

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	POLICY AND GOVERNING PRINCIPLES	1
II.	RESULTS OF OPERATIONS--CONTESTED ADJUSTMENTS	2
A.	<u>AVISTA’S REQUEST FOR THE KETTLE FALLS EQUITY “KICKER” SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED, AS IT DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS</u>	5
B.	<u>TREATMENT OF THE COMPANY’S GAIN ON THE SALE OF THE CENTRALIA PLANT</u>	9
C.	<u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION--CEO BASE SALARY ADJUSTMENT</u>	10
	1. National Comparison of CEO Base Salaries	11
	2. Regional and Internal Comparison of CEO Base Salaries	13
D.	<u>SIGNING BONUSES AND RESTRICTED STOCKS</u>	13
E.	<u>PROFORMA INCREASE TO OFFICERS’ SALARIES</u>	17
F.	<u>ALLOCATION OF OFFICERS’ SALARIES BETWEEN REGULATED AND NON-REGULATED OPERATIONS</u>	18
G.	<u>TEAM INCENTIVE BONUSES</u>	20
H.	<u>RELOCATION EXPENSES</u>	23
I.	<u>INJURIES AND DAMAGES</u>	24
	1. 1991 Firestorm Litigation Expenses	24
	2. 1996 Ice Storm Expenses	25
J.	<u>HYDRO RELICENSING</u>	28
K.	<u>NEZ PERCE SETTLEMENT</u>	28

L.	<u>MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS</u>	28
1.	Name Change Expenses	28
2.	Y2K Expenses	29
M.	<u>STAFF RESTATING ADJUSTMENTS</u>	30
1.	Political Advertising	30
2.	Allocation of Costs of New CEO Search	31
3.	Paul Redmond Tribute Film	31
N.	<u>RESTATE EXCISE TAXES/FRANCHISE FEES</u>	31
III.	THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT APPROVE AVISTA’S REQUEST FOR A POWER COST ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM AT THIS TIME	31
A.	<u>THE WUTC HAS PREVIOUSLY SET OUT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF A PROPOSED PCA MECHANISM</u>	33
1.	A PCA Shifts Risks of Higher Power Costs from the Company to the Ratepayers	34
B.	<u>THE COMPANY’S PROPOSED PCA DOES NOT MEET THE COMMISSION’S CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL OF A PCA</u>	35
C.	<u>STAFF HAS ADDITIONAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE COMPANY’S REVISED PCA MECHANISM</u>	39
1.	The Proposed PCA Mechanism Contains No Incentives For Least-Cost Acquisition of Power	39
2.	The Hourly Shape Adjustment in the Proposed PCA Is Difficult to Follow	40
D.	<u>STAFF RECOMMENDS A PUBLIC PROCESS, WITH CUSTOMER INVOLVEMENT, TO EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITIES OF A PCA MECHANISM IF THE COMMISSION WISHES TO CONSIDER ADOPTING SUCH A MECHANISM</u>	40

E.	<u>BEFORE APPROVING A PCA MECHANISM, THE COMMISSION MAY WANT TO EXPLORE OTHER RATEMAKING OPTIONS</u>	41
F.	<u>THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN THIS CASE SUGGESTS THAT AVISTA MAY NOT NEED A PCA MECHANISM ON A GOING-FORWARD BASIS</u>	41
IV.	POWER SUPPLY ISSUES-STIPULATED ADJUSTMENTS	41
A.	<u>WATER YEARS STIPULATION</u>	42
B.	<u>MID-COLUMBIA ADJUSTMENT</u>	43
C.	<u>FUEL CELL ADJUSTMENT</u>	44
D.	<u>CALCULATIONS RELATING TO UNCONTESTED ADJUSTMENTS</u>	44
1.	Settlement Exchange Power	44
2.	Proforma Potlatch July 2000-June 2001	44
V.	POWER SUPPLY ISSUES--CONTESTED ADJUSTMENTS	45
A.	<u>PGE CAPACITY CONTRACT ADJUSTMENT</u>	45
1.	Avista Improperly Characterizes the Series of Transactions Involving its Assignment in 1998 of all its Rights and Obligations Under the PGE Capacity Contract to an Affiliated Interest for \$143.4 Million, and Proposes that Rates be Based Upon a Contractual Fiction that Does Not Exist	47
2.	Avista's Proposed Ratemaking Treatment of PGE's Buydown of the Capacity Contract Improperly Withholds from Ratepayers the Benefits of the \$145 Million Lump-Sum Payment that Avista Received in 1998	50
3.	Avista's Wholly Inadequate Notice to the Commission of this Highly Complex and Significant Series of Transactions, Involving the Receipt of \$143.4 Million	

