | 4:1 | asking 15 | 207:19 225:14 |
| 145:10 163:3 | 117:17 119 | appro | 159:19 162:13 | assum |
| 164:8 181:7 | 132:6 133:23 | 55:3 | 172:23 180:8,14 | 90: |
| allow 101:7 115 | 136:18 141:20 | 196:3 | 80:24 181:6,10 |  |
| 136:25 179:7 | 173:14 174:14, | ap | 198:9,11 225:14 | 35:23 136:2 |
| 180:3 | 184:18 191:11, | 171:13 | aspects 137:2 165:9 | assure 153:22 |
| allowed 156:24 | 203:10 210: | 181:10 | 15:6 219:16 | assured 136: |
| allows 106:17 | 213:24 216:2 | ap | Assessment 89 | attachment 86:15 |
| 11,13 167:5 | $4: 8$ | 7:12 | :3 | 09:2 |
| 217:19, | answered | 172:3 | asset 87:22 92 | attend 151: |
| alluded 123:17 | 118 | 4:6 | 125:17,20 129:8 | attendance 225: |
| America 100:17, | answering 151 | approved | 206:16 | attention 122:2 |
| 6:14 109:2 | answers 224:24 | 181:8 | 7:2 210:8,9 | Attorney 84:11, |
| 111:10,12 | anticipated 150:18 | approves | 1:14,17,20 | 85:3 100:6,13 |
| amortization 86:1 | 157:25 169:23 | 215:11 | 2:3,18 223:18 | attorneys 136:22 |
| 3:3 | 174:14 175:10 | approving 109:19 | assets 97:10,12,14 | 36:24 179:8,9,14 |
| 4:15 205:21,23 | anticipating 146 | 180:19 193:23 | 109:11 120:20,24 | 4:14,18 |
| 6:1,2,17 207:16 | 157:19 | approxima | , | 4:13 |
|  | anticipation 225:12 | 201 | 30:3,10,18 143:8 | attributed 154:14 |
| amortize | apart | approximately 99:8 | 1,9,15 | audio 207:1 |
| 182:1 205:2 |  | 4:13 105:3 | 147:8,13 156:2 | ugust 83:16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| amortizing 205: |  |  |  | 179:24 205 |
| am |  |  |  |  |
| 150:23 154:14 |  |  |  |  |
| 159:14 176:5 |  |  | assign 126:10 | 7:21 118:11,21 |
| 84:14 188:12 | appearances 99:19 | 126:7 129:10,11 | 135:13 | 8:22 119:2 |

Docket Nos. UE-191024, UE-190750, UE-190929, UE-190981 and UE-180778 (Consolidated) - Vol. V - 8/24/2020
Page 230

| 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 |
| B | 202:7,13,14,22,24 | based 108:21 | behavior 190:4 | 174:1 176:15,19 |
| B-a-l-1 111:3 | 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 | Baldwin 85:12 | 175:17 181:18 | 125:23 126:14 | 222:16,17,20,24 |
| 158:4 159:18 | 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 | 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 |
| 179:21 190:13 | 119:14,20 121:8,9 | baseline 105:17 | 164:6,24 165:2,14 | benefitting 128:24 |
| 195:19 201:2 | 127:17,24 128:18 | 113:16,22,24 | 188:9 192:16 | 192:12,13 |
| 204:16 205:1 | 128:25 130:8,23 | 115:5,17,20 118:9 | 193:19 205:4 | best 115:6 173:18 |
| 213:3,14 215:23 | 130:24 131:13,22 | 119:4 120:25 | 210:11 211:12 | 185:2 227:9 |
| 220:7 | 132:2,5,8 134:20 | 122:2 124:2 135:2 | 213:5 217:14 | better 110:10 112:6 |
| Bainbridge 85:5 | 134:20 139:13,21 | 135:3,13 139:14 | 221:14,18 223:15 | 112:21 117:21 |
| balance 106:2 | 140:4,16,23 141:7 | 139:16,18,22 | bench $86: 3,4,5,6,7$ | 118:14 125:14,23 |
| 107:10 140:5,21 | 141:12,19 145:17 | 140:3 141:16 | 86:8 102:1,16 | 190:5 213:6 |
| 141:18,21,23 | 145:17 148:13 | 148:16,19,20 | 112:2 147:12,12 | beyond 120:15 |
| 144:2 145:2,4 | 155:21 162:18 | 149:6 177:10 | 148:6,9 179:5,25 | 157:18 |


| 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 | 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-1890:16 | 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-I-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-291:16 | 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 | ertify 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 | CA | 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 | 21:16 | 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 | 4:25 | 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 |


