## Docket No. UE-230172 and UE-210852 - Vol. IV

## WUTC v. PacifiCorp / In the Matter of Alliance of Western Energy Consumers

**December 11, 2023** 



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

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

email: info@buellrealtime.com



Page 61	Page 63
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, ) Complainant, ) DOCKET NO. UE-230172 v. ) UE-210852 PACIFICORP d/b/a PACIFIC POWER ) & LIGHT COMPANY, )	1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED 2 For PacifiCorp: 3 Ajay Kumar 4 Carla Scarsella Joe Dallas 5 PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 2000 Portland, OR 97232 (503) 290-3620 7 Ajay.kumar@pacificorp.com Carla.scarsella@pacificorp.com  5 Jocelyn Pease Adam Lowney
Respondent. )    The Matter of Alliance of Western Energy Evidentiary Hearing    Volume IV (Pages 61 - 182)   Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Presiding December 11, 2023  * A Portion of Testimony is Designated Confidential And is Sealed Under Separate Cover. *	McDowell Rackner & Gibson PC
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98054 REPORTED BY: Tia B. Reidt, Washington RPR, CCR 2798 Oregon # 22-0001	21 403Î SE Hawthorne Boulevard Portland, OR 97214 22 (503) 756-7533 Joni@sanger-law.com 23 Irion@sanger-law.com 24 25
For the Commission:  Administrative Law Judge Michael Howard Commissioner Ann Rendahl Commissioner Milt Doumit  For Public Counsel:  Lisa Gafken (via Zoom) Ann Paisner (via Zoom) Assistant Attomeys General Washington Attorney General's Office Public counsel Unit 0 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 464-6595 Lisa.Gafken@atg.wa.gov Ann.Paisner@atg.wa.gov  Commission Staff:  Nash Callaghan Assistant Attomeys General Office of the Attomey General Utilities and Transportation Division 1400 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W. P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504 (360) 586-7777 Nash.callaghan@atg.wa.gov  Alliance of Westem Energy Consumers: Sommer Moser Tyler Pepple Davison Van Cleve, P.C. 1750 South Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, OR 97201 (503) 241-7242 Sjm@dvclaw.com Tcp@dvclaw.com	Page 64  APPEARANCES CONTINUED For Sierra Club: Rose Monahan (via Zoom) Sierra Club 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300 Oakland, CA 94612 (415) 977-5704 Rose.monahan@sierraclub.org  For Walmart: Justina Caviglia (via Zoom) Parsons Behle & Latimer 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, Nevada 89501 (775) 323-1601 Jcaviglia@parsonsbehle.com  Also present: Multiple Zoom participants  * * * * * *  Multiple Zoom participants  * * * * * *

	Page 65		Page 67
1	EXAMINATION INDEX	1	Gibson.
2	PAGE	2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
	Witness: RAMON J. MITCHELL	3	Could we hear from staff?
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Kumar 100	4	MR. KUMAR: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Pepple 101	5	Nash Callaghan, AAG, on behalf of commission
5	Followup by Commissioner Rendahl 126 Further Followup by Commissioner Rendahl 160	6	staff.
6	Witness: SHERONA CHEUNG Direct Examination by Mr. Kumar 128	7	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
7	Cross-Examination by Ms. Moser 129	8	And could we have an appearance by public
8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Kumar 143 Recross-Examination by Ms. Moser 145	9	counsel?
9	Followup by Commissioner Doumit 147	10	MS. GAFKEN: Yes.
10	Followup by Chair Danner 149	11	Good morning.
11	Witness: MATTHEW D. McVEE Introduction by Mr. Lowney 153	12	This is Lisa Gafken, Assistant Attorney
	Followup by Commissioner Rendahl 153	13	General, appearing on behalf of public counsel. And my
12	Witness: ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA	14	cocounsel, Assistant Attorney General Ann Paisner is
13	Introduction by Mr. Kumar 156	15	also online.
14	Followup by Commissioner Rendahl 157	16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
15	Witness: ROBERT M. MEREDITH Introduction by Mr. Kumar 165	17	Could we hear from Alliance of Western Energy
	Followup by Commissioner Rendahl 166	18	Consumers or AY?
16 17	Witness: LANCE D. KAUFMAN	19	MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your Honor.
	Followup by Chair Danner 172	20	Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf
18 19	Witness: ANDREA C. CRANE	21	of AY.
20	Followup by Commissioner Doumit 175	22	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
21		23	And the Emergency Project?
22 23		24	MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your Honor.
24		25	This is Yochanan Zakai with Shute, Mihaly &
25			The is restrained Edital Mill States, Millery a
	Page 66		Page 68
1	Lacey, Washington; Monday, December 11, 2023	1	Weinberger on behalf of The Energy Project today.
2	9:00 a.m.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
3	-000-	3	Could we have an appearance from Northwest
4		4	Energy Coalition or NY?
5	JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning, everyone.	5	MS. SLIGER: Good morning, Your Honor.
6	Let's get on the record.	6	For the record, this is Joni Sliger with
7	It's Monday, December 11th, 2023, and the time	7	Sanger Law, appearing on behalf of Northwest Energy
8	is 9 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. I'm an	8	Coalition. Also with me for at least part of today's
9	administrative law judge with the Washington Utilities	9	hearing is Irion Sanger.
10	and Transportation Commission, and I'm presiding this	10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
11	matter along with the Commissioners who will be joining	11	Could we hear from Sierra Club?
12	us shortly.	12	MS. MONAHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
13	We are here today for an evidentiary hearing	13	This is Rose Monahan for Sierra Club's
14	in Dockets UE-230172 and UE-210852, which are captioned	14	environmental law program on behalf of Sierra Club.
15	respectively WUTC versus Pacificorp, doing business as	15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
16	Pacific Power & Light Company; and in the matter of the	16	And could we have an appearance for Walmart?
17	Alliance of Western Energy Consumers' petition for an	17	MS. CAVIGLIA: Good morning, Your Honor.
18	order of approving deferral of increased fly ash	18	This is Justina Caviglia from Parsons Behle &
19	revenue.	19	Latimer, representing Walmart.
20	Let's start by taking appearances, beginning	20	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
21	with the company.	21	So let's talk about our plans overall for
22	MR. KUMAR: Thank you, Your Honor.	22	today's hearing.
23	On behalf of the company, my name is Ajay	23	The parties recently advised the Commission
24	Kumar. And along with Carla Scarsella and Adam Lowney	24	that there has been a settlement in principle on some
25	and Jocelyn Pease of the firm of McDowell Rackner &	25	but not all issues in the case joined by all parties

Page 69 Page 71 1 except for Sierra Club and public counsel. 1 let's move to admitting the exhibits. 2 2 As I noted in my email to parties last week Do the parties stipulate to the admission of 3 3 all of the prefiled testimony and exhibits, including and in our notice issued last Friday, we are proceeding 4 4 with the evidentiary hearing today, and we were the cross-examination exhibits? And I would turn first 5 5 requiring the settlement and supporting documents to be to the company. 6 filed on December 15th as proposed by the parties. I'm 6 MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. 7 7 working to identify time for a settlement hearing in The company does not object to any of the 8 early or mid-January, and we'll likely have a preparing 8 exhibits that were provided by other parties. 9 conference for issue of notice after receiving the 9 I will note, given the stipulation, the 10 settlement on the 15th to finalize some of the details 10 company will not be offering its cross-examination 11 about the settlement hearing and any subsequent 11 exhibits today because they are -- address issues that 12 briefing. 12 have been resolved. 13 At this moment, I'm looking at January 12th 13 JUDGE HOWARD: So just to be -- just to confirm, the company is not currently moving for those 14 for the settlement hearing. But, again, that's subject 14 to confirming that works with all the parties and 15 15 to be admitted into evidence? 16 Commissioners. 16 MR. LOWNEY: Correct. 17 And it's my understanding that the parties 17 JUDGE HOWARD: And that's all the 18 plan to focus today on NPC, Net Power Cost, and PCAM, 18 company's cross-examination exhibits? 19 Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism issues at the hearing 19 MR. LOWNEY: Yes. And I have those 20 20 today because these issues are not included in the numbers, if it would be helpful to recite. 21 JUDGE HOWARD: That shouldn't be settlement in principle. The Commission may, however, 21 22 ask bench questions about issues other than NPC and the 22 necessary. 23 PCAM. 23 All right. I was just making a note of that. 24 So in terms of the hearing today and the steps 24 Could I hear from staff? 25 for it. we will turn first to the admission of the 25 MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection from Page 70 Page 72 1 prefiled exhibits and testimony, including cross 1 commission staff, Your Honor. 2 2 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. exhibits. The Commissioners will join us at 3 3 And public counsel? approximately 9:15 a.m., and then we'll allow for brief 4 opening statements limited to ten minutes each before 4 MS. GAFKEN: Public counsel has no 5 5 we turn to the cross examination of witnesses following objection to the admission of exhibits. 6 the parties agreed order of presentation. 6 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 7 Since the parties have notified us of a 7 Could we hear from AY? 8 8 MS. MOSER: No objection from AY. settlement in principle, the hearing today will 9 probably conclude before lunch. We will take a 9 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 midmorning break if it looks like we will be using the 10 And The Energy Project? MR. ZAKAI: Your honor, no objection to 11 majority of the morning, though. 11 12 And I want to remind the parties to keep their 12 the admission of exhibits. 13 13 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. microphones muted unless they are speaking, and also to 14 only use video for those portions of the hearing when 14 Could we hear from NY? 15 they have a speaking role. 15 MS. SLIGER: Yes. Your Honor. 16 If you are having any technical issues or you 16 This is Joni Sliger for NY. No objection to the admission of the exhibits. 17 observe that a party that is appearing virtually, for 17 18 instance, has dropped off the online meeting, please 18 Thank you. 19 feel free to mention that in the chat, which should be 19 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 20 reserved for technical issues or requests for breaks 20 And Sierra Club? 21 only. 21 MS. MONAHAN: This is Rose Monahan for 22 Are there any questions before we turn to the 22 Sierra Club, and we have no objections, Your Honor. 23 admission of the exhibits? 23 JUDGE HOWARD: And Walmart? 24 24 MS. CAVIGLIA: This is Justina Caviglia for (No response.)

Walmart, and we also have no objections.

25

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none,

25

	Page 73		Page 75
1	Thank you.	1	And The Energy Project?
2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	2	MR. ZAKAI: Good morning.
3	With that, I will deem all the prefiled	3	Yochanan Zakai appearing today on behalf of
4	testimony and exhibits as shown on the exhibit list	4	The Energy Project today.
5	admitted into evidence, with the exception of	5	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
6	PacifiCorp's cross-examination exhibits, which are not	6	And NY?
7	being moved into evidence at this time.	7	MS. SLIGER: Good morning.
8	And I will provide the exhibit list to the	8	This Joni Sliger with Sanger Law appearing
9	court reporter following today's hearing.	9	today on behalf of Northwest Energy Coalition. And
10	So our next our next item would be opening	10	with me for a portion of today is Irion Sanger.
11		11	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	statements. But the Commissioners are going to be	12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12	joining us here at 9:15. So I appreciate the parties		And Sierra Club?
13	amicability about the exhibits. And we have a few	13	MS. MONAHAN: Good morning.
14	minutes. Let's go off the record for a recess.	14	This is Rose Monahan on behalf of Sierra Club.
15	(Pause in the proceedings.)	15	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let's get back	16	And Walmart?
17	on the record.	17	MS. CAVIGLIA: Good morning.
18	lt's 9:16 a.m.	18	Justina Caviglia, with Parsons, Behle &
19	The Commissioners have joined us here in the	19	Latimer, on behalf of Walmart.
20	hearing room.	20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
21	Could we have short appearances for the	21	And I will note for the Commissioners that all
22	Commissioners, and then we'll turn to opening	22	of the prefiled testimony and exhibits shown on the
23	statements?	23	exhibit list have been admitted into evidence with the
24	Let's turn first to the company.	24	exception of PacifiCorp's cross exhibits, which they
25	MR. LOWNEY: Good morning.	25	have not been moved into evidence at this time.
	Page 74		Page 76
1	Page $74$ This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of	1	Page 76 So with that, we're providing an opportunity
1 2		1 2	
	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of		So with that, we're providing an opportunity
2	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of	2	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.
2	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and	2 3	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.
2 3 4	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas.	2 3 4	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.
2 3 4 5	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas.  Thank you.	2 3 4 5	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.  Good morning, Commission Chair Danner,
2 3 4 5 6	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have	2 3 4 5 6	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.  Good morning, Commission Chair Danner,  Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank
2 3 4 5 6 7	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas.  Thank you.  (Reporter clarification.)	2 3 4 5 6 7	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.  Good morning, Commission Chair Danner,  Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit. Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit. Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit. Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.  Good morning, Commission Chair Danner,  Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas.  Thank you.  (Reporter clarification.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range.  Mr. Callaghan?  MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.  Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff.  JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard.  Good morning, Commission Chair Danner,  Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And AY?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas.  Thank you.  (Reporter clarification.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range.  Mr. Callaghan?  MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.  Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff.  JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel?  MS. GAFKEN: Good morning.  Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  And AY?  MS. MOSER: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on calendar year 2024, using a compliance filing update
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And AY? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on calendar year 2024, using a compliance filing update like that used in prior rate cases. In the compliance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you.  (Reporter clarification.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range.  Mr. Callaghan?  MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.  Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff.  JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel?  MS. GAFKEN: Good morning.  Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  And AY?  MS. MOSER: Good morning.  Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf of AY. With me is Tyler Pepple, also with Davison Van	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on calendar year 2024, using a compliance filing update like that used in prior rate cases. In the compliance filing, the company will incorporate all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you. (Reporter clarification.) JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range. Mr. Callaghan? MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel? MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And AY? MS. MOSER: Good morning. Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf of AY. With me is Tyler Pepple, also with Davison Van Cleve.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on calendar year 2024, using a compliance filing update like that used in prior rate cases. In the compliance filing, the company will incorporate all the adjustments recommended by staff in its response
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is Adam Lowney of the law firm of McDowell Rackner & Gibson, appearing today on behalf of Pacific Power and Light. With me is Ajay Kumar and Carla Scarsella, and Joe Dallas. Thank you.  (Reporter clarification.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Our microphones have limited range.  Mr. Callaghan?  MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.  Nash Callaghan, assistant Attorney General on behalf of commission staff.  JUDGE HOWARD: Could we hear from public counsel?  MS. GAFKEN: Good morning.  Lisa Gafken, assistant Attorney General, appearing on behalf of public counsel along with co-counsel assistant attorney general Ann Paisner.  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.  And AY?  MS. MOSER: Good morning.  Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf of AY. With me is Tyler Pepple, also with Davison Van	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So with that, we're providing an opportunity for parties to give brief opening statements.  And I would turn first to Pacificorp.  MR. LOWNEY: Thank you, Judge Howard. Good morning, Commission Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit.  Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today. This hearing is the culmination of many months of hard work by the parties, which has resulted in a partial settlement that resolves most of the issues among most of the parties.  The settling parties will be submitting that stipulation and supporting testimony on Friday. So I will not discuss that settlement today. Instead, I will limit my comments to the two issues that remain in dispute: The Net Power Cost, or NPC, forecast, and the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM.  Turning first to Net Power Costs.  The company proposes to forecast NPV based on calendar year 2024, using a compliance filing update like that used in prior rate cases. In the compliance filing, the company will incorporate all the

2.0

Page 77

impacts of the federal Ozone Transport Rule, or OTR.

The company will also incorporate several corrections and updates identified in its rebuttal testimony. Together, these accepted adjustments, updates, and corrections collectively reduce power costs by approximately \$8.8 million.

Given the company's acceptance of staff's recommendations and removal of the OTR, there are only a handful of power cost issues still in dispute that I'll briefly touch on this morning.

First, there's a dispute over the appropriate test period used to forecast NPC. The company's forecast is based on calendar year 2024 to align the NPC forecast with the forecast of all other revenue requirement items, including the capital costs for the generation and transmission resources used to derive the NPC forecast. The company's approach ensures that all cost-of-service components are considered and evaluated at the same point in time, as required by the matching principle. The company's approach is consistent with the forecast used in the last power cost only rate case filing, which was supported by staff and approved by the Commission.

AWEC and staff recommend that the company set the power cost baseline to align with the rate

resources included in Washington rates. This approach benefits Washington by, for example, enabling resources that are not allocated to Washington to hold reserves necessary to integrate renewable generation that is allocated to Washington.

Page 79

Page 80

To accurately reflect AWEC's adjustment would require the company to create a Washington-only dispatch scenario using only those resources allocated to Washington under the WIJAM. This would fundamentally change the WIJAM and require cascading changes to other NPC elements that, on the whole, would increase Washington rates.

The third disputed power cost issue involves the use of market capacity limits, or market caps, in the NPC model. In this case, the company imposed market caps at all market hubs to reflect the company's declining ability to transact in the market. AWEC recommends lifting market caps from three hubs, Mid Columbia, Palo Verde, and Four Corners, which would allow the NPC model to increase sales at those hubs, notwithstanding the historical fact of declining sales at those same hubs.

The final NPC issue relates to the company's proposal to include four corrections and two modeling updates in its compliance filing power cost update.

Page 78

effective period. This approach, however, creates a mismatch that would allow customers to, among other things, receive the power cost benefits of new wind and transmission resources without paying the attendant costs of those resources.

Adopting a mismatched forecast period also provides little customer relief because the reduced costs in rate year one are offset by higher costs in rate year two as a result of removing coal generation for the months in rate year two that extend into 2026.

The next disputed power cost issue is what AWEC refers to as the Washington Balancing Adjustment and relates to how power costs are calculated under the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology, or WIJAM. Under the WIJAM, there is an inherent energy deficit for serving Washington load. This deficit is eliminated with modeled market transactions, either through a reduction in market sales or an increase in market purchases. AWEC recommends replacing a portion of increased market purchases with modeled gas generation from gas plants allocated to Washington.

AWEC's proposal, however, is contrary to the underlying framework of the WIJAM, which starts with a simulation that models total-system dispatch and then allocates costs to Washington based on only those

1 Collectively, these six changes reduce

Washington-allocated power costs by \$4.4 million. AWEC

3 objects to only one of the corrections, which relates

4 to the Day Ahead and Real Time, or DA/RT, adjustment.

The correction fixed a formula error that was imputing unrealistic revenues into the NPC forecast. Fixing

this error produces a more accurate NPC forecast.

Turning now to the PCAM. The company initially proposed eliminating the dead and sharing bands, thereby aligning the PCAM with the vast majority of similar cost recovery mechanisms across the country and ensuring that Washington customers pay the prudently incurred costs to provide them with service, no more and no less.

In response to the company's proposal, staff recommended several changes to the PCAM, most notably a change to a symmetrical 90/10 sharing band. The company agrees with many of staff's conclusions, including that the current PCAM is inequitable, not optimal, unnecessarily complicated, and has resulted in customer losses when actual power costs were lower than forecast power costs.

Staff also concluded that the key drivers of power cost variances, like deviations in load, renewable resource generation, and market prices are

5 (Pages 77 to 80)

Page 81 outside PacifiCorp's control, and that increased renewable generation will increase power cost variability. While staff did not necessarily recommend an immediate change to the PCAM, given that the company largely agrees with staff's conclusions, the company supports staff's 90/10 sharing as a reasonable alternative to the company's primary recommendation and requests that the Commission approve a modification to the PCAM in this case to align with either the company's primary recommendation to eliminate the dead and sharing bands or adopt staff's 90/10 sharing bands. Thank you, and I look forward to presenting our case to you today. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could we hear from staff? MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. In the interest of time, commission staff will waive an opening statement. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would public counsel like to provide an opening statement? MS. GAFKEN: Yes, please. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MS. GAFKEN: Good morning, Chair Danner,

sharing band.

PacifiCorp claims that its potential participation in organized electricity markets and difficulty forecasting an accurate Net Power Cost are reasons to eliminate the deadband and sharing bands. Neither reason is sufficient to grant PacifiCorp's request.

Page 83

Page 84

Looking first at market participation,
PacifiCorp points to its participation or impending
participation in markets, including the EIM and EDAM.
While the price received for many of its resources may
be determined in EDAM, a significant portion will not.

Moreover, whether or not PacifiCorp resources are priced through EDAM, PacifiCorp is responsible for the cost of those resources dispatched either through EDAM or another mechanism. PacifiCorp maintains control over how it chooses to bid resources into the EDAM. Even with market participation, PacifiCorp will still have areas in which it should still be expected to optimize its performance.

Because PacifiCorp will still need the -- will still have the need and opportunity to actively optimize its resources, it is appropriate to continue applying the deadband and sharing bands, which are designed to appropriately incentivize PacifiCorp to

Page 82

With respect to the settlement that settling parties will be filing shortly, public counsel recognizes that it is premature to address the terms of that settlement and understands that there will be an additional process to address the settlement. As a result, my comments this morning will focus on the litigated power cost issues.

Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, and ALJ Howard.

2.5

As to other issues presented in the case, public counsel's litigation position has not changed from the testimony we filed in response and cross-answering.

For these comments, I will focus on the proposals to modify PacifiCorp's Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, PCAM. Other power cost issues will be addressed on brief.

PacifiCorp proposes eliminating the deadband and sharing bands from its PCAM.

In rebuttal, PacifiCorp's primary position remained the same, but alternatively recommends that the Commission adopt staff's proposal. Staff's proposal is to modify the PCAM to have a single 90/10 sharing band.

Public counsel opposes the proposal to eliminate the deadband and sharing bands and also opposes staff's proposal to shift to a single 90/10

carefully manage its power costs while protecting ratepayers in the event of extraordinary power cost fluctuations that are beyond the company's control.

Looking next at -- excuse me.

Looking next at PacifiCorp's ability to accurately forecast Net Power Costs. One of the most basic components of a utility's job is to address volatile fuel prices. Fuel prices are well known to be volatile, and the relevant question is whether PacifiCorp has done enough to address volatility and risk

PacifiCorp has two approaches to addressing volatility and risk. One, reliance on long-term contracts; and, two, hedging. Neither practice is optimized on behalf of Washington ratepayers. Both are carried out to optimize on a system-wide basis with no regard to the consequences specific to Washington.

PacifiCorp has not established that it would be appropriate to eliminate the deadband and sharing bands of its PCAM. Indeed, doing so would inappropriately place 100 percent of the variance risk on ratepayers, which contradicts the Commission's long-standing approach to power costs.

Similarly, staff's proposal to apply a single 90/10 sharing band does not appropriately assign risk

6 (Pages 81 to 84)

2.0

Page 85

between PacifiCorp and its ratepayers. The deadband is designed to capture PacifiCorp's normal Net Power Cost variability, while the sharing bands assign how extraordinary cost variances are shared between PacifiCorp and ratepayers.

The amount falling within the deadband is not a windfall either PacifiCorp or to ratepayers, but rather recognizes that some variability between forecasted and actual Net Power Costs is reasonable.

Evaluating whether the deadband is too large or too small might be warranted - this has not been raised - but its elimination is not appropriate. Staff believes that PacifiCorp's risk should be reduced, but the corollary is increased ratepayer risk. Assigning 90 percent of risk to ratepayers is inequitable, especially given that PacifiCorp has a long history of complaining about its inability to manage its power costs. Assigning PacifiCorp a scant 10 percent of the risk eviscerates the incentive for the company to carefully manage its costs.

Indeed, the Commission has recognized that establishing a 90/10 sharing band with no deadband fails to adequately balance risk and benefits between shareholders and ratepayers.

Staff recognizes that its proposal -- staff

here on behalf of the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. I'm going to touch on a couple of power cost issues, and then hand it to my colleague, Ms. Moser, to discuss the PCAM.

Page 87

Page 88

As PacifiCorp mentioned, one of the issues in dispute is what PacifiCorp calls a correction to the DA/RT adjustment, the Day Ahead and Real Time adjustment. As will be shown, this correction did more than just fix an error in the DA/RT adjustment. It changed how the DA/RT adjustment works.

The company has used the DA/RT adjustment since 2015, and it was first included as a component of the Net Power Cost forecast in Washington in the 2019 rate case. The stated purpose of the DA/RT adjustment is to reflect system balancing costs that PacifiCorp incurs in actual operations that are not reflected in the power cost model.

As PacifiCorp describes it, the DA/RT adjustment has two components, a price component, and a volume component. The price component is designed to recognize that PacifiCorp tends to make more purchases in high-priced hours and make more sales in low-priced hours than is reflected in the model. The volume component is designed to recognize that PacifiCorp needs to continually balance its system -- it's market

Page 86

recognizes that its proposal will result in rate surcharges in future years because there is a strong probability that actual costs will exceed forecasted costs. Modifying the PCAM with anticipated continuous surcharges is imbalanced and unfair to consumers.

Public counsel recommends that the Commission reject PacifiCorp's request to eliminate the deadband and sharing bands of its PCAM, and PacifiCorp's alternative request to adopt staff's proposal of applying a single 90/10 sharing band. Instead, the Commission should retain PacifiCorp's current deadband and sharing bands.

PacifiCorp witness Dr. Robert Earle is available to answer questions regarding public counsel's positions with respect to power cost. Witness Andrea Crane is also available for Commissioner questions, as requested. All other public counsel witnesses can be available as well should the Commissioners or Judge wish to ask them questions.

Thank you very much.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
Would AY like to give an opening statement?
MR. PEPPLE: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

Good morning, Commissioners and Judge Howard.

For the record, my name is Tyler Pepple. I'm

position through a series of purchases and sales, which are not reflected in the power cost model because that model perfectly balances the system at all times.