	for the Buydown of the PGE Capacity Contract, Provides Evidence that the Company Intended to Retain all of the Benefits of this Transaction, to the Exclusion of the Ratepayers	53
B.	<u>POTLATCH PURCHASE ADJUSTMENT</u>	55
C.	<u>RATHDRUM LEASE ADJUSTMENT</u>	57
D.	<u>WOOD POWER AMORTIZATION BUYOUT</u>	59
E.	<u>DISPATCH CREDIT ADJUSTMENT</u>	60
F.	<u>COLSTRIP AVAILABILITY</u>	65
G.	<u>CAPACITY PURCHASE ADJUSTMENT</u>	66
H.	<u>CENTRALIA POWER SUPPLY EXPENSE</u>	68
I.	<u>MARKET TRANSACTION ADJUSTMENT</u>	70
VI.	MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES	74
A.	<u>PROFORMA RESTATE DEBT INTEREST</u>	74
B.	<u>CONVERSION FACTOR</u>	75
C.	<u>DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT (DSM) PROGRAMS AND TARIFF</u>	75
D.	<u>PROFORMA DEPRECIATION (ELECTRIC AND GAS)</u>	75
VII.	COMMISSION STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE FAIR OVERALL RATE OF RETURN FOR AVISTA UTILITIES BE SET AT NO MORE THAN 8.64%	76
A.	<u>INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW</u>	76
1.	Recommendations of the Parties	76
2.	The Commission Should Determine the Appropriate Capital Structure and Rate of Return for the Regulated	

	Gas and Electric Operations of Avista Utilities, Not for Avista Corporation as a Whole	77
B.	<u>THE CAPITAL STRUCTURE RECOMMENDED BY DR. LURITO IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE CAPITAL STRUCTURE TO USE IN SETTING AVISTA’S RATES</u>	79
C.	<u>COST OF DEBT</u>	82
	1. The Cost of Debt Used to Set Rates in this Case Should be the Most Current, Reliable Estimates of the Company’s Costs	82
D.	<u>COST OF COMMON EQUITY CAPITAL</u>	84
	1. General Principles	84
	2. The Presentation of the Company–Dr. William Avera	84
	3. The Presentation of Staff–Dr. Richard Lurito	95
	4. Cost of Common Equity–Summary	97
E.	<u>THE COMPANY’S REQUEST FOR AN UPWARD ADJUSTMENT TO ITS RETURN ON EQUITY, OR EQUITY “KICKER” OF 25 BASIS POINTS SHOULD BE REJECTED</u>	101
VIII.	<u>COST OF SERVICE, RATE SPREAD, AND RATE DESIGN</u>	101
A.	<u>COST OF SERVICE STUDIES</u>	101
	1. Electric Cost of Service Studies	101
	2. Natural Gas Cost of Service Studies	101
B.	<u>ELECTRIC RATE SPREAD</u>	102
C.	<u>ELECTRIC RATE DESIGN</u>	102
D.	<u>GAS RATE SPREAD</u>	102
E.	<u>GAS RATE DESIGN</u>	103

IX. CONCLUSION 103