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

Docket No. UE-210829 - Volume IV

March 22, 2024



1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 Bellingham | Everett | Tacoma | Olympia | Yakima | Spokane Seattle 206.287.9066 Tacoma 253.235.0111 Eastern Washington 509.624.3261 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: audio@buellrealtime.com

Docket No. UE-210829 - Volume IV - 3/22/2024

Page 6	Page 68
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 APPEARANCES
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	2 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT:
	3 Yochanan Zakai
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)	4 Shute, Mihaley & Weinberger LLP
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)	5 396 Hayes Street
Complainant,)	6 San Francisco, California 94102
vs.) DOCKET NO. UE-210829	7
PACIFICORP d/b/a PACIFIC POWER)	8 FOR AWEC:
& LIGHT COMPANY,)	9 Summer Moser
Respondent.) PAGES 66 - 144	10 Davison Van Cleve
	11 107 SE Washington Street, Suite 430
EXCERPT OF OPEN RECESSED MEETING - VOLUME IV	12 Portland, Oregon 97214
March 22, 2024	
	14 FOR THE SIERRA CLUB:
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	15 Rose Monahan
621 Woodland Square Loop SE	16 Sierra Club
Lacey, Washington 98504	172101 Webster Street, Suite 130018Oakland, California 94612
COMMISSION:	18 Oakland, California 94612
CHAIR DAVID DANNER	
COMMISSIONER MILT DOUMIT	20 Also present: 21 Katie Ware, NWEC
COMMISSIONER ANN RENDAHL	22 Matt McVee, PacifiCorp
	23 Randy Baker, PacifiCorp
TRANSCRIBED BY: Marjie Jackson, CET	24 Tom Burns, PacifiCorp
······································	25 Stephanie Chase, Regulatory Analyst, WA State Attorney General
Page 6	Page 69
1 APPEARANCES	1 -000-
2 FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	2 March 22, 2024
3 Josephine Strauss	3
4 Washington UTC	4 CHAIR DANNER: So with that, let's now move on to
5 Office of the Attorney General	5 Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp.
6 PO Box 40128	6 And, Jaclynn Simmons, thank you for your patience
7 Olympia, Washington 98504	7 this morning.
8	8 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, Good morning, Chair
0	8 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning. Good morning, Chair
9 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn
	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory
9 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	 9 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn
 9 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 10 L. Jeffrey Roberson 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory
 9 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 10 L. Jeffrey Roberson 11 Jaclynn Simmons 12 Nash Callaghan 13 Public Counsel Unit 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket
 9 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: 10 L. Jeffrey Roberson 11 Jaclynn Simmons 12 Nash Callaghan 13 Public Counsel Unit 14 Attorney General of Washington 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update.
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets,
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology,
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology, thermal resource projections, recent enactment of federal
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500 Portland, Oregon 97232 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology, thermal resource projections, recent enactment of federal legislation and an additional focus on PacifiCorp' public
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500 Portland, Oregon 97232 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology, thermal resource projections, recent enactment of federal legislation and an additional focus on PacifiCorp' public participation plan.
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500 Portland, Oregon 97232 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology, thermal resource projections, recent enactment of federal legislation and an additional focus on PacifiCorp' public participation plan. There were a total of two comments filed in the
 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL: L. Jeffrey Roberson Jaclynn Simmons Nash Callaghan Public Counsel Unit Attorney General of Washington 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104 FOR PACIFICORP: Zachary Rogala PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1500 Portland, Oregon 97232 	 Danner and Commissioners Rendhal and Doumit. Jaclynn Simmons here with regulatory analysts for regulatory services. I'm here today to present Item D(3) in Docket UE-210829, PacifiCorp' 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update or Biennial Update. I will introduce the filing, then hand it over to PacifiCorp to present their biennial update. On November 1, 2023, PacifiCorp filed its 2023 biennial update. Staff filed responsive comments on the biennial update on January 11, 2024. The comments detail Staff's review of PacifiCorp' revised interim targets, changes to its multi-state allocation methodology, thermal resource projections, recent enactment of federal legislation and an additional focus on PacifiCorp' public participation plan.

1 (Pages 66 to 69)

	Page 70		Page 72
1	All were filed on January 11, 2024. All comments	1	MS. SIMMONS: Give me one moment.
2	recommended conditions for approval of the biennial	2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And you can think about this
3	update. The company proposed a reduction in the interim	3	while I ask a question for counsel.
4	targets in this biennial update.	4	And so in conditions this is in Appendix A in
5	For 2023, it was a 16 percent decrease. For 2024,	5	Condition 2 and Condition 9 to Staff's memo, there's a
6	it was a 38 percent decrease. And for 2025, it's a 45	6	proposal that the Commission would assess penalty amounts
7	percent decrease. A total decrease proposed or,	7	that are different than the statutory amount for
8	sorry, total average decrease proposed is 28.3 percent	8	failure to comply with an order. So that's in Condition
9	for a four-year compliance period.	9	2.
10	The company cited several reasons for the decrease,	10	And 80.04.380 sets \$1,000 a day limit, and Staff's
11	including thermal asset use, allocation methodology,	11	condition makes that penalty \$5,000 a day.
12	federal legislation and more. The company also updated	12	And in Condition 9, this is the sort of the
13	its energy efficiency specific target consistent with its	13	overall compliance by statute in CETA in 19.405.090 and
14	approved 2024/2025 Biennial Conservation Plan.	14	increases that penalty to \$10,000 per violation per day.
15	Staff filed comments relating to the 24/25 Biennial	15	And so my concern is I'm not sure that we have the
16	Conservation Plan and its targets and programs in	16	authority to do that. And so I'm appreciating Counsel's
17	Docket UE-230904.	17	thoughts here. And then based on what Counsel says, I'll
18	The company also made some updates to its public	18	go back to you, Jaclynn.
19	participation plan. For this biennial update to be	19	CHAIR DANNER: Nash Callaghan.
20	approved with the drastic changes into the interim	20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. So I was
21	targets, Staff determined that, along with the 50	21	going to address this after we heard from the company,
22	conditions that were approved in the company's 2021 CIP	22	but so one thing to keep in mind is Staff was hoping
23	settlement, there should be nine additional conditions.	23	that we could take this opportunity today to after
24	Staff's understanding is that Public Council	24	we've heard from all the parties to have an open
25	Energy or, sorry, Northwest Energy Coalition Inlet;	25	discussion. And, you know, maybe after Staff has
	Page 71		Page 73
1			
_	The Energy Project; Alliance for Western Energy	1	explained the reasoning behind their conditions, we were
2	The Energy Project; Alliance for Western Energy Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are	1 2	explained the reasoning behind their conditions, we were hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a
2	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are	2	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a
2 3	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either	2 3	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today.
2 3 4	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an	2 3 4 5 6	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the
2 3 4 5	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial	2 3 4 5	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these
2 3 4 5 6	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1,	2 3 4 5 6	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say this. If the Commission were to modify some of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My question is: Short of a settlement, do we have authority
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say this. If the Commission were to modify some of the conditions and I will say my concern is particularly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My question is: Short of a settlement, do we have authority to, you know, have penalties of these numbers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say this. If the Commission were to modify some of the conditions and I will say my concern is particularly to the level of penalties that exceed the statutory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My question is: Short of a settlement, do we have authority to, you know, have penalties of these numbers? MR. CALLAGHAN: So I don't know if Jeff Roberson had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say this. If the Commission were to modify some of the conditions and I will say my concern is particularly to the level of penalties that exceed the statutory amount if Staff were if the Commission were to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My question is: Short of a settlement, do we have authority to, you know, have penalties of these numbers? MR. CALLAGHAN: So I don't know if Jeff Roberson had intended to address this, but I can certainly address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Consumers, AWEC; Renewable Northwest and Sierra Club are all aware of the proposed nine conditions and either support or take no issue with eight of the nine conditions. Staff recommends that the Commission either issue an order in Docket UE-210829, accepting Pacifica's biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan filed on November 1, 2023, subject to conditions in attachment A, or initiate adjudication of PacifiCorp' biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan update in Docket UE-210829. Staff would prefer the first option. I'm available for questions. And after this, we'll give it over to the company to do their presentation. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Are there questions for Jaclynn Simmons? Commissioner Rendahl? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, Jaclynn, this is in part a question for you and in part a question for counsel. So is it Staff's recommendation or let me just say this. If the Commission were to modify some of the conditions and I will say my concern is particularly to the level of penalties that exceed the statutory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 hoping that we could open the discussion up and have a negotiation today. So in that case, you know, if we are able to come to an agreement and settle that, then I think that these terms are appropriate because it's essentially the equivalent of a settlement. Now, I can go through all of that now and sort of explain Staff's reasoning. But, you know, our hope is that we are able to, you know, open the discussion up and, you know, have a discussion about how we can resolve this matter short of an adjudication. And I can go into further why that's we think that that's the best option, but I can also just hold off for now if you'd like. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. We can hold off for now. I just want to signal my concern that the Commission may be limited, and so that's my concern. CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Thank you. And, Nash, I raised this in our briefing. My question is: Short of a settlement, do we have authority to, you know, have penalties of these numbers? MR. CALLAGHAN: So I don't know if Jeff Roberson had

2 (Pages 70 to 73)

	Page 74		Page 76
1	opportunity to speak up.	1	time, a lot of as we're going through this and we're
2	CHAIR DANNER: Well, Jeff Roberson has just turned	2	seeing the same issue arise in Oregon with its clean
3	his video on. Good morning, Jeff.	3	energy policy, it's hard to address all of this through,
4	MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Commissioners. I think	4	say, rulemaking or policy dockets in advance. You have
5	the simple answer is the Commission does not have the	5	to kind of muddle your way through with some facts.
6	power to impose penalties that exceed the statutory	6	So I appreciate that all of the utilities are
7	maximums outside the context of a settlement where Pac	7	presenting now and we have that opportunity to listen to
8	waiving kind of any kind of challenge to that	8	each one.
9	imposition.	9	So with that, if we could go to the next slide,
10	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	10	please. And this was briefly discussed by Staff. Also
11	Commissioner Rendahl?	11	just to, you know, by way of background, you know, we
12	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I appreciate that, Jeff	12	filed our initial Clean Energy Implementation Plan in
13	Roberson. That answers my question. So I guess I will	13	2021. The biennial update was filed very shortly after
14	hold my question to Jaclynn until we have some discussion	14	the Commission approved our initial CEIP.
15	on the record today. And so I had a good conversation	15	You know, that initial CEIP, we did end up with a
16	with Staff about all of the issues, in this update to	16	significant amount of time to discuss the conditions with
17	PacifiCorp's Biennial Conservation Plan, understand	17	the interested parties in that proceeding, and we were
18	Staff's recommendations, and so I don't have further	18	very appreciative of the efforts and we thought we had
19	questions for Staff at this time.	19	very thorough discussion on the conditions and were able
20	CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner Doumit?	20	to explain some of the particular issues related to
21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No. Fully briefed by Staff	21	PacifiCorp. And so we got our we were able to get a
22	previously, and thanks for servicing the discussion on	22	settlement of that. And we do appreciate all the
23	the penalties. But for now, no further questions.	23	parties' commitment to those discussions.
24	Thanks.	24	For the biennial update, as Staff stated, we updated
25	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So let's hear from the	25	the interim targets. That was something that was one of
	Page 75		
			Page 77
1	company. And, Jaclynn, don't go far. And then we can	1	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our
2	have a discussion.	2	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the
2 3	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning.	2 3	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions.
2 3 4	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me?	2 3 4	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some
2 3 4 5	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you.	2 3 4 5	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process.
2 3 4 5 6	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning,	2 3 4 5 6	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation
2 3 4 5 6 7	 have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and 	2 3 4 5 6 7	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Allocation Methodology
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross over from one utility to another. There's definitely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses some specific allocation components for Washington.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross over from one utility to another. There's definitely different factual components that will be distinct among	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses some specific allocation components for Washington.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross over from one utility to another. There's definitely different factual components that will be distinct among the utilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses some specific allocation components for Washington. So as we were going through those negotiations, the original 2020 protocol, of which both Packaging
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross over from one utility to another. There's definitely different factual components that will be distinct among the utilities. PacifiCorp is very differently situated than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses some specific allocation components for Washington. So as we were going through those negotiations, the original 2020 protocol, of which both Packaging Corporation of America and Staff had executed, and they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have a discussion. Matt McVee, good morning. MR. McVEE: Good morning. Can you hear me? CHAIR DANNER: We can see you and hear you. MR. McVEE: Okay, great. Well, Good morning, Commissioner Danner I'm sorry, Chair Danner and Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. My name, for the record, is Matt McVee, and I'm vice president of regulatory policy and operations for PacifiCorp. And so we wanted to walk through and do a short presentation on our 2023 Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update. I did want to take a moment to just, you know, thank the commissioners and the Commission from for having this discussion. It's very helpful. I don't you know, PacifiCorp and Utilities generally don't intervene in other utilities cases. And this is this is a difficult task, as you discussed. And so it's very good to hear the discussion that's going on with each one of the utilities, because it will cross over from one utility to another. There's definitely different factual components that will be distinct among the utilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the conditions. We raised that in the discussions on our original CEIP, and that was addressed as one of the settlement conditions. And then we did some minor updates to the CBIs, some additional information on our public engagement process. We had a separate docket for the public participation plan, which we filed. And then we revised the incremental cost analysis. Those were fairly minor revisions to that. Next slide, please. And if I have control of the dec, please just let me know. So the updated interim and specific targets, we did have several things and this is unique to PacifiCorp. And as a six-state utility, we use the 2020 Pacific War Interjurisdictional Allocation Protocol for allocating costs and benefits of our system resources among all the states. And then there's a specific Washington, the WIJAM, the Washington Interjurisdictional Allocation Methodology that was attached to the 2020 protocol that addresses some specific allocation components for Washington. So as we were going through those negotiations, the original 2020 protocol, of which both Packaging

3 (Pages 74 to 77)

	Page 78		Page 80
1	towards a new allocation methodology that would start in	1	were able to purchase the RECs. And in that process, we
2	2024. And that methodology was originally contemplated	2	actually had some good lessons learned.
3	to provide a fixed share of resources rather than what we	3	In that one particular agreement, an agreement for
4	have now, which is dynamic, so it changes based on the	4	RECs, we carved out a share that would go to Washington.
5	proportion of load across our entire system.	5	So it would still be a system resource, but while the
6	And so the fixed allocation would also apply to	6	RECs were stripped, for the other states to go to this
7	future resources, and so based on need. And with the	7	customer, which brought down the price of the PPA. So it
8	idea being that Oregon with its clean energy policy,	8	made a non-immediate resource less expensive for our
9	Washington with its clean energy policy, would get a	9	customers.
10	certain allocation of new, renewable or non-emitting	10	We did carve it out so that we withheld some RECs in
11	resources, and that would be fixed for their life.	11	order to make sure that we were still staying CETA
12	Over the course of the discussions with parties,	12	compliant when we brought that PPA to the Commission for
13	several of the interested parties brought up concerns.	13	review.
14	We heard it both from parties from Oregon, parties from	14	Another issue that we through this process that
15	Utah. And some of our other interested parties took that	15	we learned was, in the EIM with the greenhouse gas
16	feedback and that discussion and came up with a new	16	pricing for California, if we had that price adder, we
17	proposal. And that new proposal was very similar, but it	17	could have generation from certain resources deemed
18	would maintain dynamic for non-emitting. And so what it	18	delivered to California, which would then raise questions
19	would mean is that for Oregon and Washington, instead of	19	about the non-energy attributes and where those went.
20	getting a fixed allocation of these new resources, they	20	And so we've changed our practices there, also.
21	would get just a very large dynamic allocation. And as	21	So Another one of the big factors, as you're well
22	PacifiCorp, as a system, moved towards lowering all of	22	aware, given that we've just received or the
23	its emissions across the entire system, then the share of	23	Commission just issued the order in our JRC, was the rate
24	those kind of original resources that would flow to	24	impacts from the high energy prices that we've seen in
25	Oregon and Washington would decrease, but they would be	25	the last few years. And so in that rate case, we did
		1	
	Page 79		Page 81
1	Page 79 replaced by new or non-emitting resources.	1	Page 81 propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal
1 2		1 2	
	replaced by new or non-emitting resources.		propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal
2	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on	2	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation
2 3	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah	2 3	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those
2 3 4	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that	2 3 4	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional
2 3 4 5	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised	2 3 4 5	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high
2 3 4 5 6	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less	2 3 4 5 6	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high
2 3 4 5 6 7	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and	2 3 4 5 6 7	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that we could show that they were we'd still be entering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that we could show that they were we'd still be entering into prudent agreements. And so we started to pull back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know, what is unreasonably excessive as far as a cost to get to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that we could show that they were we'd still be entering into prudent agreements. And so we started to pull back on that RFP.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know, what is unreasonably excessive as far as a cost to get to compliance with interim targets prior to 2030? We viewed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that we could show that they were we'd still be entering into prudent agreements. And so we started to pull back on that RFP. In doing so, we still ended up with a couple	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know, what is unreasonably excessive as far as a cost to get to compliance with interim targets prior to 2030? We viewed the Clean Energy Implementation Plan as the incentive for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	replaced by new or non-emitting resources. And so what that would allow is more of a sharing on the system basis, which would allow states such as Utah to still take advantage of some of these resources that we get into early. One of the concerns that was raised by some of the parties was if they don't get into these early resources, then they're not the best resources, and the later resources may be more expensive, less productive. And so the idea was this allows us to share across all of our six-state system. And so we started exploring that. That led to an extension of the 2020 protocol for an additional two years because of the complications surrounding it. But more importantly for the changes in our interim targets, was the 2020 all source RFP. Due to supply chain issues, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we ended up with a significant number of those resources repricing. And it got to the point where we weren't comfortable that we could show that they were we'd still be entering into prudent agreements. And so we started to pull back on that RFP. In doing so, we still ended up with a couple resources. We were able to work out some deals with, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	propose that while we depreciated the Colstrip coal generation plant and the Jim Bridger coal generation plant for 2023, we kept, as an option, using those resources to serve Washington customers for an additional two years, essentially to hedge against that kind of high market price. And we unfortunately ran into those high market prices, And so our proposal was to keep serving those, which meant that we weren't going to go to the market because we had sufficient capacity. And so that changed where we started in 2021. And then as was discussed by other utilities, And as I think it ties to that discussion that the Commission just had on Puget, we did start looking as we were looking at modifying our interim targets, we were looking at a bunch of different options. We're looking at short-term contracts. We were looking at just REC purchases, you know. But the situation that we were concerned about is exactly what the Commission was grappling with, you know, what is unreasonably excessive as far as a cost to get to compliance with interim targets prior to 2030? We viewed the Clean Energy Implementation Plan as the incentive for us to show that we're moving towards compliance in 2030

