

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PACIFICORP dba
PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Respondent.

In the Matter of

ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY
CONSUMERS'

Petition for Order Approving Deferral of
Increased Fly Ash Revenues

Docket UE-230172
(Consolidated)

Docket UE-210852
(Consolidated)

PACIFICORP

EXHIBIT OF MATTHEW D. MCVEE

Staff Response to PacifiCorp Data Request 2

October 2023

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STAFF
RESPONSE TO DATA REQUEST

DATE PREPARED: September 27, 2023
DOCKET: UE-230172
REQUESTER: PacifiCorp

WITNESS: Molly Brewer
RESPONDER: Molly Brewer

REQUEST NO. 2:

On pages 22-24 of Exhibit MAB-1T, Witness Brewer asserts that the Commission did not reject the distributional equity analysis proposals related to Puget Sound Energy and Avista Corporation. In the relevant Avista Order,¹ the Commission elucidated that the Settling Parties had agreed to formulate “methods and standards” for distributional equity analysis in accordance with the guidance provided by the New York University Institute for Policy and Integrity. However, the Commission, in granting its approval of the stipulation, imposed a modification to this term, determining that “the Commission should establish a broad, Commission-led collaborative process to establish methods and standards for distributional equity analysis.” (emphasis added).

- a. Does Staff understand that Avista is proceeding with the distributional equity analysis in alignment with the methods and standards recommended by the New York University Institute for Policy and Integrity, rather than adhering to the forthcoming “Commission-led collaborative process to establish methods and standards for distributional equity analysis”? If so, please provide an explanation for this understanding.

RESPONSE:

No, that is not Staff’s current understanding. However, Staff would encourage Avista, as it encouraged PacifiCorp in response testimony, to take action now on developing DEA. Either company “need not wait for any pending Commission-led process to make progress towards learning about and planning for how it might incorporate a DEA” Brewer, Exh. MAB-1T at 24:4-5.

¹ *Avista Corp. v. WUTC*, Docket UE-220053, et al., Order 10/04 (Dec. 12, 2022).