| 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 19 | 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 | 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 | 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: | 108:11 109:18,19 | 176:11 177:17 |
| 210:9 223:10 | clear 120:6 | 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 | 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 | 221:1 | 192:1 | 162:13 165:3 | 191:14,24 192:22 |
| 146:8 154:8,25 | clearer 210 | Combined 89:8,10 | 171:12,23 172:1 | 193:25 194:17 |
| 156:14 183:24 | Clearing 143:15 | come 104:16 | 172:18 180:14,2 | 195:9,22,23 200:1 |
| 189:15 209:17 | clearly 221:9 | 113:19 116: | 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 | 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 |
| characteri | 223:12 | 174:23 175:16 | 224:5 | 205:22 206:5,9,15 |
| 184:9 | closer 118 | 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 | comfo | 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 |


| companies 144:22 | 160:12 161:2,22 | 90:21,24 91:3,6 | 63:7 165:15 | 206:13,14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| company $83: 8$ | 161:25 162:3,10 | 91:10,11,12,14,19 | 169:3 176:7 190:9 | corrections |
| 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 | tinue | 208:15 |
| 113:1 114:1 | 160:21,22 | 171:22 | continuing 106:20 | rrects 186 |
| 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 | ,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 | conversation | 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 112:2 | 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 |


| 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 | 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 | 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 |


| 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 | 46:19 | 144:13 161:18,19 |
| 207:19 | develop 118: | 196:7 | doing 117:22 127:4 | 166:14,25,25 |
| depreciate 173:6 | 196:3 | disconnection | 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 | 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 | 97:9 222:4 |
| 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 |
| 109:3,5,12,14,2 | 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 |
| 168:23 169:2,8,1 | differences 122:9 | 165:24 176:19 | draw 223: | effect 119:18 |
| 171:10,14,24 | 209:7,9,9,15,16 | 193:22 19 | drawing 153:20 | 122:13 125:25 |
| 205:10 | 209:18 | 223:18,21 | drives 161:7 | 192:7 210:8 |
| depreciations | different | discussions 131:17 | RM-1HT 98:3 | effective 105:7 |
| 205:9 | 114:3 115:11 | 187:10,13 | d 142:4 | 108:21 122:25 |
| derived | 119:10 122:14 | dispatch 114:19 | :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 | 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 | 124:10,11,21,2 | E 84:1,1 85:1,1 | effort 112:1 223:21 |
| descriptions 120:7 | difficult 104:14 | 125:24 130:14 | $7: 15$ 99:4,4 | eight 146:4 183:5,7 |
| design 106:24 | 164:8 216 | 133:5,13,15 | 227: | 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 | $2: 18,24,2$ | 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 | 77:13,15 178:22 | 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 |
| 112:5 203:1 | 110:9 126:12 | dive 115 | 140:16 150:7 | EL-2 86:21 |
| details 91:14,24 | 130:18 148:24 | diversity 106:18 | 70:2 207:6 220:8 | 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 | e | electric 99:16 |
| 93:22 | 222:23 | 102:2,23 108:5,14 | E | electrons 130:10 |
| determination | di | 220:1 223:15 | Easement 90:8 | element 193:21 |
| 123:7 218:5 | direction 108:22 | dockets 86:9 99:15 | 1 | 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 |


| :11 163:14 | especially $124: 19$ | excess 105:22 145:5 | 150:15 157:17,24 | 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2: 14$ | 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 1 | 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 | stablished 199:7 | 211:20 212:4,18 | Expenditures 88:4 | fair 107:9 152:15 |
| email 148:7 | blishes 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 | 7:1 98:1 101:13 | 132:16 136:22 | 95:15 |
| 186:19 187:7,24 | 191:19 212:8 | 01:17 102:2 | 137:1,10 143:1 | Feeder 96:1 |
| 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 110:5 174:1 |
| engaging 116:19 | 194:5 196:4,19 | :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 | 129:18 221:14,1 |
| 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 |
| on 112:10 | $\text { examination } 124: 8$ | 172:11 215:16 | F | filed 101:8 102:2 |
| envisions <br> EP 154:12 | examine | 153:12 | F227:1 | 108:19 121:16 148:23,23 149:13 |
| equal 160:16 | 192:5 | expect 117:25 | F-u-l-I-e-r 204:6 | 152:14 177:2 |
| 162:25 | example | 50:12 153:18 | facilitate 151:17 | 205:3 |
| equitable 164:18 | 167:7 173:18 | 156:17 157:4 | facilities 88:24 | files 109:12 |
| 16:24 217:5 | 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 |


| 120:24 121:17 | 89:20,21,23,24 | forthcoming | Function 9 | 160:9 210:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 122:21,21,22 | 90:3,5,7,8,10 | 194:11 | functionality | erate 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 |
| 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 | 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: |
| finishes 132:9 | 137:4 150:6 | Fruit 92 | G | 212:13 |
| Fire 96:15 | 80:11 201:23 | 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 | 46:9 159:3 | 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 |