4 (Pages 78 to 81)

	Page 82		Page 84
1	RECs in order to meet a certain standard. We didn't see	1	With the CBI's, you know, in response to feedback
2	that that provided significant benefits for customers.	2	and discussions with interested parties, we tried to
3	We're looking at long-term resources.	3	improve some clarity, also in response to, the
4	Now, with all of that said, we are in a bit of a	4	discussions that we had on our original CEIP. We added
5	unique situation. We've received two ratings downgrades	5	directionality to the CBIs, we clarified the metric
6	from two different rating agencies, and so we're in a	6	units, and we updated the CBIs and metrics to identify
7	situation where we have to be very mindful of our	7	three additional metrics that were inadvertently
8	metrics. And so, you know, as far as going or for one	8	excluded. It was the additional outreach, energy
9	of the recommendations from Staff, restarting an RFP, we	9	efficiency expenditures and demand response expenditures.
10	are a little bit concerned with that as a direction	10	Excellent. Thank you.
11	because that could have greater impacts for our	11	Energy equity and public participation. We are
12	customers, and that runs into that same situation as to	12	striving to incorporate energy equity into our
13	compliance at all costs.	13	decision-making. We've been working on those issues. We
14	It could run into situations where we're not really	14	understand the importance from the Cascade order. A lot
15	helping customers. And for PacifiCorp itself, we're	15	of our kind of current the investment decisions that
16	really talking about a question of not only will a PPA	16	are going into effect now, those decisions predated that
17	price may be higher, depending, you know, whether we need	17	order. And so we are working quickly to catch up with
18	to get letters of credit, et cetera, but if it adversely	18	all of that. But we have been actively engaged in public
19	hurts our metrics and that leads to additional	19	participation. We both we have our energy advisory
20	downgrades, then we have a higher cost of debt to get the	20	group.
21	capital we need for general service, and that could	21	In addition, our equity advisory group, but in
22	increase costs across the board and so beyond those	22	addition to that, we also have a clean energy
23	PPAs.	23	implementation plan engagement group. We are trying to
24	And so we are somewhat uniquely situated. We did	24	be active in our community and provide multiple forums
25	revise the biennial update, but, again, we are committed	25	for discussions with interested parties. And in
1	Page 83	1	Page 85
1 2	to do this. We were you know, other things have	1	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan
2	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states,	2	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking
	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and		particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the
2 3	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without	2 3	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural
2 3 4	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you	2 3 4	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that
2 3 4 5	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least	2 3 4 5	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for
2 3 4 5 6	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially	2 3 4 5 6	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that
2 3 4 5 6 7	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least	2 3 4 5 6 7	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we again, like I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment. We also updated based on our new biennial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we again, like I said at the beginning, you know, we were very thankful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment. We also updated based on our new biennial conservation plan. And then it includes distribution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we again, like I said at the beginning, you know, we were very thankful for the level of engagement we had when we were had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment. We also updated based on our new biennial conservation plan. And then it includes distribution efficiency and production efficiency consistent with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we were very thankful for the level of engagement we had when we were had discussions, our original CEIP. You know, we would like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment. We also updated based on our new biennial conservation plan. And then it includes distribution efficiency and production efficiency consistent with the compliance with EIA.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we again, like I said at the beginning, you know, we were very thankful for the level of engagement we had when we were had discussions, our original CEIP. You know, we would like to have more of that because we are very complex and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to do this. We were you know, other things have changed with new legislation in some of our other states, and we're actively trying to address those situations and how we can meet each state's energy policy without adversely affecting the other. But we are also, you know, wanting to make sure that we do it as the least cost for all of our customers. And, you know, especially for our customers on the west side of our system in both well, in all of the states: California, Oregon and Washington. But especially Washington and California, we serve some of the lowest income areas for all of the IOUs. So if you'd go to the next slide. So the incremental energy efficiency. We did make some updates to the incremental energy efficiency, so the 2022 to 2025 savings are now characterized by megawatt hour and year. You know, we were trying to be responsive to, you know, what we see in the market and to the feedback from stakeholders. This aligns with the EIA, the Energy Information Administration treatment. We also updated based on our new biennial conservation plan. And then it includes distribution efficiency and production efficiency consistent with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	particular, kind of beyond the public participation plan that we filed in Docket UE-210305, we've been taking steps to further develop our web page hub, which is the Energy Resource Center, and then conduct multicultural campaigns and then additional track feedback that we've been getting so that we can have that available for interested parties. Now, for the incremental cost for the biennial update, we had some minimal changes to both modeled and non-modeled administrative costs and did an update to the estimate of the average incremental revenue requirement to 1.35 million per year. So it was a 0.4 percent increase. This was still less than the alternative compliance. And so we're still you know, still following investments, trying to move towards our targets. And then next slide. Thank you. And so, you know, based on this discussion, you know, PacifiCorp, we understand the concerns raised by Staff and other parties. You know, we were very thankful for the level of engagement we had when we were had discussions, our original CEIP. You know, we would like

5 (Pages 82 to 85)

	Page 86		Page 88
1	multi-state nature is one component, but also just, you	1	the public participation plan, but we are always open to
2	know, the situation with the downgrades leads to	2	improving that process. We want more public engagement.
3	additional complexity.	3	You know, more education as to the utility business is
4	So our recommendation is that the Commission either	4	better. Better informed customers is better.
5	approve the biennial update and if you know, we're	5	And then we do see that the penalties, as I
6	open to guidance. Our original stipulation that was	6	mentioned before, put us in a tough position. The
7	approved by the Commission for the CEIP has a bunch of	7	Commission has already addressed this with Puget. You
8	conditions that we will incorporate into our 2025 CEIP,	8	know, how far do we comply? Do we purchase RECs in order
9	our next version. And so additional guidance to help us	9	to get compliance on the interim, or should we really be
10	with that is would be welcome.	10	focusing on resources, long term BPAs or other assets?
11	There are several of the issues I have a page	11	So with that, I'm open to questions.
12	full of notes from the discussion on PSE, you know, that	12	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Any questions for Matt
13	is will be critical to us trying to identify the right	13	McVee?
14	standards. You know, are they aspirational or are they	14	You want to start, Mr. Doumit?
15	enforceable goals? You know, what is the best way to	15	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Maybe it's a rhetorical
16	approach that? You know, I was encouraged by the	16	question, Matt. I'm not sure. Maybe not. No, it's not.
17	discussion.	17	So you just heard us tie ourselves in knots, basically,
18	We are all looking at good faith compliance with the	18	over a request to reduce the 2025 interim target for PSE
19	statute. We have no interest in trying to avoid	19	by 5 percent.
20	compliance as long as we're maintaining reliability and	20	MR. McVEE: Yeah.
21	affordability. That is really our concern. We don't	21	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Your '25 target is
22	want to have the risk that we don't have power available	22	would ask for a reduction of 45 percent.
23	because we don't have the offsetting, you know, the RECs	23	MR. McVEE: Yes.
24	that we can't get them or they're going to be, you	24	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: And over the four-year
25	know, unreasonably excessive prices. And, you know,	25	compliance period, as I calculated, 38 percent reduction
1	Page 87 further information, kind of guidance will develop as to	1	Page 89 on average over the compliance period.
2	what that means, but it does leave the utilities in a bit	2	MR. McVEE: Correct.
3	of a difficult position of trying to determine whether	3	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: How would you give us any kind
4	there's a risk of disallowance because it was you	4	of confidence that that is going to that that would
5	know, maybe it was the costs were excessive, or it's a	5	lead to compliance in 2030?
6	compliance risk with potential penalties.	6	MR. McVEE: Well, I think that there are several
7	And so, you know, approval of the plan is definitely	7	things that are changing right now. And we're kind of on
8	our preferred our preferred approach. But if not, we	8	the cusp of being able to present those or at least being
9	would be fine with adjudication. It gives PacifiCorp,	9	able to come up with a plan that we can then go to the
10	because of our complexity, more time to discuss all of	10	Commissions.
11	those issues with the interested parties, with the	11	I mean, we are definitely differently situated than
12	interveners in the proceeding, so that we can educate	12	Puget. Puget is a single-state utility. You know, they
13	them as to what we're actually dealing with and the risks	13	have good access to a longer term contracts for you
14	that we're trying to avoid or mitigate against to help	14	know, from, you know, hydro marketers.
15	our customers.	15	PacifiCorp, as a six-state utility, we're trying to
16	So as far as adopting Staff's recommendation in this	16	balance the needs. And historically what we've done
17	proceeding, we do have some concerns about that. We do	17	and we believe that it's been able to keep our rates very
18	think it would be inappropriate without that further	18	low for our customers is to essentially use the low
1.0	consideration, without a more full record, especially	19	diversity, the resource diversity, the geographic
19		20	diversity across our system and then dispatch on the
20	I mean, the Commissioner has pointed out some of the	0.1	
20 21	concerns about the level of penalties that we would have	21	least cost basis.
20 21 22	concerns about the level of penalties that we would have to agree to, which, you know, I am definitely not	22	You know, it's somewhat akin to a market except for
20 21 22 23	concerns about the level of penalties that we would have to agree to, which, you know, I am definitely not authorized to agree to a penalty higher than what's in	22 23	You know, it's somewhat akin to a market except for there's not multiple sellers, it is just PacifiCorp, but
20 21 22	concerns about the level of penalties that we would have to agree to, which, you know, I am definitely not	22	You know, it's somewhat akin to a market except for

	Page 90		Page 92
1	reason why, you know, we have coal resources, they were	1	8 percent of a resource, a solar resource, say, a 200
2	built at a time when coal resources were the preferred	2	megawatt solar resource, it might take 100 percent or
3	generation resource. And they were they were located	3	split it with Oregon, but take larger shares. That gives
4	next to mines, so we didn't have big transportation	4	us incremental improvement, much more than we would have
5	costs. And so we were able to bring, you know, that	5	as just a system development. So that is one of the
6	energy to all of our system.	6	components that we're looking at.
7	And we're doing a transition. But those you	7	The other issue for us is we do have to get past our
8	know, that benefit still applies. Wind from Wyoming is	8	financial kind of considerations right now. Further
9	some of the highest capacity wind that we can get in the	9	downgrade is going to be more expensive for everyone.
10	country. Solar from southern Utah can be very helpful	10	And so one of the issues that was pointed out is, you
11	and potentially have higher capacity factors than other	11	know, we believe, yes, we absolutely have a requirement
12	areas, especially the Northwest in the middle of winter.	12	for good faith pursuit, but we have to be very careful
13	And so, you know, there is some benefit to all of	13	about increasing costs across the board. I mean, access
14	that, but with that came a process that we've used for	14	to capital is the key for this industry. We have to get
15	I mean, you know, frankly, our multi-state process has	15	capital so that we can build the lines, so we can
16	been around since 2005, but we've had allocation	16	interconnect customers, so we can get the transmission,
17	methodology discussions long before that. In fact, prior	17	so we can get the generation. And we're concerned that
18	to the merger with Utah Power, PacifiCorp still served	18	if we start going for, you know, expansion for one state
19	five states, and so we had an allocation methodology for	19	for the entire system at the wrong time, that could
20	those five states, which included Washington.	20	adversely affect our costs for all of our customers for
21	So we're in the process, and we've been in	21	all of our operations.
22	negotiations kind of under the guise of the 2020 protocol	22	And so we're trying to work through those issues,
23	and getting to that next allocation methodology, where	23	too. That means, as there's a period of time when and
24	we're starting to really look at: Well, what can we do?	24	that's what's reflected in these revised the revised
25	Also, there's been the 2023 IRP is out, and we're	25	targets for our first CEIP, so we believe we can meet
	Page 91		Page 93
1	producing a 2023 IRP update for other states. Other	1	those targets. If they're accelerated, then we're going
2	states are on a two-year cycle for their IRPs, unlike	2	to start to be worried about issues.
3	Washington. And, you know, part of that and part of the	3	Now in our discussions with Staff on this, Staff did
4	discussions in our discussion our allocation	4	raise the potential or the statutory language about
5	discussions is: Is there a different way that we plan?	5	getting a return on BPAs. That is something that we're
6	And if there's a different way that we plan, can we	6	also looking at. We've been playing around with
7	start you know, is there an opportunity for more situs	7	different options for dealing with that, but for that to
8	resources?	8	actually work to potentially help so it doesn't adversely
9	Now, those have because we've built our system	9	affect our metrics because BPAs, we get imputed
10	around this system dispatch, there's ramifications for	10	somewhere between 20 and 25 percent of the BPA is imputed
11	each one of those. And so we have to look at each one of	11	as debt, which then swings our financial metrics.
11 12	each one of those. And so we have to look at each one of those and determine what consequences there are. So if	11 12	But if we can develop something and then work that
		1	
12	those and determine what consequences there are. So if	12	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be
12 13	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet	12 13	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and
12 13 14	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch?	12 13 14	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a
12 13 14 15	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice?	12 13 14 15	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating
12 13 14 15 16	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we	12 13 14 15 16	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington.
12 13 14 15 16 17	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice?	12 13 14 15 16 17	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice? We've been working through all of those for the past	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups then. So BPAs, what would your solution be? Rate of
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice? We've been working through all of those for the past several years and very intense over the last year, to try	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice? We've been working through all of those for the past several years and very intense over the last year, to try to figure out those issues. But we're getting to that point where I think situs, especially with new legislation in Wyoming and Utah, that developing	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups then. So BPAs, what would your solution be? Rate of return on BPAs is a possible solution? Is that what to hedge or
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice? We've been working through all of those for the past several years and very intense over the last year, to try to figure out those issues. But we're getting to that point where I think situs, especially with new legislation in Wyoming and Utah, that developing resources just for particular states is probably where we	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups then. So BPAs, what would your solution be? Rate of return on BPAs is a possible solution? Is that what to hedge or MR. McVEE: Yeah. I mean, we haven't I have to
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those and determine what consequences there are. So if we have a significant number of situs resources to meet the need to serve just Washington, how do we dispatch? Does that create competition between Oregon and Washington as far as what those resources are? How do we deal with customer choice? We've been working through all of those for the past several years and very intense over the last year, to try to figure out those issues. But we're getting to that point where I think situs, especially with new legislation in Wyoming and Utah, that developing	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	But if we can develop something and then work that out with Staff, interested parties, then we would take that to the rating agencies and see if that would be something that they would accept to at least lower and maybe remove that imputation. That could then provide a different avenue where we could start really accelerating compliance for Washington. COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So just a couple of follow-ups then. So BPAs, what would your solution be? Rate of return on BPAs is a possible solution? Is that what to hedge or

7 (Pages 90 to 93)

	Page 94		Page 96
1	that. You know, there's I don't know that that is the	1	endeavor, right? Which is good to be thinking about.
2	only option. I think there might be some other options	2	Let me just ask this last question.
3	out there. But it is you know, it is something	3	MR. McVEE: Okay.
4	that as Staff pointed out, it's in the statute and	4	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I know my colleagues have
5	it's one of the tools that we could potentially use. But	5	questions as well.
6	that's one of those things that it is going to take a	6	An adjudication, that doesn't resolve the
7	little bit more time to develop, given our current	7	fundamental issues. That gets us into more facts, where
8	situation, for us to kind of work that through to see	8	I think, you know, is we need to, you know, understand
9	what would work.	9	the facts here, but is that just more time or what I
10	We want to make sure that we're going through	10	mean, what is the what is the benefit of bringing
11	stakeholder engagement, you know, to get a better	11	adjudication?
12	understanding, to increase the education about it. And	12	MR. McVEE: Well, I mean, at this point, I mean, I
13	then we would have to go to rating agencies and see	13	tend to agree, our preferred approach would be, you know,
14	what's happening.	14	the direction to help us move towards that 2015 CEIP .
15	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: So back to the original	15	Adjudication, you know, in my mind, it can be adversarial
16	question, how in the world do you expect to make it at	16	or it can be you know, we can end up in discussions
17	2030? It sounds like you're really saying, I think,	17	where we have that opportunity. And I feel like in the
18	you know: We don't know at this point. Because of	18	CEIP, once we got to have some conversations on the
19	you've got these new policies in Wyoming and Utah, you	19	actual CEIP, those were very productive because we were
20	know, self-sufficient, you know, energy states; and then	20	able to discuss through issues, talk about what was
21	you've got wind in Utah and wind in Wyoming, solar in	21	specific towards our utility versus Puget versus Avista,
22	Utah that now apparently you're determining, you know,	22	where we had some differences.
23	will stay there. And that leaves us as the big question	23	You know, those and I, you know, I think that
24	mark, it sounds like, given our policy. So I mean, at	24	the fact that we're able to get a stipulation on the
25	this point you don't it sounds to me like and I	25	majority of the issues in our rate case and a stipulation
1	don't mean this in a negative way you just don't	1	in the CEIP. And it goes towards the fact that, you
2 3	really have a good answer in terms of how you're going to	2	know, it shows parties are willing to listen to us and
4	get there in 2030. MR. McVEE: Yeah. I mean, I you know, I believe	4	we're able to have those conversations. Given the timing, I mean, I think I mean, our
5	we have to be fairly transparent. I mean, we don't have	5	of course, our preferred approach would be approve the
6	a smooth path. I mean, right now when we're in	6	biennial update. And then with I think it would be
7	discussions about allocations, I mean, it's very	7	reasonable to say directions regarding some of the
8	complicated. And we have you know, there's some	8	some of the conditions that are raised by Staff. I mean,
9	individuals that, you know, outside the company that are	9	I think the you know, again, to be, you know, very
10	very engaged, you know, really trying to help. And then	10	transparent, the next CEIP is going to cover four years
11	there's a lot the interested parties that, you know,	11	going towards 2029.
12	they're as overwhelmed as we are, or more so, because	12	You know, as far as setting standards, where, you
13	it's how difficult it is.	13	know, we could be exposed to penalties, we have to be
14	Now, I do think that there's some opportunities.	14	very careful about that. But at the same time, we can't
15	And, again, you know, this I'm not part of our IRP	15	be at zero. We can't stay at, you know, 20 percent
16	team, I would have to defer to them. But some of the	16	through that time period. And so we're working hard to
17	things that we've been discussing might allow more of	17	figure out a way so that we can show that incremental
18	those situs resources. Now, if we can figure out how to	18	improvement of long-term resources, long-term BPAs so
19	fit those into market, how to operate with them as far as	19	that we can meet compliance.
20	dispatch so that we're being fair to all customers, that	20	So I think, of those two, we prefer kind of more
21	allows a real incremental step, because instead of 8	21	discussion and some direction from the Commission without
22	percent of any new wind, solar renewable project	22	adjudication, but we understand adjudication provides
23	essentially being allocated to Washington, it's closer to	23	some opportunities for us.
24	100 percent.	24	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I may have more, but that's
25	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: That's a long-term, you know,	25	all for now. Thanks.
		1	