The quote/unquote "correction" PacifiCorp made was to the volume component of the DA/RT adjustment. However, PacifiCorp did not simply fix an errant number in a spreadsheet or make a minor formulaic correction. Instead, it simply implemented an entirely new formula that fundamentally changes how the modeling -- the model implementing the DA/RT adjustment works. Because PacifiCorp did this in its rebuttal testimony, it has deprived other parties of the ability to review the reasonableness of this change. Moreover, this change is material. It represents a \$5.2 million increase to Washington power costs, equivalent to 2.7 percent of total Washington power costs.

Accordingly, AWEC recommends that the Commission reject PacifiCorp's modeling change to the DA/RT adjustment. This change is inconsistent with how the DA/RT adjustment works, as previously approved by the Commission, and lacks a sufficient record supporting its reasonableness. If PacifiCorp wishes to implement this modeling change in the future, it should be required to do so in its opening case where parties have a chance to review and respond to it.

7 (Pages 85 to 88)

Page 89

Additionally, AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission require PacifiCorp to align its power cost forecast for rate year one with the rate year, instead of basing it on calendar year 2024. This better reflects statutory requirements applicable to multi-year rate plans, and better reflects the power costs customers are likely to pay for the 2024 rate

The timing of this case relative to when PacifiCorp must remove coal from rates, January 1, 2026, makes the timing of any forecast somewhat awkward because the second rate year will extend into 2026. That said, AWEC believes that the most reasonable approach is to use the rate year for the power cost forecast for rate year one, use calendar year 2025 as the forecast period for rate year two, and require PacifiCorp to do a complete update of its power costs through a power cost only rate case effective January 1, 2026.

Moreover, the components of these forecasts should include, among other things, incremental wheeling revenues that will be realized when Gateway West and Gateway South go into service, as well as an update to production tax credits. While AWEC now agrees with PacifiCorp that the production tax credit

As Mr. Mullins' testimony recounts, the

Page 91

Commission has long held ratepayer interests and protections in mind in PCAM design, rejecting several

previous attempts from PacifiCorp to disturb the balance of protecting ratepayers and shareholder

interests including attempts to implement dollar-for-dollar recovery of actual power costs.

As the Commission noted in its -- in PacifiCorp's 2012 General Rate case, deadbands and sharing bands are critically important elements that provide an incentive for the company to manage carefully its power costs and that protect ratepayers in the event of extraordinary power cost excursions that are beyond the company's ability to control.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Ms. Moser, could you slow down just a bit?

MS. MOSER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. MS. MOSER: Sorry.

In this case, the Commission should again reject all proposals that would modify the current PCAM

structure. As demonstrated by AWEC witness Mr.Mullins' testimony in this proceeding, the PCAM is in

fact functioning as the Commission intended, and

therefore there is no basis to modify its design. In

Page 90

rate will stay at 2.9 cents per kilowatt for 2024, it's highly likely that this rate will increase to 3.0 cents in 2025 based on inflationary trends. With new wind resources coming online, and going into customer rates, customers should receive the full value of PTCs associated with these and PacifiCorp's other wind resources.

And I'll turn it over to Ms. Moser.

MS. MOSER: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit, and Judge Howard.

I'm Sommer Moser. I am offering a brief statement on behalf of AWEC related to PacifiCorp's primary proposal to eliminate consumer protections from the Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism, as well as staff's proposal to restructure the PCAM in a way that reduces ratepayer protections.

In this case, PacifiCorp is proposing to fully eliminate the deadbands and sharing bands in the PCAM that were first established in 2015 through a collaborative process. In response, staff recommends changes to the PCAM that would retain, but nevertheless alter the applicable deadbands.

(Reporter requests to please read slowly when reading.)

MS. MOSER: Sorry. Absolutely.

Page 92

fact, PacifiCorp's own analysis demonstrates that actual Net Power Cost has been above the baseline in most years, meaning that PacifiCorp over-collected its NPC in total.

When that has not been the case, for example in 2021, there were non-Net Power Cost drivers to the scale of those impacts. Given the imperfection inherent in forecasting, actual Net Power Costs will always or generally be higher or lower than forecast. But based on experience to date, there is no indication of a bias that would warrant adoption of PacifiCorp's proposal.

The Commission should also not be swayed by PacifiCorp's arguments that certain circumstances, namely difficulties in forecasting Net Power Cost, increasing renewable resources as a result of CETA, its potential participation in an organized market, and the lack of control over NPC drivers are either accurate or weigh in favor of eliminating the deadbands and sharing bands in the PCAM. Again, as the testimony of Mr. Mullins demonstrates, PacifiCorp's arguments on these issues are easily rebutted and without merit.

AWEC continues to recommend that the Commission preserve the PCAM in its current state and reject modifications offered by PacifiCorp and other

8 (Pages 89 to 92)

Page 93 parties to this proceeding. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would The Energy Project like to give an opening statement? MR. ZAKAI: Thank you, Your Honor, and Commissioners. The Energy Project does not intend to offer an opening statement today. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would NY like to provide an opening statement? MS. SLIGER: Thank you, Commissioners, and Judge Howard. (Inaudible Zoom audio) staff and The Energy Project, and we waive opening statement today. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Same question to Sierra Club. MS. MONAHAN: I do, Your Honor. Yes, we do have a brief opening statement. JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. MS. MONAHAN: Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and Commissioner Doumit. For the record, my name is Rose Monahan, and I am appearing today on behalf of Sierra Club. Sierra Club intervened in this proceeding to

Commission concluded that these limited protections did not equitably apportion risk between ratepayers and shareholders.

Page 95

A year later, in 2007, PacifiCorp's PCAM proposal was rejected again because the proposed deadbands and sharing bands did not recognize the asymmetry of power cost risk. Here, the Commission emphasized that a PCAM for PacifiCorp must reflect this asymmetry in the design of deadbands and sharing bands.

In 2013, the Commission once again rejected the company's proposal because this time, and despite clear Commission direction, the proposal included neither deadbands nor sharing bands. The Commission described these elements as critically important in providing an incentive for the company to carefully manage its power costs and in protecting ratepayers in the event of extraordinary power cost excursions.

Finally, in 2015, when the company once again proposed an adjuster mechanism that would provide dollar-for-dollar annual recovery, the Commission flatly rejected the proposal and provided the company with an extremely short timeframe to propose an acceptable PCAM, which resulted in the current structure that PacifiCorp has today with both a deadband and asymmetrical sharing bands.

Page 94

Adjustment Mechanism, or PCAM. I will do my best not to repeat arguments heard this morning but add Sierra Club's perspective.

address PacifiCorp's proposed changes to the Power Cost

As the company has many times before, it once again asks this Commission to authorize yearly, dollar-for-dollar recovery of its Net Power Costs outside the confines of a rate case, although it is willing to accept staff's proposal to eliminate the deadband and limit the sharing band to 90/10.

The Commission has long recognized the significant benefits that adjuster mechanisms provide to utility shareholders and the resulting shifting of risk onto ratepayers. As a result, the Commission has been steadfast that PacifiCorp's PCAM must include ratepayer protections in the form of deadbands and sharing bands.

Indeed, this Commission rejected PacifiCorp's PCAM proposals no less than four times because the -- because the company had not included sufficient customer protections. And it is worth briefly reviewing these decisions.

In 2006, the Commission first rejected the company's PCAM proposal. As public counsel noted, at that time, the company proposed a 90/10 sharing band and no deadband, as is proposed today, and the

Page 96

The Commission thus considered PacifiCorp's PCAM for over 11 years before authorizing an adjuster mechanism. The Commission never wavered from its determination that both a deadband and asymmetrical sharing bands are necessary components. And there is no compelling evidence raised in this case to modify the Commission's extensive and well-reasoned precedent.

At most, PacifiCorp raises two arguments for change that we've heard about today. The first is the company argues that the volatility of Net Power Costs justifies a 100 percent pass-through mechanism. But volatility is nothing new, and is, in fact, one of the primary reasons why PacifiCorp was granted a PCAM in the first place. The company complains that the volatility of Net Power Costs is becoming worse due to the increasing penetration of renewable energy, particularly wind. Sierra Club expert witness Ronald Binz explained through responsive and cross-answering testimony that the company greatly exaggerates the impact of renewable energy on Net Power Cost volatility.

The biggest variable -- the biggest variable driving Net Power Costs is natural gas, an unpredictable, global commodity that the company knowingly chooses to rely upon. Conversely, renewable

9 (Pages 93 to 96)

Page 97 Page 99 1 energy only has a limited impact on Net Power Cost 1 Thank you. 2 2 volatility, and for the vast majority of the year, JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 3 variability in renewable generation will not cause Net 3 Would Walmart like to give an opening 4 4 Power Costs to be erratic or difficult to forecast statement? 5 because it only has a small impact on market prices, 5 MS. CAVIGLIA: Thank you, Your Honor and 6 which are dominated by the natural gas market. 6 Commissioners. 7 7 To the extent that renewable energy will cause Walmart waives its opening statement. 8 swings in Net Power Costs, this is restricted to hours 8 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 9 9 when demand is high. But utility planners know that So that concludes our opening statements this 10 wind generation tends not to track with peak demand and 10 mornina. 11 thus plan to meet that demand with other resources with 11 Let's now turn to the cross-examination of 12 higher capacity factors. In other words, the 12 witnesses. 13 variability of renewable energy is not forcing 13 And the parties revised order of presentation 14 PacifiCorp to make unplanned decisions that are driving 14 shows two witnesses for this morning. We may call 15 up Net Power Costs. Indeed, the record evidence 15 additional ones for bench questions as needed. 16 establishes that renewable energy drives down Net Power 16 Our first witness is Ramon Mitchell for 17 17 Costs. Pacificorp. 18 18 Is Mr. Mitchell Present? Second, PacifiCorp suggests that its 19 participation in the Extended Day-Ahead Market, or 19 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Mitchell, if you would 20 20 EDAM, will drive down Net Power Costs and the company please raise your right hand, I'll swear you in. 21 will not be incentivized through a sharing band or 21 22 22 deadband to further reduce costs. RAMON J. MITCHELL, 23 23 The timing of their entrance into the EDAM is having been first duly sworn, 24 uncertain, but, at a minimum, will not occur until 24 testified as follows: 25 2026. And even after the company enters the EDAM, this 25 Page 98 Page 100 1 1 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. will not be a reason to eliminate the deadband or 2 2 asymmetrical sharing bands. As public counsel noted Could the company please introduce the witness 3 3 this morning, the company will still retain significant and [inaudible] for cross. responsibility for controlling its Net Power Costs, 4 4 MR. KUMAR: Yes. 5 5 perhaps most importantly through its resource Thank you, Judge Howard. 6 acquisition decisions. 6 7 It is notable that none of the parties 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 weighing in on the PCAM modifications, Sierra Club, 8 BY MR. KUMAR: 9 AWEC, public counsel, and staff, support moving to a 9 Q. Witness Mitchell, could you please state and 10 dollar-for-dollar recovery model. In the majority of 10 spell your name for the record. parties, Sierra Club, AWEC, and Public Counsel, support 11 11 A. Ramon Mitchell, spelled, first name, 12 maintaining the PCAM's current structure. 12 R-A-M-O-N; Mitchell, last name, spelled 13 13 The support for cost-sharing mechanisms is M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L. 14 Q. And how are you employed? 14 unsurprising, as they achieve multiple purposes, 15 including encouraging PacifiCorp to reduce costs, 15 A. I am the manager of Net Power Costs at Pacific 16 equitably sharing risk between shareholders and 16 Power. 17 Q. And in that capacity, did you file direct and ratepayers, and ensuring that PacifiCorp has some skin 17 18 rebuttal testimony in this case? in the game when it decides which resources it should 18 19 rely upon. In sum, these customer protection 19 A. Yes, I have. 20 mechanisms achieve the purposes that the Commission 20 Q. And do you have any corrections to that 21 originally intended them to achieve, and the Commission 21 testimony? 22 should retain them. 22 A. No, I do not. 23 We look forward to this hearing and the 23 Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions 24 24 today, would your answers be the same? Commission s careful consideration of the record 25 25 evidence. Thank you. A. Yes, they would.

Page 101 Page 103 1 MR. KUMAR: Thank you. 1 read it into the record, but could you just review the 2 2 Witness Mitchell is available for question that starts on page 11 and the response. 3 Please describe the volume component of the DA/RT 3 cross-examination. 4 adjustment. 4 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 5 5 AY indicated cross for this witness. You may A. Page 11 of this? 6 6 Q. Line 11, page 7. proceed. 7 7 A. Would you like me to read it out loud, or ...? 8 8 Q. I think if you just review it and refresh your **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 9 BY MR. PEPPLE: 9 recollection on that, that would be fine. 10 10 Q. Good morning, Mr. Mitchell. A. I am complete. 11 A. Good morning. 11 Q. Okay. 12 12 Are you aware this was the first time the Q. Thank you for being here. 13 company implemented the DA/RT adjustment in Washington? 13 I would like to discuss today the Day Ahead 14 14 and Real Time adjustment with you, which I will refer A. No, I'm not aware. 15 Q. Okay. That's fine. 15 to as the DA/RT adjustment. 16 Do you know what I'm talking about when I 16 Are you aware that the company was using grid as its NPC forecast model in this case? 17 17 refer to the DA/RT adjustment? 18 A. I believe you're referring to page 14 of my 18 A. Yes. I am aware. 19 rebuttal testimony where I list four corrections and 19 Q. Okay. 20 20 two more updates. One of them is titled "Day Ahead Can you now turn to what's been marked as AWEC 21 cross exhibit RJM-13CX. This is an excerpt of 21 Realtime (DA/RT) Volume Component" as number 4. 22 22 Mr. Staple's testimony for the company in PacifiCorp's Q. All right. 23 2021 power cost only rate case, which also discusses 23 That is part of it. 24 At the moment, I'm mostly just interested in 24 the DA/RT adjustment. 25 making sure that you understand what the DA/RT 25 And, again, for the volume component Page 102 Page 104 adjustment is when I say "the DA/RT adjustment." discussion, I'll refer you to page 7 of the exhibit, 1 1 2 2 A. Yes. I believe that is what you're referring which is line -- page 20 of the testimony. 3 3 Just let me know when you're there. to, as I mentioned previously. 4 4 Q. Okay. A. I'm there. 5 5 And as you mentioned, one of the components of Q. Okay. 6 the DA/RT adjustment is the volume component; correct? 6 Can you review that question and response as 7 A. Yes, that is correct. 7 well. Please describe the volume component of the 8 8 DA/RT adjustment. Q. Okay. 9 Could you turn to AY Cross Exhibit RJM-14CX? 9 A. I am complete. 10 This is an excerpt of Mr. Wildings's testimony for the 10 Q. Okay. company in PacifiCorp's 2019 general rate case 11 Now, would you agree with me that both 11 12 discussing the DA/RT adjustment. 12 Mr. Wilding's testimony and Mr. Staple's testimony 13 Let me know when you're there. 13 describe the volume component of the DA/RT adjustment 14 14 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Excuse me. in substantially the same way? 15 What page of the testimony are you looking at? 15 A. Yes. They both do describe it in 16 MR. LOWNEY: If you could turn to page 7 16 substantially the same way. 17 17 of the exhibit, which is page 57 of the testimony. Q. Okay. 18 THE WITNESS: I am there. 18 And I'll try to summarize it, but then you 19 BY MR. PEPPLE: 19 feel free to correct me to the extent that you need to. 2.0 20 But my understanding of the volume component 21 Are you familiar with this testimony? 21 is that it is needed, in the company's mind, because 2.2 A. I am generally familiar. I have not read it 22 both grid and Aurora balance the company market 23 in quite some time. 23 position with perfect foresight at all times, which 24 24 does reflect how things work in reality. In reality, Q. Okay. 25 25 Could you just -- I don't think we need to the company takes an iterative approach to balancing

Page 105 Page 107 1 its system, which requires numerous purchases and sales 1 perfect [indecipherable] set model that balances the 2 2 of products that aren't reflected in grid or Aurora. entire year in one go, executes transactions to within 3 3 Would you say that's accurate? a fraction of a megawatt, and does not have the concept 4 4 A. That is only half the story. of heavy load hours or light load hours when it does 5 5 The other half of the story is that in the the simulations of market transactions. 6 bilateral markets in the west, energy is traded in 6 Q. Okay. 7 7 heavy-load-hour and light-load-hour products. These And would that description apply to both 8 8 are 16-hour and 8-hour block products. And when these Aurora and grid? 9 9 A. Yes. products are purchased, energy is purchased in 10 increments of 25 megawatts. So we have incremental 10 Q. Okay. 11 energy blocks and blocks of time. Grid and Aurora has 11 And in your rebuttal testimony, you describe 12 12 what you call a correction to the volume component of no concept of incremental energy blocks, nor does it 13 have a concept of blocks spread across time, such as 13 the DA/RT adjustment. 14 the heavy load and light load that I referred to. 14 Do you recall that? 15 A. Yes, I do. That inefficiency in the real western 15 bilateral markets that is not reflected in these 16 Q. Okay. 16 17 perfect models is the second reason for the adoption of 17 And can you just summarize what that 18 the DA/RT volume component. 18 correction is? 19 Q. Okay. Thank you. 19 A. In the DA/RT volume component, in the initial 20 20 And just to make sure we're clear, filing, there was an arbitrage revenue produced of over 21 21 Mr. Staple's testimony, this was based on the Aurora \$100 million. And by that, I mean the result of the 22 model in the PCAM; is that correct? 22 DA/RT volume component was a reduction to Net Power 23 23 A. Correct. Costs of over \$100 million. 24 Mr. Wilding's testimony was based on the grid 24 The DA/RT volume component, however, was 25 model. Mr. Staple's testimony was based on the Aurora 25 designed to address the inefficiencies in the real Page 106 Page 108 1 1 model. western bilateral markets and designed to reflects 2 2 Q. Okay. costs. And can you now turn know to page 18, line 17, 3 3 The approximately \$100 million revenue is 4 4 of your rebuttal testimony? unsupported by the historical data of arbitrage 5 Looking at the question that says "What is the 5 revenues and unachievable in actual operations. And DA/RT volume component?" 6 6 for that reason, the formulaic pricing of the DA/RT 7 Do you see that? 7 volume component was corrected to remove this 8 8 A. Yes, I do see it. artificial arbitrage revenue of over \$100 million and 9 Q. Okay. 9 retain the real arbitrage revenue that is implicit in 10 And would you agree with me that your 10 the historical data. description of the volume component in this testimony 11 11 Q. Thank you. 12 is also substantially similar to the description that 12 And then looking at page 19, line 17 to 18, 13 Mr. Staples and Mr. Wilding gave in their testimony? 13 you reference \$102 million total company. That -- is 14 that the same \$100 million that you were just A. With the caveat that my description is a bit 14 15 15 more complete. It describes that second component to mentioning? A. Yes, it is. 16 16 where in the real bilateral markets have heavy-load and 17 light-load-hour products, Increments of 25 megawatt 17 Q. Okav. 18 hours, 16-hour blocks, 8-hour blocks. 18 And if you could turn to page 20 of your 19 Q. Okay. Thank you. 19 rebuttal testimony. I'm looking at lines 13 through 20 And since you mentioned both grid and Aurora, 20 21 and this has been used in both models, I take it as a 21 A. I am there. 22 given that you feel that the volume component and the 22 Q. Okay. 23 DA/RT adjustment more generally is necessary regardless 23 And here you identify the work paper that was 24 of whether you're using grid or Aurora; is that true? 24 used for the DA/RT adjustments in your initial 25 25 testimony and also the work paper that was used in the A. It is necessary so long as the model used is a

Page 109 Page 111 1 rebuttal testimony. 1 Does the company identify anyone who should not be in 2 Do you see that? 2 the breakout room? 3 3 A. Yes. I do. MR. KUMAR: Judge Howard, do we Q. Okay. 4 automatically move into the breakout room? 4 5 5 MR. PEPPLE: At this time, Judge Howard, I JUDGE HOWARD: It should -- it should have need to go into confidential session and do my best to 6 6 sent a prompt. It sent me a prompt asking me to join 7 7 share my screen. And we'll see how that goes. the breakout session. 8 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Certainly. 8 MR. KUMAR: It says for me, I think, "The 9 9 host has open breakout rooms. Please wait to be So what we are going to do is transfer --10 10 since we're both in person and online, we're going to assigned." 11 transfer the online portion into a breakout room in the 11 MR. SMITH: What is the name that you're 12 12 under? Zoom meeting. 13 And we have made a list of everyone who signed 13 MR. KUMAR: Ajay Kumar. 14 confidentiality agreements in this proceeding, but I 14 MR. SMITH: Yeah, that's because I didn't 15 appreciate the company's attorneys also confirming that 15 have you on here. 16 we have the appropriate people in that breakout room 16 Let me add you. 17 once we set it up here in a moment. And then for the 17 JUDGE HOWARD: I will -- and then I think 18 people in the room, we would need to confirm that 18 the only [indecipherable]. 19 everyone here has signed a confidentiality agreement or 19 (Reporter clarification.) 20 works directly with the Commissioners such as an ALD or 20 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, Courtney Wagner is 21 21 employed in the records center here at the Commission 22 22 and is one of our staff. So I would not, yeah, find it And I'm looking around the hearing room, and 23 23 I'm seeing Keith Quinata. necessary for her to sign it. 24 Mr. Quinata, you signed confidentiality 24 MR. KUMAR: And then is Beshan Giza 25 agreement? 2.5 [phonetic] a commission employee. Page 110 Page 112 1 (Nonverbal response.) 1 JUDGE HOWARD: Likewise, he's an ALD. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. 2 2 MR. KUMAR: Okay. 3 3 I'm not really concerned about anyone else in Yeah, then I don't think we have any concerns. 4 JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. 4 the hearing room. 5 5 Does the company have any concerns about Mr. Pepple, you may share your screen. MR. PEPPLE: Thank you. 6 anyone in the hearing room? 6 I would note that Ms. Gafken had her hand 7 MR. KUMAR: No. It appears that the rest 7 8 8 of the hearing room works for the company. raised. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 9 9 JUDGE HOWARD: Oh. 10 Mr. Smith, could you transfer us over to the 10 Ms. Gafken? breakout room for the Zoom call? 11 MS. GAFKEN: I apologize. I was going to 11 12 And I would also ask that the court reporter 12 go into the chat too. It looked like the majority of 13 13 my team also missed the breakout prompt. So Ann segregate this portion of the record that we're about 14 Paisner, Andrea Crane, Robert Earle, and Corey Dahl 14 to start here any moment and prepare it under a 15 15 separate cover page. (inaudible Zoom audio) --MR. PEPPLE: Let me know if I'm okay to MR. SMITH: I didn't have them on the 16 16 17 share. 17 list --18 JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. 18 (Speaking simultaneously. Unreportable 19 Let's -- let's just give it one moment, and 19 crosstalk.) 20 I'm going to look through the participant list. I 20 MS. GAFKEN: -- breakout room. 21 encourage the company's attorneys to do the same as 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's go off the record for 22 well. We've tried to create the breakout room based on 22 a moment. 23 our list of everyone who signed confidentiality 23 (Pause in the proceedings.) 24 24 JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Pepple, you may agreements. 25 25 I'm not seeing anyone concerning on here. proceed.

	Page 113			Page	115
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		
23	OCIVIDEIVINE TEOTIMOVI		OOM IDENTIAL TECHNICITY		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	Page	116
24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		

14 (Pages 113 to 116)

	Page 117		Page 119
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*
	Page 118		Page 120
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*
25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*

15 (Pages 117 to 120)

		Page 121			Page	123
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	Page 121	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	Page	123
24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		24 25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	Page 122	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	Page	124
25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*		

16 (Pages 121 to 124)

	Page 125		Page 127
1	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1	[*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*
2	CONTIDENTAL LECTION	2	[ 13
3		3	
4		4	
5		5	
6		6	
7		7	
8		8	
9		9	*OONEDENTIAL TEOTIMONIVA
10		10	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY* ]
11		11 12	So our next witness is Sherona Cheung for the
12		13	company.
13 14		14	Is Ms. Cheung present?  MR. KUMAR: Yes.
15		15	JUDGE HOWARD: Please please come
16		16	forward, and I'll swear you in.
17		17	Please raise your right hand.
18		18	
19		19	SHERONA CHEUNG,
20		20	having been first duly sworn,
21		21	testified as follows:
22		22	
23		23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
24		24	Please introduce the witness and confirm if
25	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	25	there are any changes to the prefiled testimony.
	Page 126		Page 128
1	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY*	1	MR. KUMAR: Yes.
2		2	
3		3	DIRECT EXAMINATION
4		4	BY MR. KUMAR:
5		5	Q. Ms. Cheung, could you please state and spell
6		6	your full name.
7		7 8	A. My name is Sherona Cheung. That's spelled
8		9	spend S-H-E-R-O-N-A; last name C-H-E-U-N-G.  Q. And how are you employed by the company?
9 10		10	A. I am the revenue requirement manager at
11		11	Pacificorp.
12		12	Q. And have you filed direct and rebuttal
13		13	testimony along with attendant exhibits in this
14		14	proceeding?
15		15	A. I have.
16		16	Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to
		17	those exhibits that have not already been filed in an
17		18	errata?
17 18			
17 18 19		19	A. I have no corrections or changes.
17 18 19 20		19 20	Q. If I were to ask you those same questions in
17 18 19 20 21		19 20 21	Q. If I were to ask you those same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answers?
17 18 19 20 21 22		19 20 21 22	Q. If I were to ask you those same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answers?  A. I would.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23		19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. If I were to ask you those same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answers?</li> <li>A. I would.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22	*CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY* ]	19 20 21 22	Q. If I were to ask you those same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answers?  A. I would.