| 127:7 128:9,10,21 | 163:25 | hard 104:11 196:13 | Honor 99:21 | 34: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 133:3,6,8,12,16 | grid 113:8 116:11 | head 154:20 210:11 | 101:20 102:4 | implementati |
| 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 | :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 | 25:22 | ideas 138:17 | improvement |
| 100:23 101:2 | 6 188:20 | 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 |


| 144:15 146:20 | 218:2 | 151:19 195 | 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 | 37:15 167:24 |
| 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 | 9:22 170:13 |
| 189:23 190:21 | 125:13 135:24 | interested 194:23 | 159:20 160:4,5 | 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 | investigate 133:25 | 222:2 | join 191:2 |
| increased 107:4 | integer 136:5 | 155:3 | issuing 225:20 | joined 99:13 102: |
| 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 | 09.91 |
| incremental 137:21 | 151:24 178:17 | investment 106: |  | 181:23 220 |
| 137:25 167:19 | 194:4 | 106:19 | $\xrightarrow{\text { J }}$ J | JT-1 86:17 |
| incurred 173:11 | intent 116:8,9 | investments 104:23 | J 97:16 | JT-1r 86:11 |

Page 240

| 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 | 66:25 18 |
| 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 114:1 |
| 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 83:894:11 | 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--i-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 | 204:19 206:7 |

Page 241

| 220:2,15 | 130:12 | 196:14 | 106:9 113:11 | misunderstood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| looks 106:20 | Maps 92:9 | meetings 108:13,15 | 114:23 117:5 | 206:21 |
| 182:13 199:2 | market 113:20 | 151:22 152:20 | 124:24 126:7 | Mitigation 96:16 |
| Loop 83:19 | 119:1 145:3 | 153:1 | 127:13 128:15 | mix 164:20 |
| 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 |
|  | 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 |


| 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 | tes 211:16 |
| 130:25 142:12,13 | 186:1,2,3,5 204:1 | 115:4,19,25 | nodal 112:7 114:1 | tice 159:20 |
| 180:11 211:13 | 204:2,4,6 | 116:16,22 117:11 | 114:17,18,19 | ovember 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 | 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, | 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 |
| 4:15 | 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, |
| 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 | 9:3 162:21 | nine 183:5 | 209:8,13,19 210:2 | 221:8,21 224:10 |
|  | 164:4 165:2,15 | NLK-1T 88:10,2 | normalizing 208: | 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 | 000-- 99:3 |

objections 225:18
objectives 128:22
objects 101:7
obligation 161:25 163:5
obligations 130:11 164:1 165:12 216:18
obviously 113:19 152:2 177:25
occur 156:14 163:3 175:12 184:11
occurred 125:17
occurs 135:15
October 88:9 112:9 113:17,17 121:14 122:3,11 139:13 139:14,18,19,22 140:3 141:1 146:17 147:16 152:21 177:11
offered 220:17
office 84:11,16 100:7 115:1
officer 108:7
official 113:12,18
offset 140:21
153:25 154:4
161:11
Oh 146:14 205:19 208:19
okay 100:2,10,16 100:21 101:4,25 102:7 103:10,22 107:20 108:2 109:23 110:13,14 110:17 111:23,24 119:11 128:19 129:23 137:3 143:4 146:14 148:1 152:6,19,24 153:6 156:17 157:6 159:25 160:7 164:13 165:22 167:18,22 167:22 168:2,12

168:18 172:7,22 174:21 176:18 177:13,16 178:6 179:2,17 181:14 181:20 183:2,19 184:16 185:7,11 185:25 186:7
187:16 188:2
193:25 195:22
200:10,16 201:7
201:16 202:7
203:8,12,17,25
204:7 208:7,19 209:3 213:9 214:4
214:11 215:7 218:8,20,25
219:21 220:14 221:21 224:10,14 225:8,22
old 115:8
Olympia 83:24
84:12
once 114:8 117:5 146:1 167:9,20 172:16
one-off 153:22
one-time 181:25
ones 126:20,21
128:2
online 157:25 158:1
158:5,5,13 159:5
159:13,15,16 198:5
onset 206:20
open 129:18 138:15
153:21 217:19
opened 125:20
opening 102:12
103:12,15 108:4
155:8
operate 129:12
132:1 165:5
operated 212:8
operates 213:7
operating 125:7,22
126:18 190:8
operation 154:25
175:19
operational 181:12
operations 92:23
92:24 93:8,9
104:23 115:1,14
125:24 212:3,5
opportunity 103:12
105:13 112:4,21
132:21 136:21
176:2 180:3
214:17
oppose 177:9
opposed 151:12,15
opposite 199:8
opposition 225:18
opt-in 194:20
optimized 144:11
144:16 145:10
options 189:7 196:6
order 109:19
114:13 141:22
168:23 172:1,4,11
190:17 215:23
216:3 220:2 222:5
223:10,15
ordered 177:1
orders 215:16
222:6,7
Oregon 84:21 85:9 108:17
organization 148:5
organized 151:22
organizing 151:21
originally $123: 17$
211:3
outcome 148:21
149:5
outlined 192:17 195:14
outlines 126:16 172:13
output 134:13,25
outputs 134:9 135:20
outreach 193:6