Page 98		Page 100
CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	1	We can run those sensitivities. Our real problem
Commissioner Rendahl?	2	comes when we're supposed to run that in a preferred
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, thank you, Matt.	3	portfolio that may be a system preferred portfolio. And
And keeping on that on that theme, obviously, you know,	4	as I mentioned before, we're working on ways where we can
having the Staff and the company negotiate during an open	5	kind of run, you know, potentially state specific, and
meeting is a different thing for the Commission, so I'm	6	then we'd come up with that, and then look for
not sure that we're going to get there today. But I	7	efficiencies.
appreciate the fact that Staff and the company have had	8	If we can get that done because, again, it's very
some good conversations and work through these issues.	9	complicated over a six-state system. You're talking
This is a process, very much so. I understand, you know,	10	about essentially the same level of planning that you
PacifiCorp's CEIP was approved, and then you had to turn	11	would get in an organized market because of what we have
around within less than a week and file the, you know,	12	to deal with. And that's hard. I mean, organized
biennial. So I know there's still issues that are really	13	markets are you know, they struggle with that and they
being worked out. So timing is different for PacifiCorp	14	try to simplify it as much as they can.
than the other companies.	15	But, yes, of course, the Commission gave us
On some of the specific issues where I think there	16	direction on the IRP. The IRP informs the CEIP. We
may be some disagreement, I've wanted to ask, it seems	17	understand that relationship and the Commission's
that the company is concerned about including conditions	18	authority there.
on what should be included, not just in future CEIPs,	19	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I sympathize with
which we did do for PSE, but also the IRP process.	20	the markets, having been involved in a lot of the
And so from my view, and just letting you know, the	21	discussions this year. So in terms of the timing and
IRP under the current statutory scheme informs the CEIP.	22	if you the timing of the multi-state allocation, I
And if there's no way to make changes to the IRP process,	23	have not been engaged in that. In prior years I've been
then how do we make sure they flow into the CEIP?	24	pretty engaged in that. So, what is the if you can
So I don't have legal concerns, as I did about the	25	just be really succinct, what is the current status of
Page 99		Page 101
penalties, about the Commission ordering direction to the	1	that process? And is there actual likelihood that it
	2	could result in this state-preferred, you know, situs
	3	option.
have it there? What's the what's the concern?	4	MR. McVEE: Well, we do have the current 2020
MR. McVEE: I think the we understand, you know,	5	protocol does include an idea of state-specific
the issues with the IRP and the CEIP. The IRP, we've	6	initiatives and resources associated with those, so we do
	7	have an avenue that we could use now. It really gets to
	8	a question of operations if you take it beyond a few
through, you know, the complaint case after we originally	9	resources, so community solar, some of the early
filed the CEIP, and get resolution of that so that we	10	community solar projects. And in Oregon, we're an
could run and provide the data that Staff wanted.	11	example of things that we treated as situs to Oregon.
You know, the issue that we ran into is, you know,	12	And then what we did sorry, you said concise but we
social cost of greenhouse gas. You know, incorporating	13	had a way of treating that so that the energy is still
that, especially for that would change dispatch on a	14	going on and everyone's essentially paying as if it was
system basis for resources that are not used to serve	15	market.
Washington customers that are not in Washington	16	So we have that kind of opportunity to do that, but
customers' rates. But we were able to accommodate it and	17	we did get an extension in four of our six states.
do those runs.	18	Washington had the WIJAM. The WIJAM was designed not to
We still believe that that's probably not very	19	need an extension; it would continue. And then we reach
beneficial information when you're talking about the	20	out to the signatories and discuss options.
CEIP. And so, I mean, as far as guidance with the IRP,	21	California, essentially, that's they take the
you know, what we would you know, of course, the	22	2020 protocol. They just approved that earlier this
	23	year, and that will run until we bring the next one to
Commission has authority. I mean, we have an IRP	23	, ,
Commission has authority. I mean, we have an IRP requirement in Washington. The Commission can tell us	24	them.
	<text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text></text>	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. 1 Commissioner Rendahl? 2 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, thank you, Matt. 3 And keeping on that on that theme, obviously, you know, having the Staff and the company negotiate during an open meeting is a different thing for the Commission, so I'n not sure that we're going to get there today. But I appreciate the fact that Staff and the company have had some good conversations and work through these issues. 9 This is a process, very much so. I understand, you know, 10 PacifiCorp's CEIP was approved, and then you had to turn around within less than a week and file the, you know, 12 biennial. So I know there's still issues that are really 13 being worked out. So timing is different for PacifiCorp than the other companies. 15 On some of the specific issues where I think there 16 may be some disagreement, I've wanted to ask, it seems 17 that the company is concerned about including conditions 18 on what should be included, not just in future CEIPs, 19 which we did do for PSE, but also the IRP process, 23 then how do we make sure they flow into the CEIP? 24 So I don't have legal concerns, as I did about the 25 Page 292 penalties, about the Commission ordering direction to the insues whith the IRP and the CEIP?

9 (Pages 98 to 101)

1moving. And we're getting you know, I personally1Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale2believe that I've been doing that our multi-state2of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to3process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now3meet CETA's obligations?4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full		Page 102		Page 104
3 unfortunately, we are at the mercy of the kind of greater 3 set their state policy, and if that's important to them. 4 environment, the policical environment. And so 4 You know, as a utility that serves multiple states, we 6 legislation that is control yassed and signed into law always strike to meet every state's policy. 7 unfortunately - you know, they'te complicating 7 9 but we are working - we are working hard to try to move 7 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is - that's on my list. 12 13 That is one of my tasks that th assigned, is working 13 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 15 figure that out, but it is - it's a change in 15 16 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 19 the way that we have to address it, geographic diversity, geographic diversity, geographic diversity, geographic diversity, geographic diversity, geographic diversity, geographic diversi	1 extensi	on, and so we're continuing to have those	1	really trying to kind of protect some of the local
4 environment, the political environment. And so. 4 You know, as a utility that serves multiple states, we always strive to meet every state's policy. 5 legislation that is recently passed and signed into law 5 6 in Utah, pending legislation in Wyorning, all of those are always strive to meet every state's policy. 7 unfortunately you know, they're complicating 7 8 discussions. And so I dont have a time frame for it, 8 9 but we are working we are working hard to try to move 7 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list. 12 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 14 trough the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 15 figure that out, but it is like everything, it's a 15 16 corr system, and so we're working through those. But with 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 19 the market approaching, wese et at as a hup benefit to 10 us because that assertide benefits to 11 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of </td <td>2 discuss</td> <td>sions. Now, as far as the timing goes, I mean,</td> <td>2</td> <td>economic hits, which and that's their state. They can</td>	2 discuss	sions. Now, as far as the timing goes, I mean,	2	economic hits, which and that's their state. They can
5 legislation that is recently passed and signed into law 5 always strive to meet every state's policy. 6 in Utah, pending legislation in Wyoming, all of those are 6 And so they could take additional shares of 7 unfortunately – you know, theyre complicating 6 For exerces as other states exit, essentially. So, Hunter 8 discussions. And so I don't have a time frame for it, 8 and Huntington, you know, they exactly a baddress it. 10 comward and figure out a way to address it. 10 rates, but there's an extra 8 percent because of the 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is - that's on my list. 11 system allocate, operate 16 journey. We're trying – that is a – it's a change in 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that wave to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 opportunities fight now. You know, it's ust engagement. 10 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 10 11 mowing. And we're getting – you know, it is ust engagement. </td <td>3 unfortu</td> <td>nately, we are at the mercy of the kind of greater</td> <td>3</td> <td>set their state policy, and if that's important to them.</td>	3 unfortu	nately, we are at the mercy of the kind of greater	3	set their state policy, and if that's important to them.
6 in Utah, pending legislation in Wyoming, all of those are unfortunately — you know, they complicating 6 And so they could take additional shares of resources as other states exit, assentially. So, Hunter 7 unfortunately — you know, they a time frame for it, 9 but we are working we are working hard to try to move forward and figure out a way to address it. 7 resources as other states exit, assentially. So, Hunter 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 7 resources as other states exit, assentially. So, Hunter 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 10 rates, but there's an exit a 8 percent because of the system allocation calculation that is uncovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that so in my list. 11 system allocation calculation that is uncovered. The 13 That is one of my tasks that 1m assigned, is working 13 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, essentially, there's that B percent that could be picked 14 through the MEX, ban so so we're working through those. But with the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 16 CHAIR DANNER: CNay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, pan, allocate, operate 10 respecting every state's policies and complying with that -1 mean, obviously, our state's ballogies and complying with that -1 mean, that so and earbon fire by 2045. 18 ou	4 environ	ment, the political environment. And so	4	You know, as a utility that serves multiple states, we
7 unfortunately you know, they're complicating 7 resources as other states exit, essentially. So, Hunter 8 discussions. And so I don't have a time frame for it, 9 and Huntington, you know, those units are not used to 9 but we are working hard to try to move 9 serve Washington customes. They're not in Washington 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 rates, but there's an extra 8 percent because of the 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 utility. PacifiCarp, does not get recovery for that 8 16 journey. We're trying that is a it's a change in 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 that I mean, dowe're working through those. But with 18 that I mean, oviousily, units is a ware that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 nothecommissione Dounti, I'm not confident, giv	5 legislati	ion that is recently passed and signed into law	5	always strive to meet every state's policy.
8 discussions. And so I don't have a time frame for it, 9 and Huntington, you know, those units are not used to 9 but we are working — we are working hard to try to move 9 serve Washington customers. They're not in Washington 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 rates, but there's a nerka 8 percent because of the 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is — thar's on my list. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working is working is working percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 14 through the MSP. We are working thiogup those. But with is porcent, which would be Washington's share. And so, is working - we are share a 1 or those benefits to try to 16 journey. We're trying - that is a - it's a change in in CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate in we're set hat as shue be benefits to flow 18 our system, and so we're seeing a lot of in we're set hat as alwight of the staw benefits to flow 21 tha lows that same me - all of thos eatakeholders really in the -	6 in Utah	, pending legislation in Wyoming, all of those are	6	And so they could take additional shares of
9 but we are working we are working hard to try to move 9 serve Washington customers. They're not in Washington 10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 rates, but there's an extra 8 percent because of the 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list. 11 utility. PacifiCorp, does not get recovery for that 8 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 14 through the MSP. We are working through those. But with 14 percent, which would be Washington customers. They're not in Washington 16 journey. We're trying that is a - it's a change in 16 respecting every state's policies and complying with 16 it way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 19 mumbers and I'm just I'mean, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load wre'ny to now, it'fs just engagement. 23	7 unfortu	nately you know, they're complicating	7	resources as other states exit, essentially. So, Hunter
10 forward and figure out a way to address it. 10 rates, but there's an extra 8 percent because of the 11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is - that's on my list. 12 utility. PacificOry, does not get recovery for that 8 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 16 journey. We're trying that is a it's a change in 16 16 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 characte's laws are that you'le going by Utah. 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 18 that - I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you'le going bit that same footprint, 19 that does diversity, geographic diversity. 11 isak mee a numbers and I'm just I mean, i'm not confident, given 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, i'm not confident, given 22 It allows that same - all of thoes banefits to flow 23 for. And when he	8 discuss	sions. And so I don't have a time frame for it,	8	and Huntington, you know, those units are not used to
11 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. 11 system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The 12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list. 12 utility. PacifiCorp, does not get recovery for that 8 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 15 figure that out, but it is like everything, it's a 15 up by Utah. 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 that I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 10 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just - I mean, I'm not confident, given 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you direcity, I think you kind	9 but we	are working we are working hard to try to move	9	serve Washington customers. They're not in Washington
12 MR. McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list. 12 utility. PacifiCorp, does not get recovery for that 8 13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 recent, which would be Washingtor's share. And so, essentially, there's that 8 percent that could be picked 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 essentially, there's that 8 percent that could be picked 16 journey. We're trying that is a it's a change in 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 and like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 10 mumbers, that you would achieve what CETA is asking 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 24 opportunities right now. You know, it personally 10 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 25 l mean, we've got to get all	10 forward	l and figure out a way to address it.	10	rates, but there's an extra 8 percent because of the
13 That is one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working 13 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to ty to 14 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 15 figure that out, but it is like everything, it's a 15 percent, which would be Washington's share. And so, 16 journey. We're trying that is a it's a change in 16 16 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so were working through those. But with 18 the	11 CO	MMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.	11	system allocation calculation that is unrecovered. The
14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 14 through the MSP. We are working diligently to try to 15 figure that out, but it is like everything, it's a 15 up by Utah. 16 journey. We're trying that is a - ti's a change in 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 that I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for . And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, I's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, can you give me on a scale 1 moving. And we're getting you know, I pe	12 MR.	McVEE: You know, that is that's on my list.	12	utility, PacifiCorp, does not get recovery for that 8
15 figure that out, but it is – like everything, it's a 15 up by Utah. 16 journey. We're trying – that is a – it's a change in 16 CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Well, along the lines of 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 that – I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just – I mean, I'm not confident, given 22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 22 these numbers, that you would achieve what CETA is asking 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if –- you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders reaily 1 Give m	13 That is	one of my tasks that I'm assigned, is working	13	percent, which would be Washington's share. And so,
16 journey. We're trying - that is a - it's a change in 16 17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 respecting every state's policies and complying with 19 the market approaching, we see that as an uge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, l'm not confident, given 22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 22 ta saking 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 for and we're getting you know, I personally 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 4 than I've seen for, y	14 through	the MSP. We are working diligently to try to		
17 the way that we have to address, plan, allocate, operate 17 respecting every state's policies and complying with 18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 that I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 24 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to s	15 figure t	hat out, but it is like everything, it's a	1	up by Utah.
18 our system, and so we're working through those. But with 18 that I mean, obviously, our state's laws are that you 19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 11 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 21 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 Fage 103 2 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 of 1 to 10, how confident are you know, can you give me on a scale 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, ag				
19 the market approaching, we see that as a huge benefit for 19 will be carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon free by 2045. 20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 20 and like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just - I mean, I'm not confident, given 22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 22 these numbers, that you would achieve what CETA is asking 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 to raise costs. 26 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 7 Give resoner you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 9 We've you know, we were movin		· · · · ·	1	
20 us because that essentially gives that same footprint, 21 20 And like Commissioner Doumit, I'm looking at these numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 22 21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 23 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 24 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 24 26 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 24 27 moving. And we're getting you know, i'p personally 1 28 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 30 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 5 years of that project. 5 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 7 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 9 9 is? 9 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 10				
21 broad footprint, load diversity, geographic diversity. 21 numbers and I'm just I mean, I'm not confident, given 22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 22 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 to raise costs. 1 moving. And we're getting you know, I personally 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 2 believe that I've been doing that - our multi-state 2 of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 8 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 9			1	
22 It allows that same all of those benefits to flow 22 these numbers, that you would achieve what CETA is asking 23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 these numbers, that you would achieve what CETA is asking 1 moving. And we're getting you know, if's just engagement now 24 Sive me some you know, can you give me on a scale 2 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 9 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 3 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 10 syst			1	
23 through via the market. And so we're seeing a lot of 23 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 26 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 26 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 27 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 26 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 26 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 27 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 27 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you kind of 28 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 for. And when he asked you directly, I think you're going to 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030? 5 years of that project. 6 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm			1	
24 opportunities right now. You know, it's just engagement. 24 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going to raise costs. 25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 said, we can meet these if you know, if it's not going to raise costs. 1 moving. And we're getting you know, I personally 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to meet CETA's obligations? 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030? 5 years of that project. 5 CHAIR DANNER: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 6 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 8 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 10 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of 11 transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full 12 bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly 12 system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 13 aggressive as far as their				
25 I mean, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really 25 to raise costs. Page 103 Page 103 Page 105 1 moving. And we're getting you know, I personally 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 2 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030? 5 years of that project. 5 CHAIR DANNER: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 6 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 7 of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 8 going to be it is definitely a different approach. 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 10 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 10 system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 11 the Wyoming. But there I		•	1	
Page 103 Page 103 1 moving. And we're getting you know, I personally 1 Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale 2 believe that I've been doing that our multi-state 2 of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to 3 process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now 3 meet CETA's obligations? 4 than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven 4 MR. McVEE: By 2030? 5 years of that project. 5 CHAIR DANNER: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. 6 MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part 7 CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what 7 of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is 8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 8 going to be it is definitely a different approach. 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 10 system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 11 the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of 11 transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full 12 bills that are floating around,			1	
1moving. And we're getting you know, I personally1Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale2believe that I've been doing that our multi-state2of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to3process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now3meet CETA's obligations?4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	25 I mean,	, we've got to get all of the stakeholders really	25	to faise costs.
2believe that I've been doing that our multi-state2of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to3process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now3meet CETA's obligations?4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.		Page 103		Page 105
2believe that I've been doing that our multi-state2of 1 to 10, how confident are you that you're going to3process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now3meet CETA's obligations?4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	1 moving	And we're getting you know. I personally	1	Give me some you know, can you give me on a scale
3process since 2015, and I'm seeing more engagement now than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven years of that project.3meet CETA's obligations?4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven years of that project.4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation is?6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of 1110system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 1112bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly 1312system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication 13	-			
4than I've seen for, you know, the first five to seven4MR. McVEE: By 2030?5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.		_	3	
5years of that project.5CHAIR DANNER: Yes.6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.			4	-
6COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.6MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what7of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is8the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation8going to be it is definitely a different approach.9is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.		-	5	
7CHAIR DANNER: So, Matt, could you remind us what the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 97of the IRP team. And we've got our update, which is going to be it is definitely a different approach. 99is?9We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 1010MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 1110system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 1111the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of 1211transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full 1213aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.			6	MR. McVEE: By 2030, you know, again, I'm not part
8 the Utah legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation 8 going to be it is definitely a different approach. 9 is? 9 We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a 10 MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on 10 system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone 11 the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of 11 transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full 12 bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly 12 system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication 13 aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable 13 there.			7	
10MR. McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on10system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	8 the Uta	h legislation was and what the Wyoming legislation	8	going to be it is definitely a different approach.
11the Wyoming. But there I know that there's a lot of11transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	9 is?		9	We've you know, we were moving towards 2050 as a
12bills that are floating around, and they can be fairly12system decarbonization. Now we've got some complication13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	10 MR.	McVEE: Wyoming, I'm a little more sketchy on	10	system kind of prior to kind of the stay of the ozone
13aggressive as far as their preference for dispatchable13there.	11 the Wy	oming. But there I know that there's a lot of	11	transport rule, and so we were looking at kind of a full
	12 bills that	at are floating around, and they can be fairly	12	system decarbonization. Now we've got some complications
14 resources. 14 As you know, we will strive. Can we get, you	13 aggress	sive as far as their preference for dispatchable	13	there.
	14 resource	ces.	14	As you know, we will strive. Can we get, you
15 Utah, the one that they just passed, sets a state 15 know, all the way there by 2030? I think we can strive	15 Utał	n, the one that they just passed, sets a state	15	know, all the way there by 2030? I think we can strive
policy that preferences dispatchable resources and would 16 to get there. I think, you know, we you know, with	16 policy t	hat preferences dispatchable resources and would	16	to get there. I think, you know, we you know, with
17allow, Utah the Utah Commission, the Public Service17the proper participation, you know, getting into a	17 allow, L	Jtah the Utah Commission, the Public Service	17	the proper participation, you know, getting into a
18Commission, to approve a greater allocation of emitting18market, getting the resources. I think where we start to				
19resources, I believe that are located in Utah that are19run into complications is also meeting resource adequacy.			1	
20just that qualify as dispatchable.20And so, you know, kind of one of our concerns is,				•
21 And so that kind of sets up a situation where I 21 you know one of the conditions was to also set up		-		
22 mean, really what they're I mean, they're looking at 22 resource adequacy. And so getting the technology	,		1	
23 the economic impacts. I mean, Wyoming, if you look at 23 isn't really there to meet all or potentially not				
				there to meet the resource adequacy. We'd have to have a
25it is based on excise tax. And so, you know, they're25ton of batteries. And batteries, you got four or six,	25 it is bas	sed on excise tax. And so, you know, they're	25	ton of batteries. And batteries, you got four or six,