	Page 129		Page 131
1	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	1	Can I please have you turn do you have all
2	AWEC, you may proceed.	2	of the cross exhibits?
3	MS. MOSER: All right.	3	A. I believe I do, yes.
4	Thank you, Your Honor.	4	Q. Okay.
5	• .	5	I'm going to be a little funny, and I'm going
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION	6	to actually refer you to one from Mr. Mitchell. It's
7	BY MS. MOSER:	7	RJM-14X.
8	Q. Good morning, Ms. Cheung.	8	A. I apologize. I have all of the cross exhibits
9	Thank you so much for being here and answering	9	directed to me. I don't have all the cross exhibits.
10	some questions for me.	10	Q. Okay.
11	I think maybe the easiest place to start is at	11	Maybe counsel can help you.
12	your rebuttal testimony. If we turn to page 26, and	12	A. Okay. I have them.
13	you can let me know when you're there.	13	Q. Okay.
14	A. I'm there.	14	And I'm going to direct you to page 12 of that
15	Q. Thank you.	15	exhibit, which is page 64 on the pdf. So depending
16	And this section of your testimony is	16	on
17	responsive to an adjustment raised by AWEC witness,	17	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry.
18	Mr. Mullins, related to Bridger Mine appreciation	18	Which I'm having trouble finding my exhibits.
19	reclamation costs; is that correct?	19	MS. MOSER: Oh, I'm sorry.
20	A. That's correct.	20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Which exhibit are
21	Q. Okay.	21	we on?
22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry. Can you	22	MS. MOSER: RJM-14X.
23	remind me which page you're at on the rebuttal?	23	MR. KUMAR: What's the name of the
24	MS. MOSER: Yes. Page 26.	24	exhibit?
25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.	25	MS. MOSER: It's Mr. Wildings's testimony
23	COMMISSIONER NEW PARTY. Thank you.		INO. INOGER. Its IVII. Wildings's testimony
	Page 130		Page 132
1	BY MS. MOSER:	1	in the 2019 general rate case. It is the exhibit that
2	Q. And so the first thing I want to ask you about	2	Mr. Pepple referred to referred Mr. Mitchell to
3	is the operational life of the Bridger Mine on a system	3	earlier.
4	basis.	4	THE WITNESS: It had a total of 13 pages?
5	And so on page 27, line 9 of your rebuttal	5	MS. MOSER: I believe yes.
6	testimony	6	THE WITNESS: It's the redacted
7	A. Okay.	7	MS. MOSER: Yes.
8	Q am I correct in understanding that the	8	THE WITNESS: direct testimony?
9	expenses calculated were based on Bridger Mine being	9	MS. MOSER: Yes.
10	operational through 2037?	10	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm there in the
11	A. You're referring to, in the previous rate	11	right place.
12	case, where it was approved. That's the baseline	12	Thank you.
13	assumption, yes.	13	BY MS. MOSER:
14	Q. Okay.	14	Q. And so starting in the Q&A on line 3.
15	So PacifiCorp's position is that in the last	15	I don't think we need to necessarily read it
16	rate case, the baseline system operational life for	16	into the record, but do you want to take a moment just
17	Bridger Mine was 2037?	17	to read that Q&A?
18	A. Yes.	18	A. Can you point me to that page again, please.
19	Q. Okay.	19	Q. Yes. Page 12, line 3.
20	And so then am I also correct that if we	20	A. Okay. I've read that Q&A.
21	just turn the page to page 28, line starting on 8	21	Q. Okay. Thank you.
22	and 9, then in this case Pacificorp revised that system	22	And so would you agree with me that
23	operational date until to 2028; correct?	23	Mr. Wilding's testimony in the 2020 rate case makes
24	A. Yes.	24	clear that the test period projects surface coal
25	Q. Okay.	25	deliveries cease in 2028, and the underground mine

Page 133

production terminates in 2021?

- A. That's what it says, yes.
- Q. Okay.

So would you also agree with me, then, that the company, in the previous case, made the adjustment from 2037 to 2028?

- A. I'm sorry. I don't follow.
- Q. On the system operational life, the adjustment that we were just talking about in your testimony where you stated that in the 2020 rate case, the assumption was a 2037 life system operational life for Bridger Mine?
- A. That is my understanding, that it was assumed to be 2037.
  - Q. Okay.

And so then I'm asking you, in looking at Mr. Wilding's testimony in the Q&A that we just referenced, am I correct in understanding that, in fact, in the 2020 rate case, the test period assumed that coal deliveries for the surface mine would seize in 2028?

A. That is what the testimony says; however, I was not participating in that case, and so I don't -- I don't have a full comprehension of what -- how all those played into the numbers. But it is my

is that you recalibrated those amounts?

- A. Yes. The company has recalibrated those amounts --
  - Q. Sure.

A. -- taking into account the changes in the currently assumed closure dates and the currently assumed coal removal date for Washington costs.

Q. Okay.

And so in that recalibration, my question is: Were the assumptions about reclamation and depreciation from the 2020 rate case carried forward to the amounts that are recovered in this case, or were those numbers updated?

Page 135

Page 136

- A. They were updated.
- Q. Okay.

And so they -- okay.

And can you, I guess, describe what specific costs were updated as part of this proceeding?

A. I can at a high-level describe what was updated. And I think I would point you to an illustration in my rebuttal testimony that I think best describes the updates that's been changed.

So specifically it's page 30 of my rebuttal testimony. It's -- if your version is printed in color like mine, it should be quite colorful.

Page 134

assumption -- my understanding that the incremental reclamation costs established in the last case was based on mine closure date of 2037.

Q. Okay.

And so -- okay. And now I'm going to turn you to your rebuttal testimony again, starting on page 26.

A. I'm there.

Q. And here you describe that PacifiCorp is proposing to recover, again, Bridger Mine reclamation and unrecovered investment costs for 2024 and 2025 as part of Net Power Costs. Is that correct?

A. Yes. So as established in the 2020 rate case outcome, I believe there is a cross exhibit directed for me with the ordering paragraph in there. Without looking at it, based on memory, I recall the ordering paragraph outlining that when the balancing account for incremental reclamation cost was established, that there was an acknowledgment that in the baseline Net Power Cost that there would be a contribution to that reclamation amount. So the two is understood to exist simultaneously.

Q. Okay.

And so I guess in determining the amounts that are going to be included in both Net Power Costs and the regulatory liability in this case, your testimony

So what's illustrated here is the changes that we have made to the reclamation recovery assumed in Washington rates.

And so taking a couple steps back. At the top -- so this picture here shows three scenarios. The top scenario reflects a reality where there is no early exit date from coal for Washington customers. And so if that were the case, then the reclamation contribution would just be built in to rates through Net Power Costs through fuel cost until the end of whatever operational life is assumed for the coal mines. And there would be no need to establish any incremental recovery for those amounts that would not be reflected through fuel costs in Washington rates.

Now, you take a step down into that second bar, where now there's a blue and green section, what's happening there is this is depicting what was approved in the last rate case, where the assumption was that as of the end of 2023, there were no longer going to be coal costs in Washington's Net Power Cost calculations.

And so what happens, then, is after 2023, there would be no place in Washington's rates where that reclamation contribution is reflected because coal costs isn't part of Net Power Costs anymore.

And so accordingly, acknowledging that that

19 (Pages 133 to 136)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 137

was going to be the case, in the last rate case, the balancing account to capture that incremental reclamation cost was established. And that amount had started to be built into rates affective. I believe. 2021.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in '21, '22, '23, the company has accumulated an annual amount of approximately two and a half million dollars a year. The approval for that balancing account was to record that accumulation over ten years, at that time, through 2030. So that was what was approved in the last case.

Now, in this case, that's the third bar at the bottom of the illustration, you'll notice now that in blue, which represents the recovery of reclamation cost through Net Power Cost, we show the blue bar extending now through 2025. But then beyond that, because the mine is still operational, however, in Washington's Net Power Cost, there will no longer be fuel costs associated with coal. There is still a red bar now that still needs to be captured by the balancing account.

So the reality that resulted in the establishment of that balancing account in the 2021 rate case where Washington was going to cease receiving coal cost prior to the mine ceasing operation, that

what would be recovered through the regulatory liability and through a Net Power Costs?

A. No. I'm only speaking to the incremental reclamation amounts that's accumulating through the balancing account.

Page 139

Q. And do you know, if we add those two together, if those costs are greater or less than what was stipulated in the rate case -- the 2020 rate case?

A. When you say "add the two together," you're talking about the amounts that we have collected since '21, and then the updated amounts projected through 2030?

Q. Yes.

A. Okav.

Yes, it is lower. So the math goes -- in the last case, we were approved about \$2.5 million per year for ten years. If we do the quick math, that's about \$25 million. \$25 and a half million over ten years.

In this case, with the update that will be effective in 2024, that number becomes three years of collection at about \$2.5 million. So that even seven and a half million dollars for the first three years accumulated, plus, let's say, about \$2 million -- it's just below that, but we'll say it's \$2 million -- for the next seven years remaining for the balancing

Page 138

reality is still a reality today, even with the two-year extension of coal usage through Net Power Costs.

And so that leaves us with the red bar at the bottom there. But not only that, the company has also, as I mentioned, collected for three years, since '21, \$2.5-give-or-take million a year into that balancing account.

And so what the company has now reflected in its rebuttal revenue requirement is the delta between the red bar and the green bar. That amount is now spread over the remaining time through the end of 2030 to be collected from customers as the incremental reclamation cost that would not otherwise be reflected in Net Power Cost. And that amount, on an annual basis, compared to the two and a half that was approved in the last case as a rebuttal recalculation, that amount has decreased to just below \$2 million.

Q. Thank you, Ms. Cheung. That's a helpful description of the mechanics of the company's cost recovery.

I guess, am I correct, then, in understanding that the decrease in costs that you just mentioned going from about two and a half million to 2 million is a total number for both the regulatory liability --

Page 140

account. That's about \$14 million. So 14 plus the seven and a half that's already been collected is only \$21 and a half million dollars.

So overall, over the ten-year time frame, it's about 3 and a half, \$4 million lower over the lifetime of the balancing account that it's been approved for.

Q. Thank you.

And, I guess -- I guess my other -- my other question, and I apologize if this was answered in that response, is whether the NPC portion of what was assumed in rates in the 2020 rate case and then the NPC portion that is assumed in rates in PacifiCorp's proposal, is the current case, those costs, higher or lower than what is in the 2020 rate case? Just the Net Power Cost portion.

A. I'm not equipped to speak to what has been built into the Net Power Cost in this case.

Q. Okav.

And are you aware, is there a witness that Pacificorp sponsored to speak to the specific components, coal costs, that went into in Net Power Cost in this case?

A. I suspect witness Mitchell would be closer to it than I am. Nonetheless, the coal costs that are built into our Net Power Cost forecast, as well as in

20 (Pages 137 to 140)

Page 141 Page 143 1 1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION this incremental reclamation cost calculation, that 2 2 calculation is done by our fuels resource group. And I BY MR. KUMAR: 3 Q. Now, Ms. Cheung, is it your understanding of 3 don't believe that we have a company witness currently the WIJAM that Washington customers -- that that 4 available to respond to that, but I assume we can find 4 5 agreement intended for actual decommissioning and 5 remediation costs -- sorry [inaudible]. 6 Q. Thank you, Ms. Cheung. 6 7 7 I just have one more -- one more line of (Reporter clarification.) 8 8 MR. KUMAR: And I'll start again. 9 If we turn to page 29 now of your rebuttal 9 BY MR. KUMAR: 10 10 testimony. Q. Ms. Cheung, with regards to the agreement in 11 A. I'm there. 11 the WIJAM, is it your understanding of that agreement 12 Q. In the Q&A, beginning on line 9, you discuss a 12 that it is meant to include actual remediation costs in correction to the calculation of the Bridger Mine 13 13 rates? reclamation and depreciation adjustment; is that 14 14 MS. MOSER: I'm going to object. I'm sorry. This is just outside of the scope 15 correct? 15 16 A. That is correct. 16 of the questioning that I asked the witness. 17 Q. And that amounts to about \$250,000? 17 MR. KUMAR: I think it reflects on the 18 A. Yes. 18 updates that were discussed and how they were updated 19 Q. Okay. 19 and why they were updated. 20 I'm hoping that you can just tell me what 20 MS. MOSER: I would just have a follow-up specific costs were corrected in that rebuttal 21 21 question, then, to that question. 22 correction. 22 JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow it. 23 23 A. I sure can. In fact, it's actually And I will provide a brief follow-up 24 illustrated in the illustration that we were looking at 24 opportunity. 25 earlier. The correction is attributable to the green 25 THE WITNESS: Yes. It is my understanding Page 142 Page 144 1 1 that under WIJAM Washington customers will ultimately bar. So that represents the amount that had been 2 accumulating since the approval of the balancing 2 be paying for the actual remediation costs for the coal 3 3 account 2021. resources. And so that's why in the last rate case the 4 4 In rebuttal, upon examining all the party's approval was to have the collected amounts be recorded 5 5 positions on this issue, we recognize that we had to a balancing account. That balancing account will be 6 neglected to take into account the amounts that had 6 trued up, whether the collected amounts are above or 7 already been collecting in the balancing account. And 7 below the amounts that have been established in the 8 8 so that correction was to make sure that we offset that last rate case. 9 against essentially the red bar that's been calculated 9 BY MR. KUMAR: 10 in this case. 10 Q. And I believe this may have already been 11 covered in some of Ms. Moser's questioning, but when Q. And just to be clear, is it that the number 11 12 that was assumed to have already been collected, that 12 you, you know, identified the -- essentially the 13 you then corrected, was just different, or are you 13 remediation amounts for Bridger Coal Company, or BCC, 14 saying that the company did not include at all? those reflected updated amounts that you had received 14 A. In the original -- in the initial filing, the 15 from the company's fuel resources group; correct? 15 16 A. Yes, they do. 16 company had neglected to include that balance as an 17 17 offset all together. JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be careful to ask 18 18 MS. MOSER: Okay. Thank you. open-ended questions of the witness on redirect as 19 19 I have no further questions. well 20 JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect? 2.0 MR. KUMAR: Okay. 21 MR. KUMAR: Just a -- just few questions, 21 BY MR. KUMAR: 22 Your Honor. 22 Q. My next question, understanding that you're 23 23 not an NPC witness, can you generally explain why it is 24 /// 24 important to include a certain portion of BCC 25 25 /// remediation costs in the fuel cost?

Page 145 Page 147 1 1 A. I can at a high-level. And as Ms. Moser Q. And I don't want to go down it. We can 2 address it in briefing. I just -- I can be done with 2 eluded to, there is -- there has always been a baseline 3 collection for a reclamation cost in Net Power Cost. 3 questions. 4 And the reason, as I understand it, is because the fuel 4 Thank you. 5 5 cost, reflecting reclamation cost, properly reflects JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. 6 the cost of coal. 6 Any re-direct following those couple of cross 7 7 And then the Net Power Cost model, and of questions? 8 8 MR. KUMAR: No, I do not have any course witness Mitchell is much more versed in this 9 9 world than I am, but it is my very basic understanding additional. 10 10 that having that reclamation cost reflected in the in JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 11 Net Power Cost properly informs the model how much coal 11 Do we have any questions from the bench for 12 to dispatch. And so there is a modeling implication to 12 this witness? making sure that there is a base allocation of that 13 13 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. coal cost in Net Power Cost. Or, sorry, reclamation 14 14 Thank you. cost inside the coal cost in Net Power Cost. That is 15 15 JUDGE HOWARD: Please, go ahead. 16 my understanding. 16 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Kind of clearing up 17 MR. KUMAR: I have no further questions. 17 a discrepancy in direct testimony of the witness. 18 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. 18 In your direct testimony, Exhibit SLC-1T at 19 And I'll allow a brief cross follow-up. 19 page 21. 20 MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 Are you there? 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm there. 21 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** 22 2.2 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. 23 23 BY MS. MOSER: At the top of the page, there's a graphic. 24 Q. Just -- do you recall Mr. Kumar talking to you 24 And the first line, January 31, 2024, is the first NPC, 25 about the WIJAM in your response? 25 update. Page 146 Page 148 Would you agree, though, that the WIJAM is a 1 1 You see that, right? cost allocation? Or it's what's used to allocate costs 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2 3 among the states. It does not represent or 3 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. 4 predetermine rate making treatment; is that correct? 4 Now, if you look at -- and I don't know if you 5 5 A. I don't believe the WIJAM would preclude any have it with you or not -- but witness McVee's direct 6 further commission opinion on whether costs are --6 testimony. 7 should or should not be appropriately built into rates. 7 Do you have that? 8 8 I mean, I think that isn't -- it doesn't preclude any THE WITNESS: I don't have a copy of that 9 of that. However, it does give us an indication as to 9 testimony, but I'm sure I can get a copy. 10 what should be considered. And under the WIJAM, it 10 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. would -- it's my understanding that remediation costs 11 And I can just tell you, as well, unless 11 12 are agreed upon to be the responsibility -- prudent 12 you -- yeah, go ahead. 13 remediation costs will ultimately be borne by 13 It's a similar graph. There's just a 14 14 Washington customers. discrepancy in the dates. Q. And just one last question. 15 15 And so that's at page 27. Are you aware, or would you agree that 16 16 Do you see his first update would be Mr. Mitchell's testimony references you as the witness 17 17 February 16th of 2024? to discuss coal updates or NPC forecast? 18 18 THE WITNESS: I do see that. 19 A. I am not aware of that specifically. Perhaps 19 COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And I'm just 20 you could point me to that section of his testimony. 20 wondering which -- which is -- do you know which is 21 I think in the context of aligning Net Power 21 correct? 22 Cost forecast to the rest of the revenue requirement 22 THE WITNESS: I suspect that my testimony 23 forecast, I can certainly attest to that. But the 23 reflected an outdated date. I would go by Mr. McVee's 24 technicalities of Net Power Cost modeling and 24 testimony. 25 25 forecasting is certainly outside of my wheelhouse. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Great.

	Page 149		Page 151
1	Thank you.	1	Ms. Coleman's testimony with me.
2	That's all from me. Thank you.	2	CHAIR DANNER: You can then look at your
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions from	3	own testimony
4	the bench?	4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I have some questions	5	CHAIR DANNER: at SLS-AT
6	on other topics.	6	THE WITNESS: Okay.
7	Good morning.	7	CHAIR DANNER: at page 25, line 7.
8	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	8	THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
9	CHAIR DANNER: I wanted to ask you about	9	There it is. Thank you.
10	the the question regarding fly ash deferral.	10	Yes. So in my testimony, the \$6.9 million
11	Referring to your rebuttal testimony, you	11	reference is a revenue requirement number.
12	assert that there are various errors with AWEC's	12	CHAIR DANNER: Whereas Mr. Coleman's
13	calculations. And you discuss the impact of AWEC's and	13	testimony
14	staff's proposals for returning the amortized fly ash	14	THE WITNESS: Would be an expense number.
15	revenues back to customers.	15	CHAIR DANNER: All right.
16	If the Commission grants AWEC's petition for	16	Thank you for that.
17	deferred accounting treatment in Docket 210852, and	17	Does the company have any reason to believe
18	commission accepts the corrections you have identified	18	that the significant increase for insurance premiums
19	at pages 58 to 60 of or your rebuttal testimony, does	19	negotiated in August 2023 has any relationship to
20	the company take any position on AWEC's proposal for	20	downgrades of credit ratings, or are these just due to
21	returning the amortized balance to customers over one	21	other factors that are more within the company's
22	year as opposed to staff's proposal to return balance	22	control.
23	to customers over two years?	23	THE WITNESS: I would have to defer those
24	THE WITNESS: I believe this is part of	24	questions to Ms. Coleman or Mr. McVee.
25	the settlement agreement that has been reached. In my	25	CHAIR DANNER: All right.
	,		-
	Page 150		Page 152
1	testimony, however, I did not offer a preference	1	Thank you.
2	between one year or two years.		
	Detrices one year or the years.	2	I have no further questions.
3	CHAIR DANNER: Okay.	2 3	I have no further questions.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
3 4			·
	CHAIR DANNER: Okay.	3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
4	CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that.  Insurance liability, is that also covered in	3 4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)
4 5	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement?	3 4 5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?
4 5 6	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.	3 4 5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.
4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a	3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.
4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung. You are excused. No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung. You are excused. No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung. You are excused. No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung. You are excused. No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time. Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung. You are excused. No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time. Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman? And you can take those in time [inaudible].
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do. JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or is this an inconsistency in the testimony?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe so, yes.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or is this an inconsistency in the testimony? THE WITNESS: Will you kindly point me to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe so, yes.  Yes, we do have a question for McVee.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or is this an inconsistency in the testimony? THE WITNESS: Will you kindly point me to the specific page?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe so, yes.  Yes, we do have a question for McVee.  JUDGE HOWARD: Will you please raise your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or is this an inconsistency in the testimony? THE WITNESS: Will you kindly point me to the specific page? CHAIR DANNER: In Mr. Coleman's testimony,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe so, yes. Yes, we do have a question for McVee.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So of course we don't have the benefit of any proposed settlement. So I will hold off on that. Insurance liability, is that also covered in the proposed settlement? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. CHAIR DANNER: So because we have only a partial settlement, I'm going to ask the question anyway. And you can respond as you see fit. Both you and Witness Coleman testified the increased insurance premiums related to wildfires. You both highlight significant increases in the year over year amounts. But I need some clarification. Coleman notes that this results in an increase of 6.6 million, whereas you estimate this number to be around 6.9 million. And I want to know if this discrepancy reflects an application of gross effect or is this an inconsistency in the testimony? THE WITNESS: Will you kindly point me to the specific page?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any further questions from the bench for this witness?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your testimony today, Ms. Cheung.  You are excused.  No party can do cross for any of the remaining witnesses from the company or the other non-company parties at this time.  Do we have any questions from the bench for witnesses McVee, Zacharia, Meredith, Kaufman, Crane, Berreth, or Coleman?  And you can take those in time [inaudible].  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Any questions for McVee to begin?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe so, yes.  Yes, we do have a question for McVee.  JUDGE HOWARD: Will you please raise your

	Page 153		Page 155
1	MATTHEW D. McVEE,	1	Right now, our systems do not collect the data
2	having been first duly sworn,	2	at the census tract level. So we would have to go out
3	testified as follows:	3	and procure the services of a contractor to help us
4	tostillod as follows.	4	convert that data.
5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	5	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you could hire
6	Please introduce the witness.	6	the contractor again to get that data?
7	. Isaaca maraasa aha maraasa.	7	THE WITNESS: I believe we could. It
8	MR. LOWNEY: Witness McVee, could you	8	would just then be manipulating the data and, you know,
9	please state and spell your name for the record.	9	to with additional information to translate it.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Matthew	10	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
11	McVee, spelled M-A-T-T-H-E-W; last name, M-C-V-E-E.	11	I'm looking to see if I have any other
12	MR. LOWNEY: And how are you employed?	12	questions for you.
13	THE WITNESS: I am the vice president of	13	I don't believe I do.
14	regulatory policy and operations for Pacificorp.	14	Thank you very much.
15	MR. LOWNEY: And in that capacity, did you	15	JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions from
16	file testimony in this case?	16	the bench?
17	THE WITNESS: I did.	17	(No response.)
18	MR. LOWNEY: And if I were to ask you the	18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
19	same questions today, would your answers be the same?	19	Thank you, Mr. McVee.
20	THE WITNESS: They would.	20	Do we have any questions from the bench for
21	MR. LOWNEY: Thank you.	21	company witness Zacharia or Meredith?
22	Mr. McVee is available for commissioner	22	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. Both.
23	questions.	23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
24	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.	24	And is Zacharia present?
25	Good morning, Mr. McVee.	25	MR. KUMAR: Yes.
	Page 154		Page 156
1	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	1	Page 156  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
1 2	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask	1 2	
	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you		JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.
2	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at	2	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If you would please raise your right hand. ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA,
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.	2 3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If you would please raise your right hand. ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn,
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state	2 3 4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If you would please raise your right hand. ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA,
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.	2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30,	2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022 assessment until such time as Pacificorp can determine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? THE WITNESS: I do not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022 assessment until such time as Pacificorp can determine how to integrate that metadata into their system?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: If I were to ask you those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022 assessment until such time as Pacificorp can determine how to integrate that metadata into their system?  THE WITNESS: Well, let me start by saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: If I were to ask you those same questions today, would you give the same answer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022 assessment until such time as Pacificorp can determine how to integrate that metadata into their system?  THE WITNESS: Well, let me start by saying this is an issue that was part of the negotiations of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record.  THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: If I were to ask you those same questions today, would you give the same answer? THE WITNESS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Good morning.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask you a question about performance measures. And if you would like to, it's at your testimony MDM-1T at page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you state the page again.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Page 30, lines 9 through 12.  THE WITNESS: I'm there.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So your testimony indicates that PacifiCorp is currently unable to track performance measures by census tract without significant expense. But both staff and AWEC staff and AWEC and public counsel submit testimony regarding the company's 2022 Washington energy burden assessment, in which census tract data was reported by the company.  So can the company obtain the census tract data as completed by its contractor for the 2022 assessment until such time as Pacificorp can determine how to integrate that metadata into their system?  THE WITNESS: Well, let me start by saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  If you would please raise your right hand.  ISAIAH M.R. ZACHARIA, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Please introduce the witness. MR. KUMAR: Thank you. Could you please state and spell your name for the record. THE WITNESS: My name is Isaiah Zacharia. That's I-S-A-I-A-H, Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A. MR. KUMAR: Now, Mr. Zacharia did have cause to file rebuttal testimony in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: I did. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to that testimony? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: If I were to ask you those same questions today, would you give the same answer?