194:12 195:1
196:3,19
outside 219:18
outstanding 103:7 131:25 181:3
overall 105:1 107:9
190:6,16 192:16
overhaul 178:16
overlooked 218:18
overview 108:10
owed 210:25
Owner 91:13
$\begin{array}{r}\mathbf{P} \\ \hline \mathbf{P} 8: 1\end{array}$
P84:1,1 85:1,1 99:4
P.C 85:8
p.m 179:19,24

226:2
Pac 144:12,13 166:24,25 167:1 168:4
Pacific 83:7 84:20 96:16
PacifiCorp 83:7
84:19 86:23 91:16
99:20,22 104:1,10
106:20 108:8,19
108:25 109:10,15
110:20 113:8
122:21 125:6,7,8
125:9 126:2,2,3,4
126:18 150:19
151:2,10,20 155:1
167:14 179:21
186:5 190:14
198:1 204:5
210:17 216:18
PacifiCorp's 86:21
99:16 101:7,9
102:23 104:3,12
104:17,22 106:1,5
106:11,15,17,24
130:11 138:23
140:21 144:2
153:9 154:25

160:12 163:21
166:4 167:11
200:13 223:24
224:2
package 191:4
Packaging 100:17
100:19 106:13
109:1 111:10,12
114:16
Packing 161:16
page 86:2 87:2 88:2
89:2 90:2 91:2
92:2 93:2 94:2
95:2 96:2 97:2
98:2 120:18 166:6
166:6 183:1,3
Pages 83:12 94:15
95:16
paid 171:2
Paisner 100:14
pandemic 157:15
157:16
panel 102:15 103:5
109:25 110:16
136:23 179:25
214:12
PaR 89:5,8
paragraph 150:10
202:3 216:4 220:2
paragraphs 200:5
223:16
parallel 118:15
paraphrase 166:24
Parsons 85:13
part 101:14 105:5
106:7 108:8
112:11 113:25
114:25 115:1,3
125:18,19 127:11
133:24 135:7
137:11,13,13
138:2 140:10,13
148:23,24 149:1
149:25 156:18,20
157:4 164:19
167:16 168:15

| 171:11 175:11 | 215:3 | 221:13,20 | 95:12 184:12,17 | play 123:25 146:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 178:2 181:10 | arts 13 | 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 | 86:1 204:1 |
| parties' 149:10 | 167:24 168:3,5,10 | pilot 94:5,8 95:8,11 | 202:3 218:1 | 217:20 219:14 |


| 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 |

Page 246

| 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 | 122:5,23,25 | 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 | 125:18 140:24 | 173:9,21 175:20 |
| 158:17 | PVRR(d)(Benefi... | 119:8 121:11 | 144:4 146:5 | 176:25 177:3 |
| PSE 123:18,19 | 89:5,10 | 127:18 132:22 | 153:22 154:15 | 178:1 200:7,8,9 |
| 213:15 |  | 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 | 202:20 204:14 |
| 155:24 156:1,14 | Q4 157:18 | 148:3 151:5,7 | 159:14 160:4 | 205:1,25 207:14 |
| 157:1,4 159:24 | Qualifications | 155:13 164:25 | 172:15 176:22 | 207:24 210:3,5 |
| PTCs 153:9 154:6,9 | 97:16 | 169:9 177:18 | 177:2 178:1 | 217:17 218:3 |
| 154:11,14,22 | qualifies 160:23 | 178:25 179:5,7,12 | 179:22 185:1 | 220:3 |
| 155:6,13,15,16,17 | qualify 159:23 | 179:25 180:1 | 186:17,18 189:7 | Rating 88:15 |
| 155:20 156:4,12 | 161:22 | 181:3 182:11 | 191:8 197:16 | Ratings 88:16 |
| 159:21 222:17 | quantifiable 126:12 | 184:17 185:1 | 199:3,4,6,7 | RAV-1T 92:7 |
| public 84:14 88:13 | 220:4 222:23 | 193:7,11,13 200:2 | 200:12,12,17,19 | RAV-2 92:9 |
| 100:11,12 101:17 | 223:2 | 202:17 203:11,14 | 200:22,24 201:2,5 | RAV-3 92:10 |
| 101:18,18,21 | quantifies 222: | 206:10 211:8,11 | 201:12,24 203:3 | RAV-4 92:12 |
| 104:19 106:13 | quantify $223: 3$ | 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 | quite 128:25 | 221:20 | RAV-8 92:18 |
| 135:18 161:15 | 111:25 112:21 | 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 | $128: 13$ $136: 19$ $132: 7,2$ |  | ratemaking 119:3 | reach 104:11 151:3 |
| 178:23 189:22 | 136:19 138:6 | R | 209:14 | reached 134:2 |
| 190:20 191:4 | 139:12 141:20 | R 84:1 85:1 | 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 |