10 (Pages 102 to 105)

	Page 106		Page 108
1		1	
1 2	eight hours. But then charging those, are you charging them with, you know, clean energy or you charging them		CHAIR DANNER: Don't worry about that. Don't worry about that.
3	with system energy? You know, what's coming off the	3	MR. BAKER: Yeah, apologies for that. Speaking from
4	market?	4	the perspective of the Integrated Resource Planning
5	So I think I'm in my discussions with the IRP	5	Group, and as the director of Integrated Resource
6	team and they can they can jump in to correct me	6	planning, you know, we are fully committed to hitting the
7	but, you know, the idea is by 2030, reasonably close and	7	2030 mark and I think, not to get out over my ski tips,
8	potentially could get there. It may be a little more	8	but speaking at a high level, my conception of it is
9	expensive than what we would prefer, but you know,	9	this: Circumstances on the ground and in the environment
10	potentially get there.	10	change significantly, you know, causing us to shift our
11	Actually, I'm getting some I think Randy Baker	11	view in terms of the prudency of an immediate or more
12	might be able to jump in, but I think the you know,	12	immediate acquisition of resources. You know, the
13	2030 is an attainable goal. You know, noncompliance by	13	procurements that are necessary and the actions that are
14	2030 is something that we will, you know, strive to get	14	necessary to hit the 2030 target, I'm still fully
15	there. We understand the statutory risk, the risk of	15	confident that we're going to be able to do those things.
16	penalties on that.	16	I suspect that a lot more of it is going to occur in the
17	2045, you know, that's technology dependent. We've	17	second CEIP cycle, as opposed to what we had anticipated
18	said that, I think, in all of our filings. And so it's	18	for the first.
19	kind of this time period. So 2030, we'll get there with	19	And I'll also point out and I see that Tom wants
20	resources. New allocation might make it easier to get	20	to chime in, so maybe I'll just stop there and let him
21	there. We may be able to get there faster, but we really	21	speak, as well.
22	have to look at the allocation methodology and then get	22	CHAIR DANNER: All right.
23	that updated plan.	23	Go ahead, Tom.
24	So I don't know if Randy Baker would is on the	24	MR. BURNS: Yes. This is this is Tom Burns. I'm
25	line. He can talk a little bit more about what they're	25	the vice president of resource planning and acquisitions
	De		
	Page 107		Page 109
1	seeing in the IRP.	1	at PacifiCorp.
2	CHAIR DANNER: So, yeah. Randy Baker.	2	Can everyone hear me okay?
3	What I heard was not a commitment that you're going	3	CHAIR DANNER: It's a little shaky, but we can hear
4 5	to meet CETA's statutory obligations. Is that is that correct?	4	you enough. MR. BURNS: Okay.
6	MR. McVEE: Well, let me clarify. I'm a lawyer by	6	CHAIR DANNER: That's better.
7	training, so I can't it's hard for me to get rid of	7	MR. BURNS: Given the landscape that we had as we
8	that.	8	were preparing our 2023 IRP and we were moving through
9	CHAIR DANNER: Well, okay. Yeah, what I what I	9	our 2022, also our RFP, there were several things that
10	heard was a lot of caveats, that, boy, you're striving to	10	had all of our states on a parallel path towards
11	get there; you have no confidence that you will; you hope	11	procuring resources, namely the ozone transport rule.
12	you will. And I'm a lawyer, too, but that was the way I	12	When that ozone transport rule received a stay, it
13	synthesized what you said. So and that that is	13	changed the economic landscape for part of our system.
14	very concerning to me.	14	And so that caused us to take a pause, pause our
15	You know, we're not talking about 1 or 2 percentage	15	procurement because, for a portion of our system, it was
16	points in 2025. We're talking pretty significant	16	no longer prudent for us to be moving in that direction
17	decreases in your update here. And it's very concerning	17	for procuring resources and constraining, you know,
18	to me.	18	resources that no longer had a NOx constraint applied
19	So, Randy Baker, are you there?	19	against them.
20	MR. BAKER: Yes. Can you hear me?	20	So in our approach with our '23 IRP update, you
21	CHAIR DANNER: Yes. We can't see you, but we can	21	know, we're taking significant strides towards having a
22	hear you.	22	more individualized view of each state's IRP and resource
23	MR. BAKER: Oh, sorry. I actually turned my camera	23	procurement path, and we're going to be able to meet the
24	on, and evidently it's not picking up, even though it	24	2030 targets, but now we have to do an extra level of
25	worked when I tested it. Anyway, apologies	25	diligence because each state is not procuring at the same

11 (Pages 106 to 109)

	Page 110		Page 112
1	level because those economic drivers are not aligning all	1	first I wanted to say, you know, Staff, if it sounds
2	six states simultaneously.	2	like the company doesn't have authority to agree to
3	Does that help shine some light on it?	3	anything if it's similar to condition 9. That's really
4	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I mean, that's consistent with	4	unfortunate because one of the things I'm going to talk
5	what Randy said. I think that, you know, I haven't dived	5	about is, you know, why adjudication is actually a very
6	into it. The stay of the ozone rule is just a stay. I	6	bad option here. And we might inevitably get there, but,
7	mean, are you seeing this as a permanent repeal? What	7	you know, I do want to make sure that everyone knows
8	happens if you make procurement decisions and that rule	8	before we pursue that option what that could look like
9	is the stay is lifted?	9	and what that means. So let's just, you know, talk about
10	MR. BURNS: So that is something to be considered.	10	what it would look like to adjudicate this case.
11	And it's not so much procurement decisions. Well, it is	11	So it's currently end of March, 2024. If we set
12	procurement decisions; it's a decision to not procure.	12	this for an adjudication, it would get resolved probably
13	CHAIR DANNER: Mm-hmm.	13	in 8 to 10 months. So what we're looking at there is
14	MR. BURNS: Right now, though, if you look at	14	late 2024, early 2025, probably. And of course, one of
15	things and this is all publicly available so I'm not	15	the issues there would be the interim targets, as we've
16	putting anything out there that's, you know, soon to be	16	been talking about.
17	filed on the 1st of April but the in-roll forward	17	So that creates a lot of risk and uncertainty for
18	price curve is declining, so we see minimal risk with	18	everyone involved. I mean, for the company, the
19	waiting until a prudent time to procure.	19	currently approved interim targets is 40 percent for this
20	So there was, as a result of the ozone transport	20	year and 60 percent for 2025. So it's unclear how the
21	rule, I would say, a bump in prices from developers that	21	Commission would deal with that. Let's say, for example,
22	were, you know, anticipating strong need up front.	22	that after the adjudication, the Commission decides to
23	So, you know, the pause, in my opinion, is going to	23	set interim targets that aren't what the company
24	be beneficial for everyone because it will give the	24	proposes. Probably not going to be 40 and 60 percent,
25	marketplace and developers time to you know, one, the	25	but they could be higher than what the company is
1	Page 111 supply chain issues will work themselves out, and, two,	1	Page 113 proposing today. So that could create a lot of risk.
2	it'll have a more measured and prudent approach towards	2	It's unclear how we would be able to deal with that.
3	procurement rather than everybody trying to get through	3	The other problem that this creates is, even if
4	the doorway at once in regards to build-out of	4	we're not talking about just 2024, if the Commission sets
5	non-emitting resources.	5	different interim targets for 2025, how's the company
6	CHAIR DANNER: Mm-hmm. But in the meantime we have	6	going to be able to transition and change that? So I
7	continued reliance on Jim Bridger more than we originally	7	think it's unfortunate if we do set for an adjudication,
8	had, so there are things like that that obviously are	8	but I do think that it's in everyone's best interest to
9	concerning to me.	9	try and reach some kind of acceptable set of conditions
10	MR. BURNS: (Inaudible) 2025.	10	today.
11	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.	11	If we can't do that, we could still try and
12	MR. McVEE: Sorry. Chair Danner, if I may. I mean,	12	negotiate a settlement after an adjudication is set, but
13	I think the other thing to keep in mind is the scale,	13	I just want everyone to be aware that, you know, fully
14	too. I mean, Washington is, you know, it's 8 percent of	14	litigating this might create some really thorny issues
15	our load. So we're really looking at a few hundred	15	for the Commission to deal with later on, so I hope that
16	megawatts. So I think, you know, if it's	16	we're all trying to work to avoid that.
17	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I understand that. I	17	The second issue that I want to address relates to
18	appreciate your raising that. Thank you.	18	condition 9. It's something that we've been talking
19	MR. McVEE: Yeah.	19	about and you all are clearly concerned with. And I
20	CHAIR DANNER: So Staff has proposed nine	20	think as I talk about this, if you have it with you, if
21	conditions. Okay. Before we get into that, Nash	21	you look on the biennial update on page 8 and figure 1.1,
22	Callaghan, do you want to	22	this would be helpful.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, I	23	So the interim targets that PacifiCorp is
24	wanted to just briefly address two things. These are	24	proposing
25	different topics so this may be a little jarring, but	25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry, Nash. Which page

12 (Pages 110 to 113)

	Page 114		Page 116
1 ar	e you talking about?	1	MR. McVEE: If I may, Chair Danner
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry. Page 8, figure 1.1.	2	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.
3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.	3	MR. McVEE: and I don't know if I need to prolong
4	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yeah. So the biennial update that	4	this, but, you know, our concern is and as I stated at
5 the	e the interim targets that the company is proposing,	5	the beginning, yes, we understand the whole point is to
	ey are concerning not just because they're reducing the	6	be making progress. We just we do not agree with, you
	gets themselves by quite a bit, but also because they	7	know, putting in numbers when, one, there isn't an
	e essentially flat. Over a four-year period, what	8	adequate record, and that are getting ahead of, like, a
	e're looking at is about a 2 percent increase, so half a	9	proper, planning process, proper cost evaluation.
10 pe	rcent a year.	10	We know that there's the next CEIP is going to
11	Now, that does raise some legal and policy questions	11	have higher targets. But a response where it's a
12 ab	out whether that's sufficient under CETA. And, you	12	directive for certain amounts when we don't know we
13 kn	ow, the interim targets and the specific actions that	13	don't know when that ramp may be. You know, if it's over
14 un	derlie them are meant to show progress, And there's a	14	a four-year average that you know, that's one thing.
15 rea	al question of whether or not that actually is	15	If we're looking at each year, that's another thing.
16 pr	ogress.	16	These are all issues that, you know, the Commission is
17	So pragmatically speaking, though, it presents	17	grappling with. And these are these are hard issues to
18 an	other issue, which is, if these targets are approved,	18	look at and to determine.
19 th	en looking at figure 1.1, it becomes really crucial for	19	But we think that, you know, this has to be based on
20 th	e company to ramp up in the next compliance period,	20	modeling and an analysis. We shouldn't be setting kind
21 be	cause we only have one compliance period prior to 2030,	21	of arbitrary standards in this proceeding. And, you
22 S C	that makes it really crucial that the company sets	22	know, I this is I don't believe this is the right
23 int	erim targets in the 2026 to 2029 compliance period	23	forum for negotiating a solution. And I think that's why
24 tha	at are significant and that they meet those targets.	24	we included that second alternative recommendation is
25	So what Staff's concern here? Well, what if the	25	that, if we really want to talk about it, then we need to
	Page 115 mpany doesn't meet those targets in 2026 to 2029? What	1	Page 117 have discussions.
	here's a significant shortfall for whatever reason?	2	Staff put in their memo that, you know, we had one
3	Well, if they're not even close to 80 percent by	3	meeting. They presented us with some conditions. We
	30, then they're going to have to rely on the	4	responded to the conditions, and then that was it, it was
	ernative compliance pathway in order to meet the	5	over. Staff talked to other parties, not the company,
	atutory requirements, And that could really	6	until we reached out. And so to kind of have that
-	nificantly delay the transition to clean energy.	7	situation, you know, the situation that's being requested
8	So the question then is: What can we do now to	8	where we start negotiating in this forum, we don't think
	event that from happening? So Staff was looking at	9	is appropriate.
	ndition 9 and the specifics of condition 9 aren't	10	CHAIR DANNER: So if we adjudicated, that would
	ally important. The important part is we needed a	11	provide you that forum?
	ndition that guaranteed or assured us that, in the next	12	MR. McVEE: I think yes, I think so. I mean, I think that is the
	mpliance period, the company is going to be properly	13 14	think that's an opportunity to I mean, that is the
	ptivated to meet those goals, to get close within that	14	process. So we're okay with the process. I mean, we're
15 CO 16	mpliance period to the 80 percent obligation. So if there's an alternative to condition 9 that the	16	accustomed to that. If we need more time to go to go through it and, you know, talk to parties and talk about
	mpany would be willing to agree with, Staff is open to	17	where we're at, we'll have the advantages. As Tom Burns
	ving a conversation about that, but we do think that	18	mentioned, you know, we'll have, an IRP update that's
	e overall goal and the purpose of condition 9 needs to	19	filed at the end of April. You know, we'll have more
	met and, otherwise, the Staff would ask to adjudicate.	20	facts. So, yeah, that is we included that as an
	ank you.	20	option for that particular reason.
22	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	22	So, again, our preferred is, you know, let's we
1	Commissioners, do you have questions for Nash?	23	understand, we hear you loud and clear. It is not lost
23			
23 24		24	-
	(No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.		on us that we have to make progress to get towards 2030. So if our preferred approach, of course, is approval

13 (Pages 114 to 117)