	Page 157		Page 159
1	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Good morning,	1	Mr. Zacharia.
2	Mr. Zacharia.	2	JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for
3	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	3	this witness?
4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I'm going to ask	4	CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
5	you about your testimony on page 5 relating to the	5	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
6	liquid markets issue.	6	Thank you for your testimony.
7	THE WITNESS: I'm there.	7	Any questions from the bench for company
8	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	8	witness Meredith?
9	So you testified that the Four Corners, Mid	9	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I believe I do have
10	Columbia, and Palo Verde are not liquid.	10	one, yes.
11	Why should the Washington balancing adjustment	11	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
12	in the WIJAM assume to address a short position in	12	Is Meredith present?
13	Washington using forecast prices or market purchases if	13	Or we had a time
14	there's such low trading volume at these hubs.	14	MR. KUMAR: Would you like to call
15	(Pause.)	15	Mr. Mitchell back?
16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Do you want me to	16	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: We can bring
17	repeat the question?	17	Mitchell back.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, please.	18	JUDGE HOWARD: Can we have Mr. Mitchell
19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So why should the	19	return to the witness stand.
20	Washington balancing adjustment in the WIJAM assume to	20	Mr. Mitchell, since I excused you earlier from
21	address the short position in Washington using forecast	21	the hearing, I will swear you in, just to err on the
22	prices of market purchases if there is such low trading	22	side of formality here.
23	or illiquid trading at these hubs?	23	,,
24	THE WITNESS: I believe that would that	24	///
25	would have to be because of the settlement agreements	25	 
	<b>G</b>		
	Page 158		- 160
	1496 130		Page 160
1	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would	1	RAMON J. MITCHELL,
1 2		1 2	
	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would		RAMON J. MITCHELL,
2	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement	2	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn,
2	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.	2 3	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn,
2 3 4	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	2 3 4	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
2 3 4 5	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.	2 3 4 5	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.	2 3 4 5 6	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to	2 3 4 5 6 7	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, maybe you can answer the next question. And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell. Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Would the declining trading volumes lead to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: I believe, subject to check,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions, which are market purchases. The lack of liquidity and the lessened trading volumes experienced by the company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: I believe, subject to check, that that option was discussed in Mr. Mitchell's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions, which are market purchases. The lack of liquidity and the lessened trading volumes experienced by the company are related to sales volumes. Specifically, the market
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: I believe, subject to check,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions, which are market purchases. The lack of liquidity and the lessened trading volumes experienced by the company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Well, maybe you can answer the next question.  And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure.  Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: I believe, subject to check, that that option was discussed in Mr. Mitchell's testimony. So, again, I'll have to refer you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions, which are market purchases. The lack of liquidity and the lessened trading volumes experienced by the company are related to sales volumes. Specifically, the market capacity limits in the model are only applied to sales.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	made around the introduction of the WIJAM. And I would have to refer any specifics to those settlement agreements around the WIJAM to [inaudible] control.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, maybe you can answer the next question. And if not, I will talk to Mr. Mitchell. Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Sure. Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short position, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?  THE WITNESS: I believe, subject to check, that that option was discussed in Mr. Mitchell's testimony. So, again, I'll have to refer you to Mr. Mitchell.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	RAMON J. MITCHELL, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Good morning again. THE WITNESS: Good morning. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So you've heard the questions, but I'll repeat them for you. The first one is: Why should the Washington balance adjustment in the WIJAM assume to address the short position in Washington using forecast prices of market purchases if there is such low volume trading at the Four Corners, Mid Columbia, and Palo Verde hubs? THE WITNESS: As an initial matter, the short position in the WIJAM is primarily related to imputing market purchases; modeled market transactions, which are market purchases. The lack of liquidity and the lessened trading volumes experienced by the company are related to sales volumes. Specifically, the market capacity limits in the model are only applied to sales. And, more broadly, in the bilateral energy

Page 161

These are specific counterparties that during certain periods of the year have volume from their hydroelectric facilities available. Purchasing in those time periods tend to not be an issue; although there will, of course, be scarcity pricing expressed in general across the markets, as we have seen for the past three years.

And so the market capacity limits discussed by witness Zacharia is relevant to the sales that the company is able to achieve, and not so much to the purchases.

As a first answer to your question, I would be more than happy to elaborate.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think for now that's sufficient.

And I guess the second question would be: Would the declining trading volumes lead to higher prices, making a different option better for filling the short positions, such as sales from Chehalis, Hermiston, Jim Bridger units 1 or 2, or another resource?

THE WITNESS: There's a curious phenomenon for load serving entities that must balance the system and serve load no matter what the market conditions are. And this pertains, interestingly enough, to the

Page 163

And in the WIJAM, the short position is first closed by reversing the market sales and then bringing in market purchases. And so there is that dynamic wherein the low-priced market sales are backed down, so to speak, and the short position is closed. So in other words, in energy that we sold, we model it as being bought back at the same low price.

And then after the short position is closed with those model market sales, the WIJAM then closes the remainder of the position with model market purchases by purchasing energy at the same prices on average that we purchased in the -- in the actual deals during the test period.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: But in a situation where there's not the wind, why aren't those resources that are in the western control area being used to address the short position instead of the market prices that are significantly higher because of the gas prices?

THE WITNESS: The reasons are primarily transmission availability to move the energy from the generation to the load, wherever that load may be. And also, the reserves held on those resources to integrate the large volume of wind and solar resources on the system to regulate further intermittent generation.

Page 162

Day Ahead and Real Time adjustment.

Load serving entities tend to purchase, of course, when they must purchase. And that often happens over peak load periods. Stress system conditions prices are high, and they must purchase the energy.

Conversely, when entities find themselves with a surplus of energy, it is often the case that all entities in a similar situated region also find themselves with a surplus of energy. As we transition -- as the energy transition moves towards more renewables, as an example, wind. Specifically, as a more specific example, in the Columbia Gorge, when it blows, it blows across all the facilities for all the utilities.

And so when the company and all of the utilities experience that surplus of energy that they must get rid of because the system must be balanced and supply must always be equivalent to demand, absent the prevalence of large-scale batteries, then the price becomes depressed in the markets, and the energy is sold at very low prices. And so it would be observed that those low prices tend to be less than the dispatch prices on average at those power plants that you referenced.

Page 164

And so whenever there is not that surplus of energy that I referenced, and they are using gas plants, as an example, those plants available with what may be perceived as capacity that could be converted into energy and dispatched up, the economics of the system generally don't support that ability because of transmission and because of reserves.

And there were one other -- one or two other factors that I identified in my testimony. I can take a moment to look.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's okay. So I'm going go back and clarify on the first question.

I'm not sure you addressed the declining trading volume at the hubs and what impact that should have on the forecast of prices. I'm assuming it goes up with the reduced trading volume.

THE WITNESS: In the Aurora model that we used to simulate those trading volumes, which flow into the WIJAM, prices do not move. The way the company utilizes Aurora, the prices input into the model are the real forward market prices. That is to say, energy traded today for delivery six months from now, as an example. And so no matter how the model dispatches its resources, the sales prices and the purchase prices,

	Page 165		Page 167
1	they never change. They remain constant.	1	So in your direct testimony at page 12, lines
2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.	2	4 through 9.
3	I don't believe I have any other questions,	3	THE WITNESS: I'm there.
4	unless my colleagues have questions.	4	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
5	(No response.)	5	You indicate that the company shared the
6	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.	6	proposed rate structure with its Equity Advisory Group,
7	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	7	and that feedback was provided to the company.
8	Thank you, Mr. Mitchell.	8	You also indicate that members of the Equity
9	Do we have any questions from the bench for	9	Advisory Group raised some concerns. Can you tell me
10	Meredith?	10	which agencies or parties participated in the EAG and
11	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, I have one.	11	what specific feedback was provided?
12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	12	THE WITNESS: I don't know that I know
13	And did is Meredith present right now?	13	exactly all of the entities who are part of the Equity
14	Please raise your right hand, and I'll swear	14	Advisory Group. I believe it does include agencies,
15	you in.	15	local agencies, who administer low income assistance
16	,	16	programs. I think it also includes a member who is
17	ROBERT M. MEREDITH,	17	part of a technical institute that's local in the
18	having been first duly sworn,	18	Yakima area, and also some other nonprofit entities.
19	testified as follows:	19	I presented this information to the Equity
20		20	Advisory Group. I think that we heard from several
21	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	21	members that they thought that the changes were
22	Please introduce your witness.	22	positive and were a good way to advance equity, advance
23	MR. KUMAR: Mr. Mitchell, could you please	23	issues that could help low income customers with high
24	state and spell your name for the record.	24	energy burdens.
25	THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Robert	25	There was one member who was a little bit
	Page 166		Page 168
1	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled	1	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of
1 2	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.	1 2	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could
	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you		concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that
2 3 4	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp?	2 3 4	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And
2	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp	2 3	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally
2 3 4	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy.	2 3 4 5 6	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.
2 3 4 5	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and	2 3 4 5 6 7	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding?	2 3 4 5 6 7	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H. MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer? THE WITNESS: I would.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer? THE WITNESS: I would. MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer? THE WITNESS: I would. MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for commissioner questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp? THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy. MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits? THE WITNESS: I do not. MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer? THE WITNESS: I would. MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction with the seasonal rates. Again, this is the company's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp?  THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy.  MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits?  THE WITNESS: I do not.  MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer?  THE WITNESS: I would.  MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for commissioner questions.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And this is related to the low income rates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction with the seasonal rates. Again, this is the company's proposal. I realize there may be differences in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp?  THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy.  MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits?  THE WITNESS: I do not.  MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer?  THE WITNESS: I would.  MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for commissioner questions.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And this is related to the low income rates. And I realize this may be per the settlement, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction with the seasonal rates. Again, this is the company's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp?  THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy.  MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits?  THE WITNESS: I do not.  MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer?  THE WITNESS: I would.  MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for commissioner questions.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And this is related to the low income rates. And I realize this may be per the settlement, but there's some clarification of your testimony that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction with the seasonal rates. Again, this is the company's proposal. I realize there may be differences in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Meredith. R-O-B-E-R-T; Meredith is spelled M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H.  MR. KUMAR: And in what capacity are you employed by Pacificorp?  THE WITNESS: I'm employed by Pacificorp as the director of pricing and tariff policy.  MR. KUMAR: And have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony, including [inaudible] exhibits in this proceeding?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. KUMAR: Do you have any changes or corrections to those exhibits?  THE WITNESS: I do not.  MR. KUMAR: And if I were to ask you the same questions in that testimony today, would you give the same answer?  THE WITNESS: I would.  MR. KUMAR: This witness is available for commissioner questions.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. And this is related to the low income rates. And I realize this may be per the settlement, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerned that maybe instead of entirely getting rid of tiered rates, maybe a different type of structure could be employed, like a higher tier, I think was what that individual expressed at the Equity Advisory Group. And so that was why I mentioned that it was generally supportive, but there was one concern from one member.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So did you talk about ways to address that concern?  THE WITNESS: We talked about it. I think that one of the concerns that we had, and others had, is just how with tiered rates it really can't they really can't impact, especially large households, large multi-generational households. I think there was just maybe some disagreement.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  Was there any concern about I'm going to move to another topic here.  Your exhibit in RMM-6 indicates that the company plans to use time-of-use rates in conjunction with the seasonal rates. Again, this is the company's proposal. I realize there may be differences in settlement.

Page 169 Page 171 1 1 based upon federal poverty level percentages, and also THE WITNESS: There weren't any concerns 2 2 the area -- sorry, federal property level and the area that there was -- about the complexity of the nexus 3 3 median income. I'm sorry. I had to remember what the between those two, time-of-use and seasonal rates. 4 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 4 other measurement was. 5 5 So how would adding in a time-of-use rate There's two different variables that are 6 simplify that structure for customers? 6 considered to determine which tier of discount level a 7 7 THE WITNESS: How -- I'm sorry. Can you customer who is participating in low income bill 8 8 assistance falls under. And we're not proposing any ask that again? How would --9 9 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: How would adding in changes to that, but we are proposing that following 10 1.0 a time-of-use variable to the seasonal rates simplify the legislation for the multiyear rate plan -- I have 11 matters for customers? 11 an exhibit, which makes sure that we're complying with 12 THE WITNESS: So in my direct testimony, 12 that such that whatever increase is ordered for 13 and also in my rebuttal testimony, which are different 13 residential customers that there is double the increase 14 than what ultimately was settled, which I know you 14 in benefits to low income bill assistance participants. 15 don't have before you right now, there was not a COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 15 16 proposal for imposing any new time-of-use rates. There 16 I think it was the use of the word "tiers" --17 was a proposal to have something, which we call net 17 THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: -- that confused 18 billing, for customer generators after we had reached 18 19 our cap. In my rebuttal testimony, we withdrew that 19 me. So I appreciate your clarification. That's all I have for Mr. Meredith. 20 20 proposal. 21 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for So I -- there is not, right now, any sort of 22 time-of-use proposal before the Commission. We do have 22 this witness. 23 23 an optional time-of-use opt-in rate schedule that's (No response.) 24 currently effective on a pilot basis. There's no 24 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you for your 25 change being proposed to that right now. 25 testimony. Page 170 Page 172 1 1 THE WITNESS: Thanks. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 2 2 JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions And the last question I have for you has to do 3 3 with the proposal for seasonal rates that eliminates from the bench for AWEC witness Kaufman? 4 4 the tiered energy rates currently in the rate CHAIR DANNER: Yes, I have one question for 5 5 structure. Kaufman. 6 And then your testimony also discusses meeting 6 JUDGE HOWARD: Is Kaufman online? 7 the multiyear rate plan statute requirement for low 7 MS. MOSER: I believe he is. 8 income programs. 8 JUDGE HOWARD: Good morning, Mr. Kaufman. 9 Can you hear and see me all right? And so I know that those -- there are 9 10 discounted rates in there as well. So by proposing to 10 THE WITNESS: I can hear you. 11 eliminate the tiers for the rate structure, you're not 11 Can you hear me? eliminating the discounted rate tiers? 12 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. 13 13 THE WITNESS: No. No, Commissioner. What If you can, please raise your right hand, and 14 I'll swear you in. 14 we are proposing is -- so let me -- let me break that 15 15 apart into two -- two pieces here. And it might be LANCE D. KAUFMAN, 16 confusing because we use the word "tier" both to 16 17 discuss the discount levels within our Low Income Bill 17 having been first duly sworn, 18 Assistance Program, or LIBA. 18 testified as follows: 19 Additionally, in the residential rates that 19 20 customers pay, the energy charges are tiered such that 20 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 21 the first 600 kilowatt hours of usage during a monthly 21 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. 22 billing period receives a lower price, and kilowatt 22 Good morning, Mr. Kaufman. 23 hours 601 and beyond have a higher price. 23 I have a question about liability insurance. 24 24 In your testimony, in exhibit LDK-1CT at page So we are proposing no change to the low 25 25 income discount tier levels, those levels that are 48, line 10, you state that the 2019-2020 figure

	Page 173		Page 175
1		1	
1	includes an abnormal level of injuries, and therefore a	1 2	ANDREA C. CRANE,
2	two-year average should be used.		having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
3 4	And I wanted to ask first, why is this 2019 to	3 4	testified as follows:
5	2020 figure considered abnormal?  THE WITNESS: If I recall, it was about	5	THE WITNESS: Voc. I do
6		6	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you.
7	ten times higher than the other two years (inaudible Zoom audio).	7	Thank you for appearing.
8	(Reporter clarification.)	8	I'm referring to your recommendations at in
9	JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Kaufman, could you	9	direct testimony ACC-1T, at page 29, lines 8 through
10	repeat that? It came through a little garbled due to	10	15, the recommendation to set the O&M expenses at
11	the connection.	11	10 percent on an annual basis, resulting in a
12	THE WITNESS: Sure.	12	27 percent increase by rate year ten.
13		13	Did you intend to refer there to rate years
14	Let me adjust my audio here.  Does this sound better?	14	one or two, or was that is that correct what you
15	JUDGE HOWARD: Possibly.	15	meant there?
16	THE WITNESS: Okay.	16	THE WITNESS: No, I did not mean rate
17	Well, I'll try and speak I'll try and speak	17	year I did not mean rate year ten. Thank you for
18	a little louder.	18	that catch. On net rate year one.
19	The I believe that the rate for 2019 was	19	And then I go on to state the company did not
20	around ten times more than the other two years, give or	20	include a separate adjustment for rate year two, so I
21	take maybe five to ten times more. And I was not able	21	just carried over my rate year one adjustment to rate
22	to determine the reason for the the abnormal level.	22	year two as well.
23	CHAIR DANNER: Okay.	23	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Great. Thank you
24	So you know that they were about ten times	24	for that clarification. That was all. I just wanted
25	higher, but you don't know the reasons why that year	25	to get that on the record.
23	riigher, but you don't know the reasons why that year		to get that on the record.
	Page 174		Page 176
1	Page 174 was abnormal?	1	Page 176 Thank you.
1 2		1 2	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.
	was abnormal?		Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?
2	was abnormal? THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should	2	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)
2	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?	2 3	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions
2 3 4	was abnormal? THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should	2 3 4	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)
2 3 4 5	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?	2 3 4 5	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions
2 3 4 5 6	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation,	2 3 4 5 6	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or
2 3 4 5 6 7	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?  (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right.  That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Thank you for your testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right.  That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right.  That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Thank you for your testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right.  That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right.  Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane?  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation? THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane?  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane?  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation? THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation?  THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane?  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we may have addressed the questions for Coleman because they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation? THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we may have addressed the questions for Coleman because they were also to Ms. Cheung.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation? THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would you please raise your right hand, and I will swear you in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we may have addressed the questions for Coleman because they were also to Ms. Cheung.  JUDGE HOWARD: Am I correct that that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was abnormal?  THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Is it your view, then, that that year should be removed from the calculation? THE WITNESS: That was my recommendation, yes.  CHAIR DANNER: Okay. All right. That's all I have. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions from the bench for public counsel witness Crane? COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is Witness Crane in the online meeting here? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would you please raise your right hand, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Thank you.  THE WITNESS: Thank you.  JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions? (No response.)  JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for company witnesses Berreth or Coleman?  And we may have limited availability for one of these witnesses at this time.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a I have some questions for witness Berreth.  JUDGE HOWARD: Is Berreth available right now, or is that or is Berreth available after noon?  MR. LOWNEY: Witness Berreth is available this afternoon.  We do have witness Coleman available now, if there are any questions for her.  COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I think this could be addressed through a bench request, Your Honor, for witness Berreth.  COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I think we may have addressed the questions for Coleman because they were also to Ms. Cheung.

Page 177 Page 179 1 CHAIR DANNER: Yes. 1 pre-hearing conference or issue a notice providing 2 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Well, I do have a 2 briefing following the settlement hearing. And the 3 3 briefing for that would likely allow the parties their question for Mr. Mullins, if he's available. I don't 4 know if he's available. The time change may be 4 post-hearing briefing around the settlement. 5 5 significant, but I don't know if he's available. Yes, I see the company would like to make a 6 JUDGE HOWARD: Is Mr. Mullins on the line? 6 comment. 7 7 MR. PEPPLE: We told him he was excused --MR. KUMAR: Yeah. 8 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's guite all 8 And I apologize, Your Honor. I want to just 9 right. I understand he's in a very different time 9 maybe go back to the notice issue, just to make sure 10 10 zone. So -that we know exactly what we're doing. 11 MR. PEPPLE: Sorry. We didn't see him on 11 I think we -- did you waive the 30-day notice 12 the list of --12 period? I just want to make sure I understand because 13 13 JUDGE HOWARD: We can issue a bench we -- I think we have to do newspaper notices, and then 14 request if needed. 14 that would take us from one to two weeks. JUDGE HOWARD: I see. 15 All right. That brings us to the end of our 15 16 witness examinations this morning. 16 So is the concern primarily, then, around the 17 I have a couple of housekeeping items before 17 lead-up to publishing the newspaper notices? 18 18 MR. KUMAR: Yeah. And it will take us we adjourn. 19 Turning to the issue of public comments and 19 about one to two weeks to get the newspaper notices 20 public participation. 20 completed and noticed. 21 Normally at this point, at the end of a rate 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Would it be possible to hold the public comment hearing towards the end of 22 case hearing, I would be asking -- I would be 22 23 discussing the issue of the public comment exhibit with 23 January and still meet all of these deadlines or rules 24 public counsel. But here we have the recent 24 if we acted now and we file a motion requesting 25 settlement. And I would expect that it would be likely 25 exemption if not? Page 178 Page 180 1 to hold a public comment hearing on the settlement 1 MR. KUMAR: Yes. As long as I -- I don't 2 itself. And that would be scheduled in early to mid 2 think there's anything required on the evidentiary 3 3 January, which would mean that time is of the essence hearing to happen after the public comment hearing 4 for scheduling this and for getting our notice out to 4 [inaudible whispering]. 5 5 customers. (Reporter clarification.) 6 I would plan to make an oral ruling here that 6 (No response.) the public comment hearing on the settlement is a date 7 7 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, we have the 8 to be determined with customer notice 30 days prior, as 8 flexibility to make that as we need to. 9 MR. KUMAR: Okav. 9 required by our rules. Ms. Gafken, do you have any 10 concerns with that approach? 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's plan on that for now. MS. GAFKEN: (Inaudible Zoom audio.) 11 And if the company wants to request an exemption, it 11 12 JUDGE HOWARD: I believe you are muted. 12 can later. 13 MS. GAFKEN: Yes, I am. I double muted. 13 MR. KUMAR: Okay. 14 14 Sorry about that. Thank you, Your Honor. Judge Howard, I have no -- no concerns with 15 So for the briefs that we currently have on 15 16 the schedule, which I would understand the parties 16 that approach. 17 Thank you. 17 would likely limit their arguments to NPC and PCAM JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 18 18 issues in these briefs, due January 12th. And that's 19 In that case, my rulings were what I just 19 one round of briefing on the schedule. We would set 20 20 the page limit for those briefs to be 40 pages. Four, 21 On the issue of briefing, post-hearing 21 zero pages. And we'll address any subsequent briefing 22 briefing, we currently have one round of post-hearing 22 following the settlement hearing at a later time. 23 briefing on the schedule at the moment. Those are due 23 Are there any questions from the parties 24 24 before we adjourn? January 12th. 25 25 And as I indicated earlier, we plan to hold a (No response.)