reasoning 183:23
reasons 124:5
125:22 161:13
reassigned 169:11
169:18
reassignment
170:10 172:6
Rebuild 96:15
REC 181:25
receive 156:1,12 170:20
received 101:19 183:22
receives 134:9
receiving 217:25
reclamation 137:8
137:14 150:8,24
152:10,18
recognition 128:23
recognized 136:16 136:17 137:20 144:3
recommend 107:11 213:5
reconvene 179:4 record 89:23 90:10 90:17,19 91:6,7 99:6,19 101:15 110:19 142:8,8, 12 142:12 179:12,17 179:21,21 204:3 221:6 223:7 225:25
recovered 137:13 154:15
recruitment 195:1
RECs 181:24
reduces 190:5
reduction 109:4
124:12 140:24
141:5 156:5
177:12 216:6
reductions 112:8
reevaluated 172:14
ref- 127:3
refer 106:9 192:23
203:15 205:5
220:7
referenced 222:7,8 222:9
references 143:7,9 222:4
referred 130:9 180:16
referring 138:13 147:19 154:10 203:5,7 204:23 221:10
refine 114:22,22
reflect 104:22 105:17 168:13 188:4
reflected 150:23 168:16 176:15 177:5,6
Reflecting 97:5,6
reflects 125:23 143:8 224:3
refund 105:11 121:21,25 122:5,6 123:9 155:19 159:10,15 167:19 200:7 201:24
regard 112:17
regard- 132:17
regarding 101:19 103:3 132:20 180:4 185:1 206:11 208:16 211:19 214:19 220:8
regardless 135:15 176:4
regards 190:10 192:6 223:7
regulation 174:11 regulatory 88:6 104:1 115:9,19 118:23 134:15 206:16 207:2,18 208:1
rejected 215:24
rejoin 110:1
related 116:1 143:4
152:20,21 153:15
155:13,16 169:9 172:10 175:19 186:24 200:18 216:24
relates 191:22
relation 184:21 192:7 208:21
relationship 212:3 213:7
relative 109:5
release 156:2
relevancy 216:14
relevant 215:21
216:13
reliability $140: 10$
remain 172:8
remaining 102:25 150:24 204:25 207:18
remains 188:21
remediation 172:9 172:25 173:10 174:8 175:18,24 176:5 217:13
removal 154:6
remove 170:4 174:12
removed 173:21
217:16
removing 186:23
Rendahl 83:13 84:3 103:11 104:6 116:2,3 118:4 133:11 134:17 135:17 142:1,2,16 142:25 143:4 145:13 146:15 147:10 148:1 150:5 151:18
152:6,19,24
157:13 158:23
159:25 160:7
163:9 164:13

165:17,21 166:23
167:18,22 168:2
168:12,18 177:17
178:6,18,24 180:8
180:10 181:14,20
182:9 192:22
193:25 194:18
195:9,22,23 200:1
200:10,16 201:7
201:16,23 211:10
212:15 213:9
214:8,10 216:23
225:9
renewable 92:6
93:18 104:24
126:3 130:3 163:5
163:13 181:22
repeat $121: 11$
204:9 206:6
208:23 209:22
221:9
rephrase 185:16
report 107:7 117:1
195:19
REPORTED 83:21 reporter 101:14
205:17 206:23,24
227:7
reporting 83:22
107:4 192:25
Repowered 92:3
repowering 89:4,6
91:22,24 154:12
158:4
represent 122:3
224:1
representation
213:6
representative
113:1 137:1
214:15 218:13
representatives
215:3
represented 151:19
reprieve 155:2
request 86:3,4,5,6

86:7,8 104:19
147:12 185:5
202:11 204:18
220:15,18,19 224:5,22
requested 209:7
requesting 108:20
requests 102:6
148:6,9 155:1
202:6,9 204:22
224:23 225:1,2,4
225:13,21
require 105:8 185:6
197:21
required 163:22
170:2
requirement $89: 7$
89:10 93:20
121:21 123:6
135:3 151:15
154:8 161:12
200:25 201:3
202:2 205:24
210:19 222:20
requirements 104:22 163:14 165:14 173:22,24
173:25 216:24
requires 107:3
109:11 170:3
Research 88:9
researching 139:8
reserve 171:10
resetting 120:25
124:1
residen- 188:8
residential 93:25
94:5 95:6,7 105:4
107:1 188:8 192:9
resolution 176:20
resolve 106:22
126:19 139:6
resolved 107:17,19
125:19 152:22
resolves 102:22,24
107:21

| 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: |
| 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 |