	Page 118		Page 120
1	with direction. We have to show we have to show data,	1	to add?
2	we have to be transparent, and we have to show progress	2	MS. SIMMONS: No, ma'am.
3	in the next CEIP. We would be fine with that.	3	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.
4	But we also understand the process. We understand	4	CHAIR DANNER: And I agree, we're not I don't
5	where parties are coming from. You know, we did address	5	think we're making much progress today. You know, this
6	this. This was addressed in the stipulation for, you	6	has been frustrating. I know that, you know, we've had
7	know, the original filing. Now we're having this	7	some delays here. We're not required to approve a CEIP
8	discussion again. So we understand we may have to have	8	update anyway, right? I mean, we could walk away today
9	more of that discussion. And adjudication is it's	9	and just leave the original CEIP targets in place and
10	part of the process, and we will go through it.	10	enforce against those if necessary.
11	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.	11	I'm just trying to figure out the best course of
12	Commissioner Doumit?	12	action here. Well, I will turn to my colleagues for any
13	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yeah, I'm just throwing this	13	ideas.
14	out. Maybe it wouldn't be acceptable, because I what	14	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm thinking unless and we
15	I'm hearing because, as Commissioner Rendahl pointed out,	15	haven't heard from other commenters, which we need to
16	we're sort of here, I guess, overseeing, you know, what	16	give them an opportunity.
17		17	CHAIR DANNER: Yes.
18	was perhaps thought to be a negotiation. A bit odd, right? So then I take these numbers that you presented,	18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And so I'd like to think
19	you know, here as, as a starting point, you know. Would	19	about this, but I don't know that we have a choice unless
20		20	
	it be valuable, short of adjudication, to have more time	20	it's, as you said, unless if there's not a legal
21	to attempt to negotiate this or not? Just a question. I	21	obligation to approve this or reject this, I don't
22	don't know whether it's feasible or not. Sorry.	23	unless there's, you know, it was in the Commission's
23	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I guess the question is,	23	order and if it's not complied with, then we have that
24 25	and this is maybe for Nash: Do we have a statutory	24	compliance issue. So maybe a quick response from Nash and then go to
20	deadline to do this today, or is there short of	25	So maybe a quick response norm hash and then go to
1	Page 119 adjudication, is there any benefit to moving this to	1	Page 121 the folks who have comments.
2	another open meeting for resolution, or we adjudicate it	2	CHAIR DANNER: Nash Callaghan, do you want to
3	and the parties negotiate? Those are the two options in	3	respond to Commissioner Rendahl?
4	my mind, because I don't think we're I don't think	4	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Sorry, Your Honor, I was so
5	we're making progress here today. I don't think that's	5	the Commission's rules so the biennial update is not
6	going to happen.	6	in statute. It's something that the Commission created
7	So I guess I would ask either Jaclynn or Nash their	7	as part of the rule making. The Commission's rules do
8	preference here, and also the company's preference as to	8	state that if a once a biennial update or a CEIP is
9	which way we go. And I don't know if there's a legal	9	put on an open meeting, if a party requests adjudication,
10	requirement to do this today.	10	then the Commission will set it for an adjudication.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. First, no,	11	So I think that, unless the Commission is going to
12	there's no legal requirement to do this today. I don't	12	make an exemption to the rule, that it would it would
13	think that a continuance would be helpful. One of the	13	need to be set for an adjudication, unfortunately.
14	reasons why Staff did reach out to the parties and to the	14	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
15	company, but once it became clear that we were too far	15	All right. Matt McVee, did you have any further
16	apart, we asked for this to be set for an open meeting,	16	slides there? Anything else that you had as part of your
17	is we don't want to have this drag out.	17	presentation?
18	I mean, on a practical level, there is a timeline	18	MR. McVEE: No, that was it, Chair Danner.
19	where a decision on a biennial update is doesn't	19	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.
20	become valuable anymore because we too much time has	20	Let me ask then turn to others who wish to
21	passed. So I do think that setting for a adjudication	21	comment on this docket.
22	and, you know, of course, the company and the parties can	22	Yochi Zakai, you had signed up to testify on this.
23	negotiate in that context, as well, would be the	23	MR. ZAKAI: Hello. Excuse me. Hello again. Thank
1	G	24	you for the opportunity to comment on PacifiCorp's CEIP
24	preferred option from Staff.	24	
24 25	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Jaclynn, do you have anything	25	biennial update. The Energy Project believes that, in

14 (Pages 118 to 121)

	Page 122		Page 124
1	the long term, PacifiCorp should design its programs so	1	I don't think it gives us time to think about things, to
2	that proportionally more benefits can flow to customers	2	talk about things internally.
3	in names [sic] community excuse me customers in	3	So I guess, in my mind, the decision I would hope
4	named communities. Staff's conditions 6 and 7 represent	4	the Commission is considering is between, you know,
5	a good starting place for that minimum designation.	5	approval as filed or setting things for an adjudication.
6	The Energy Project looks forward to working with the	6	From a process standpoint, I don't think that just
7	company to improve its approach for identifying and	7	because this would be set for an adjudication, it means
8	tracking customers in vulnerable populations. In our	8	that we would have to have, you know, sort of a long
9	original CEIP settlement, we envisioned workshops	9	drawn-out, eight-month-long process. I think it's
10	starting no later than July for that refinement to occur.	10	something that could be addressed more quickly than that.
11	Those workshops haven't happened yet, but I just wanted	11	But I will say I'll just start with kind of the
12	to point out that we're very much looking forward to	12	AWEC's larger concern, condition 9 is deeply concerning
13	participating in that and helping, you know, the company	13	for AWEC as a condition to PacifiCorp'S CEIP update. It
14	refine its process for tracking customers in vulnerable	14	creates a scenario where Pacifica will be incented to
15	populations.	15	avoid penalties and procure resources, even if that's not
16	So all of that first part that I said was to say	16	the most cost effective, you know, considering risk, way
17	that, you know, we support Staff's conditions and are	17	to meet CETA compliance or to meet CETA's
18	particularly supportive of conditions 6 and 7 concerning	18	requirements.
19	the minimum designations.	19	And we are just as interested in PacifiCorp meeting
20	It was very concerning to hear in the discussion	20	CETA requirements as anyone else. I worry about the
21	just preceding this that the company was unable to make a	21	implications of finding that they're not doing so.
22	clear commitment to comply with Washington state law.	22	However, you know, it was a little concerning to me, as
23	And I just wanted to say that that's very concerning to	23	well, to hear that part of the motivation for Staff
24	The Energy Project.	24	proposing this condition is in hearing that PacifiCorp
25	Next, I'd like to address the issue of an	25	could rely on alternative compliance for meeting its CETA
	Page 123		Page 125
1	adjudication. The Energy Project would prefer not to	1	requirements.
2	have an adjudication and would prefer to have the	2	And, you know, I don't think we need to get into a
3	Commission decide what conditions are appropriate to	3	back-and-forth about that for purposes of this meeting.
4	impose on PacifiCorp's 2023 biennial update today at this	4	What I will say is that wrapped up in this condition are
5	meeting.	5	a lot of legal and policy implications that I think
6	And I think that concludes my comments. Thank you.	6	deserve the exploration, and this benefit would really
7	And, of course, I'm available for questions should you	7	benefit from the development of a full record if the
8	have any.	8	Commission is considering moving forward with
9	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you very much.	9	condition 9, which, you know, I think it's also an option
10	Commissioners, do you have any questions for Yochi?	10	to just remove that condition.
11	(No audible reply).	11	And then just briefly on conditions 6 and 7, it was
12	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you so much.	12	just a little concerned there was a lot of back and
13	Was there anyone else on the line who	13	forth about this condition, at least in the stakeholder
	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Summer Moser.	14	process, with Staff and other non-company parties. And I
14		15	appreciate the discussion that happened there and the
15	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Summer Moser, are you		•••
15 16	there? I see him. Yeah, I got him.	16	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know,
15 16 17	there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay?	16 17	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns.
15 16 17 18	there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you,	16 17 18	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the
15 16 17 18 19	there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well.	16 17 18 19	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may
15 16 17 18 19 20	there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well. MS. MOSER: Okay, great. Well, I'll just start with	16 17 18 19 20	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may be the right number, but it doesn't seem like it came
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well. MS. MOSER: Okay, great. Well, I'll just start with saying that this has been a lot to absorb from a 	16 17 18 19 20 21	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may be the right number, but it doesn't seem like it came from a place where there was a lot of analysis behind
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well. MS. MOSER: Okay, great. Well, I'll just start with saying that this has been a lot to absorb from a stakeholder perspective. I at least was pretty surprised 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may be the right number, but it doesn't seem like it came from a place where there was a lot of analysis behind that. So our preference would be that, you know, the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well. MS. MOSER: Okay, great. Well, I'll just start with saying that this has been a lot to absorb from a stakeholder perspective. I at least was pretty surprised to hear that this forum could be used as sort of a 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may be the right number, but it doesn't seem like it came from a place where there was a lot of analysis behind that. So our preference would be that, you know, the Commission directs PacifiCorp to come back in a future
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 there? I see him. Yeah, I got him. MS. MOSER: I am there. Can you hear me okay? CHAIR DANNER: I can. Thank you. We can see you, as well. MS. MOSER: Okay, great. Well, I'll just start with saying that this has been a lot to absorb from a stakeholder perspective. I at least was pretty surprised 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	explanation for what's gone on with PSE and, you know, for parties kind of hearing AWEC's concerns. I think, you know, we still have a concern that the 15 percent minimum designation may be arbitrary. It may be the right number, but it doesn't seem like it came from a place where there was a lot of analysis behind that. So our preference would be that, you know, the

15 (Pages 122 to 125)

	Page 126		Page 128
1	premature to make that determination here.	1	morning, but just wanted to offer Public Counsel support
2	And I understand the motivation or the how we got	2	of the Staff condition 1, which would require the company
3	here. I know it's trying to leverage on a lot of the	3	to provide an update about their all-source RFP.
4	work that's been done with PSE, but I think, as we also	4	As has been part of the discussion today, we
5	heard in the PSC discussion, there's a lot of work to be	5	continue to be concerned about the company's ability to
6	done there. And it's not clear to me that PacifiCorp is	6	meet their targets, and I really want to encourage
7	in the same place as PSE. Frankly, I'm not sure that	7	forward motion on that. And that's all I have for you
8	they are as far down the line. And so I worry that this	8	today, but have appreciated the discussion and I'm open
9	is just kind of putting an arbitrary condition in the	9	for any questions.
10	CEIP that could be problematic later.	10	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.
11	And I also wanted to just point out, sort of	11	Commissioners, any questions then for Public
12	relatedly, more related to condition 7, we appreciated	12	Counsel?
13	the inclusion of language that cost recovery would be	13	(No audible reply).
14	determined in a separate commission proceeding. You	14	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
15	know, AWEC isn't a part of the advisory committees that	15	MS. CHASE: Thank you.
16	develop these programs and sort of the scope of the	16	CHAIR DANNER: Rose Monahan from Sierra Club.
17	programs, the acquisitions that will be made pursuant to	17	MS. MONAHAN: Good afternoon, Chair Danner and
18	these programs. We're not asking to be, but it does	18	Commissioners. My name is Rose Monahan for Sierra Club,
19	create a problem where if you have something that's	19	for the record. Thank you for the opportunity to provide
20	decided in an advisory group and you have a fully baked	20	a comment today. This has been quite an interesting
21	program that then comes to the Commission perhaps at an	21	discussion this afternoon. And I just want to put on the
22	open meeting to, do we really have a fair shake? Do we	22	record that it is Sierra Club's preference to resolve
23	really have the ability to review that program, to make	23	PacifiCorp's CEIP update without an adjudication. We do
24	proposals to address cost allocation issues, or is it,	24	have concerns about a delay, and I think that there's
25	you know, sort of seen as, well, this was decided in an	25	important guidance that the Commission can give to
	Page 127		Page 129
1	advisory group, and so we're not going to kind of mess	1	PacifiCorp to make sure that they are on track to meet
2	with what was what was determined there. And so I'm	2	CETA'S targets.
3	raising it as a process question. I think that the edit	3	We heard today that IRP is obviously very important
4	that's there addresses that concern in condition 7, but I	4	to the CEIP. And I just want to underscore that the 2025
5	did just want to highlight or provide some context around	5	IRP is being developed right now. That modeling is
6	why that's, in particular, important for AWEC.	6	there are stakeholder meetings. The modeling is starting
7	Happy to answer any questions that you may have.	7	to be developed, and we know that once the modeling is
8	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much.	8	done, it's very difficult to make adjustments. And so I
9	Commissioners.	9	do want to underscore that moving into an adjudication
10	Do you have any questions for AWEC?	10	and pushing out when there might be an order from the
11	(No audible reply).	11	Commission, even by a few months really could have a
12	CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you very much.	12	significant impact.
13	Let me now turn to Stephanie Chase from Public	13	And the other thing I wanted to lift up,
14	Counsel Unit.	14	particularly from Staff's conditions, is condition 3,
15	MS. CHASE: Good morning. Can you hear me, Chair	15	which is analyzing IRA and IIJA incentives. I'm
16	Danner?	16	highlighting this because I think it's an example of one
17	CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Good afternoon actually.	17	of the important guidances that the Commission could
18	MS. CHASE: Or good afternoon. Yes, it is well into	18	provide right now. We heard today about how it will be
19	the afternoon now.	19	much easier to meet CETA's requirements if PacifiCorp's
20	CHAIR DANNER: Yes, it is.	20	entire system moves towards decarbonization. And to
21	MS. CHASE: Okay. Well, good afternoon, Chair	21	date, I just do not believe that we've seen from
22	Danner and Commissioner Rendahl and Doumit. I'm	22	PacifiCorp a really thorough analysis of federal
23	Stephanie Chase, regulatory analyst with the Public	23	incentives that can make that decarbonization cost
24	Counsel Unit of the Washington State Attorney General's	24	effective, not only in Washington, but also in Utah and
25	office. And I have some very limited comments this	25	Wyoming and in all their states.
I		1	

	Page 130		Page 132
1	So I wanted to lift that up as an example of	1	Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit. You know, I just
2	something that the Commission could act on right now. So	2	wanted to I wanted to follow up with clarification,
3	in sum, there are a lot of concerns about PacifiCorp's	3	you know, that was mentioned by TEP, about a failure to
4	ability to meet CETA targets, and I would encourage the	4	commit. You know, I have to defer to my the IRP team,
5	Commission to provide near-term guidance as in Staff's	5	the planning and procurement team. You know, Tom Burns
6	Conditions. And I'm happy to answer any questions.	6	stated equivocally that, you know, we do expect to meet
7	Thank you.	7	the 2030 date. You know, that is something that we're
8	CHAIR DANNER: Thank you very much.	8	striving for, so I just want to make sure that that's
9	Commissioners, so you have any questions for Sierra	9	clear.
10	Club?	10	And then in response to the IRA/IIJA, you know, I
11	(No audible reply).	11	think that that's It is something that we can
12	CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing none. Thank	12	consider. I think where our struggle has been is
13	you very much for your comments.	13	imposing that in an IRP essentially says that we're going
14	Katie Ware?	14	to assume project specific savings in proxy resources,
15	THE WITNESS: Thanks, Chair Danner and the rest of	15	which we generally use that to flow through kind of the
16	the commissioners for the opportunity to.	16	IRP or the RFP process so that we can get the most
17	First, I want to thank the Commission staff I'm	17	cost effective resources. But I think we understand kind
18	not seeing my video, I don't know why that's not	18	of that interest in seeing, you know, how that may
19	working thank Commission staff for all	19	relate.
20	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: We can see you.	20	But if there's additional questions on that relative
21	MS. WARE: Okay.	21	to the IRP, you know, Mr. Burns and Mr. Baker are
22	all the collaboration in developing the proposed	22	available.
23	conditions. And also because, given the uncertainty of	23	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Is there
24	where this is headed, I just also wanted to add to what	24	anyone else on the call or in the hearing room who wishes
25	Rose was saying about the ongoing development of the 2025	25	to speak to this docket item?
	Page 131		
1		1	(No sudible reph)
1	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments	1	(No audible reply).
2	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended	2	(No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing.
2 3	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these	2 3	(No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling
2 3 4	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which	2 3 4	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very
2 3 4 5	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to	2 3 4 5	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive.
2 3 4 5 6	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond.	2 3 4 5 6	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the
2 3 4 5 6 7	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what	2 3 4 5	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its
2 3 4 5 6	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue	2 3 4 5 6 7	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Are there questions for Katie Ware?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's better to resolve this at an open meeting than it is through adjudication. We have a lot of adjudications
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Are there questions for Katie Ware? (No audible reply).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's better to resolve this at an open meeting than it is through adjudication. We have a lot of adjudications already on the plate. I'm looking at our ALD director
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Are there questions for Katie Ware? (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: No? Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's better to resolve this at an open meeting than it is through adjudication. We have a lot of adjudications already on the plate. I'm looking at our ALD director right now. And I don't think this moves everyone forward
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	IRP and mention that Renewable Northwest and comments submitted jointly with NWEC and Sierra Club recommended an additional condition to what you are seeing these nine conditions an additional condition which addresses a cost adder that PacifiCorp has added to renewable resources in year 2024 and beyond. I won't get into the details, given all of what we're discussing today, but I would like to continue discussion with Staff and the Commission on including a condition which would address this cost escalation, as that is something the Oregon PUC has addressed in their recent order regarding the IRP in that setting. And I can include a link in the chat if that's helpful, to the to the order and the exact language included that guides the company on how to address this transparency issue moving forward for the 2025 IRP. But that is the most notable thing I wanted to mention today for the record. Thank you. CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. Are there questions for Katie Ware? (No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: No? Okay. Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(No audible reply). CHAIR DANNER: All right. I'm hearing nothing. Commissioners, how do we begin? I mean, I'm feeling I don't have good choices here. And adjudication is very Time and resource intensive. I am concerned I'm very concerned that the company is really unable to commit to even meeting its CETA goals. I don't feel that we can simply say, oh, they're facing the same things that the other utilities are. We didn't really go through the conditions one by one, and I didn't I didn't believe there was value in doing that. I'm just not sure how to proceed and whether we even need to make a decision today or we come back and revisit this on a later date. Just wondering if either of you have some thoughts on how we should proceed. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I have a thought sort of along those same lines. I think I agree with what everybody has said. Given the interests involved, it's better to resolve this at an open meeting than it is through adjudication. We have a lot of adjudications already on the plate. I'm looking at our ALD director right now. And I don't think this moves everyone forward to where we need to be. And so I'm going to ask

17 (Pages 130 to 133)