	Page 181	
1	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	
2	Hearing none, thank you to all of the was	
3	there a question from the company?	
4	MR. KUMAR: Your Honor, I don't know if	
5	you want to handle this on or off the record, but we	
6	I think before we were on the we previously had	
7	identified a date for the evidentiary hearing, and	
8	there was some scheduling stuff. So I don't know if	
9	you want to do that now or later.	
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's discuss the	
11	scheduling of that at a later time.	
12	MR. KUMAR: Okay.	
13	JUDGE HOWARD: That may be after the	
14	commission receives the settlement on the 15th, and we	
15	will act quickly to schedule it then.	
16	MR. KUMAR: Okay.	
17	JUDGE HOWARD: Any other questions from	
18	any other parties?	
19	(No response.)	
20	JUDGE HOWARD: All right.	
21	Thanks to all the parties, their attorneys,	
22	and their witnesses.	
23	We are adjourned.	
24	(The hearing concluded at 11:43 a.m.)	
25	(The fleating conducted at 11.16 a.m.)	
	Page 182	
1	CERTIFICATE	
2	CERTIFICATE	
3	STATE OF WASHINGTON	
4	COUNTY OF PIERCE	
5		
6	I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in	
7	and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that	
8 9	the foregoing transcript of the Evidentiary Hearing,	
9 10	Volume IV, on December 11, 2023, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.	
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my	
11 12	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023	
12	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023	
12 13 14		
12 13 14 15	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023	
12 13 14 15	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt	
12 13 14 15 16	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798	
12 13 14 15	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of	
12 13 14 15 16	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington.	
12 13 14 15 16	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	
12 13 14 15 16 17	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington.	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	
12 13 14 15 16 17	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	hand and seal this 26th day of December, 2023 /S/ Tia B. Reidt Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CCR 2798 NOTARY PUBLIC, State of Washington. My commission expires	

A	86:3 87:16 91:7	175:20,21	<b>ALD</b> 109:20 112:1	answer 86:14
<b>a.m</b> 66:2,8 70:3	92:2,8 108:5	adjustments 76:24	align 77:13,25 81:9	156:22 158:5
73:18 181:24	143:5,12 144:2	77:4 108:24	89:2	161:12 166:16
AAG 67:5	163:12	administer 167:15	aligning 80:10	answered 140:9
ability 79:17 84:5	<b>Adam</b> 63:9 66:24	administrative	146:21	answering 129:9
88:12 91:14 164:6	74:1	61:14 62:3 66:9	<b>ALJ</b> 81:25	answers 100:24
	Adam@mrg-law	admission 69:25	<b>Alliance</b> 61:11	128:21 141:5
182:10	63:12	70:23 71:2 72:5	62:20 66:17 67:17	153:19
able 161:10 173:21	add 94:2 111:16	72:12,17	87:1	anticipated 86:4
abnormal 173:1,4	139:6,9	admitted 71:15	allocate 146:2	anymore 136:24
173:22 174:1	<b>adding</b> 169:5,9	73:5 75:23	allocated 78:21	anyway 150:11
<b>absent</b> 162:19	addition 76:25	admitting 71:1	79:3,5,8	apart 170:15
Absolutely 90:25	additional 82:5	adopt 81:11 82:20	allocates 78:25	apologize 112:11
ACC-1T 175:9	99:15 147:9 155:9	86:9	allocation 78:14	131:8 140:9 179:8
accept 94:8	<b>Additionally</b> 89:1	<b>Adopting</b> 78:6	145:13 146:2	appear 76:8
acceptable 95:23	170:19	adoption 92:11	allow 70:3 78:2	appearance 67:8
acceptance 77:7	address 71:11 82:3	105:17	79:20 143:22	68:3,16
accepted 77:4	82:5 84:7,10	advance 167:22,22	145:19 179:3	appearances 62:1
accepts 149:18	93:25 107:25	advised 68:23	alter 90:22	63:1 64:1 66:20
account 134:16	147:2 157:12,21	<b>Advisory</b> 167:6,9	alternative 81:7	73:21
135:5 137:2,9,21	160:12 163:17	167:14,20 168:4	86:9	
137:23 138:8		· ·		<b>appearing</b> 67:13 68:7 70:17 74:2
139:5 140:1,6	168:8 180:21	168:23	alternatively 82:19	
142:3,6,7 144:5,5	addressed 82:15	affective 137:4	amicability 73:13	74:17 75:3,8
accounting 149:17	164:14 176:19,22	<b>afternoon</b> 176:15	amortized 149:14	93:23 175:7
accumulated 137:7	addressing 84:12	agencies 167:10,14	149:21	appears 110:7
139:23	adequately 85:23	167:15	amount 85:6	applicable 89:5
accumulating	<b>adjourn</b> 177:18	<b>agree</b> 104:11	134:20 137:3,7	90:22
139:4 142:2	180:24	106:10 132:22	138:11,15,18	application 150:19
accumulation	<b>adjourned</b> 181:23	133:4 146:1,16	142:1	applied 160:22
137:9	adjust 173:13	agreed 70:6 146:12	amounts 134:23	apply 84:24 107:7
accurate 80:7 83:4	<b>adjuster</b> 94:11	<b>agreement</b> 109:19	135:1,3,11 136:13	applying 83:24
92:18 105:3 182:9	95:19 96:2	109:25 143:5,10	139:4,10,11	86:10
accurately 79:6	adjustment 69:19	143:11 149:25	141:17 142:6	apportion 95:2
84:6	76:18 78:12 79:6	agreements 109:14	144:4,6,7,13,14	appreciate 73:12
achieve 98:14,20	80:4 82:13 87:7,8	110:24 157:25	150:15	109:15 171:19
98:21 161:10	87:9,10,11,14,19	158:3	analysis 92:1	appreciation
acknowledging	88:5,10,19,20	agrees 80:18 81:5	<b>Andrea</b> 65:19	129:18
136:25	90:14 94:1 101:14	89:25	86:16 112:14	approach 77:17,20
acknowledgment	101:15,17 102:1,1	ahead 80:4 87:7	175:1	78:1 79:1 84:23
134:18	102:6,12 103:4,13	101:13,20 147:15	<b>Ann</b> 62:4,8 67:14	89:14 104:25
acquisition 98:6	103:24 104:8,13	148:12 162:1	74:18 112:13	178:10,16
act 181:15	106:23 107:13	<b>Ajay</b> 63:3 66:23	Ann.Paisner@at	approaches 84:12
acted 179:24	129:17 133:5,8	74:3 111:13	62:12	appropriate 77:11
actively 83:22	141:14 157:11,20	Ajay.kumar@pa	<b>annual</b> 95:20 137:7	83:23 84:19 85:12
actual 80:21 85:9	160:12 162:1	63:7	138:15 175:11	109:16
L	•		•	•

	1	1	1	-
appropriately	135:6,7 136:2,11	average 162:24	81:11 82:17,24	172:7 173:19
83:25 84:25 146:7	140:11,12 142:12	163:12 173:2	83:5,24 84:20	178:12
approval 137:8	assuming 164:16	aware 103:12,14,16	85:3 86:8,12	believes 85:13
142:2 144:4	assumption 130:13	103:18 140:19	90:18 91:10 92:20	89:13
approve 81:8	133:10 134:1	146:16,19	94:16 95:6,9,13	bench 69:22 99:15
approved 77:23	136:18	<b>AWEC</b> 77:24 78:12	95:25 96:5 98:2	147:11 149:4
88:20 130:12	assumptions	78:19 79:17 80:2	<b>bar</b> 136:16 137:12	152:4,13 155:16
136:17 137:11	135:10	88:17 89:1,13,24	137:15,19 138:4	155:20 159:7
138:16 139:16	asymmetrical	90:12 91:22 92:23	138:11,11 142:1,9	165:9 172:3
140:6	95:25 96:4 98:2	98:9,11 103:20	<b>base</b> 145:13	174:14 176:6,19
approving 66:18	asymmetry 95:7,9	129:2,17 154:14	<b>based</b> 76:20 77:13	176:25 177:13
approximately 70:3	attempts 91:4,6	154:15 172:3	78:25 90:3 92:10	benefit 150:4
77:6 108:3 137:7	attendant 78:4	<b>AWEC's</b> 78:22	105:21,24,25	<b>benefits</b> 78:3 79:2
arbitrage 107:20	128:13	79:6 149:12,13,16	110:22 130:9	85:23 94:11
108:4,8,9	attest 146:23	149:20	134:3,15 171:1	171:14
area 163:16 167:18	<b>attorney</b> 62:9,15	awkward 89:11	<b>baseline</b> 77:25 92:2	<b>Berreth</b> 152:15
171:2,2	67:12,14 74:11,16	<b>AY</b> 67:18,21 72:7,8	130:12,16 134:18	176:6,11,12,13,14
areas 83:19	74:18	74:20,23 86:22	145:2	176:20
<b>argues</b> 96:10	attorneys 62:8,15	101:5 102:9	<b>basic</b> 84:7 145:9	<b>Beshan</b> 111:24
arguments 92:14	109:15 110:21		basing 89:4	<b>best</b> 94:1 109:6
92:21 94:2 96:8	181:21	B	<b>basis</b> 84:16 91:25	135:21 182:10
180:17	attributable 141:25	<b>B</b> 61:24 182:16,16	130:4 138:16	<b>better</b> 89:5,6 158:8
artificial 108:8	<b>audio</b> 93:13 112:15	back 73:16 136:4	169:24 175:11	158:16 161:18
<b>ash</b> 66:18 149:10	173:7,13 178:11	149:15 159:15,17	batteries 162:20	173:14
149:14	<b>August</b> 151:19	163:7 164:12	<b>BCC</b> 144:13,24	<b>beyond</b> 84:3 91:14
asked 143:16	<b>Aurora</b> 104:22	179:9	becoming 96:15	137:16 170:23
asking 111:6	105:2,11,21,25	backed 163:4	beginning 66:20	<b>bias</b> 92:11
133:16 177:22	106:20,24 107:8	balance 85:23	141:12	<b>bid</b> 83:17
asks 94:5	164:18,21	87:25 91:5 104:22	<b>behalf</b> 66:23 67:5	<b>biggest</b> 96:22,22
assert 149:12	authorize 94:5	142:16 149:21,22	67:13,20 68:1,7	<b>bilateral</b> 105:6,16
assessment 154:16	authorizing 96:2	160:12 161:23	68:14 74:2,12,17	106:16 108:1
154:20	automatically	balanced 162:18	74:22 75:3,9,14	160:23
assign 84:25 85:3	111:4	balances 88:3	75:19 84:15 87:1	<b>bill</b> 170:17 171:7,14
assigned 111:10	availability 163:21	107:1	90:12 93:23	<b>billing</b> 169:18
<b>Assigning</b> 85:14,18	176:8	<b>balancing</b> 78:12	<b>Behle</b> 64:8 68:18	170:22
assistance 167:15	<b>available</b> 86:14,16	87:15 104:25	75:18	<b>Binz</b> 96:18
170:18 171:8,14	86:18 101:2	134:16 137:2,9,20	<b>believe</b> 101:18	<b>bit</b> 91:16 106:14
assistant 62:8,15	128:25 141:4	137:23 138:7	102:2 131:3 132:5	167:25
67:12,14 74:11,16	153:22 156:24	139:5,25 140:6	134:13 137:4	<b>block</b> 105:8
74:18	160:24 161:3	142:2,7 144:5,5	141:3 144:10	blocks 105:11,11
associated 90:6	164:3 166:18	157:11,20	146:5 149:24	105:12,13 106:18
137:19	176:12,13,14,16	band 80:17 82:22	151:17 152:20	106:18
assume 141:4	177:3,4,5	83:1 84:25 85:22	155:7,13 157:24	blows 162:14,14
157:12,20 160:12	<b>Avenue</b> 62:10	86:10 94:9,24	158:20 159:9	<b>blue</b> 136:16 137:14
<b>assumed</b> 133:13,19	63:10	97:21	165:3 167:14	137:15
		<b>bands</b> 80:10 81:11		
	•	•	•	-

	1	1	1	
<b>borne</b> 146:13	149:13	139:19 140:11,13	80:16 88:9 90:21	coal 78:9 89:10
<b>bottom</b> 137:13	calendar 76:21	140:14,17,22	93:25 127:25	132:24 133:20
138:5	77:13 89:4,15	142:10 144:3,8	128:16,19 135:5	135:7 136:7,11,20
<b>bought</b> 163:7	<b>call</b> 99:14 107:12	153:16 162:8	136:1 156:18	136:23 137:19,25
<b>Boulevard</b> 63:21	110:11 159:14	177:22 178:19	166:11 167:21	138:2 140:21,24
Box 62:17	169:17	cases 76:22	171:9	144:2,13 145:6,11
<b>break</b> 70:10 170:14	Callaghan 62:14	catch 175:18	charges 170:20	145:14,15 146:18
<b>breakout</b> 109:11,16	67:5 71:25 74:9	cause 97:3,7 156:16	<b>chat</b> 70:19 112:12	Coalition 63:18
110:11,22 111:2,4	74:10,11 81:16	<b>caveat</b> 106:14	check 158:20	68:4,8 75:9
111:7,9 112:13,20	<b>calls</b> 87:6	Caviglia 64:8 68:17	<b>Chehalis</b> 158:10,18	cocounsel 67:14
<b>breaks</b> 70:20	<b>cap</b> 169:19	68:18 72:24,24	161:19	<b>Coleman</b> 150:12,16
<b>Bridger</b> 129:18	capacity 79:14	75:17,18 99:5	Cheung 65:6	151:24 152:15
130:3,9,17 133:11	97:12 100:17	<b>CCR</b> 61:24 182:16	127:11,13,19	176:7,16,22
134:9 141:13	153:15 160:22	cease 132:25	128:5,7 129:8	<b>Coleman's</b> 150:23
144:13 158:10,18	161:8 164:4 166:3	137:24	138:19 141:6	151:1,12
161:20	capital 77:15	ceasing 137:25	143:3,10 152:8	collaborative 90:20
<b>brief</b> 70:3 76:2	caps 79:14,16,18	census 154:13,17	176:23	colleague 87:3
82:15 90:11 93:18	captioned 66:14	154:18 155:2	chooses 83:17	colleagues 165:4
143:23 145:19	<b>capture</b> 85:2 137:2	center 111:21	96:25	collect 155:1
briefing 69:12	captured 137:20	cents 90:1,2	circumstances	<b>collected</b> 138:6,13
147:2 178:21,22	careful 98:24	certain 92:14	92:14	139:10 140:2
178:23 179:2,3,4	144:17	144:24 160:25	claims 83:2	142:12 144:4,6
180:19,21	carefully 84:1	161:1	clarification 74:6	collecting 142:7
<b>briefly</b> 77:10 94:20	85:20 91:12 95:15	certainly 109:8	111:19 143:7	collection 139:21
<b>briefs</b> 180:15,18,20	Carla 63:4 66:24	110:18 146:23,25	150:15 166:23	145:3
<b>bring</b> 159:16	74:4	Certified 182:6	171:19 173:8	collectively 77:5
bringing 163:2	Carla.scarsella@	certify 182:7	175:24 180:5	80:1
<b>brings</b> 177:15	63:7	<b>CETA</b> 92:16	<b>clarify</b> 164:12	<b>color</b> 135:24
<b>broadly</b> 160:23	carried 84:16	<b>Chair</b> 62:4 65:9,17	clarity 166:24	colorful 135:25
<b>built</b> 136:9 137:4	135:11 175:21	76:5 81:24 90:9	clear 95:12 105:20	Columbia 79:19
140:17,25 146:7	cascading 79:10	93:20 149:5,9	132:24 142:11	157:10 160:15
<b>burden</b> 154:16	case 68:25 77:22	150:3,9,23 151:2	clearing 147:16	162:13
<b>burdens</b> 167:24	79:15 81:9,13	151:5,7,12,15,25	Cleve 62:22 67:20	come 127:15
business 66:15	82:8 87:14 88:24	159:4 172:4,21	74:22,24	<b>coming</b> 90:4
	89:9,18 90:17	173:23 174:3,8	<b>closed</b> 163:2,5,8	comment 177:23
	91:9,20 92:5 94:7	177:1	closer 140:23	178:1,7 179:6,22
C 65:19 175:1	96:6 100:18	chance 88:25	<b>closes</b> 163:9	180:3
182:1,1	102:11 103:17,23	<b>change</b> 79:10 80:17	<b>closure</b> 134:3 135:6	comments 76:16
C-H-E-U-N-G 128:8	130:12,16,22	81:4 88:13,13,18	Club 64:2,3 68:11	82:6,12 177:19
	132:1,23 133:5,10	88:19,23 96:9	68:14 69:1 72:20	commission 61:2,4
CA 63:16 64:4	133:19,23 134:2	165:1 169:25	72:22 75:12,14	61:21 62:2,4,13
<b>calculated</b> 78:13 130:9 142:9	134:12,25 135:11	170:24 177:4	93:16,23,24 96:17	66:10 67:5 68:23
	135:12 136:8,18	<b>changed</b> 82:9 87:10	98:8,11	69:21 72:1 74:12
<b>calculation</b> 141:1,2 141:13 174:5	137:1,1,11,12,24	135:22	Club's 68:13 94:3	76:5 77:23 81:8
	138:17 139:8,8,16	<b>changes</b> 79:11 80:1	co-counsel 74:18	81:17 82:20 85:21
calculations 136:20				

				1 age 100
86:6,11 88:18,21	71:7,10,14 73:24	169:2	122:1,25 123:1,25	151:22 158:3
89:2 91:2,8,20,24	76:20,23,25 77:2	compliance 76:21	124:1,25 125:1,25	163:16
92:13,24 94:5,10	77:24 79:7,15	76:22 79:25	126:1,25 127:1,10	controlling 98:4
94:13,17,22 95:1	80:8,18 81:4,5	complicated 80:20	confidentiality	Conversely 96:25
95:7,10,12,13,20	85:19 87:11 91:11	complying 171:11	109:14,19,24	162:7
96:1,3 98:20,21	94:4,19,24 95:15	component 87:12	110:23	convert 155:4
98:24 111:21,25	95:18,21 96:10,14	87:19,20,20,24	confines 94:7	converted 164:4
146:6 149:16,18	96:19,24 97:20,25	88:5 101:21 102:6	<b>confirm</b> 71:14	<b>copy</b> 148:8,9
169:22 181:14	98:3 100:2 102:11	103:3,25 104:7,13	109:18 127:24	Corey 112:14
182:18	103:13,16,22	104:20 105:18	confirming 69:15	<b>Corners</b> 79:19
Commission's	104:22,25 108:13	106:6,11,15,22	109:15	157:9 160:15
84:22 96:7	110:5,8 111:1	107:12,19,22,24	confused 171:18	corollary 85:14
commissioner 62:4	127:12 128:9	108:7	confusing 170:16	correct 71:16 102:6
62:5 65:4,5,8,11	133:5 135:2 137:6	components 77:18	conjunction 168:19	102:7 104:19
65:13,15,19 76:6	138:5,9 141:3	84:7 87:19 89:20	connection 173:11	105:22,23 129:19
76:6 86:16 91:15	142:14,16 144:13	96:5 102:5 140:21	consequences	129:20 130:8,20
91:18 93:21,21	149:20 151:17	comprehension	84:17	130:23 133:18
102:14 129:22,25	152:11 154:17,18	133:24	consideration	134:11 138:22
131:17,20 147:13	155:21 159:7	concept 105:12,13	98:24	141:15,16 144:15
147:16,22 148:3	160:20 161:10	107:3	considered 77:18	146:4 148:21
148:10,19,25	162:16 164:20	<b>concern</b> 168:6,8,16	96:1 146:10 171:6	174:2 175:14
152:17,20 153:22	167:5,7 168:19	179:16	173:4	176:24
153:24 154:2,8,11	175:19 176:6	concerned 110:3	consistent 77:21	corrected 108:7
155:5,10,22	179:5 180:11	168:1	constant 165:1	141:21 142:13
156:25 157:1,4,8	181:3	concerning 110:25	consumer 90:13	correction 80:5
157:16,19 158:4	company's 71:18	concerns 110:5	consumers 62:20	87:6,8 88:4,7
158:14,24 159:9	77:7,12,17,20	112:3 167:9	67:18 86:5 87:2	107:12,18 141:13
159:16 160:6,9	79:16,23 80:15	168:10,23 169:1	Consumers' 66:17	141:22,25 142:8
161:14 163:14	81:7,10 84:3	178:10,15	<b>context</b> 146:21	corrections 77:3,5
164:11 165:2,6,11	91:14 94:23 95:11	conclude 70:9	continually 87:25	79:24 80:3 100:20
166:19,20 167:4	104:21 109:15	concluded 80:23	continue 83:23	101:19 128:16,19
168:7,15 169:4,9	110:21 138:20	95:1 181:24	CONTINUED 63:1	149:18 156:19
170:1,13 171:15	144:15 151:21	concludes 99:9	64:1	166:12
171:18 174:16	154:16 168:20	conclusions 80:18	continues 89:1	<b>cost</b> 69:18,19 76:17
175:6,23 176:10	compared 138:16	81:5	92:23	76:18 77:9,22,25
176:18,21 177:2,8	compelling 96:6	conditions 161:24	continuous 86:4	78:3,11 79:13,25
Commissioners	Complainant 61:5	162:5	contractor 154:19	80:11,24 81:2
66:11 69:16 70:2	complaining 85:17	conference 69:9	154:25 155:3,6	82:7,13,14 83:4
73:11,19,22 75:21	complains 96:14	179:1	contracts 84:14	83:15 84:2 85:2,4
81:25 86:19,24	complete 89:17	confidential 61:15	contradicts 84:22	86:15 87:3,13,17
90:10 93:6,11	103:10 104:9	109:6 113:1,25	contrary 78:22	88:2 89:3,14,18
99:6 109:20	106:15	114:1,25 115:1,25	contribution	90:14 91:13 92:2
commodity 96:24	completed 154:19	116:1,25 117:1,25	134:19 136:9,23	92:6,15 93:25
company 61:7	179:20	118:1,25 119:1,25	<b>control</b> 81:1 83:17	95:7,17 96:20
66:16,21,23 71:5	complexity 168:24	120:1,25 121:1,25	84:3 91:14 92:18	97:1 103:23
		,		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

	Ī	İ	Ī	ı
134:17,19 136:10	country 80:11	customer 78:7	Davison 62:22	91:22
136:20 137:3,14	<b>COUNTY</b> 182:4	80:21 90:4 94:20	67:20 74:22,23	demonstrates 92:1
137:15,18,25	<b>couple</b> 87:2 136:4	98:19 169:18	day 80:4 87:7	92:21
138:14,15,20	147:6 177:17	171:7 178:8	101:13,20 162:1	depending 131:15
140:15,17,22,25	course 145:8 150:4	customers 78:2	182:12	depicting 136:17
141:1 144:25	161:5 162:3	80:12 89:7 90:5	<b>Day-Ahead</b> 97:19	depreciation
145:3,3,5,5,6,7,10	<b>court</b> 73:9 110:12	136:7 138:13	days 178:8	135:10 141:14
145:11,14,14,15	182:6	143:4 144:1	dead 80:9 81:10	depressed 162:21
145:15,15 146:2	Courtney 111:20	146:14 149:15,21	<b>deadband</b> 82:16,24	deprived 88:12
146:22,24	<b>cover</b> 61:16 110:15	149:23 167:23	83:5,24 84:19	<b>derive</b> 77:16
cost-of-service	covered 144:11	169:6,11 170:20	85:1,6,10,22 86:7	describe 103:3
77:18	150:6	171:13 178:5	86:11 94:9,25	104:7,13,15
cost-sharing 98:13	<b>Crane</b> 65:19 86:16		95:25 96:4 97:22	107:11 134:8
<b>costs</b> 76:19 77:6,15	112:14 152:14	<u>D</u>	98:1	135:17,19
78:5,8,8,13,25	174:15,19 175:1	<b>D</b> 65:10,17 153:1	deadbands 90:18	described 95:14
80:2,13,21,22	<b>create</b> 79:7 110:22	172:16	90:22 91:9 92:19	describes 87:18
84:1,6,23 85:9,18	creates 78:1	<b>d/b/a</b> 61:7	94:15 95:6,9,13	106:15 135:22
85:20 86:3,4	<b>credit</b> 89:25 151:20	<b>DA/RT</b> 80:4 87:7,9	deadlines 179:23	description 106:11
87:15 88:15,16	credits 89:24	87:10,11,14,18	deals 163:12	106:12,14 107:7
89:7,17 91:7,12	critically 91:10	88:5,10,19,20	December 61:14	138:20
92:8 94:6 95:16	95:14	101:15,17,21,25	66:1,7 69:6 182:9	<b>design</b> 91:3,25 95:9
96:10,15,23 97:4	cross 70:1,5 75:24	102:1,6,12 103:3	182:12	DESIGNATED
97:8,15,17,20,22	100:3 101:5 102:9	103:13,24 104:8	decides 98:18	61:15
98:4,15 100:15	103:21 131:2,8,9	104:13 105:18	decisions 94:21	designed 83:25
107:23 108:2	134:13 145:19	106:6,23 107:13	97:14 98:6	85:2 87:20,24
129:19 134:2,10	147:6 152:10	107:19,22,24	<b>declining</b> 79:17,21	107:25 108:1
134:11,24 135:7	cross-answering	108:6,24	158:7,15 161:17	despite 95:11
135:18 136:10,14	82:11 96:18	<b>Dahl</b> 112:14	164:14	details 69:10
136:20,24,24	cross-examination	<b>Dallas</b> 63:4 74:4	decommissioning	determination 96:4
137:18 138:3,23	65:4,7 71:4,10,18	<b>Danner</b> 62:4 65:9	143:5	determine 154:20
139:2,7 140:13,21	73:6 99:11 101:3	65:17 76:5 81:24	decrease 138:23	171:6 173:22
140:24 141:21	101:8 128:25	90:9 93:20 149:5	decreased 138:18	determined 83:12
143:6,12 144:2,25	129:6	149:9 150:3,9,23	<b>deem</b> 73:3	178:8
146:2,6,11,13	crosstalk 112:19	151:2,5,7,12,15	<b>defer</b> 151:23	determining
<b>counsel</b> 62:6,9 67:9	culmination 76:9	151:25 159:4	deferral 66:18	134:23
67:13 69:1 72:3,4	curious 161:22	172:4,21 173:23	149:10	deviations 80:24
74:14,17 81:20	current 80:19	174:3,8 177:1	deferred 149:17	differences 168:21
82:2,23 86:6,17	86:11 91:21 92:24	data 108:4,10	<b>deficit</b> 78:16,16	different 142:13
94:23 98:2,9,11	95:23 98:12	154:17,19 155:1,4	deliveries 132:25	158:8,16 161:18
131:11 154:15	140:13	155:6,8	133:20	168:2 169:13
174:15 177:24	currently 71:14	date 92:10 130:23	<b>delivery</b> 164:23	171:5 177:9
counsel's 82:9	135:6,6 141:3	134:3 135:7 136:7	delta 138:10	difficult 97:4
86:15	154:12 169:24	148:23 178:7 181:7	demand 97:9,10,11	difficulties 92:15
counterparties	170:4 178:22	dates 135:6 148:14	162:19	difficulty 83:4
161:1	180:15	David 62:4	demonstrated	<b>direct</b> 65:3,6 100:7
		Daviu 02.4		