Page 249

Schubert 103:18,19
scope 120:13 121:4
121:5 151:4 195:6 se 189:5
Seattle 83:23,23 84:17
second 105:16 146:23 224:19
sections 128:1,4 see 110:14 115:24 120:7 122:20 134:25,25 147:4 178:4 183:3 187:25 194:23 216:18 224:14
seeing 103:10 224:17
seen 136:16
segment 102:17
selecting 103:20
Selection 87:18
SEM-1T 92:21
SEM-2 92:22
SEM-3C 92:24
SEM-4C 93:3
SEM-5 93:4
SEM-6T 93:6
SEM-7 93:7
SEM-8C 93:9
SEM-9 93:11
send 148:6 224:24
senior 111:21 204:5
sense 128:6 147:23
separate 127:5
200:7 206:2,4 221:11
September 108:19 113:18 139:23 140:3
serve 114:12 166:25
serves 114:11 198:11
service 88:13 93:14 93:15,17 94:20,22 94:24 106:11

138:16 157:16,19
163:21 166:14
186:5 212:1
216:12,13
Services 94:17
servicing 111:22
set 107:6 119:4
123:5 160:22
187:9 193:16
212:23 213:4,8
sets 112:15 164:2
setting 113:13
118:8 119:3 135:1
135:2 192:25
settlement $83: 11$
86:9,9,11,14,17
99:14 100:8
102:12,15,22
103:1,4 104:3,7,8
104:16 107:17,19
107:21 108:4,10
108:25 109:25
112:1,3,7,15,23
119:18 120:4
121:24 123:17
125:20 131:8
134:5 136:21,23
139:16 140:19
146:19 147:20,22
148:16,20,21
149:4,9,16 150:10
152:8,22 155:14
155:24 160:3
162:14 163:11,16
168:5,13,19,24
169:7 171:23
172:3,12 176:16
177:22 180:13
184:5 188:7
190:25 191:2,3,12
193:4,22 194:2,8
195:6 200:4,11,13
200:17 201:25
202:19 204:15
205:24 206:11
208:15 209:11

217:18,23 219:9
219:13
settlement's 146:20
settlements 103:2
settles 106:23
settling 86:14
102:11 103:13
132:16 193:23
Seven 225:11
shadow 118:15 180:17
shake 170:16
shaking 224:14
shape 207:19
share 114:6 134:10 134:11,12 163:25 169:11,13 171:3 173:7 181:16,18 193:17 195:5
shared 114:7 134:11,15 175:24 193:10
Shawn 85:20
111:16 194:1,18
short 99:19
shorter 137:22 138:1
Shorthand 227:6
show 161:4 198:16 223:10
shows 155:8
side 144:5,6 161:18 161:19 166:14 216:10
$\operatorname{sign}$ 127:21
signal 117:2 190:7 190:16 192:7
signals 190:3
signed 108:25 127:24 219:7
significant 104:23 106:18 207:13 209:1 210:9 222:16,16 223:6 similar 144:20 151:21 195:5

Simon 85:3 100:24 simon@ffitchlaw... 85:6
simpler 210:23
simply 118:22
163:12
single 138:23
Site 89:15,24 90:11 90:22
sites 163:22
six 110:5 114:6
131:17 138:16
146:4 151:19
six-state 151:25
skill 227:9
slightly $126: 15$
small 191:12
Snow 92:13
solar 109:11,13 144:22
sole 166:17,20 167:7,13
solely 129:20
solution 117:15
solve 117:10
sorry 132:19,22 134:11 140:4 148:20 159:10 173:12 178:24
179:1 183:15
185:22 189:17
200:22 203:1
204:19 205:5,19
sort 135:24 136:11
180:16 181:15
215:9,22 216:10
216:23 217:21
222:1 224:7
sorted 167:20
sounds 193:1
South 85:13 206:13
207:16 208:6,14
Southeast 83:19
span 109:13
Spanos 97:16
108:23
speak 102:19
132:23 135:9
193:13 195:4
speaking 121:15
132:10
specific 111:25
121:1 123:1,19
126:16 129:15
132:22 136:5
147:12 151:7
152:7 154:3,3
165:13 194:24,25
196:23 202:3,4
210:19
specifically 130:17
131:10 152:17
164:14 165:25
184:20 186:16
190:25 192:2
195:7 198:9,12,18
202:25 207:10
220:2 222:6,13,15
223:9,15,19
specifics 195:10
specified 109:9
specifies 147:1
specify 196:23
spell 186:2 204:2
spelled 111:8 186:5 204:6
spelling 110:19
spent 212:6 223:22
spikes 209:14
spirit 197:7
spoken 101:21
spread 106:23
spreadsheet 143:8
143:12,13,17
144:17 145:12,19
145:21 146:6
149:19
Springs 90:11,13
90:14,16,17,19
157:24
Square 83:19
SRM-1T 96:22