	- 104		- 126
	Page 134		Page 136
1	could be my I've been sitting here a long time and I	1	kind of about the procedural path forward. I believe, as
2	don't know whether this is helpful or not. A number of	2	Mr. Callaghan said earlier, the rules state that these
3	the conditions I support, I'm one you know, with the	3	filings will either proceed through the open meeting or
4	exception, as I mentioned earlier, the additional penalty	4	if a party asks for an adjudication, the Commission will
5	amounts in number 2. I have a lot of concerns with	5	initiate an adjudication. There's no provision for a
6	number 9. I'm happy to go forward, particularly with the	6	continuance. There's also no provision for a partial
7	direction in the IRP and do sort of a partial direction,	7	order accepting. But the Commission has kind of control
8	partial order now and reset the rest for another open	8	over the procedural matters in front of it. If you
9	meeting, and hopefully that gives the company direction	9	wanted to issue a partial order providing some guidance
10	that we do want them to meet these and we do want them to	10	and accepting some of the conditions and setting the
11	work with Staff and the parties to come to some	11	other stuff aside, theoretically you could do that.
12	agreement.	12	You could also just set everything just continue
13	Really, I think the interim target issue for me is a	13	this to another open meeting and give the parties to
14	very important thing, and it either has to be litigated	14	discuss everything. Those are two options.
15	or we simply find the company not in compliance with the	15	The third option is just to set this for an
16	direction to do what they're doing. So I'm okay with	16	adjudication, and that would just depend on what the
17	conditions 1 through 8 with the exception of the language	17	parties, Staff included, continue to ask for.
18	on the additional penalty amount in No. 2, that's kind of	18 19	CHAIR DANNER: Well, just so I'm clear, if we were
19 20	where I am.	20	to decide to approve conditions 1 through 8 with the
20	So it's either we go for adjudication or we do some sort of partial and let the company continue to negotiate	20	exceptions that Commissioner Rendahl mentioned, do we still does that still require an adjudication as to
22	with the parties on the interim targets issue. That's	22	the interim targets?
23	kind of where I am.	23	MR. ROBERSON: To the extent that Staff wants to
24	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you for that.	24	adjudicate those, yes, I believe that that would be
25	Josephine Strauss, you have your hand up?	25	required.
	Page 135		Page 137
1	Page 135	1	Page 137
1	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so	1	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.
2	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about	2	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your
2 3	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting,	2 3	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I
2 3 4	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to	2 3 4	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not
2 3	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some	2 3	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction
2 3 4 5	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements.	2 3 4 5	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not
2 3 4 5 6	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet the targets.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the entire thing for adjudication?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet the targets. I see Jeff Roberson has his camera on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the entire thing for adjudication? MS. SIMMONS: Hi. So sorry about that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet the targets. I see Jeff Roberson has his camera on. Sorry, Chair Danner, I should let you do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the entire thing for adjudication? MS. SIMMONS: Hi. So sorry about that, Commissioners. Nash
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet the targets. I see Jeff Roberson has his camera on. Sorry, Chair Danner, I should let you do that. CHAIR DANNER: It's all right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the entire thing for adjudication? MS. SIMMONS: Hi. So sorry about that, Commissioners. Nash COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. STRAUSS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you so much. If the commissioners are thinking about essentially this continuance to a next open meeting, Staff would ask that the Commission order PacifiCorp to submit new conditions to the docket that display some level of responsibility for meeting these requirements. Staff is just very concerned that, given the last offer that PacifiCorp provided, that we're not going to be able to get anywhere with those discussions. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I understand that, which is why I'm not sure that there's merit to that. And so if Staff doesn't believe there's merit, then I think our only option is adjudication, which is not a happy place for me. Because it, you know there is work that the company needs to do here for Washington, not just for its six-state system. And it's frustrating to lose the opportunity to really get direction for the IRP that supports the rest of the CEIP, let alone meet the targets or identify an alternative for how they're going to meet the targets. I see Jeff Roberson has his camera on. Sorry, Chair Danner, I should let you do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. And, Commissioner Rendahl, how does that inform your recommendation? Because I mean, I COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I kind of feel like it's not worth it to do that, but I'm kind of sending my direction as to where I think this needs to end up. So I'm happy to just make a motion to adjudicate. I'm not sure we're getting anywhere here today, and I'm not sure what the value is of holding this over for another open meeting if that doesn't give people enough time. So I that's kind of where I am. CHAIR DANNER: I'm with you 100 percent. I'm just wondering if we were to take your suggestion, let's approve Conditions 1 through 8 with the changes that you recommended COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And set the rest for CHAIR DANNER: And set the rest for adjudication. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Does that Nash Callaghan and Jaclynn, does that help? Would you prefer to set the entire thing for adjudication? MS. SIMMONS: Hi. So sorry about that, Commissioners. Nash

	Page 138		Page 140
1	the rest for adjudication.	1	that my proposal would not include any of the additional
2	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I think that maybe	2	penalties that Staff proposes, but just rely on the
3	Commissioner Doumit, where are you on this?	3	statute the penalties at least for number 2 would
4	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I mean, I'm there. I guess	4	remove the language about additional penalties. And not
5	that that includes the condition of starting	5	include number 9, which also includes the issue about
6	restarting the RFP no later than April 1, 2024. Correct?	6	penalties. But I guess I there are plenty of times
7	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Or the alternative for the	7	when we address controversial issues at the open meeting
8	company to explain.	8	and enter an order. And I do believe that the Washington
9	CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, to explain.	9	Administrative Procedure Act does allow there is an
10	All right. Zach Rogala? Good afternoon.	10	option for judicial review of it's my understanding,
11	Zach Rogala, you're muted. We can't hear you.	11	for other agency action. That's been the case before.
12	MR. ROGALA: Commissioners, can you hear me okay?	12	So I guess I would disagree with your conclusion
13	CHAIR DANNER: There we go. Yes.	13	that we can't address contentious issues at the open
14	MR. ROGALA: Great. Okay, great. Okay. For	14	meeting. But regardless, I think this just proves the
15	judicial review purposes, I think I need to lay my	15	point that further adjudication is going to be resulting
16	objection to any open meeting process that requires my	16	from whatever we do today. And I think it might just be
17	client to agree to conditions 1 through 8, frankly, any	17	cleaner just to set the whole thing for hearing, which is
18	conditions that we don't agree to. Unfortunately, I	18	disappointing to me. I don't believe the company is
19	don't think that's the place for open meeting processes.	19	really demonstrating an interest in trying to resolve
20	An open meeting process is meant to provide a quick	20	this. I understand this is a unusual process. Like you,
21	resolution of uncontested issues of fact or law and	21	I've not seen the open meeting be used for negotiation
22	streamline and economize commission resources.	22	previously. But, clearly, there needs to be some
23	CHAIR DANNER: Just so I get that straight, what	23	negotiation, and I would suggest it needs to happen
24	you're saying is that no item can be resolved at an open	24	sooner rather than later. And so at this point, I'm
25	meeting That is not a consensus item among all the	25	ready to move for adjudication.
	Page 139		Page 141
1	interested parties?	1	
2			CHAIR DANNER: All right I wanted to give leff
	IVIK. RUGALA: I NAT'S MY DOSITION HERE WHERE WE HAVE		CHAIR DANNER: All right. I wanted to give Jeff Roberson an opportunity to respond.
3	MR. ROGALA: That's my position here where we have strong objections to the recommendations here because	2	Roberson an opportunity to respond.
3 4	strong objections to the recommendations here because	2	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just
	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with	2 3	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say.
4	strong objections to the recommendations here because	2 3 4	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her
4 5	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt	2 3 4 5	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say.
4 5 6	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling	2 3 4 5 6	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you.
4 5 6 7	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right.
4 5 6 7 8	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I
4 5 7 8 9	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an
4 5 7 8 9 10	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for alternative compliance mechanisms and application of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's I mean, honestly, it almost sounds disingenuous for them
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for alternative compliance mechanisms and application of the cost cap.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's I mean, honestly, it almost sounds disingenuous for them to compare themselves to the other utilities in our state
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for alternative compliance mechanisms and application of the cost cap. So I just want to stop there and preserve my 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's I mean, honestly, it almost sounds disingenuous for them to compare themselves to the other utilities in our state and that I think are making very good progress.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for alternative compliance mechanisms and application of the cost cap. So I just want to stop there and preserve my objection on both issues of law and the factual issues. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's I mean, honestly, it almost sounds disingenuous for them to compare themselves to the other utilities in our state and that I think are making very good progress. So I'm very, very disappointed in that, but I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 strong objections to the recommendations here because we've raised factual concerns. So for example, with condition 9, where Staff is recommending we adopt specific interim targets that do not have any modeling support. CHAIR DANNER: And we were not we were not planning to include condition 9 in our list of conditions. MR. ROGALA: And thank you, Commissioner Danner. We have the same concerns with conditions 6 and 7 for that 15 percent figure has not been backed up by any specific analyses. And we also have questions about the penalty concerns that raise, I think, some questionable incentives, given the ability for CETA to allow for alternative compliance mechanisms and application of the cost cap. So I just want to stop there and preserve my objection on both issues of law and the factual issues. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Roberson an opportunity to respond. MR. ROBERSON: I think Commissioner Rendahl just mooted what I was going to say. CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Okay. So you are adopting her statement by reference. Is that correct? All right. Thank you. Yeah, I have to say, I'm disappointed, as well. I think that, yeah, I'm not looking forward to an adjudication at a time when we have a very heavy workload. I think that I'm I understand the challenges that PacifiCorp faces, but I also understand that I mean, I want to just emphasize that we have a state law that requires this company to be carbon neutral by 2030, and I'm not seeing them going in the right direction. I'm seeing just the opposite, that they're going in the wrong direction. And I don't think it's I mean, honestly, it almost sounds disingenuous for them to compare themselves to the other utilities in our state and that I think are making very good progress. So I'm very, very disappointed in that, but I will I think if we are going to adjudicate this, I

19 (Pages 138 to 141)

	Page 142		Page 144
1	I also want to say that, I agree with Commissioner	1	CERTIFICATE
2	Rendahl's interpretation of the Administrative Procedures	2	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
3	Act in the state of Washington.	3)
4	So, with that, Commissioner Doumit, your thoughts?	4	COUNTY OF KING)
5	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yeah, I'm that's where I am	5	I, the undersigned, do hereby certify under penalty
6	too, at the end of the day. And I don't want I don't	6	of perjury that the foregoing court proceedings or legal
7	want this to be seen as precedent for us not being able	7	recordings were transcribed under my direction as a certified
8	to take issues off the table and focus in adjudication.	8	transcriptionist; and that the transcript is true and accurate
9	In this case, you know, it sounds like we're going to	9	to the best of my knowledge and ability, including changes, if
10	have, you know, all these issues adjudicated, and maybe	10	any, made by the trial judge reviewing the transcript; that I
11	that provides leverage. I don't know, you know, in terms	11	received the electronic recording in the proprietary court
12	of, subsequent negotiations, but it seems like for	12	format; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
13	purposes of, you know, judicial economy, we ought to be	13	counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
14	able to and I think we are able to narrow the focus if	14	interested in its outcome.
15	we want to. In this case, it's such a such a it's	15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
16	difficult. And so I concur, for purposes of this, that	16	this 28th day of May, 2024.
17	we just throw the whole thing into an adjudication.	17	
18	COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. And in the	18	
19	interest of time, I'm ready to make a motion. But first,	19	
20	I want to apologize for taking over Counsel's job and	20	
21	opining on the legal issues here.	21	
22	But so I move in Docket UE-210829 that the	22	Ment Our W
23	Commission issue an order initiating an adjudication of	23	1 pig a wom
24	PacifiCorp's biennial clean energy implementation plan	24	s/ Marjorie Jačkson, CET
25	update. Period.	25	
	Page 143		
1	COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Second the motion.		
2	CHAIR DANNER: And the motion carries. All right,		
3	that brings us to the end of today's open meeting. Thank		
4	you all for being here. We will be taking this matter		
5	up, obviously, later, and thank you. Have a good weekend		
6	and have a good rest of your day. We're adjourned.		
7	(Conclusion of open meeting)		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19 20			
20			
21 22			
22 23			
23 24			
24 25			
2.3			

20 (Pages 142 to 144)

				T dgc 140
A	81:4 82:19 84:7,8	administrative	100:22 103:18	appreciate 74:12
ability 126:23	85:5 86:3,9 104:6	85:10 140:9 142:2	104:11 106:20,22	76:6,22 98:8
128:5 130:4	131:3,4 132:20	adopt 139:5	126:24	111:18 125:15
139:17 144:9	134:4,18 140:1,4	adopting 87:16	allocations 95:7	appreciated 126:12
able 73:4,10 76:19	address 72:21	141:5	allow 79:2,3 95:17	128:8
76:21 79:23 80:1	73:24,24 76:3	advance 76:4	103:17 139:17	appreciating 72:16
89:8,9,17,25 90:5	83:3 102:10,17	advantage 79:4	140:9	appreciative 76:18
96:20,24 97:3	111:24 113:17	advantages 117:17	allows 79:9 95:21	approach 86:16
99:8,17 106:12,21	118:5 122:25	adversarial 96:15	102:22	87:8 96:13 97:5
108:15 109:23	126:24 131:10,15	adversely 82:18	alternative 85:13	105:8 109:20
113:2,6 135:8	140:7,13	83:5 92:20 93:8	115:5,16 116:24	111:2 117:25
142:7,14,14	addressed 77:2	advisory 84:19,21	124:25 135:19	122:7
absolutely 92:11	87:25 88:7 118:6	126:15,20 127:1	138:7 139:18	approaching
absorb 123:21	124:10 131:11	affect 92:20 93:9	America 77:24	102:19
accelerated 93:1	addresses 77:20	affordability 86:21	amount 71:24 72:7	appropriate 73:6
accelerating 93:17	127:4 131:5	afternoon 127:17	76:16 134:18	117:9 123:3
accept 93:15	adequacy 105:19	127:18,19,21	amounts 72:6	approval 70:2 87:7
acceptable 113:9	105:22,24	128:17,21 138:10	116:12 134:5	117:25 124:5
118:14 123:24	adequate 116:8	agencies 82:6 93:14	analyses 139:14	approve 86:5 97:5
accepting 71:7	adjourned 143:6	93:25 94:13	analysis 77:8	103:18 120:7,21
136:7,10	adjudicate 112:10	agency 140:11	116:20 125:21	136:19 137:14
access 89:13 92:13	115:20 119:2	aggressive 103:13	129:22	approved 70:14,20
accommodate	136:24 137:7	agree 87:22,23	analyst 68:25	70:22 76:14 86:7
99:17	141:22	96:13 112:2	127:23	98:11 101:22
accurate 144:8	adjudicated 117:10	115:17 116:6	analysts 69:10	112:19 114:18
accustomed 117:15	142:10	120:4 133:17	analyzing 129:15	approving 137:25
achieve 104:22	adjudication 71:10	138:17,18 142:1	ANN 66:22	April 110:17
acquisition 108:12	73:12 87:9 96:6	agreement 73:5	answer 74:5 95:2	117:19 138:6
acquisitions 108:25	96:11,15 97:22,22	80:3,3 134:12	127:7 130:6	arbitrary 116:21
126:17	112:5,12,22 113:7	agreements 79:20	answers 74:13	125:19 126:9
act 130:2 140:9	113:12 118:9,20	ahead 108:23 116:8	anticipated 108:17	areas 83:11 90:12
142:3	119:1,21 121:9,10		anticipating 110:22	
action 120:12	121:13 123:1,2	akin 89:22	anymore 119:20	asked 104:23
140:11	124:5,7 128:23	ALD 133:21	anyway 107:25	119:16 135:25
actions 108:13	129:9 133:4,20	aligning 110:1	120:8	asking 104:22
114:13	134:20 135:13	aligns 83:19	apart 119:16	126:18
active 84:24	136:4,5,16,21	all-source 128:3	apologies 107:25	asks 136:4
actively 83:3 84:18	137:17,20 138:1	Alliance 71:1	108:3	aspirational 86:14
actual 96:19 101:1	140:15,25 141:10	allocate 102:17	apologize 142:20	assess 72:6
add 120:1 130:24	142:8,17,23	allocated 95:23	apparently 94:22	asset 70:11
added 84:4 131:5	adjudications	allocating 77:15	Appendix 72:4	assets 88:10
adder 80:16 131:5	133:20	allocation 69:20	application 139:18	assigned 102:13
addition 84:21,22	adjustments 129:8	70:11 77:15,19,21	applied 109:18	associated 101:6
additional 69:22	Administration	78:1,6,10,20,21	applies 90:8	assume 132:14
70:23 77:5 79:12	83:20	90:16,19,23 91:4	apply 78:6	assured 115:12

Page	1	46

				<u> </u>
attached 77:20	106:24 107:2,19	123:4 142:24	Callaghan 67:12	Center 85:4
attachment 71:9	107:20,23 108:3	big 80:21 90:4	72:19,20 73:23	certain 78:10 80:17
attainable 106:13	132:21	94:23	111:22,23 114:2,4	82:1 116:12
attempt 118:21	balance 89:16	bills 103:12	119:11 121:2,4	certainly 73:24
attorney 67:5,14	based 72:17 78:4,7	bit 82:4,10 87:2	133:25 136:2	certified 144:7
68:25 127:24	83:21 85:18	94:7 106:25 114:7	137:18	certify 144:5
144:12	103:25 116:19	118:17	camera 107:23	CET 66:24 144:24
attributes 80:19	basically 88:17	board 82:22 92:13	135:21	CETA 72:13 80:11
audible 115:24	basis 79:3 89:21	Box 67:6	campaigns 85:5	104:22 114:12
123:11 127:11	99:15	boy 107:10	cap 139:19	124:17,20,25
128:13 130:11	batteries 105:25,25	BPA 93:10	capacity 81:9 90:9	130:4 133:8
131:21 133:1	beginning 85:21	BPAs 88:10 93:5,9	90:11	139:17
authority 72:16	116:5	93:20,21 97:18	capital 82:21 92:14	CETA's 105:3
73:21 99:23	believe 87:25 89:17	Bridger 81:2 111:7	92:15	107:4 124:17
100:18 112:2	92:11,25 95:4	briefed 74:21	carbon 104:19,19	129:2,19
authorized 87:23	99:19 103:2,19	briefing 73:20	141:14	cetera 82:18
available 71:12	116:22 129:21	briefly 76:10	careful 92:12 93:24	chain 79:16 111:1
85:6 86:22 110:15	133:11 135:12	111:24 125:11	97:14	Chair 66:20 69:4,8
123:7 132:22	136:1,24 140:8,18	bring 90:5 101:23	carries 143:2	71:15 72:19 73:19
avenue 67:15 93:17	believes 121:25	141:25	carve 80:10	74:2,10,20,25
101:7	beneficial 99:20	bringing 96:10	carved 80:4	75:5,7 88:12 98:1
average 70:8 85:11	110:24	brings 143:3	Cascade 84:14	103:7 104:16
89:1 116:14	benefit 90:8,13	broad 102:21	case 73:4 80:25	105:5 107:2,9,21
Avista 75:25 96:21	91:24 96:10	brought 78:13 80:7	96:25 99:9 112:10	108:1,22 109:3,6
avoid 86:19 87:14	102:19 119:1	80:12	140:11 142:9,15	110:4,13 111:6,11
113:16 124:15	125:6,7	budget 103:24	cases 75:17	111:12,17,20
aware 71:3 80:22	benefits 77:16 82:2	build 92:15	catch 84:17	115:22,25 116:1,2
113:13	102:22 122:2	build-out 111:4	caused 109:14	117:10 118:11
AWEC 68:8 71:2	best 73:13 79:7	built 90:2 91:9	causing 108:10	120:4,17 121:2,14
124:13 126:15	86:15 89:25 113:8	bump 110:21	caveats 107:10	121:18,19 123:9
127:6,10	120:11 144:9	bunch 81:15 86:7	CBI's 84:1	123:12,15,18
AWEC's 124:12	better 87:25 88:4,4	Burns 68:24 108:24	CBIs 77:4 84:5,6	127:8,12,15,17,20
125:17	88:4 94:11 109:6	108:24 109:5,7	CEIP 76:14,15 77:2	127:21 128:10,14
	133:19	110:10,14 111:10	84:4 85:23 86:7,8	128:16,17 130:8
B	beyond 82:22 85:1	117:17 132:5,21	92:25 96:14,18,19	130:12,15 131:19
B 71:25	101:8 131:6	business 88:3	97:1,10 98:11,22	131:22,25 132:23
back 72:18 79:20	biennial 69:12,13	buy 81:25	98:24 99:6,10,21	133:2 134:24
94:15 125:12,23	69:15,17,18 70:2		100:16 108:17	135:22,23 136:18
131:24 133:13	70:4,14,15,19	C	116:10 118:3	137:1,12,17 138:9
back-and-forth	71:7,10 74:17	C 67:1 68:1 144:1,1	120:7,9 121:8,24	138:13,23 139:8
125:3	75:12 76:13,24	calculated 88:25	120:7,9 121:0,24	139:23 141:1,5
backed 139:13	82:25 83:21 85:8	calculation 104:11	125:24 126:10	143:2
background 76:11	86:5 97:6 98:13	California 68:6,18	128:23 129:4	challenge 74:8
bad 112:6	113:21 114:4	80:16,18 83:9,11	135:18	challenges 141:12
baked 126:20	119:19 121:5,8,25	101:21	CEIPs 98:19	change 71:25 99:14
Baker 68:23 106:11	11,11,121.0,0,20	call 132:24		
	l			l