				1 ago 100
100:17 128:3,12	dollar-for-dollar	97:25	167:24 170:4,20	<b>event</b> 84:2 91:13
131:14 132:8	91:7 94:6 95:20	effect 150:19	ensures 77:17	95:17
147:17,18 148:5	98:10	effective 78:1 89:18	ensuring 80:12	Evergreen 62:16
166:7 167:1	dollars 137:8	139:20 169:24	98:17	evidence 71:15
169:12 175:9	139:22 140:3	<b>EIM</b> 83:10	enters 97:25	73:5,7 75:23,25
directed 131:9	dominated 97:6	either 78:17 81:9	entire 107:2	96:6 97:15 98:25
134:13	<b>double</b> 171:13	83:15 85:7 92:18	entirely 88:8 168:1	evidentiary 61:11
direction 95:12	178:13	elaborate 161:13	entities 161:23	66:13 69:4 180:2
directly 109:20	<b>Doumit</b> 62:5 65:8	electricity 83:3	162:2,7,9 167:13	181:7 182:8
director 166:6	65:19 76:6 81:25	elements 79:11	167:18	eviscerates 85:19
disagreement	90:10 93:21	91:10 95:14	entities/utilities	exactly 167:13
168:14	147:13,16,22	eliminate 81:10	160:25	179:10
discount 170:17,25	148:3,10,19,25	82:24 83:5 84:19	entrance 97:23	exaggerates 96:19
171:6	174:16 175:6,23	86:7 90:13,18	environmental	examination 65:1,3
discounted 170:10	176:10,18	94:8 98:1 170:11	68:14	65:6,7 70:5 100:7
170:12	downgrades 151:20	eliminated 78:17	equipped 140:16	128:3 143:1
discrepancy 147:17	Dr 86:13	eliminates 170:3	equitably 95:2	examinations
148:14 150:19	<b>drive</b> 62:16 97:20	eliminating 80:9	98:16	177:16
discuss 76:15 87:4	drivers 80:23 92:6	82:16 92:19	equity 167:6,8,13	examining 142:4
101:13 141:12	92:18	170:12	167:19,22 168:4	<b>example</b> 79:2 92:5
146:18 149:13	<b>drives</b> 97:16	elimination 85:12	168:23	162:12,13 164:3
170:17 181:10	<b>driving</b> 96:23 97:14	eluded 145:2	equivalent 88:15	164:24
discussed 143:18	dropped 70:18	<b>email</b> 69:2	162:19	exceed 86:3
158:21 161:8	due 96:15 151:20	Emergency 67:23	err 159:21	exception 73:5
discusses 103:23	173:10 178:23	emphasized 95:8	errant 88:6	75:24
170:6	180:18	employed 100:14	errata 128:18	<b>excerpt</b> 102:10
discussing 102:12	duly 99:23 127:20	111:21 128:9	erratic 97:4	103:21
177:23	153:2 156:5 160:2	153:12 166:4,5	<b>error</b> 80:5,7 87:9	excursions 91:13
discussion 104:1	165:18 172:17	168:3	<b>errors</b> 149:12	95:17
<b>dispatch</b> 78:24 79:8	175:2	employee 111:25	especially 85:16	excuse 84:4 102:14
145:12 162:23	dynamic 163:3	enabling 79:2	168:12	excused 152:9
dispatched 83:15		encourage 110:21	essence 178:3	159:20 177:7
164:5	<u> </u>	encouraging 98:15	essentially 142:9	executes 107:2
dispatches 164:24	<b>E</b> 182:1,1	<b>energy</b> 61:11 62:20	144:12	exemption 179:25
<b>dispute</b> 76:17 77:9	<b>EAG</b> 167:10	63:13,18 66:17	establish 136:12	180:11
77:11 87:6	Earle 86:13 112:14	67:17 68:1,4,7	established 84:18	<b>exhibit</b> 73:4,8
disputed 78:11	earlier 132:3	72:10 75:1,4,9	90:19 134:2,12,17	75:23 102:9,17
79:13	141:25 159:20	78:15 87:1 93:3,7	137:3 144:7	103:21 104:1
disturb 91:4	178:25	93:13 96:16,20	establishes 97:16	131:15,20,24
<b>Division</b> 62:16	early 69:8 136:7	97:1,7,13,16	establishing 85:22	132:1 134:13
<b>Docket</b> 61:5 149:17	178:2	105:6,9,11,12	establishment	147:18 150:24
Dockets 66:14	easiest 129:11	154:16 160:23,24	137:23	168:18 171:11
documents 69:5	easily 92:22	162:6,8,10,11,17	estimate 150:17	172:24 177:23
doing 66:15 84:20	economics 164:5	162:21 163:6,11	evaluated 77:19	<b>exhibits</b> 70:1,2,23
179:10	<b>EDAM</b> 83:10,12,14	163:21 164:2,5,22	Evaluating 85:10	71:1,3,4,8,11,18
	83:16,18 97:20,23			
			1	•

70.5 10 17 72.4 6	Fohmow: 149.17	flowibility 100.0	101.10 157.0	144:23 164:6
72:5,12,17 73:4,6 73:13 75:22,24	February 148:17 federal 77:1 171:1	flexibility 180:8 flow 164:19	101:19 157:9 160:15 180:20	168:5
128:13,17 131:2,8	171:2	fluctuations 84:3	fraction 107:3	generation 77:16
		fly 66:18 149:10,14	frame 140:4	C
131:9,18 166:8,12	<b>feedback</b> 167:7,11	,		78:9,21 79:4
exist 134:20	<b>feel</b> 70:19 104:19	focus 69:18 82:6,12	framework 78:23	80:25 81:2 97:3
exit 136:7	106:22	follow 133:7	Francisco 63:16	97:10 163:22,25
expect 177:25	Fifth 62:10	follow-up 143:20	free 70:19 104:19	generators 169:18
<b>expected</b> 83:19	figure 172:25 173:4	143:23 145:19	Friday 69:3 76:14	getting 168:1 178:4
expense 151:14	file 100:17 153:16	<b>following</b> 70:5 73:9	<b>fuel</b> 84:8,8 136:10	<b>Gibson</b> 63:9 67:1
154:14	156:16 179:24	147:6 171:9 179:2	136:14 137:18	74:2
expenses 130:9	<b>filed</b> 69:6 82:10	180:22	144:15,25 145:4	give 76:2 86:22
175:10	128:12,17 166:7	follows 99:24	fuels 141:2	93:3 99:3 110:19
experience 92:10	<b>filing</b> 76:21,23	127:21 153:3	<b>full</b> 90:5 128:6	128:21 146:9
162:17	77:22 79:25 82:2	156:6 160:3	133:24	156:22 166:15
experienced 160:20	107:20 142:15	165:19 172:18	<b>fully</b> 90:17	173:20
<b>expert</b> 96:17	<b>filling</b> 158:9,17	175:3	functioning 91:24	given 71:9 77:7
expires 182:18	161:18	<b>Followup</b> 65:4,5,8	fundamentally	81:4 85:16 92:7
explain 144:23	<b>final</b> 79:23	65:9,11,13,15,17	79:10 88:9	106:22
explained 96:18	finalize 69:10	65:19	<b>funny</b> 131:5	<b>Giza</b> 111:24
expressed 161:5	Finally 95:18	forcing 97:13	<b>further</b> 65:5 97:22	<b>global</b> 96:24
168:4	<b>find</b> 111:22 141:4	<b>forecast</b> 76:17,20	142:19 145:17	<b>go</b> 73:14 89:23
<b>extend</b> 78:10 89:12	162:7,9	77:12,13,14,14,17	146:6 149:3 152:2	107:2 109:6
Extended 97:19	<b>finding</b> 131:18	77:21 78:6 80:6,7	152:4 155:15	112:12,21 147:1
extending 137:15	<b>fine</b> 103:9,15	80:22 84:6 87:13	158:25 159:2	147:15 148:12,23
extension 138:2	<b>firm</b> 66:25 74:1	89:3,11,15,16	163:25 171:21	155:2 164:12
extensive 96:7	<b>first</b> 69:25 71:4	92:9 97:4 103:17	174:10 176:3	175:19 179:9
<b>extent</b> 97:7 104:19	73:24 76:3,19	140:25 146:18,22	<b>future</b> 86:2 88:23	goes 109:7 139:15
extraordinary 84:2	77:11 83:8 87:12	146:23 157:13,21		164:16
85:4 91:13 95:17	90:19 94:22 96:9	160:13 164:16	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{G}}}$	<b>going</b> 73:11 87:2
extremely 95:22	96:14 99:16,23	forecasted 85:9	<b>Gafken</b> 62:7 67:10	90:4 109:9,10
	100:11 103:12	86:3	67:12 72:4 74:15	110:20 112:11
F	127:20 130:2	forecasting 83:4	74:16 81:22,24	131:5,5,14 134:5
F 182:1	139:22 147:24,24	92:8,15 146:25	112:7,10,11,20	134:24 136:19
facilities 161:3	148:16 153:2	forecasts 89:20	178:9,11,13	137:1,24 138:24
162:14	156:5 160:2,11	foregoing 182:8	game 98:18	143:14,22 150:10
fact 79:21 91:24	161:12 163:1	foresight 104:23	garbled 173:10	154:2 157:4
92:1 96:12 133:19	164:12 165:18	<b>form</b> 94:15	gas 78:20,21 96:23	164:12 168:16
141:23	170:21 172:17	formality 159:22	97:6 163:18 164:2	<b>good</b> 66:5 67:11,19
factors 97:12	173:3 175:2	formula 80:5 88:8	Gateway 89:22,23	67:24 68:5,12,17
151:21 164:9	<b>fit</b> 150:11	formulaic 88:7	general 62:8,15,15	73:25 74:10,15,21
fails 85:23	<b>five</b> 173:21	108:6	67:13,14 74:11,16	75:2,7,13,17 76:5
falling 85:6	fix 87:9 88:6	forward 81:12	74:18 91:9 102:11	81:24 86:24 90:9
<b>falls</b> 171:8	<b>fixed</b> 80:5	98:23 127:16	132:1 161:6	93:20 101:10,11
familiar 102:21,22	Fixing 80:6	135:11 164:22	General's 62:9	129:8 149:7,8
154:24	<b>flatly</b> 95:21	<b>four</b> 79:19,24 94:18	generally 92:9	153:25 154:1
<b>favor</b> 92:19			102:22 106:23	
		I	I	l

157:1,3 160:7,8	hear 67:3,17 68:11	history 85:16	153:5 155:15,18	implicit 108:9
167:22 172:8,22	71:24 72:7,14	hold 79:3 150:5	155:23 156:1,8	important 91:10
<b>Gorge</b> 162:13	74:13 81:15 172:9	178:1,25 179:22	159:2,5,11,18	95:14 144:24
<b>grant</b> 83:6	172:10,11	<b>honor</b> 66:22 67:4	160:5 165:7,12,21	importantly 98:5
granted 96:13	<b>heard</b> 94:2 96:9	67:19,24 68:5,12	171:21,24 172:2,6	imposed 79:15
<b>grants</b> 149:16	160:9 167:20	68:17 72:1,11,15	172:8,12,20 173:9	imposing 169:16
<b>graph</b> 148:13	hearing 61:11	72:22 74:10 81:16	173:15 174:10,12	imputing 80:5
graphic 147:23	66:13 68:9,22	86:23 93:5,17	174:18,21 176:3,5	160:18
Great 112:4 148:25	69:4,7,11,14,19	99:5 128:24 129:4	176:12,24 177:6	inability 85:17
175:23	69:24 70:8,14,25	142:22 145:20	177:13 178:12,15	inappropriately
greater 139:7	73:9,20 76:8	147:13 159:4	178:18 179:15,21	84:21
<b>greatly</b> 96:19	98:23 109:22	174:16 176:19	180:7,10 181:1,10	inaudible 93:13
green 136:16	110:4,6,8 159:21	179:8 180:14	181:13,17,20	100:3 112:15
138:11 141:25	177:22 178:1,7	181:4	<b>hubs</b> 79:16,18,20	143:6 152:16
<b>grid</b> 103:16 104:22	179:2,22 180:3,3	hoping 141:20	79:22 157:14,23	158:3 166:8 173:6
105:2,11,24	180:22 181:2,7,24	host 111:9	160:15 164:15	178:11 180:4
106:20,24 107:8	182:8	hours 87:22,23	hydroelectric 161:3	incentive 85:19
<b>gross</b> 150:19	heavy 105:14 107:4	97:8 106:18 107:4		91:11 95:15
<b>group</b> 141:2 144:15	heavy-load 106:16	107:4 170:21,23	I	incentivize 83:25
167:6,9,14,20	heavy-load-hour	households 168:12	I-S-A-I-A-H	incentivized 97:21
168:4,24	105:7	168:13	156:14	include 79:24 89:21
guess 134:23	hedging 84:14	housekeeping	identified 77:3	94:14 142:14,16
135:17 138:22	held 91:2 163:23	177:17	144:12 149:18	143:12 144:24
140:8,8 161:16	help 131:11 155:3	<b>Howard</b> 61:14 62:3	164:9 181:7	167:14 175:20
	167:23	66:5,8 67:2,7,16	identify 69:7	included 69:20
<u> </u>	helpful 71:20	67:22 68:2,10,15	108:23 111:1	79:1 87:12 94:19
half 105:4,5 137:8	138:19 166:24	68:20 70:25 71:6	illiquid 157:23	95:12 134:24
138:16,24 139:18	hereunto 182:11	71:13,17,21 72:2	illustrated 136:1	includes 167:16
139:22 140:2,3,5	Hermiston 158:10	72:6,9,13,19,23	141:24	173:1
hand 87:3 99:20	158:18 161:20	73:2,16 74:7,13	illustration 135:21	<b>including</b> 70:1 71:3
112:7 127:17	<b>high</b> 97:9 162:5	74:19,25 75:5,11	137:13 141:24	77:15 80:19 83:10
152:23 156:2	167:23	75:15,20 76:4	imbalanced 86:5	91:6 98:15 166:8
165:14 172:13	high-level 135:19	81:14,19,23,25	immediate 81:4	income 166:21
174:22 182:12	145:1	86:21,24 90:10	<b>impact</b> 96:20 97:1	167:15,23 170:8
handful 77:9	high-priced 87:22	93:2,9,12,15,19	97:5 149:13	170:17,25 171:3,7
handle 181:5	<b>higher</b> 78:8 92:9	99:2,8,19 100:1,5	164:15 168:12	171:14
happen 150:25	97:12 140:13	101:4 109:5,8	impacts 77:1 92:7	inconsistency
180:3	158:8,16 161:17	110:2,9,18 111:3	impending 83:9	150:20
happening 136:17	163:18 168:3	111:5,17,20 112:1	imperfection 92:7	inconsistent 88:19
<b>happens</b> 136:21	170:23 173:6,25	112:4,9,21,24	implement 88:23	incorporate 76:23
162:4	highlight 150:14	127:15,23 129:1	91:6	77:2
happy 161:13	highly 90:2	142:20 143:22	implemented 88:8	increase 78:18
<b>Harbor</b> 62:22	hire 155:5	144:17 145:18	103:13	79:12,20 81:2
hard 76:9	historical 79:21	147:5,10,15 149:3	implementing	88:14 90:2 150:16
Hawthorne 63:21	108:4,10	152:3,7,18,22	88:10	151:18 171:12,13
Hayes 63:15			implication 145:12	
	ı	ı	ı	

175:12	institute 167:17	items 77:15 177:17	147:5,10,15 149:3	100:4,8 101:1
increased 66:18	<b>insurance</b> 150:6,13	iterative 104:25	152:3,7,18,22	110:7 111:3,8,13
78:20 81:1 85:14	151:18 172:23	IV 61:12 182:9	153:5 155:15,18	111:13,24 112:2
150:13	integrate 79:4		155:23 156:1,8	127:14 128:1,4,24
increases 150:14	154:21 163:23	J	159:2,5,11,18	131:23 142:21
increasing 92:16	<b>intend</b> 93:7 175:13	<b>J</b> 65:2 99:22 160:1	160:5 165:7,12,21	143:2,8,9,17
96:16	intended 91:24	<b>January</b> 69:13	171:21,24 172:2,6	144:9,20,21
incremental 89:21	98:21 143:5	89:10,19 147:24	172:8,12,20 173:9	145:17,24 147:8
105:10,12 134:1	interest 81:17	178:3,24 179:23	173:15 174:10,12	155:25 156:10,15
134:17 136:13	interested 101:24	180:18	174:18,21 176:3,5	156:18,21,24
137:2 138:13	interestingly	Jcaviglia@parso	176:12,24 177:6	159:14 165:23
139:3 141:1	161:25	64:10	177:13 178:12,15	166:3,7,11,14,18
increments 105:10	interests 91:2,6	<b>Jim</b> 158:10,18	178:18 179:15,21	179:7,18 180:1,9
106:17	Interjurisdictional	161:20	180:7,10 181:1,10	180:13 181:4,12
incurred 80:13	78:14	<b>job</b> 84:7	181:13,17,20	181:16
<b>incurs</b> 87:16	intermittent 163:25	<b>Jocelyn</b> 63:8 66:25	justifies 96:11	
indecipherable	intervened 93:24	Jocelyn@mrg-la	<b>Justina</b> 64:8 68:18	L
107:1 111:18	introduce 100:2	63:11	72:24 75:18	<b>Lacey</b> 61:23 66:1
INDEX 65:1	127:24 153:6	<b>Joe</b> 63:4 74:4		lack 92:18 160:19
indicate 167:5,8	156:9 165:22	<b>join</b> 70:2 111:6	<u>K</u>	lacks 88:21
indicated 101:5	introduction 65:11	<b>joined</b> 68:25 73:19	<b>Kaufman</b> 65:17	<b>LANCE</b> 65:17
178:20,25	65:13,15 158:1	<b>joining</b> 66:11 73:12	152:14 172:3,5,6	172:16
indicates 154:12	investment 134:10	<b>Joni</b> 63:19 68:6	172:8,16,22 173:9	large 85:10 163:24
168:18	<b>involved</b> 168:24,25	72:16 75:8	keep 70:12	168:12,12
indication 92:10	involves 79:13	Joni@sanger-la	<b>Keith</b> 109:23	large-scale 162:20
146:9	<b>Irion</b> 63:20 68:9	63:22	key 80:23	largely 81:5
individual 168:4	75:10	judge 61:14 62:3	kilowatt 90:1	<b>Latimer</b> 64:8 68:19
inefficiencies	Irion@sanger-la	66:5,9 67:2,7,16	170:21,22	75:19
107:25	63:23	67:22 68:2,10,15	Kind 147:16	law 61:14 62:3
inefficiency 105:15	<b>Isaiah</b> 65:12 156:4	68:20 70:25 71:6	kindly 150:21	63:20 66:9 68:7
inequitable 80:19	156:13	71:13,17,21 72:2	know 97:9 101:16	68:14 74:1 75:8
85:15	issue 69:9 78:11	72:6,9,13,19,23	102:13 104:3	LDK-1CT 172:24
inflationary 90:3	79:13,23 142:5	73:2,16 74:7,13	106:3 110:16	lead 158:7,15
information 155:9	154:23 157:6	74:19,25 75:5,11	129:13 139:6	161:17
167:19	161:4 177:13,19	75:15,20 76:4	144:12 148:4,20	lead-up 179:17
informs 145:11	177:23 178:21	81:14,19,23 86:19	150:18 155:8	leaves 138:4
inherent 78:15 92:8	179:1,9	86:21,24 90:10	167:12,12 169:14 170:9 173:24,25	legislation 171:10 lessened 160:20
initial 107:19	issued 69:3	93:2,9,12,15,19	170:9 173:24,25	
108:24 142:15	issues 68:25 69:19	99:2,8,19 100:1,5 101:4 109:5,8	181:4,8	let's 66:6,20 68:21
160:16	69:20,22 70:16,20	110:2,9,18 111:3	knowingly 96:25	71:1 73:14,16,24 99:11 110:19,19
initially 80:9	71:11 76:11,16	110:2,9,18 111:3	knowledge 182:10	112:21 139:23
<b>injuries</b> 173:1	77:9 82:7,8,14	111.3,17,20 112.1	known 84:8	144:17 180:10
input 164:21	87:3,5 92:22	127:15,23 129:1	Kumar 63:3 65:3,6	181:10
inside 145:15	167:23 180:18	142:20 143:22	65:7,13,15 66:22	level 155:2 171:1,2
instance 70:18	item 73:10	142.20 143.22	66:24 67:4 74:3	171:6 173:1,22
		177.1/173.10	00.27 07.7 74.3	171.0 173.1,22

				100 100 100 7
levels 170:17,25,25	load 78:16 80:24	<b>lunch</b> 70:9	math 139:15,17	138:6,23 168:5
liability 134:25	105:14,14 107:4,4		matter 61:11 66:11	mentioning 108:15
138:25 139:2	161:23,24 162:2,4	<b>M</b> 65:14 165:17	66:16 160:16	<b>Meredith</b> 65:14
150:6 172:23	163:22,22	M-A-T-T-H-E-W	161:24 164:24	152:14 155:21
LIBA 170:18	local 167:15,17	153:11	matters 169:11	159:8,12 165:10
Liberty 64:9	long 85:16 91:2	M-C-V-E-E 153:11	<b>Matthew</b> 65:10	165:13,17 166:1,1
life 130:3,16 133:8	94:10 106:25	M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H	153:1,10	171:20
133:11,11 136:11	180:1	166:2	<b>McDowell</b> 63:9	merit 92:22
lifetime 140:5	long-standing		66:25 74:2	metadata 154:21
<b>lifting</b> 79:18	84:23	M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L 100:13	McVEE 65:10	Methodology 78:14
<b>light</b> 61:7 66:16	long-term 84:13	<b>M.R</b> 65:12 156:4	151:24 152:14,19	<b>Michael</b> 61:14 62:3
74:3 105:14 107:4	longer 136:19		152:21 153:1,8,11	66:8
light-load-hour	137:18	maintaining 98:12 maintains 83:16	153:22,25 155:19	microphones 70:13
105:7 106:17	look 81:12 98:23		McVee's 148:5,23	74:7
Likewise 112:1	110:20 148:4	majority 70:11	MDM-1T 154:4	mid 79:18 157:9
limit 76:16 94:9	151:2 164:10	80:10 97:2 98:10 112:12	mean 107:21 146:8	160:15 178:2
180:17,20	looked 112:12		175:16,17 178:3	mid-January 69:8
<b>limited</b> 70:4 74:8	looking 69:13 83:8	making 71:23 101:25 145:13	meaning 92:3	midmorning 70:10
95:1 97:1 176:8	84:4,5 102:15		meant 143:12	Mihaly 63:15 67:25
limits 79:14 160:22	106:5 108:12,19	146:4 158:8,16	175:15	million 77:6 80:2
161:8	109:22 133:16	161:18	measurement	88:14 107:21,23
line 103:6 104:2	134:15 141:24	manage 84:1 85:17	171:4	108:3,8,13,14
106:3 108:12	155:11	85:20 91:11 95:16	measures 154:3,13	137:8 138:7,18,24
130:5,21 132:14	looks 70:10	manager 100:15	mechanics 138:20	138:24 139:16,18
132:19 141:7,12	<b>Loop</b> 61:22	128:10	mechanism 69:19	139:18,21,22,23
147:24 151:7	losses 80:21	manipulating	76:18 82:14 83:16	139:24 140:1,3,5
172:25 177:6	<b>loud</b> 103:7	155:8	90:14 94:1 95:19	150:17,18 151:10
lines 108:19 150:24	louder 173:18	marked 103:20	96:3,11	Milt 62:5
154:5,9 167:1	low 157:14,22	market 78:17,18,19	mechanisms 80:11	mind 91:3 104:21
175:9	160:14 162:22,23	78:20 79:14,14,16	94:11 98:13,20	mine 129:18 130:3
liquid 157:6,10	163:7 166:21	79:16,17,18 80:25	median 171:3	130:9,17 132:25
liquidity 160:19	167:15,23 170:7	83:8,18 87:25	meet 97:11 179:23	133:12,20 134:3,9
<b>Lisa</b> 62:7 67:12	170:17,24 171:7	92:17 97:5,6,19	meeting 70:18	135:25 137:17,25
74:16	171:14	104:22 107:5	109:12 170:6	141:13
Lisa.Gafken@at	low-priced 87:22	157:13,22 160:14	174:19	mines 136:12
62:11	163:4	160:18,18,19,21	megawatt 106:17	minimum 97:24
list 73:4,8 75:23	lower 80:21 92:9	161:8,24 163:2,3	107:3	minor 88:7
101:19 109:13	139:15 140:5,14	163:4,9,10,17	megawatts 105:10	minutes 70:4 73:14
110:20,23 112:17	170:22	164:22	member 167:16,25	mismatch 78:2
177:12	<b>Lowney</b> 63:9 65:11	markets 83:3,10	168:6	mismatched 78:6
litigated 82:7	66:24 71:6,16,19	105:6,16 106:16	members 167:8,21	missed 112:13
litigation 82:9	73:25 74:1 76:4	108:1 157:6	memory 134:15	Mitchell 65:2 99:16
little 78:7 131:5	102:16 153:8,12	160:24 161:6	mention 70:19	99:18,19,22 100:9
167:25 173:10,18	153:15,18,21	162:21	mentioned 87:5	100:11,12 101:2
<b>LLP</b> 63:15	176:14	matching 77:20	102:3,5 106:20	101:10 131:6
		material 88:14		
	-	-	-	·