| SRM-2 96 | 5:20 180:21 | 105:2,5,8,12,19 | substantial 153:2 | 156:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SRM-3T 97:3 | 215:2 | 105:25 106:7,23 | 154:13 161:5,8,12 | surcharges 1.5 |
| 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, | 103:16 108:4 | storage 109:11 | Suite 83:22 84:16 | ing 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 | 168:22 208:2 |
| 223:19 | states 114:3,6,8 | Street 84:21 85:13 | summarize 13 | 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: |
| 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 stipulated 101.5 | 155:18 159:10,15 167.19 19:16 | 124:7 195:14 |  |
| standards 163:2 <br> start 104:9 111:24 | stipulated 101:5 151:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:19 173:16 } \\ & \text { 175:1 200:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 211:14 } \\ \text { supported 124:6 } \end{array}$ | 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 |
| 144:14,21 148:12 | 104:18,20,25 | Subsection 164:17 | surcharge 155:19 | 149:22 150:16 |


| 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, | 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 | 201:17 202:8, | 197:5,6 198:8,9 |
| takes 165:13 | TB 89:24 90:3,5,7, | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | technology 224:19 | 192:23 195:15 | 166:13,14,18 | 219:3 220:17 |
| 126:23 154: | TELEPHONIC | 198:6,9 203:15 | 167:14 | 222:11 223:6,9,17 |
| 163:12 166:1,22 | 83:1 | 204:24,24 211:15 | thing 103:17 147:7 | 224:15 |
| 169:12 208:8,11 | tell 138 | 220:7,12,16 | 209:12 210:12 | thinking 128:8 |
| 225:10 | temporary 209:9 | 222:10 223: | 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 13 | tex | 122:7,16 125:11 | thought 171:17 |
| targeted 19 | 140.10,13,18 | thank 99:2 | 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, | 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 |
| $\boldsymbol{t a x} 93: 3$ 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 |
| 210:7,8,9 211:3 | 222:22 | 166:10 170:22 | 173:12,19 174:9 | 115:10 118:12 |


| 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: | uncomfor |
| 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 8 | understand 112 |
| 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 | 0,21,23,24 | 192:11 194:19 |
| timely 203:16 | transferring 171:9 | 181:21 182:10 | ,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 |


| 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 |  | 87:4,6 92:22 93:7 | way $85: 9 \mathrm{91:6}$ |
| 115:16 116:5 | Utah 85:14 108:16 | W | 96:21 97:19 99:1 | 118:16 124:21,22 |
| 121:15 122:2 | 109:17 | W-i-l-d-i | 99:10 104:3,4,17 | 124:23 127:4 |
| 139:14,18,19 | utilities $83: 2$ | 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 |  | waiting 1 | 125:12 126:8,9,13 | 164:3 167:2 |
| 177:6,11 | V | walking 2 | 126:17,19 127:21 | 173:14 184:9 |
| updated 93:9,11 | V | la-McNary | 128:2,17,24 | 186:20,25 193:15 |
| 94:20,22,23 95:3 | value 171 | 92:12 | 130:16,19 131:10 | 193:18 197:2,10 |
| 95:4,6,9,10,12,13 | 173.7 | Walmart | 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 | 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 $105: 17$ | variet | 134:19,21 136:8 | 147:2,3,6,9 | WCA 163:7 164:5 |
| 107:7 147:20 | various 112 | 139:14 145:18 | 149:20 150:24 | 164:8 167:23 |
| 148:25 | 193:6 | 151:6 153:6 155: | 151:23,25 152:4 | 168:16 169:4 |
| upgrade 140:1 | vary | 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 | 173:3,13 176:5,1 | 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 | viab | 201:20,21 203 | 170:14,17 171:1,1 | 115:13 116:12 |
| 149:21 180:15 | Vicki 85:12 101: | 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 |


| 167:16 175:9 | 125:16,23,25 | 165:18,19 166:7 | word 220:23 | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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: | wind $88: 2489: 4,6$ | 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 | 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 : | 112:25 113:2 | wish 179:8 195:12 | Worksheet 95:22 | 174:4 176:23 |
| weren't 165:6, | 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 | 143:17 146:7,18 | 110:18 132:14 | world 216 | 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 |  |
| WIJAM 97:6 106:9 | 153:1,4 155:7,20 | wondering 137:9 | wouldn't 128:25 | Z |
| 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 |  |
| 114:1 115:23 | 160:6,18 162:11 | 191:18 198:24 | Wyoming 108:17 | $\frac{0}{040164 \cdot 17}$ |
| 119:17 125:2,3,6 | 162:16 163:10 | Woodland 83:19 | $130: 15$ | 040 164:17 |