102:16 108:10	Club 68:14,16 71:2	121:5,7	112:18,23,25	116:4 124:12
113:6	128:16,18 130:10	Commissioner	113:5 114:5,20,22	125:18 127:4
changed 80:20	131:2	66:21,22 71:17,18	115:1,13,17 117:5	concerned 81:18
81:10 83:2 109:13	Club's 128:22	72:2 73:16 74:11	119:15,22 122:7	82:10 92:17 98:18
changes 69:20	coal 81:1,2 90:1,2	74:12,20,21 75:7	122:13,21 128:2	113:19 125:12
70:20 78:4 79:14	Coalition 70:25	87:20 88:15,21,24	131:15 133:7	128:5 133:6,6
85:9 98:23 137:14	collaboration	89:3 93:19 94:15	134:9,15,21	135:7
144:9	130:22	95:25 96:4 97:24	135:15 138:8	concerning 107:14
changing 89:7	colleagues 96:4	98:2,3 100:19	140:18 141:14	107:17 111:9
characterized	120:12	102:11 103:6	company's 70:22	114:6 122:18,20
83:16	Colstrip 81:1	104:20 113:25	99:2 119:8 128:5	122:23 124:12,22
charging 106:1,1,2	come 73:4 89:9	114:3 118:12,13	compare 141:19	concerns 78:13
Chase 68:25 127:13	100:6 125:23	118:15,23 119:25	competition 91:15	79:5 85:19 87:17
127:15,18,21,23	133:13 134:11	120:3,14,18 121:3	Complainant 66:6	87:21 98:25
128:15	comes 100:2 126:21	123:14 127:22	complaint 99:9	105:20 125:17
chat 131:13	comfortable 79:18	130:20 133:16	complex 85:24	128:24 130:3
chime 108:20	coming 106:3 118:5	135:10,25 136:20	complexity 86:3	134:5 139:4,12,16
choice 79:25 91:17	comment 121:21	137:2,4,16,18,23	87:10	concise 101:12
120:19	121:24 128:20	138:2,3,4,7	compliance 70:9	concludes 123:6
choices 133:4	commenters 120:15	139:11,25 141:3	72:13 81:21,23	conclusion 140:12
CIP 70:22	comments 69:17,18	142:1,4,5,18	82:13 83:24 85:14	143:7
Circumstances	69:24 70:1,15	143:1	86:18,20 87:6	concur 142:16
108:9	121:1 123:6	commissioners	88:9,25 89:1,5	condition 72:5,5,8
cited 70:10	127:25 130:13	69:9 74:4 75:8,14	93:18 97:19	72:11,12 112:3
clarification 132:2	131:1	115:23 123:10	114:20,21,23	113:18 115:10,10
clarified 84:5	commission 66:2,5	127:9 128:11,18	115:5,13,15	115:12,16,19
clarify 107:6	66:15,19 67:2	130:9,16 132:1	120:24 124:17,25	124:12,13,24
clarity 84:3	71:6,21,24 72:6	133:3 135:1,2	134:15 139:18	125:4,9,10,13
clean 69:12 71:8,10	73:18 74:5 75:15	137:22 138:12	compliant 80:12	126:9,12 127:4
75:12 76:2,12	76:14 80:12,23	Commissions 89:10	complicated 95:8	128:2 129:14
78:8,9 81:22	81:12,19 86:4,7	commit 132:4	99:8 100:9	131:3,4,10 138:5
84:22 106:2 115:7	88:7 97:21 98:6	133:7	complicating 102:7	139:5,9
142:24	99:1,23,24 100:15	commitment 76:23	complications	conditions 70:2,22
cleaner 140:17	103:17,18 112:21	107:3 122:22	79:13 105:12,19	70:23 71:3,5,9,22
clear 117:23 119:15	112:22 113:4,15	committed 82:25	complied 120:23	72:4 73:1 76:16
122:22 126:6	116:16 121:6,10	108:6	comply 72:8 88:8	76:19 77:1,3 86:8
132:9 136:18	121:11 123:3	committees 126:15	122:22	97:8 98:18 105:21
139:25	124:4 125:8,23	communities 122:4	complying 104:17	111:21 113:9
clearly 113:19	126:14,21 128:25	community 84:24	component 86:1	117:3,4 122:4,17
140:22	129:11,17 130:2,5	101:9,10 122:3	components 75:22	122:18 123:3,24
Cleve 68:10	130:17,19 131:9	companies 98:15	77:21 92:6	125:11 129:14
client 138:17	135:4 136:4,7	company 66:9 70:3	conception 108:8	130:6,23 131:4
close 106:7 115:3	138:22 142:23	70:10,12,18 71:14	concern 71:22	133:10 134:3,17
115:14	Commission's	72:21 75:1 95:9	72:15 73:17,18	135:5 136:10,19
closer 95:23	100:17 120:22	98:5,8,18 112:2	86:21 99:4 114:25	137:14 138:17,18
	1		1	1

Page	148

				T dgc 140
139:10,12	96:18 97:3 98:9	currently 112:11	date 129:21 132:7	depending 82:17
conduct 85:4	Corporation 77:24	112:19	133:14	depreciated 81:1
confidence 89:4	correct 89:2 106:6	curve 110:18	DAVID 66:20	deserve 125:6
107:11	107:5 138:6 141:6	cusp 89:8	Davison 68:10	design 122:1
confident 104:21	cost 77:8 81:20	customer 79:24	day 72:10,11,14	designation 122:5
105:2 108:15	82:20 83:7 85:8	80:7 91:17	142:6 143:6	125:19
consensus 138:25	89:21 99:13 116:9	customers 79:24	144:16	designations
consequences	124:16 126:13,24	80:9 81:4 82:2,12	deadline 118:25	122:19 125:24
91:12	124.10 120.13,24	82:15 83:7,8	deal 91:17 100:12	designed 101:18
conservation 70:14	129.23 131.3,10	,		detail 69:18
		87:15 88:4 89:18	112:21 113:2,15	
70:16 74:17 83:22	costs 77:16 82:13	92:16,20 95:20	dealing 87:13 93:7	details 131:7
consider 132:12	82:22 85:10 87:5	99:16 104:9 122:2	deals 79:23	determination
consideration	90:5 92:13,20	122:3,8,14	debt 82:20 93:11	126:1
87:19	104:25	customers' 99:17	dec 77:11	determine 87:3
considerations 92:8	Council 70:24	cycle 91:2 108:17	decarbonization	91:12 116:18
considered 110:10	counsel 67:9,13	D	105:12 129:20,23	determined 70:21
considering 124:4	71:19 72:3,17		decide 123:3	126:14 127:2
124:16 125:8	127:14,24 128:1	D(3) 69:11	136:19	determining 94:22
consistent 70:13	128:12 133:24	d/b/a 66:8	decided 126:20,25	develop 85:3 87:1
83:23 110:4	144:13	Danner 66:20 69:4	decides 112:22	93:12 94:7 126:16
constraining	Counsel's 72:16	69:9 71:15 72:19	decision 110:12	developed 93:25
109:17	142:20	73:19 74:2,10,20	119:19 124:3	129:5,7
constraint 109:18	country 90:10	74:25 75:5,7,7	133:13	developers 110:21
Consumers 71:2	COUNTY 144:4	88:12 98:1 103:7	decision-making	110:25
contemplated	couple 79:22 93:19	104:16 105:5	84:13	developing 91:22
77:25 78:2	course 78:12 97:5	107:2,9,21 108:1	decisions 84:15,16	130:22
contentious 140:13	99:22 100:15	108:22 109:3,6	110:8,11,12	development 92:5
context 74:7 119:23	112:14 117:25	110:4,13 111:6,11	declining 110:18	125:7 130:25
127:5	119:22 120:11	111:12,17,20	decrease 70:5,6,7,7	differences 96:22
continuance	123:7	115:22,25 116:1,2	70:8,10 78:25	different 72:7
119:13 135:3	court 144:6,11	117:10 118:11	decreases 107:17	75:22 81:15 82:6
136:6	cover 97:10	120:4,17 121:2,14	deemed 80:17	91:5,6 93:7,17
continue 101:19	Covid-19 79:16	121:18,19 123:9	deeply 124:12	98:6,14 105:8
128:5 131:8	create 91:15 113:1	123:12,15,18	defer 95:16 132:4	111:25 113:5
134:21 136:12,17	113:14 126:19	127:8,12,16,17,20	definitely 75:21	differently 75:24
continued 111:7	created 121:6	127:22 128:10,14	87:7,22 89:11	89:11
continuing 81:24	creates 112:17	128:16,17 130:8	105:8	difficult 75:18 87:3
102:1	113:3 124:14	130:12,15 131:19	delay 115:7 128:24	95:13 129:8
contracts 81:16	credit 82:18	131:22,25 132:23	delays 120:7	142:16
89:13	critical 86:13	133:2 134:24	delivered 80:18	diligence 109:25
control 77:10 136:7	cross 75:20	135:22,23 136:18	demand 84:9	diligently 102:14
controversial 140:7	crucial 114:19,22	137:1,12,17 138:9	demonstrating	direction 82:10
conversation 74:15	current 84:15 94:7	138:13,23 139:8	140:19	96:14 97:21 99:1
115:18	98:22 100:25	139:11,23 141:1,5	depend 136:16	100:16 109:16
conversations	101:4	143:2	dependent 106:17	118:1 134:7,7,9
	101.1	data 99:11 118:1		110.110.1.1,1,1,7
	I	I	I	1

Page	149
- 3 -	-

				Fage 149
124.16 125.17	01.10 14 05.20	20 mly 70.5 7 101.0	80:24 81:22 83:4	125:25
134:16 135:17	91:10,14 95:20 99:14	early 79:5,7 101:9 112:14		
137:5 141:16,17			83:14,15,20 84:8	evidently 107:24
144:7	dispatchable	easier 106:20	84:11,12,19,22	exact 131:14
directionality 84:5	103:13,16,20	129:19	85:4 90:6 94:20	exactly 81:19
directions 97:7	display 135:5	economic 103:23	101:13 106:2,3	example 101:11
directive 116:12	distinct 75:22	104:2 109:13	115:7 121:25	112:21 129:16
directly 104:23	distribution 83:22	110:1	122:6,24 123:1	130:1 139:4
director 108:5	dived 110:5	economize 138:22	142:24	exceed 71:23 74:6
133:21	diversity 89:19,19	economy 142:13	enforce 120:10	Excellent 84:10
directs 125:23	89:20,24 102:21	edit 127:3	enforceable 86:15	exception 134:4,17
disagree 140:12	102:21	educate 87:12	engaged 84:18	exceptions 136:20
disagreement	docket 66:7 69:5,11	education 88:3	95:10 100:23,24	EXCERPT 66:12
98:17	69:25 70:17 71:7	94:12	engagement 77:5	excessive 81:20
disallowance 87:4	71:11 77:6 85:2	effect 84:16	84:23 85:22 87:25	86:25 87:5
disappointed 141:8	121:21 132:25	effective 124:16	88:2 94:11 102:24	excise 103:25
141:21	135:5 142:22	129:24 132:17	103:3	excluded 84:8
disappointing	dockets 76:4	efficiencies 100:7	enter 140:8	excuse 121:23
140:18	doing 79:22 90:7	efficiency 70:13	entering 79:19	122:3
discuss 76:16 87:10	103:2 124:21	83:14,15,23,23	entire 78:5,23	executed 77:24
96:20 101:20	133:12 134:16	84:9	92:19 129:20	exemption 121:12
136:14	doorway 111:4	efforts 76:18	137:20	exit 104:7
discussed 75:18	Doumit 66:21 69:9	EIA 83:19,24	environment 102:4	expansion 92:18
76:10 81:11	74:20,21 75:8	eight 71:4 106:1	102:4 108:9	expect 94:16 132:6
discussing 95:17	88:14,15,21,24	eight-month-long	envisioned 122:9	expenditures 84:9
131:8	89:3 93:19 94:15	124:9	equity 84:11,12,21	84:9
discussion 72:25	95:25 96:4 97:24	EIM 80:15	equivalent 73:7	expensive 79:8 80:8
73:2,10,11 74:14	104:20 118:12,13	either 71:3,6 86:4	equivalent 73.7 equivocally 132:6	92:9 106:9
74:22 75:2,15,19	127:22 132:1	119:7 133:14	escalation 131:10	explain 73:9 76:20
76:19 78:16 81:12	138:3,4 142:4,5	134:14,20 136:3		138:8,9
	138.5,4 142.4,5	electronic 144:11	especially 83:7,10 87:19 90:12 91:21	,
85:18 86:12,17				explained 73:1
91:4 97:21 118:8	downgrade 92:9	emissions 78:23	99:14	explanation 125:16
118:9 122:20	downgrades 82:5	emitting 103:18	essentially 73:6	exploration 125:6
125:15 126:5	82:20 86:2	emphasize 141:13	81:5 89:18 95:23	exploring 79:11
128:4,8,21 131:9	drag 119:17	employed 144:13	100:10 101:14,21	exposed 97:13
discussions 76:23	drastic 70:20	employee 144:12	102:20 104:7,14	extension 79:12
77:1 78:12 84:2,4	drawn-out 124:9	enactment 69:21	114:8 132:13	101:17,19 102:1
84:25 85:23 90:17	drivers 110:1	encourage 128:6	135:3	extent 136:23
91:4,5 93:3 95:7	due 79:15,16	130:4	estimate 85:11	extra 104:10
96:16 100:21	dynamic 78:4,18	encouraged 86:16	et 82:18	109:24
102:2,8 106:5	78:21	endeavor 96:1	evaluation 116:9	
117:1 135:9		ended 79:16,22	everybody 111:3	F
141:23	E	energy 68:2 69:12	133:18	F 144:1
disingenuous	E 67:1,1 68:1,1	70:13,25,25 71:1	everyone's 101:14	faces 141:12
141:18	144:1,1	71:1,8,10 75:12	113:8	facing 133:9
dispatch 89:20	earlier 101:22	76:3,12 78:8,9	evidence-based	fact 90:17 96:24
-	134:4 136:2			97:1 98:8 138:21
	I	I	I	I

				<u></u>
factors 80:21 90:11	103:4 108:18	105:11 125:7	91:24 94:13	group 84:20,21,23
facts 76:5 96:7,9	112:1 119:11	fully 74:21 108:6	108:23 117:15,15	108:5 126:20
117:20	122:16 130:17	108:14 113:13	118:10 119:9	127:1
factual 75:22 139:4	142:19	126:20	120:25 133:10	guaranteed 115:12
139:21	fit 95:19	fundamental 96:7	134:6,20 135:24	guess 74:13 118:16
failure 72:8 132:3	five 90:19,20 103:4	further 73:13 74:18	138:13	118:23 119:7
fair 95:20 126:22	fixed 78:3,6,11,20	74:23 85:3 87:1	goal 106:13 115:19	124:3 138:4 140:6
fairly 77:8 95:5	flat 114:8	87:18 92:8 121:15	goals 86:15 115:14	140:12
103:12	floating 103:12	140:15 141:23	133:8	guidance 86:6,9
faith 86:18 92:12	flow 78:24 98:24	future 78:7 98:19	goes 97:1 102:2	87:1 99:21 128:25
far 75:1 81:20 82:8	102:22 122:2	125:23	going 72:21 75:19	130:5 136:9
87:16 88:8 91:16	132:15		76:1 77:22 81:8	guidances 129:17
95:19 97:12 99:21	focus 69:22 142:8	G	82:8 84:16 86:24	guides 131:14
102:2 103:13	142:14	gas 80:15 99:13	89:4 92:9,18 93:1	guise 90:22
119:15 126:8	focusing 88:10	general 67:5,14	94:6,10 95:2	
faster 106:21	folks 121:1	68:25 82:21	97:10,11 98:7	<u> </u>
feasible 118:22	follow 132:2	General's 127:24	101:14 104:24	half 114:9
federal 69:21 70:12	follow-ups 93:19	generally 75:17	105:2,8 107:3	hand 69:14 134:25
129:22	following 85:15	132:15	108:15,16 109:23	144:15
feedback 78:16	footprint 102:20,21	generation 80:17	110:23 112:4,24	happen 119:6
83:19 84:1 85:5	foregoing 144:6	81:2,2 90:3 92:17	113:6 115:4,13	140:23
feel 96:17 133:8	format 144:12	geographic 89:19	116:10 119:6	happened 122:11
137:4	forth 125:13	102:21	121:11 127:1	125:15
feeling 133:3	forum 116:23 117:8	getting 78:20 85:6	132:13 133:23	happening 94:14
Fifth 67:15	117:11 123:23	90:23 91:20 93:5	135:8,19 140:15	115:9
figure 91:20 95:18	forums 84:24	103:1 105:17,18	141:4,15,17,22	happens 110:8
97:17 102:10,15	forward 102:10	105:22 106:11	142:9	happy 127:7 130:6
113:21 114:2,19	110:17 122:6,12	116:8 137:8	good 69:8,8 74:3,4	134:6 135:13
120:11 139:13	125:8 128:7	give 71:13 72:1	74:15 75:3,4,6,19	137:6 139:22
file 98:12	131:16 133:22	73:25 89:3 105:1	80:2 86:18 89:13	hard 76:3 97:16
filed 69:16,17,24,25	134:6 136:1 141:9	105:1 110:24	92:12 95:2 96:1	99:3 100:12 102:9
70:1,15 71:8	four 97:10 101:17	120:16 128:25	98:9 122:5 127:15	107:7 116:17
76:12,13 77:7	105:25	136:13 137:10	127:17,18,21	Hayes 68:5 headed 130:24
85:2 99:10 110:17	four-year 70:9	141:1	128:17 133:4	
117:19 124:5	88:24 114:8	given 80:22 94:7,24 97:4 104:21 109:7	138:10 141:20	hear 74:25 75:4,5
filing 69:14 118:7	116:14	130:23 131:7	143:5,6	75:19 107:20,22 109:2,3 117:23
125:24	frame 102:8	133:18 135:7	grappling 81:19	109:2,5 117:25
filings 106:18 136:3	Francisco 68:6	139:17	116:17	122.20 123.17,23
financial 92:8	frankly 90:15 126:7	gives 87:9 92:3	great 75:6 123:20	138:11,12
93:11	138:17	102:20 124:1	138:14,14	heard 72:21,24
financially 144:13	free 104:19	134:9	greater 82:11 102:3	78:14 88:17 107:3
find 134:15	front 110:22 136:8	go 71:25 72:18 73:8	103:18	107:10 120:15
finding 124:21	frustrating 120:6	73:12 75:1 76:9	greenhouse 80:15	126:5 129:3,18
fine 87:9 118:3	135:16	80:4,6 81:8,25	99:13	hearing 118:15
first 71:12 92:25	full 86:12 87:19	83:13,25 89:9	ground 108:9	124:24 125:17