				<u> </u>
132:2 140:23	77:10 81:24 82:6	153:9,10,11	nevertheless 90:21	numbers 71:20
145:8 158:6,23	86:24 90:9 93:20	156:11,13 165:24	new 78:3 88:8 90:3	133:25 135:12
159:15,17,18,20	94:2 98:3 99:10	165:25	96:12 169:16	numerous 105:1
160:1 165:8,23	99:14 101:10,11	Nash 62:14 67:5	newspaper 179:13	<b>NY</b> 68:4 72:14,16
Mitchell's 146:17	129:8 149:7,8	74:11	179:17,19	75:6 93:10
158:21	153:25 154:1	Nash.callaghan	nexus 169:2	
model 79:15,20	157:1,3 160:7,8	62:18	non-company	0
87:17,23 88:2,3	172:8,22 177:16	natural 96:23 97:6	152:11	<b>O&amp;M</b> 175:10
88:10 98:10	Moser 62:21 65:7,8	<b>NE</b> 63:5	non-Net 92:6	<b>o0o-</b> 66:3
103:17 105:22,25	67:19,20 72:8	necessarily 81:3	nonprofit 167:18	Oakland 64:4
106:1,25 107:1	74:21,22 87:4	132:15	Nonverbal 110:1	<b>object</b> 71:7 143:14
145:7,11 160:22	90:8,9,11,25	necessary 71:22	noon 176:13	objection 71:25
163:6,9,10 164:18	91:15,17,19 129:3	79:4 96:5 106:23	normal 85:2	72:5,8,11,17
164:21,24	129:7,24 130:1	106:25 111:23	Normally 177:21	<b>objections</b> 72:22,25
<b>modeled</b> 78:17,20	131:19,22,25	need 83:21,22	Northwest 63:18	objects 80:3
160:18	132:5,7,9,13	102:25 104:19	68:3,7 75:9	observe 70:17
modeling 79:24	142:18 143:14,20	109:6,18 132:15	notable 98:7	observed 162:22
88:9,18,23 145:12	145:1,20,23 172:7	136:12 150:15	notably 80:16	<b>obtain</b> 154:18
146:24	Moser's 144:11	180:8	<b>NOTARY</b> 182:17	occur 97:24
models 78:24	motion 179:24	<b>needed</b> 99:15	<b>note</b> 71:9,23 75:21	<b>offer</b> 93:7 150:1
105:17 106:21	move 71:1 111:4	104:21 177:14	112:7	offered 92:25
modification 81:8	163:21 164:20	needs 87:25 137:20	noted 69:2 91:8	offering 71:10
modifications	168:17	<b>neglected</b> 142:6,16	94:23 98:2	90:11
92:25 98:8	moved 73:7 75:25	negotiated 151:19	<b>notes</b> 150:16	<b>Office</b> 62:9,15
<b>modify</b> 82:13,21	moves 162:11	negotiations	<b>notice</b> 69:3,9	<b>offset</b> 78:8 142:8,17
91:21,25 96:6	moving 71:14 98:9	154:23	137:13 178:4,8	<b>Oh</b> 112:9 131:19
Modifying 86:4	Mullins 92:21	<b>neither</b> 83:6 84:14	179:1,9,11	okay 102:4,8,20,24
<b>moment</b> 69:13	129:18 177:3,6	95:13	<b>noticed</b> 179:20	103:11,15,19
101:24 109:17	<b>Mullins'</b> 91:1,23	<b>net</b> 69:18 76:17,19	<b>notices</b> 179:13,17	104:5,10,17
110:14,19 112:22	multi-generational	83:4 84:6 85:2,9	179:19	105:19 106:2,9,19
132:16 164:10	168:13	87:13 92:2,8,15	notified 70:7	107:6,10,16
178:23	multi-year 89:6	94:6 96:10,15,20	notwithstanding	108:17,22 109:4
Monahan 64:3	multiple 64:13	96:23 97:1,3,8,15	79:21	110:2,16 112:2,4
68:12,13 72:21,21	98:14	97:16,20 98:4	<b>NPC</b> 69:18,22	129:21 130:7,14
75:13,14 93:17,20	multiyear 170:7	100:15 107:22	76:17 77:12,14,17	130:19,25 131:4
93:22	171:10	134:11,18,24	79:11,15,20,23	131:10,12,13
<b>Monday</b> 66:1,7	Multnomah 63:5	136:10,20,24	80:6,7 92:4,18	132:10,20,21
monthly 170:21	<b>muted</b> 70:13	137:15,17 138:2	103:17 140:10,11	133:3,15 134:4,5
months 76:9 78:10	178:12,13	138:15 139:2	144:23 146:18	134:22 135:8,15
164:23	<b>MVC-IT</b> 150:24	140:14,17,21,25	147:24 180:17	135:16 139:14
morning 66:5		145:3,7,11,14,15	<b>NPV</b> 76:20	140:18 141:19
67:11,19,24 68:5	N	146:21,24 169:17	number 88:6	142:18 144:20
68:12,17 70:11	name 66:8,23 86:25	175:18	101:21 138:25	147:5,22 148:3,25
73:25 74:10,15,21	93:22 100:10,11	Nevada 64:9	139:20 142:11	150:3 151:6
75:2,7,13,17 76:5	100:12 111:11	never 96:3 165:1	150:17 151:11,14	155:10 157:8
	128:6,7,8 131:23			158:4,24 160:6
	•	•	•	•

164 11 165 0	1 124 14 15	102 11 102 22	4. 1. 1. 06.17	4.04.01
164:11 165:2	ordering 134:14,15	102:11 103:22	particularly 96:17	percent 84:21
166:20 167:4	Oregon 61:25	130:15 140:12	parties 68:23,25	85:15,18 88:15
168:15 169:4	organized 83:3	page 65:1 101:18	69:2,6,15,17 70:6	96:11 175:11,12
170:1 171:15	92:17	102:15,16,17	70:7,12 71:2,8	percentages 171:1
173:16,23 174:3,8	original 142:15	103:2,5,6 104:1,2	73:12 76:2,10,12	perfect 104:23
180:9,13 181:12	originally 98:21	106:3 108:12,18	76:13 82:2 88:12	105:17 107:1
181:16	<b>OTR</b> 77:1,8	110:15 129:12,23	88:24 93:1 98:7	perfectly 88:3
Olympia 62:17	outcome 134:13	129:24 130:5,21	98:11 99:13	performance 83:20
once 94:4 95:10,18	outdated 148:23	130:21 131:14,15	152:12 154:24	154:3,13
109:17	outlining 134:16	132:18,19 134:6	167:10 179:3	<b>period</b> 77:12 78:1,6
ones 99:15	<b>outside</b> 81:1 94:7	135:23 141:9	180:16,23 181:18	89:16 132:24
<b>online</b> 67:15 70:18	143:15 146:25	147:19,23 148:15	181:21	133:19 163:13
90:4 109:10,11	over-collected 92:3	150:22,24 151:7	<b>party</b> 70:17 152:10	170:22 179:12
172:6 174:19	overall 68:21 140:4	154:5,7,8 157:5	party's 142:4	periods 161:2,4
<b>open</b> 111:9	<b>Ozone</b> 77:1	167:1 172:24	pass-through 96:11	162:4
open-ended 144:18		175:9 180:20	<b>Pause</b> 73:15 112:23	<b>person</b> 109:10
<b>opening</b> 70:4 73:10	<u>P</u>	pages 61:12 132:4	157:15	perspective 94:3
73:22 76:2 81:18	<b>P.C</b> 62:22 63:20	149:19 180:20,21	pay 80:12 89:7	pertains 161:25
81:21 86:22 88:24	<b>P.O</b> 62:17	<b>Paisner</b> 62:8 67:14	170:20	petition 66:17
93:4,8,10,14,18	<b>Pacific</b> 61:7 66:16	74:18 112:14	<b>paying</b> 78:4 144:2	149:16
99:3,7,9	74:3 100:15	<b>Palo</b> 79:19 157:10	<b>PC</b> 63:9	phenomenon
operation 137:25	PacifiCorp 61:7	160:15	<b>PCAM</b> 69:18,23	161:22
operational 130:3	63:2,5 66:15 76:3	paper 108:23,25	76:18 80:8,10,16	phonetic 111:25
130:10,16,23	82:16 83:2,9,13	paragraph 134:14	80:19 81:4,9	picture 136:5
133:8,11 136:11	83:14,16,18,21,25	134:16	82:14,17,21 84:20	pieces 170:15
137:17	84:10,12,18 85:1	<b>Park</b> 62:16	86:4,8 87:4 90:15	<b>PIERCE</b> 182:4
operations 87:16	85:5,7,16,18	<b>Parsons</b> 64:8 68:18	90:18,21 91:3,21	<b>pilot</b> 169:24
108:5 153:14	86:13 87:5,6,15	75:18	91:23 92:20,24	<b>place</b> 84:21 96:14
opinion 146:6	87:18,21,24 88:4	part 68:8 101:23	94:1,14,18,23	129:11 132:11
opportunity 76:1,8	88:6,11,22 89:2	134:11 135:18	95:4,8,23 96:2,13	136:22
83:22 143:24	89:10,17,25 90:17	136:24 149:24	98:8 105:22	<b>plan</b> 69:18 97:11
<b>opposed</b> 149:22	91:4 92:3,25 95:8	154:23 167:13,17	180:17	170:7 171:10
opposes 82:23,25	95:24 96:8,13	partial 76:10	<b>PCAM's</b> 98:12	178:6,25 180:10
opt-in 169:23	97:14,18 98:15,17	150:10	<b>pdf</b> 131:15	planners 97:9
optimal 80:20	99:17 128:11	participant 110:20	peak 97:10 162:4	plans 68:21 89:6
optimize 83:20,23	130:22 134:8	participants 64:13	Pease 63:8 66:25	168:19
84:16	140:20 153:14	171:14	penetration 96:16	plants 78:21 162:24
optimized 84:15	154:12,20 166:4,5	participated	<b>people</b> 109:16,18	164:3,3
<b>option</b> 158:8,16,21	PacifiCorp's 73:6	167:10	<b>Pepple</b> 62:21 65:4	played 133:25
161:18	75:24 81:1 82:13	participating	74:23 86:23,25	please 70:18 81:22
optional 169:23	82:18 83:6 84:5	133:23 171:7	101:9 102:19	81:23 90:23 93:19
oral 178:6	85:2,13 86:7,8,11	participation 83:3	109:5 110:16	99:20 100:2,9
order 66:18 70:6	88:18 90:6,12	83:8,9,10,18	112:5,6,24 132:2	103:3 104:7 111:9
99:13	91:9 92:1,11,14	92:17 97:19	177:7,11	127:15,15,17,24
ordered 171:12	92:21 93:25 94:14	177:20	perceived 164:4	128:5 131:1
	94:17 95:4 96:1		Polocitodio	120.0 101.1

132:18 147:15	85:2,9,17 86:15	prevalence 162:20	89:25 133:1	94:20 95:1
152:22 153:6,9	87:2,13,17 88:2	previous 91:4	products 105:2,7,8	<b>provide</b> 73:8 80:13
156:2,9,11 157:18	88:15,16 89:2,6	130:11 133:5	105:9 106:17	81:20 91:11 93:10
158:13 165:14,22	89:14,17,18 90:14	previously 88:20	program 68:14	94:11 95:19
165:23 172:13	91:7,12,13 92:2,6	102:3 181:6	170:18	143:23
174:22	92:8,15 93:25	<b>price</b> 83:11 87:19	programs 167:16	provided 71:8
<b>plus</b> 139:23 140:1	94:6 95:7,16,17	87:20 162:20	170:8	95:21 167:7,11
<b>point</b> 77:19 132:18	96:10,15,20,23	163:7 170:22,23	<b>Project</b> 63:13 67:23	provides 78:7
135:20 146:20	97:1,4,8,15,16,20	<b>priced</b> 83:14	68:1 72:10 75:1,4	providing 76:1
150:21 177:21	98:4 100:15,16	<b>prices</b> 80:25 84:8,8	93:3,7,14	95:15 179:1
points 83:9	103:23 107:22	97:5 157:13,22	projected 139:11	<b>prudent</b> 146:12
<b>policy</b> 109:21	134:11,19,24	158:8,16 160:13	projects 132:24	prudently 80:13
153:14 166:6	136:10,20,24	161:18 162:5,22	<b>prompt</b> 111:6,6	PTCs 90:5
portion 61:15	137:15,18 138:2	162:23,24 163:11	112:13	<b>public</b> 62:6,9 67:8
75:10 78:19 83:12	138:15 139:2	163:17,19 164:16	<b>properly</b> 145:5,11	67:13 69:1 72:3,4
109:11 110:13	140:15,17,21,25	164:20,21,22,25	property 171:2	74:13,17 81:20
140:10,12,15	145:3,7,11,14,15	164:25	proposal 78:22	82:2,9,23 86:6,14
144:24	146:21,24 162:24	<b>pricing</b> 108:6 161:5	79:24 80:15 82:20	86:17 94:23 98:2
portions 70:14	practice 84:14	166:6	82:21,23,25 84:24	98:9,11 154:15
Portland 62:23	pre-hearing 179:1	primarily 160:17	85:25 86:1,9	174:15 177:19,20
63:6,10,21	precedent 96:7	163:20 179:16	90:13,15 92:12	177:23,24 178:1,7
<b>position</b> 82:9,18	<b>preclude</b> 146:5,8	<b>primary</b> 81:7,10	94:8,23 95:5,11	179:22 180:3
88:1 104:23	predetermine	82:18 90:13 96:13	95:12,21 140:13	182:17
130:15 149:20	146:4	principle 68:24	149:20,22 168:21	publishing 179:17
157:12,21 158:9	preference 150:1	69:21 70:8 77:20	169:16,17,20,22	purchase 160:25
158:17 160:13,17	<b>prefiled</b> 70:1 71:3	printed 135:24	170:3	162:2,3,5 164:25
163:1,5,8,10,17	73:3 75:22 127:25	<b>prior</b> 76:22 137:25	proposals 82:13	purchased 105:9,9
positions 86:15	premature 82:3	178:8	91:21 94:18	163:12
142:5 161:19	premiums 150:13	probability 86:3	149:14	<b>purchases</b> 78:19,20
positive 167:22	151:18	probably 70:9	propose 95:22	87:21 88:1 105:1
possible 179:21	prepare 110:14	proceed 81:23	<b>proposed</b> 69:6 80:9	157:13,22 160:14
Possibly 173:15	preparing 69:8	93:19 101:6	93:25 94:24,25	160:18,19 161:11
post-hearing	present 64:12	112:25 129:2	95:5,19 150:5,7	163:3,11
178:21,22 179:4	99:18 127:13	proceeding 69:3	167:6 169:25	purchasing 161:3
potential 83:2	155:24 159:12	91:23 93:1,24	proposes 76:20	163:11
92:17	165:13	109:14 128:14	82:16	<b>purpose</b> 87:14
poverty 171:1	presentation 70:6	135:18 156:16	proposing 90:17	<b>purposes</b> 98:14,20
power 61:7 66:16	99:13	166:9	134:9 170:10,14	0
69:18,19 74:3	presented 82:8	proceedings 73:15	170:24 171:8,9	
76:17,18,19 77:5	167:19	112:23	protect 91:12	<b>Q&amp;A</b> 132:14,17,20 133:17 141:12
77:9,21,25 78:3	presenting 81:12	process 82:5 90:20	protecting 84:1	question 84:9 93:16
78:11,13 79:13,25	preserve 92:24	procure 155:3	91:5 95:16	103:2 104:6 106:5
80:2,21,22,24	president 153:13	produced 107:20	protection 98:19	135:9 140:9
81:2 82:7,13,14	presiding 61:14	produces 80:7	<b>protections</b> 90:13	143:21,21 144:22
83:4 84:1,2,6,23	66:10	production 89:24	90:16 91:3 94:15	145.21,21 144.22
				170.13 177.10

150:10 152:21	112:8 129:17	103:1,7 132:15,17	134:15 145:24	181:5
154:3 157:17	167:9	132:20	173:5	recorded 144:4
158:5,13 161:12	raises 96:8	reading 90:24	receive 78:3 90:5	records 111:21
		read 80:4 87:7		records 111.21
161:16 164:13	Ramon 65:2 99:16		received 83:11 144:14	
170:2 172:4,23	99:22 100:11	101:14 105:15		recover 134:9
177:3 181:3	160:1	106:16 107:25	receives 170:22	recovered 135:12
questioning 141:8	range 74:8	108:9 162:1	181:14	139:1
143:16 144:11	rate 76:22 77:22,25	164:22	receiving 69:9	recovery 80:11
questions 69:22	78:8,9,10 86:1	reality 104:24,24	137:24	91:7 94:6 95:20
70:22 86:14,17,19	87:14 89:3,3,6,7	136:6 137:22	recess 73:14	98:10 136:2,13
99:15 100:23	89:12,14,15,16,18	138:1,1	recite 71:20	137:14 138:21
128:20 129:10	90:1,2 91:9 94:7	realize 166:22	reclamation 129:19	Recross-Examin
142:19,21 144:18	102:11 103:23	168:21	134:2,9,17,20	65:8 145:22
145:17 147:3,7,11	130:11,16 132:1	realized 89:22	135:10 136:2,8,23	red 137:19 138:4
149:3,5 151:24	132:23 133:10,19	<b>really</b> 110:3 168:11	137:3,14 138:14	138:11 142:9
152:2,4,13,19	134:12 135:11	168:12	139:4 141:1,14	redacted 132:6
153:19,23 155:12	136:18 137:1,24	Realtime 101:21	145:3,5,10,14	redirect 65:7
155:15,20 156:22	139:8,8 140:11,14	reason 83:6 98:1	recognize 87:21,24	142:20 143:1
156:25 159:2,7	144:3,8 146:4	105:17 108:6	95:6 142:5	144:18
160:10 165:3,4,9	167:6 168:25	145:4 151:17	recognized 85:21	<b>reduce</b> 77:5 80:1
166:15,19 171:21	169:5,23 170:4,7	173:22	94:10	97:22 98:15
172:2 174:10,14	170:11,12 171:10	reasonable 81:6	recognizes 82:3	<b>reduced</b> 78:7 85:13
176:3,5,11,17,22	173:19 175:12,13	85:9 89:13	85:8,25 86:1	164:17
176:25 180:23	175:16,17,18,20	reasonableness	recollection 103:9	reduces 90:15
181:17	175:21,21 177:21	88:13,22	recommend 77:24	reduction 78:18
quick 139:17	ratepayer 85:14	reasons 83:5 96:13	81:3 89:1 92:23	107:22
quickly 181:15	90:16 91:2 94:15	163:20 173:25	recommendation	<b>refer</b> 101:14,17
<b>Quinata</b> 109:23,24	ratepayers 84:2,15	rebuttal 77:3 82:18	81:7,10 174:6	104:1 131:6 158:2
quite 102:23	84:22 85:1,5,7,15	88:11 100:18	175:10	158:22 175:13
135:25 177:8	85:24 91:5,12	101:19 106:4	recommendations	reference 108:13
quote/unquote	94:13 95:2,16	107:11 108:19	77:8 175:8	151:11
88:4	98:17	109:1 128:12	recommended	referenced 133:18
	rates 79:1,12 89:10	129:12,23 130:5	76:24 80:16	162:25 164:2
R	90:4 136:3,9,14	134:6 135:21,23	recommends 78:19	references 146:17
<b>R</b> 182:1	136:22 137:4	138:10,17 141:9	79:18 82:19 86:6	referred 105:14
R-A-M-O-N	140:11,12 143:13	141:21 142:4	88:17 90:20	132:2,2
100:12	146:7 166:21	149:11,19 156:16	record 66:6 68:6	referring 101:18
R-O-B-E-R-T	168:2,11,19,20,25	166:8 169:13,19	73:14,17 86:25	102:2 130:11
166:1	169:3,10,16 170:3	rebutted 92:22	88:21 93:22 97:15	149:11 175:8
<b>Rackner</b> 63:9 66:25	170:4,10,19	recalculation	98:24 100:10	refers 78:12
74:2	ratings 151:20	138:17	103:1 110:13	reflect 79:6,16
raise 99:20 127:17	re-direct 147:6	recalibrated 135:1	112:21 132:16	87:15 95:8 104:24
152:22 156:2	reached 149:25	135:2	137:9 153:9	reflected 87:16,23
165:14 172:13	169:18	recalibration 135:9	156:12 165:24	88:2 105:2,16
174:22	read 90:23 102:22	recall 107:14	166:25 175:25	136:14,23 138:9
raised 85:12 96:6	1044 70.23 102.22	10001107.17	100.25 175.25	150.11,25 150.7

138:14 144:14	143:12 144:2,13	representing 68:19	90:20 103:2 104:6	<b>right</b> 67:2,16 68:10
145:10 148:23	144:25 146:11,13	represents 88:14	110:1 140:10	70:25 71:23 72:6
reflecting 145:5	remember 171:3	137:14 142:1	145:25 152:6	72:9,13,19 73:2
reflects 89:5,6	<b>remind</b> 70:12	request 83:7 86:7,9	155:17 165:5	73:16 75:20 81:14
108:1 136:6	129:23	176:19 177:14	171:23 174:11	81:19 93:9,15
143:17 145:5	removal 77:8 135:7	180:11	176:4 180:6,25	99:8,20 101:4,22
150:19	<b>remove</b> 76:25 89:10	requested 86:17	181:19	109:8 110:9
refresh 103:8	108:7	requesting 179:24	responsibility 98:4	127:17,23 129:1,3
<b>regard</b> 84:17	removed 174:5	requests 70:20 81:8	146:12	132:11 145:18
regarding 86:14	removing 78:9	90:23	responsible 83:14	148:1,10 151:15
149:10 154:15	<b>Rendahl</b> 62:4 65:4	require 79:7,10	responsive 96:18	151:25 152:3,18
regardless 106:23	65:5,11,13,15	89:2,16	129:17	152:23 153:5
regards 143:10	76:6 81:25 90:10	required 77:19	rest 110:7 146:22	155:1,18,23 156:1
<b>region</b> 160:25	91:15,18 93:21	88:24 178:9 180:2	restricted 97:8	156:2 159:5,11
162:9	102:14 129:22,25	requirement 77:15	restructure 90:15	160:5 165:7,12,13
regulate 163:25	131:17,20 152:17	128:10 138:10	result 78:9 82:6	165:14 169:15,21
regulatory 134:25	152:20 153:24	146:22 151:11	86:1 92:16 94:13	169:25 172:9,13
138:25 139:1	154:2,8,11 155:5	170:7	107:21	172:21 174:8,12
153:14	155:10,22 157:1,4	requirements 89:5	resulted 76:10	174:18,22 176:12
<b>Reidt</b> 61:24 182:6	157:8,16,19 158:4	requires 105:1	80:20 95:23	177:9,15 178:18
182:16,16	158:14,24 159:9	requiring 69:5	137:22	181:1,20
reject 86:7 88:18	159:16 160:6,9	reserved 70:20	resulting 94:12	risk 84:11,13,21,25
91:21 92:25	161:14 163:14	reserves 79:3	175:11	85:13,14,15,19,23
rejected 94:17,22	164:11 165:2,6,11	163:23 164:7	<b>results</b> 150:16	94:13 95:2,7
95:5,10,21	166:20 167:4	residential 170:19	<b>retain</b> 86:11 90:21	98:16
rejecting 91:3	168:7,15 169:4,9	171:13	98:3,22 108:9	<b>RJM-13CX</b> 103:21
related 90:12	170:1 171:15,18	resolved 71:12	return 149:22	<b>RJM-14CX</b> 102:9
129:18 150:13	176:21 177:2,8	resolves 76:11	159:19	<b>RJM-14X</b> 131:7,22
160:17,21 166:21	renewable 79:4	resource 80:25 98:5	returning 149:14	<b>RMM-6</b> 168:18
relates 78:13 79:23	80:25 81:2 92:16	141:2 158:11,19	149:21	<b>Robert</b> 65:14 86:13
80:3	96:16,20,25 97:3	161:21	revenue 66:19	112:14 165:17,25
relating 157:5	97:7,13,16	resources 77:16	77:14 107:20	<b>role</b> 70:15
relationship 151:19	renewables 162:12	78:4,5 79:1,2,8	108:3,8,9 128:10	<b>Ronald</b> 96:17
relative 89:9	<b>Reno</b> 64:9	83:11,13,15,17,23	138:10 146:22	<b>room</b> 73:20 109:11
<b>relevant</b> 84:9 161:9	repeat 94:2 157:17	90:4,7 92:16	151:11	109:16,18,22
reliance 84:13	158:12 160:10	97:11 98:18 144:3	revenues 80:6	110:4,6,8,11,22
relief 78:7	173:10	144:15 163:15,23	89:22 108:5	111:2,4 112:20
rely 96:25 98:19	replacing 78:19	163:24 164:25	149:15	rooms 111:9
remain 76:16 165:1	reported 61:24	respect 82:1 86:15	reversing 163:2	Rose 64:3 68:13
remainder 163:10	154:17	respectively 66:15	review 88:12,25	72:21 75:14 93:22
remained 82:19	reporter 73:9 74:6	respond 88:25	103:1,8 104:6	Rose.monahan@
remaining 138:12	90:23 110:12	141:4 150:11	reviewing 94:21	64:5
139:25 152:10	111:19 143:7	Respondent 61:8	revised 99:13	round 178:22
remarks 76:7	173:8 180:5 182:6	response 70:24	130:22	180:19
remediation 143:6	represent 146:3	76:24 80:15 82:10	rid 162:18 168:1	<b>RPR</b> 61:24 182:16