| 050684 216:3 | 96:4,6,7,9,10,12 | 2019 88:9 92:24 | 24 83:16 88:9 99:1 | $50088: 9188: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |
| 186:3,16 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 | $55105: 3$ |
| 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 |  |
| $1.4140: 9$ | 11th 101:8 205:4 | 112:9,15,17,19 | 2994:9 95:12 | 6 |
| 1.48 109:4 | $1293: 9$ | 113:17,25 114:5 |  | $686: 8120: 18$ |
| 1:00 179:19,23 | 1325 83:22 | 114:15 115:23 | 3 | $6.310206: 7$ |
| 10 161:9 | 13th 108:19 | 119:17 125:3 | 3 86:5,16 202:11 | $6.4206: 1$ |
| 10:44 142:10 | 14 96:15 200:5 | 126:15 127:6,22 | $3092: 24$ 93:9 180:2 | 621 83:19 |
| 10:55 142:7,13 | 202:3 | 127:24,25 128:9 | 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 |
| $100159: 21,23$ | 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 | $16183: 17$ | 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 | 7 |
| 86:20,21,23,24 | 1750 85:9 | 149:25 150:18 | 31 169:8,23 170:4 | $\frac{7}{717221: 19}$ |
| 87:3,4,6,7,9,10,12 | 17th 108:24 109:22 | 154:12 157:14,17 | 173:5 | $7.17 \text { 221:19 }$ |
| 87:13,15,16,18,19 | 18 94:18 166:6 | 159:22 164:4,6 | 31st 101:24 102:3 | 0.6 204:25 207:3 |
| 87:21,22,24 88:3 | 183:18 | 165:11,16 171:8 | 113:12 | 8 |
| 88:4,6,7,9,10,12 | 1800 84:21 85:13 | 171:25 172:3 | 321 85:4 | $8 \text { 164:18 168:3,10 }$ |
| 88:13,15,16,18,19 | 19 88:16 95:7 206:3 | 175:6,11 179:24 | 3300 83:22 | $80083: 2484: 16$ |
| 88:21,22,24 89:3 | 19-94:5 | 181:1 214:22 | 3358 83:21 227:13 | $801 \text { 85:14 }$ |
| 89:4,6,8,10,12,13 | 190929 107:16 | 215:10,11,14 | $36083: 24 ~ 84: 12$ $\mathbf{3 8 3} 85: 4$ | 813-5161 84:22 |
| 89:15,16,18,20,21 | 190981 107:17 | 224:7 | 383 85:4 | $825 \text { 84:21 }$ |
| $89: 23,2490: 3,5,7$ $90 \cdot 8,10,11,13,14$ | 1st 108:21 | 2021 108:21 112:11 | 390 109:16 | 83-227 83:12 |
| $90: 8,10,11,13,14$ $90: 16,17,19,20,22$ | 2 | 113:9,22,23 | 4 | $8411185: 14$ |
| 90:23 91:3,4,6,7,9 | $286: 4,16$ 96:15 | $114: 20116: 5$ $117: 3145: 22$ | 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 | $216: 3220: 2$ $4094: 895 \cdot 10$ | 9:30 83:17 99:2 |
| 92:3,4,6,7,9,10,12 | 2:11 226:2 | 2022 124:21 | $40 \text { 94:8 95:10 }$ <br> 40128 84:11 | 9:35 99:8 |
| 92:13,15,16,18,19 | 20 115:8 206:3 | 2023 169:8,23 | $4012884: 11$ $\mathbf{4 3 0} \mathbf{2 4 2 2} 84 \cdot 17$ | 92 223:16 |
| 92:21,22,24 93:3 | 2000 84:16 | 170:1,15,23 173:5 | 430-2422 84:17 450 85.9 | $94223: 16$ |
| 93:4,6,7,9,11,12 | 2000s 123:18 | 174:5 176:2 | $450 \text { 85:9 }$ | $95182: 4,7$ |
| 93:14,15,17,18,20 | 201 85:13 | 2024 105:7 114:23 | 4Y1 96:13 | $9720185: 9$ |
| 93:21,23,24 94:3 | 2013 88:16 | 117:4 118:1 127:6 | 5 | 97232 84:21 |
| 94:5,6,8,9,11,12 | 2015 125:17,18 | 127:9 131:18 | $\mathbf{5} 86: 7223: 16$ | $9810183: 23$ |
| 94:14,15,17,19,20 | 211:18,20,22 | 135:7,21 136:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5} 86: 7 \text { 223:16 } \\ & \mathbf{5 , 0 0 0} 190: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $98104 \text { 84:17 }$ |
| 94:22,23,25 95:3 | 212:1,16 | $2025170: 4,15$ | $5.4221: 13$ | $9811085: 5$ |
| 95:4,6,7,9,10,12 | 2017 94:18 | 206 83:23 84:17 | $50216: 4$ | $98503 \text { 83:19 }$ |
| 95:13,15,16,18,19 | 2018 89:5,7,9,11 | 85:5 | $\mathbf{5 0 , 0 0 0} 190 \cdot 11$ | $9850484: 12$ |
| 95:21,22,24 96:3 | 108:19 206:3 | 22 167:24 168:5 | 50,000 190:11 | 9850484.12 |


[^0]:    21 (Pages 163 to 166)