	İ	İ	İ	1
<b>Rule</b> 77:1	105:17 106:15	shareholders 85:24	simplification	163:5 173:17,17
rules 178:9 179:23	136:15 161:16	94:12 95:3 98:16	168:24	<b>speaking</b> 70:13,15
<b>ruling</b> 178:6	section 129:16	<b>sharing</b> 80:9,17	<b>simplify</b> 169:6,10	112:18 139:3
<b>rulings</b> 178:19	136:16 146:20	81:6,11,11 82:17	simply 88:6,8	specific 84:17
	see 106:7,8 109:2,7	82:22,24 83:1,5	simulate 164:19	135:17 140:20
S	148:1,16,18	83:24 84:19,25	simulation 78:24	141:21 150:22
s 98:24	150:11 155:11	85:3,22 86:8,10	simulations 107:5	161:1 162:13
S-H-E-R-O-N-A	172:9 177:11	86:12 90:18 91:10	simultaneously	167:11
128:8	179:5,15	92:19 94:9,16,24	112:18 134:21	specifically 135:23
<b>S.W</b> 62:16	seeing 109:23	95:6,9,13,25 96:5	single 82:21,25	146:19 160:21
<b>S</b> / 182:16	110:25	97:21 98:2,16	84:24 86:10	162:12
sales 78:18 79:20	seen 161:6	Sherona 65:6	situated 162:9	specifics 158:2
79:21 87:22 88:1	segregate 110:13	127:11,19 128:7	situation 163:14	spell 100:10 128:5
105:1 158:9,17	seize 133:20	shift 82:25	six 80:1 164:23	153:9 156:11
160:21,22 161:9	sent 111:6,6	shifting 94:12	Sjm@dvclaw.com	165:24
161:19 163:2,4,9	separate 61:16	short 73:21 95:22	62:24	spelled 100:11,12
164:25	110:15 175:20	157:12,21 158:9	skill 182:10	128:7 153:11
<b>San</b> 63:16	series 88:1	158:17 160:13,17	<b>skin</b> 98:17	166:1
Sanger 63:20,20	serve 161:24	161:19 163:1,5,8	<b>SLC-1T</b> 147:18	spend 128:8
68:7,9 75:8,10	service 80:13 89:23	163:17	<b>Sliger</b> 63:19 68:5,6	sponsored 140:20
saying 142:14	services 155:3	shortly 66:12 82:2	72:15,16 75:7,8	<b>spread</b> 105:13
154:22	serving 78:16	show 137:15	93:11	138:12
says 106:5 111:8	161:23 162:2	shown 73:4 75:22	<b>slow</b> 91:16	spreadsheet 88:7
133:2,22	session 109:6 111:7	87:8	<b>slowly</b> 90:23	<b>Square</b> 61:22
scale 92:7	set 77:24 107:1	shows 99:14 136:5	SLS-AT 151:5	<b>staff</b> 62:13 67:3,6
scant 85:18	109:17 175:10	<b>Shute</b> 63:15 67:25	small 85:11 97:5	71:24 72:1 74:12
scarcity 161:5	180:19 182:11	side 159:22	<b>Smith</b> 110:10	76:24 77:23,24
Scarsella 63:4	<b>settled</b> 169:14	Sierra 64:2,3 68:11	111:11,14 112:16	80:15,23 81:3,15
66:24 74:4	settlement 68:24	68:13,14 69:1	solar 163:24	81:17 85:12,25,25
scenario 79:8 136:6	69:5,7,10,11,14	72:20,22 75:12,14	<b>sold</b> 162:22 163:6	90:20 93:13 98:9
scenarios 136:5	69:21 70:8 76:10	93:16,23,24 94:2	somewhat 89:11	111:22 154:14,14
schedule 169:23	76:15 82:1,4,5	96:17 98:8,11	<b>Sommer</b> 62:21	staff's 77:7 80:18
178:23 180:16,19	149:25 150:5,7,10	sign 111:23	67:20 74:22 90:11	81:5,6,11 82:20
181:15	157:25 158:2	<b>signed</b> 109:13,19	sorry 90:25 91:19	82:20,25 84:24
scheduled 178:2	166:22 168:22	109:24 110:23	129:22 131:17,19	86:9 90:14 94:8
scheduling 178:4	177:25 178:1,7	significant 83:12	133:7 143:6,15	149:14,22
181:8,11	179:2,4 180:22	94:11 98:3 150:14	145:14 154:6	stand 159:19
scope 143:15	181:14	151:18 154:14	169:7 171:2,3	<b>Staple's</b> 103:22
screen 109:7 112:5	settling 76:13 82:1	177:5	177:11 178:14	104:12 105:21,25
<b>SE</b> 63:21	seven 139:21,25	significantly	sort 169:21	Staples 106:13
seal 182:12	140:2	163:18	sound 173:14	start 66:20 110:14
<b>SEALED</b> 61:16	share 109:7 110:17	similar 80:11	South 62:16,22	129:11 143:8
seasonal 168:20,25	112:5	106:12 148:13	89:23	154:22
169:3,10 170:3	shared 85:4 167:5	162:9	Southeast 61:22	started 137:4
Seattle 62:10	shareholder 91:5	Similarly 84:24	speak 140:16,20	starting 130:21
<b>second</b> 89:12 97:18		<b>J</b>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	6
	I	I	I	I

132:14 134:6	sufficient 83:6	133:11 154:21	160:3 165:19	72:2,6,9,18 73:1	
starts 78:23 103:2	88:21 94:19	161:23 162:4,18	172:18 175:3	74:5,19,25 75:5	
state 92:24 100:9	161:15	163:25 164:6	testimony 61:15	75:11,15,20 76:4	
128:5 153:9 154:6	suggests 97:18	system-wide 84:16	70:1 71:3 73:4	76:7 81:12,14,16	
156:11 165:24	Suite 62:10,22 63:5	•	75:22 76:14,25	86:20,21,23 91:18	
	· ·	systems 155:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
172:25 175:19	63:10 64:4,9	T	77:4 82:10 88:11	93:2,5,11,15	
182:3,7,17	sum 98:19	T 182:1,1	91:1,23 92:20	98:25 99:1,2,5,8	
stated 87:14 133:10	summarize 104:18	take 70:9 106:21	96:19 100:18,21	100:1,5 101:1,12	
<b>statement</b> 81:18,21	107:17	132:16 136:15	101:19 102:10,15	105:19 106:19	
86:22 90:12 93:4	supply 162:19		102:17,21 103:22	108:11 112:4,6	
93:8,10,14,18	<b>support</b> 98:9,11,13	142:6 149:20	104:2,12,12	127:23 128:23	
99:4,7	164:6	152:16 164:9	105:21,24,25	129:1,4,9,15,25	
statements 70:4	supported 77:22	173:21 179:14,18	106:4,11,13	132:12,21 138:19	
73:11,23 76:2	supporting 69:5	takes 104:25	107:11 108:19,25	140:7 141:6	
99:9	76:14 88:22	talk 68:21 158:6	109:1 113:1,25	142:18 145:20	
<b>states</b> 146:3	supportive 168:6	168:7	114:1,25 115:1,25	147:4,10,14 149:1	
statute 170:7	supports 81:6	talked 168:9	116:1,25 117:1,25	149:2 151:8,9,16	
statutory 89:5	surcharges 86:2,5	<b>talking</b> 101:16	118:1,25 119:1,25	152:1,7 153:5,21	
stay 90:1	sure 101:25 105:20	133:9 139:10	120:1,25 121:1,25	153:24 155:10,14	
steadfast 94:14	135:4 141:23	145:24	122:1,25 123:1,25	155:19 156:8,10	
step 136:15	142:8 145:13	<b>tariff</b> 166:6	124:1,25 125:1,25	158:24 159:6	
steps 69:24 136:4	148:9 154:8	tax 89:24,25	126:1,25 127:1,10	160:5 165:2,6,8	
stipulate 71:2	158:14 164:14	Tcp@dvclaw.com	127:25 128:13,21	165:21 166:20	
stipulated 139:8	165:25 171:11	62:24	129:12,16 130:6	171:15,24 172:20	
stipulation 71:9	173:12 179:9,12	team 112:13	131:25 132:8,23	172:21 174:9,13	
76:14	surface 132:24	technical 70:16,20	133:9,17,22 134:6	174:17,21 175:6,7	
story 105:4,5	133:20	167:17	134:25 135:21,24	175:17,23 176:1,2	
<b>Street</b> 63:5,15 64:4	surplus 162:8,10,17	technicalities	141:10 146:17,20	178:17,18 180:14	
64:9	164:1	146:24	147:17,18 148:6,9	181:2	
Stress 162:4	suspect 140:23	tell 141:20 148:11	148:22,24 149:11	<b>Thanks</b> 172:1	
strong 86:2	148:22	167:9	149:19 150:1,20	181:21	
structure 91:22	SW 63:10	ten 70:4 137:10	150:23 151:1,3,10		
95:24 98:12 167:6	swayed 92:13	139:17,18 173:6	151:13 152:8	things 78:3 89:21	
168:2 169:6 170:5	swayed 52.13 swear 99:20 127:16	173:20,21,24	153:16 154:4,11	104:24	
170:11	159:21 165:14	175:12,17	154:15 156:16,19	think 102:25 103:8	
study 154:25	172:14 174:23	ten-year 140:4	157:5 158:22	111:8,17 112:3	
study 134.23 stuff 181:8	swings 97:8	tend 161:4 162:2	159:6 164:9 166:8	129:11 132:15	
subject 69:14	swings 97.8 sworn 99:23 127:20	162:23	166:15,23 167:1	135:20,21 143:17	
158:20	153:2 156:5 160:2	tends 87:21 97:10	169:12,13,19	146:8,21 161:14	
submit 154:15	165:18 172:17	terminates 133:1	170:6 171:25	166:24 167:16,20	
submitting 76:13	175:2	terms 69:24 82:3	170.0 171.23	168:3,9,13 171:16	
subsequent 69:11	symmetrical 80:17	test 77:12 132:24	172.24 174.13	176:18,21 179:11	
180:21	system 87:15,25	133:19 163:13	thank 66:22 67:2,4	170.18,21 179.11	
	88:3 105:1 130:3	testified 99:24	67:7,16,22 68:2	181:6	
substantially		127:21 150:12	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
104:14,16 106:12	130:16,22 133:8	153:3 156:6 157:9	68:10,15,20 71:6	third 79:13 137:12	
		155.5 150.0 157.7			

	1	<u> </u>	1	1	
thought 167:21	164:23 166:15	turn 69:25 70:5,22	134:1 138:22	Van 62:22 67:20	
three 79:18 136:5	today's 68:8,22	71:4 73:22,24	143:3,11,25	74:22,23	
138:6 139:20,22	73:9	76:3 90:8 99:11	144:22 145:9,16	variability 81:3	
161:7	told 177:7	102:9,16 103:20	146:11	85:3,8 97:3,13	
<b>Tia</b> 61:24 182:6,16	<b>top</b> 136:5,6 147:23	106:3 108:18	understands 82:4	variable 96:22,22	
182:16	topic 168:17	129:12 130:21	understood 134:20	169:10	
tier 168:3 170:16	<b>topics</b> 149:6	131:1 134:5 141:9	unfair 86:5	variables 171:5	
170:25 171:6	total 88:16 92:4	<b>Turning</b> 76:19 80:8	<b>Unit</b> 62:9	variance 84:21	
tiered 168:2,11	108:13 132:4	177:19	units 158:10,18	variances 80:24	
170:4,20	138:25	<b>two</b> 76:16 78:9,10	161:20	85:4	
tiers 170:11,12	total-system 78:24	79:24 84:12,14	unnecessarily	<b>various</b> 149:12	
171:16	touch 77:10 87:2	87:19 89:16 96:8	80:20	vast 80:10 97:2	
time 66:7 69:7 73:7	track 97:10 154:12	99:14 101:20	unplanned 97:14	<b>Verde</b> 79:19 157:10	
75:25 77:19 80:4	tract 154:13,17,18	134:20 137:7	unpredictable	160:15	
81:17 87:7 94:24	155:2	138:16,24 139:6,9	96:24	versed 145:8	
95:11 101:14	traded 105:6	149:23 150:2	unrealistic 80:6	version 135:24	
102:23 103:12	164:23	164:8 169:3	unrecovered	versus 66:15	
105:11,13 109:5	<b>trading</b> 157:14,22	170:15,15 171:5	134:10	vice 153:13	
137:10 138:12	157:23 158:7,15	173:6,20 175:14	Unreportable	<b>video</b> 70:14	
140:4 152:12,16	160:14,20 161:17	175:20,22 179:14	112:18	view 174:4	
154:20 159:13	164:15,17,19	179:19	unsupported 108:4	virtually 70:17	
161:4 162:1 176:9	transact 79:17	two-year 138:2	unsurprising 98:14	volatile 84:8,9	
176:25 177:4,9	transactions 78:17	173:2	<b>update</b> 76:21 79:25	<b>volatility</b> 84:10,13	
178:3 180:22	107:2,5 160:18	<b>Tyler</b> 62:21 74:23	89:17,24 139:19	96:10,12,15,21	
181:11	transcript 182:8	86:25	147:25 148:16	97:2	
<b>time-of-use</b> 168:19	transfer 109:9,11	<b>type</b> 168:2	<b>updated</b> 135:13,14	<b>volume</b> 61:12 87:20	
168:25 169:3,5,10	110:10		135:18,20 139:11	87:23 88:5 101:21	
169:16,22,23	transition 162:11	U	143:18,19 144:14	102:6 103:3,25	
timeframe 95:22	162:11	<b>UE-210852</b> 61:6	<b>updates</b> 77:3,5	104:7,13,20	
times 88:3 94:4,18	translate 155:9	66:14	79:25 101:20	105:18 106:6,11	
104:23 173:6,20	transmission 77:16	UE-230172 61:5	135:22 143:18	106:22 107:12,19	
173:21,24	78:4 163:21 164:7	66:14	146:18	107:22,24 108:7	
timing 89:9,11	Transport 77:1	ultimately 144:1	usage 138:2 170:21	157:14 160:14	
97:23	Transportation	146:13 169:14	use 70:14 79:14	161:2 163:24	
titled 101:20	61:2,4,21 62:16	unable 154:12	89:14,15 168:19	164:15,17 182:9	
today 66:13 68:1	66:10	unachievable 108:5	170:16 171:16	<b>volumes</b> 158:7,15	
69:4,18,20,24	treatment 146:4	uncertain 97:24	<b>utilities</b> 61:2,3,21	160:20,21 161:17	
70:8 71:11 74:2	149:17	underground	62:16 66:9 162:15	164:19	
75:3,4,9,10 76:8	trends 90:3	132:25	162:17		
76:15 81:13 93:8	tried 110:22	underlying 78:23	utility 94:12 97:9		
93:14,23 94:25	trouble 131:18	understand 101:25	utility's 84:7	W 62:4	
95:24 96:9 100:24	true 106:24 182:9	145:4 177:9	utilizes 164:21	WA 62:10,17	
101:13 128:21	trued 144:6	179:12 180:16	$oxed{\mathbf{V}}$	<b>Wagner</b> 111:20	
138:1 152:8	try 104:18 173:17	understanding	·	wait 111:9 waive 81:18 93:14	
153:19 156:22	173:17	69:17 104:20	v 61:6		
		130:8 133:13,18	<b>value</b> 90:5	179:11	

	1			<u></u>
waives 99:7	Webster 64:4	86:13,16 91:22	working 69:7	<b>Zakai</b> 63:14 67:24
Walmart 64:7	week 69:2	96:17 99:16 100:2	works 69:15 87:10	67:25 72:11 75:2
68:16,19 72:23,25	weeks 179:14,19	100:9 101:2,5	88:10,20 109:20	75:3 93:5
75:16,19 99:3,7	<b>weigh</b> 92:19	102:18 127:11,24	110:8	<b>zero</b> 180:21
want 70:12 130:2	weighing 98:8	128:24 129:17	<b>world</b> 145:9	<b>zone</b> 177:10
132:16 147:1	Weinberger 63:15	132:4,6,8,10	worse 96:15	<b>Zoom</b> 62:7,8 63:14
150:18 157:16	68:1	140:19,23 141:3	worth 94:20	63:19,20 64:3,8
179:8,12 181:5,9	well-reasoned 96:7	143:16,25 144:18	<b>WUTC</b> 66:15	64:13 93:13
wanted 149:9 173:3	went 140:21	144:23 145:8		109:12 110:11
175:24	weren't 169:1	146:17 147:12,17	X	112:15 173:7
wants 180:11	west 64:9 89:23	147:21 148:2,5,8	Y	178:11
warrant 92:11	105:6 160:24	148:18,22 149:8		
warranted 85:11	western 61:11	149:24 150:8,12	<b>Yakima</b> 167:18	0
Washington 61:1,3	62:20 66:17 67:17	150:21,25 151:4,6	yeah 111:14,22	1
61:21,23,24 62:9	87:1 105:15 108:1	151:8,14,23 152:5	112:3 148:12	
66:1,9 78:12,14	163:16	153:6,8,10,13,17	149:5 171:17	<b>1</b> 89:10,19 158:10
78:16,21,25 79:1	wheelhouse 146:25	153:20 154:1,6,10	179:7,18	158:18 161:20
79:2,3,5,9,12	wheeling 89:22	154:22 155:7,21	year 76:21 77:13	<b>10</b> 85:18 150:24
80:12 84:15,17	WHEREOF	156:9,13,17,20,23	78:8,9,10 89:3,3,4	172:25 175:11
87:13 88:15,16	182:11	157:3,7,18,24	89:8,12,14,15,15	100 65:3 84:21
103:13 135:7	whispering 180:4	158:12,20 159:3,8	89:16 95:4 97:2	96:11 107:21,23
136:3,7,14 137:24	<b>WIJAM</b> 78:15,15	159:19 160:8,16	107:2 137:8 138:7	108:3,8,14
143:4 144:1	78:23 79:9,10	161:9,22 163:20	139:16 149:22	<b>101</b> 65:4
146:14 154:16	143:4,11 144:1	164:18 165:22,25	150:2,14,15 161:2	<b>102</b> 108:13
157:11,13,20,21	145:25 146:1,5,10	166:5,10,13,17,18	173:25 174:4	<b>11</b> 61:14 66:1 96:2
160:11,13 182:3,7	157:12,20 158:1,3	167:3,12 168:9	175:12,17,17,18	103:2,5,6 182:9 <b>11:43</b> 181:24
182:17	160:12,17 163:1,9	169:1,7,12 170:13	175:20,21,22	11:43 181:24 11th 63:10 66:7
Washington's	164:20	171:17,22 172:1,3	yearly 94:5 years 86:2 92:3	<b>12</b> 131:14 132:19
136:20,22 137:17	wildfires 150:13	172:10 173:5,12	96:2 137:10 138:6	154:5,9 167:1
Washington-allo	<b>Wilding</b> 106:13	173:16 174:2,6,15		<b>134.3,9</b> 167.1 <b>126</b> 65:4
80:2	<b>Wilding's</b> 104:12	174:19,20 175:5	139:17,18,20,22	<b>120</b> 65:4 <b>128</b> 65:6
Washington-only	105:24 132:23	175:16 176:2,11	139:25 149:23 150:2 161:7 173:6	<b>128</b> 65:0 <b>129</b> 65:7
79:7	133:17	176:14,16,20	173:20 175:13	129 65: 7 12th 69:13 178:24
wavered 96:3	<b>Wildings's</b> 102:10	177:16 182:11	Yochanan 63:14	180:18
way 62:22 90:15	131:25	witnesses 70:5	67:25 75:3	<b>13</b> 108:19 132:4
104:14,16 164:20	willing 94:8	86:18 99:12,14	Yzakai@smwlaw	<b>13</b> 108:19 132:4 <b>1300</b> 64:4
167:22	wind 78:3 90:3,6	152:11,14 176:6,9	63:17	<b>13</b> 00 04:4 <b>14</b> 101:18 140:1,1
<b>ways</b> 168:8	96:17 97:10	181:22	03.17	150:24
<b>we'll</b> 69:8 70:3	162:12 163:15,24	wondering 148:20	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	<b>130</b> :24 <b>1400</b> 62:16
73:22 109:7	windfall 85:7	Woodland 61:22	Z-A-C-H-A-R-I-A	<b>143</b> 65:7
139:24 180:21	wish 86:19	word 170:16	156:14	<b>145</b> 65:8
we're 76:1 105:20	wishes 88:22	171:16	Zacharia 65:12	<b>147</b> 65:8
109:10,10 110:13	withdrew 169:19	words 97:12 163:6	152:14 155:21,24	<b>147</b> 65.8 <b>149</b> 65:9
171:8,11 179:10	witness 65:2,6,10	work 76:9 104:24	156:4,13,15,24	<b>15</b> 175:10
we've 96:9 110:22	65:12,14,17,19	108:23,25	157:2 159:1 161:9	<b>15</b> 175.10 <b>153</b> 65:11,11
				100 00.11,11

				raye 202
<b>156</b> 65:13	<b>2023</b> 61:14 66:1,7	<b>323-1601</b> 64:10	8	
<b>150</b> 65:13	136:19,21 151:19	<b>360</b> 62:18		
<b>15th</b> 69:6,10	182:9,12	<b>396</b> 63:15	<b>8</b> 130:21 175:9	
181:14	<b>2024</b> 76:21 77:13	390 03.13	8-hour 105:8	
<b>161.14</b> <b>16-hour</b> 105:8		4	106:18	
	89:4,7 90:1	<b>4</b> 101:21 140:5	<b>8.8</b> 77:6	
106:18	134:10 139:20	167:2	800 62:10	
160 65:5	147:24 148:17	<b>4.4</b> 80:2	<b>825</b> 63:5	
<b>165</b> 65:15	<b>2025</b> 89:15 90:3	<b>40</b> 180:20	<b>89501</b> 64:9	
<b>166</b> 65:15	134:10 137:16	<b>400</b> 63:10	9	
<b>16th</b> 148:17	<b>2026</b> 78:10 89:11	<b>40128</b> 62:17	<del></del>	
<b>17</b> 106:3 108:12	89:12,19 97:25	<b>40126</b> 02.17 <b>4031</b> 63:21	9 66:8 130:5,22	
<b>172</b> 65:17	<b>2028</b> 130:23 132:25	<b>415</b> 63:16 64:5	141:12 154:5,9	
<b>175</b> 65:19	133:6,21		167:2	
<b>1750</b> 62:22	<b>2030</b> 137:10 138:12	<b>419</b> 63:10	<b>9:00</b> 66:2	
<b>18</b> 106:3 108:12	139:12	<b>450</b> 62:22	<b>9:15</b> 70:3 73:12	
<b>182</b> 61:12	<b>2037</b> 130:10,17	<b>464-6595</b> 62:11	<b>9:16</b> 73:18	
<b>19</b> 108:12,20	133:6,11,14 134:3	<b>48</b> 172:25	90 85:15	
2	<b>206</b> 62:11	5	<b>90/10</b> 80:17 81:6,11	
	<b>21</b> 137:6 138:6	<b>5</b> 150:24 157:5	82:21,25 84:25	
<b>2</b> 138:18,24 139:23	139:11 140:3	<b>5.2</b> 88:14	85:22 86:10 94:9	
139:24 158:10,18	147:19	<b>5/15/2026</b> 182:18	94:24	
161:20	<b>2101</b> 64:4	<b>50</b> 64:9	<b>94102</b> 63:16	
<b>2.5</b> 139:16,21	<b>210852</b> 149:17	<b>503</b> 62:23 63:6,11	<b>94612</b> 64:4	
2.5-give-or-take	<b>22</b> 137:6	63:22	<b>97201</b> 62:23	
138:7	<b>22-0001</b> 61:25		<b>97205</b> 63:10	
<b>2.7</b> 88:15	<b>23</b> 137:6	<b>552-7272</b> 63:16	<b>97214</b> 63:21	
<b>2.9</b> 90:1	<b>241-7242</b> 62:23	<b>57</b> 102:17	<b>97232</b> 63:6	
<b>20</b> 104:2 108:18	<b>25</b> 105:10 106:17	<b>58</b> 149:19	<b>977-5704</b> 64:5	
<b>2000</b> 62:10 63:5	139:18,18 151:7	<b>586-7777</b> 62:18	<b>98054</b> 61:23	
<b>2006</b> 94:22	<b>250,000</b> 141:17	6	<b>98104</b> 62:10	
<b>2007</b> 95:4	<b>26</b> 129:12,24 134:6	<b>6.6</b> 150:17	<b>98504</b> 62:17	
<b>2012</b> 91:9	<b>26th</b> 182:12	<b>6.9</b> 150:18 151:10		
<b>2013</b> 95:10	<b>27</b> 130:5 148:15	<b>60</b> 149:19		
<b>2015</b> 87:12 90:19	175:12			
95:18	<b>2798</b> 61:24 182:16	<b>600</b> 170:21		
<b>2019</b> 87:13 102:11	<b>28</b> 130:21	<b>601</b> 170:23		
132:1 173:3,19	<b>29</b> 141:9 175:9	<b>61</b> 61:12		
<b>2019-2020</b> 172:25	<b>290-3620</b> 63:6,11	<b>621</b> 61:22		
<b>2020</b> 132:23 133:10		<b>64</b> 131:15		
133:19 134:12	3	7		
135:11 139:8	<b>3</b> 132:14,19 140:5	<b>7</b> 102:16 103:6		
140:11,14 173:4	<b>3.0</b> 90:2	104:1 151:7		
<b>2021</b> 92:6 103:23	<b>30</b> 135:23 154:5,8	<b>750</b> 64:9		
133:1 137:5,23	178:8	<b>756-7533</b> 63:22		
142:3	<b>30-day</b> 179:11			
<b>2022</b> 154:16,19	<b>31</b> 147:24	<b>775</b> 64:10		
<u> </u>			1	