				Fage 151
120 10 122 24	1 102 10		T.A	100 2 5 121 1 12
130:12 132:24	huge 102:19	Inaudible 111:10	Integrated 108:4,5	129:3,5 131:1,12
133:2 140:17	hundred 111:15	incented 124:14	intended 73:24	131:16 132:4,13
heavy 141:10	Hunter 104:7	incentive 81:22	intense 91:19	132:16,21 134:7
hedge 81:5 93:22	Huntington 104:8	incentives 129:15	intensive 133:5	135:17
Hello 121:23,23	hurts 82:19	129:23 139:17	interconnect 92:16	IRPs 91:2
help 86:9 87:14	hydro 89:14	include 101:5	interest 86:19	issue 71:4,6 76:2
93:8 95:10 96:14		131:13 139:9	113:8 132:18	80:14 92:7 99:12
110:3 137:19	I	140:1,5	140:19 142:19	113:17 114:18
helpful 75:16 90:10	Idaho 101:25	included 90:20	interested 76:17	120:24 122:25
113:22 119:13	idea 78:8 79:9	98:19 116:24	78:13,15 79:25	131:15 134:13,22
131:13 134:2	101:5 106:7	117:20 131:14	84:2,25 85:7	136:9 140:5
helping 82:15	ideas 120:13	136:17	87:11 93:13 95:11	142:23
122:13	identify 84:6 86:13	includes 83:22	124:19 139:1	issued 80:23
helps 89:24	135:19	138:5 140:5	144:14	issues 74:16 76:20
hereto 144:13	identifying 122:7	including 70:11	interesting 128:20	79:16 84:13 86:11
hereunto 144:15	IIJA 129:15	98:18 131:9 144:9	interests 133:18	87:11 91:20 92:10
Hi 137:21	immediate 108:11	inclusion 126:13	interim 69:19 70:3	92:22 93:2 96:7
high 80:24 81:5,6	108:12	income 83:11	70:20 76:25 77:12	96:20,25 98:9,13
108:8	impact 129:12	incorporate 84:12	79:14 81:14,21	98:16 99:6 111:1
higher 82:17,20	impacts 80:24	86:8	88:9,18 112:15,19	112:15 113:14
87:23 90:11	82:11 103:23	incorporating	112:23 113:5,23	116:16,17 126:24
112:25 116:11	implementation	99:13	114:5,13,23	138:21 139:21,21
highest 90:9	69:13 71:8,11	increase 82:22	134:13,22 136:22	140:7,13 142:8,10
highlight 127:5	75:13 76:12 81:22	85:13 94:12 114:9	139:6	142:21
highlighting	84:23 142:24	increases 72:14	Interjurisdictional	it'll 111:2
129:16	implications	increasing 92:13	77:15,19	item 69:11 132:25
historically 89:16	124:21 125:5	incremental 77:8	internally 124:2	138:24,25
hit 108:14	importance 84:14	83:14,15 85:8,11	interpretation	IV 66:12
hits 104:2	important 104:3	92:4 95:21 97:17	142:2	IV 00.12
hitting 108:6	115:11,11 127:6	individualized	intervene 75:17	J
	128:25 129:3,17	109:22		Jackson 66:24
hold 73:14,16 74:14	134:14	individuals 95:9	interveners 87:12	144:24
	importantly 79:14		introduce 69:14	Jaclynn 67:11 69:6
holding 137:9	importantity 79:14 impose 74:6 123:4	industry 92:14	investment 84:15	69:9 71:16,18
honestly 141:18	imposing 132:13	inevitably 112:6	investments 85:15	72:18 74:14 75:1
Honor 72:20	imposition 74:9	inform 137:2	involved 100:20	119:7,25 137:19
111:23 119:11	improve 84:3 122:7	information 77:5	112:18 133:18	January 69:18 70:1
121:4	improvement 92:4	83:20 87:1 99:20	IOUs 83:12	jarring 111:25
hope 73:9 107:11	97:18	informed 88:4	IRA 129:15	Jeff 73:23 74:2,3,12
113:15 124:3		informs 98:22	IRA/IIJA 132:10	
hopefully 134:9	improving 88:2	100:16	IRP 90:25 91:1	133:24 135:21,24
hoping 72:22 73:2	imputation 93:16	initial 76:12,14,15	95:15 98:20,22,23	141:1 Loffman (7,10
hour 83:17	imputed 93:9,10	initiate 71:9 136:5	99:2,6,6,21,23,25	Jeffrey 67:10
hours 106:1	in-roll 110:17	initiating 142:23	100:16,16 105:7	Jim 81:2 111:7
how's 113:5	inadvertently 84:7	initiatives 101:6	106:5 107:1 109:8	job 142:20
hub 85:3	inappropriate	Inlet 70:25	109:20,22 117:18	jointly 69:25 131:2
	87:18			Josephine 67:3
	1	1	1	1

				1 age 152
134:25	90:1,5,8,13,15	landscape 109:7,13	limited 73:18	lot 76:1 84:14
journey 102:16	91:3,7 92:11,18	language 93:4	127:25	89:24 95:11
JRC 80:23	94:1,1,3,11,18,18	126:13 131:14	line 106:25 123:13	100:20 102:23
judge 144:10	94:20,20,22 95:4	134:17 140:4	126:8	103:11,24 107:10
judicial 138:15	95:8,9,10,11,15	large 78:21	lines 92:15 104:16	108:16 112:17
140:10 142:13		0		
	95:25 96:4,8,8,13	larger 92:3 124:12	133:17	113:1 123:21
July 122:10	96:15,16,23,23	late 112:14	link 131:13	125:5,12,21 126:3
jump 106:6,12	97:2,9,9,12,13,15	law 102:5 122:22	list 102:12 139:9	126:5 130:3
K	98:4,10,12,13,21	138:21 139:21	listen 76:7 97:2	133:20 134:5
	99:2,5,9,12,12,13	141:14	litigated 134:14	loud 117:23
Katie 68:21 130:14	99:22,22 100:5,13	laws 104:18	litigating 113:14	low 89:18,18,24
131:20	101:2 102:7,12,24	lawyer 107:6,12	little 82:10 94:7	lower 93:15
keep 72:22 81:7	103:1,4,11,24,25	lay 138:15	103:10 106:8,25	lowering 78:22
89:17 111:13	104:4,8,24 105:1	lead 89:5	109:3 111:25	lowest 83:11
keeping 98:4	105:6,9,14,15,16	leads 82:19 86:2	124:22 125:12	
kept 81:3	105:16,17,20,21	learned 80:2,15	LLP 68:4	<u> </u>
key 92:14	106:2,3,7,9,12,13	leave 87:2 120:9	load 78:5 102:21	ma'am 120:2
kind 74:8,8 76:5	106:14,17,24	leaves 94:23	111:15	maintain 78:18
78:24 81:5 84:15	107:15 108:6,10	led 79:11	local 104:1	maintaining 86:20
85:1 87:1 89:3,7	108:12 109:17,21	legal 98:25 114:11	located 90:3 103:19	majority 96:25
90:22 92:8 94:8	110:5,16,22,23,25	119:9,12 120:20	long 86:20 88:10	making 116:6
97:20 100:5	111:14,16 112:1,5	125:5 142:21	90:17 122:1 124:8	119:5 120:5 121:7
101:16 102:3	112:7,9 113:13	144:6	134:1	141:20
103:21 104:1,23	114:13 116:3,4,7	legislation 69:22	long-term 82:3	March 66:13 69:2
105:10,10,11,20	116:10,12,13,13	70:12 83:2 91:22	95:25 97:18,18	112:11
106:19 113:9	116:14,16,19,22	102:5,6 103:8,8	longer 89:13	Marjie 66:24
116:20 117:6	117:2,7,16,18,19	lessons 80:2	109:16,18	Marjorie 144:24
124:11 125:17	117:22 118:5,7,16		look 90:24 91:11	mark 94:24 108:7
126:9 127:1	117.22 118.5,7,10		100:6 103:23	market 81:6,7,9,25
132:15,17 134:18	118.19,19,22	112:9,21 117:22 137:13	106:22 110:14	83:18 89:22 95:19
134:23 136:1,7	, , ,	letters 82:18		100:11 101:15
137:4,5,11	120:6,19,22		112:8,10 113:21	102:19,23 105:18
KING 144:4	122:13,17 124:4,8	_	116:18	102.17,25 105.18
knots 88:17	124:16,22 125:2,9	level 71:23 85:22	looking 81:13,14,14	marketers 89:14
know 72:25 73:4,9	125:16,18,22	87:21 100:10	81:15,16 82:3	marketplace
73:10,11,22,23	126:3,15,25 129:7	108:8 109:24	86:18 92:6 93:6	110:25
	130:18 132:1,3,4	110:1 119:18	103:22 104:20	
75:14,16 76:11,11	132:5,6,7,10,18	135:6	105:11 111:15	markets 100:13,20
76:15 77:11 79:24	132:21 134:2,3	leverage 126:3	112:13 114:9,19	Matt 68:22 75:3,9
81:17,19 82:8,17	135:14 142:9,10	142:11	115:9 116:15	88:12,16 98:3
83:1,6,7,17,18	142:11,11,13	life 78:11	122:12 133:21	103:7 121:15
84:1 85:14,18,19	knowledge 144:9	lift 129:13 130:1	141:9	131:24
85:20,21,23 86:2	knows 112:7	lifted 110:9	looks 122:6	matter 73:12 143:4
86:5,12,14,15,16		light 66:9 110:3	Loop 66:16	matters 136:8
86:23,25,25 87:5	L	likelihood 101:1	lose 135:16	maximums 74:7
87:7,22 88:3,8	L 67:10	limit 72:10	lost 117:23	McVee 68:22 75:3
89:12,14,14,22,24	Lacey 66:17			75:4,6,9 88:13,20
	I	I	I	I

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

SEATTLE 206.287.9066 OLYMPIA 360.534.9066 SPOKANE 509.624.3261 NATIONAL 800.846.6989

Page	e 153

88:23 89:2,6	135:3,6 136:3,13	129:5,6,7 139:6	narrow 142:14	non-emitting 78:10
93:23 95:4 96:3	137:9 138:16,19	modify 71:21	Nash 67:12 72:19	78:18 79:1 111:5
96:12 99:5 101:4	138:20,25 140:7	modifying 81:14	73:20 111:21	non-energy 80:19
102:12 103:10	140:14,21 143:3,7	moment 72:1 75:13	113:25 115:23	non-immediate
105:4,6 107:6	meetings 129:6	Monahan 68:15	118:24 119:7	80:8
111:12,19 116:1,3	megawatt 83:16	128:16,17,18	120:25 121:2	non-modeled 85:10
117:12 121:15,18	92:2	months 112:13	133:24 137:18,22	noncompliance
131:24,25	megawatts 111:16	129:11	nature 86:1	106:13
mean 78:19 87:20	memo 72:5 117:2	mooted 141:4	NE 67:21	Northwest 70:25
89:11,25 90:15	mention 131:1,17	morning 69:7,8,8	near-term 130:5	71:2 90:12 131:1
91:25 92:13 93:23	mentioned 88:6	74:3,4 75:3,4,6	necessary 108:13	notable 131:17
94:24 95:1,4,5,6,7	100:4 117:18	127:15 128:1	108:14 120:10	notes 86:12
96:10,12,12 97:4	132:3 134:4	Moser 68:9 123:14	need 78:7 82:17,21	November 69:16
97:4,8 99:21,23	136:20	123:15,17,20	91:14 96:8 101:19	71:8
100:12 102:2,25	mercy 102:3	motion 128:7 137:7	110:22 116:3,25	NOx 109:18
103:22,22,23	merger 90:18	142:19 143:1,2	117:15 120:15	number 79:17
104:18,21 110:4,7	merit 135:11,12	motivated 115:14	121:13 125:2	91:13 125:20
111:12,14 112:18	mess 127:1	motivation 124:23	133:13,23 138:15	134:2,5,6 140:3,5
117:12,13,14	met 115:20	126:2	needed 115:11	numbers 73:22
119:18 120:8	methodology 69:20	move 69:4 85:15	needs 89:16 115:19	104:21,22 116:7
133:3 137:3 138:4	70:11 77:19 78:1	96:14 102:9	135:15 137:6	118:18
141:13,18	78:2 90:17,19,23	140:25 142:22	140:22,23	NWEC 68:21 131:2
means 87:2 92:23	106:22	moved 78:22	negative 95:1	
112:9 124:7	metric 84:5	moves 129:20	negotiate 98:5	0
meant 81:8 114:14	metrics 82:8,19	133:22	113:12 118:21	000- 69:1
138:20	84:6,7 93:9,11	moving 77:25	119:3,23 134:21	Oakland 68:18
measured 111:2	middle 90:12	81:23 103:1 105:9	negotiating 116:23	objection 138:16
mechanisms	Mihaley 68:4	109:8,16 119:1	117:8	139:21
139:18	million 85:12	125:8 129:9	negotiation 73:3	objections 139:3
meet 82:1 83:4	MILT 66:21	131:16	118:17 123:24	obligation 115:15
91:13 92:25 97:19	mind 72:22 96:15	MSP 102:14	140:21,23	120:21
104:5,24 105:3,23	111:13 119:4	muddle 76:5	negotiations 77:22	obligations 105:3
105:24 107:4	124:3	multi-state 69:20	77:25 90:22	107:4
109:23 114:24	mindful 82:7	86:1 90:15 100:22	142:12	obviously 98:4
115:1,5,14 124:17	mines 90:4	103:2	neutral 104:19	104:18 111:8
124:17 128:6	minimal 85:9	multicultural 85:4	141:14	129:3 143:5
129:1,19 130:4	110:18	multiple 84:24	new 78:1,10,16,17	occur 108:16
132:6 134:10	minimum 122:5,19	89:23 104:4	78:20 79:1 83:2	122:10
135:18,19	125:19,24	Multnomah 67:21	83:21 91:21 94:19	odd 118:17
meeting 66:12 98:6	minor 77:4,8	muted 138:11	95:22 106:20	offer 128:1 135:7
105:19 117:3	mitigate 87:14	N	135:5	office 67:5 127:25
119:2,16 121:9	Mm-hmm 110:13		nine 70:23 71:3,4	offsetting 86:23 oh 107:23 133:8
123:5 124:19,25	111:6	N 67:1 68:1 name 75:8 128:18	111:20 131:4	
125:3 126:22	modeled 85:9	name / 5:8 128:18 named 122:4	non-company	okay 73:16 74:25 75:6 88:21 96:3
133:7,19 134:9	modeling 116:20	named 122:4 names 122:3	125:14	98:3 100:19
		Hames 122.3		70.3 100.19
L				

				i ago io i
102:11 103:6	117:21 119:24	Pacifica's 71:7	127:6	137:12 139:13
104:16 107:9	125:9 133:25	PacifiCorp 66:8	particularly 71:22	percentage 107:15
109:2,5 111:21	135:13 136:15	67:18,20 68:22,23	122:18 129:14	period 70:9 88:25
117:14 120:3	140:10	68:24 69:5,15,16	134:6	89:1 92:23 97:16
123:17,20 127:12	options 81:15 93:7	75:10,16,24 76:21	parties 69:25 72:24	106:19 114:8,20
127:21 130:21	94:2 101:20 119:3	77:13 78:22 82:15	76:17 78:12,13,14	114:21,23 115:13
131:22 134:16	136:14	85:19 87:9 89:15	78:14,15 79:6	115:15 142:25
137:24 138:2,12	order 71:7 72:8	89:23 90:18 98:14	84:2,25 85:7,20	perjury 144:6
138:14,14 141:5,5	80:11,23 82:1	104:12 109:1	87:11 93:13 95:11	permanent 110:7
Olympia 67:7	84:14,17 88:8	113:23 122:1	97:2 117:5,16	personally 103:1
once 96:18 111:4	115:5 120:23	124:19,24 125:23	118:5 119:3,14,22	perspective 108:4
119:15 121:8	129:10 131:12,14	126:6 129:1,22	125:14,17 134:11	123:22,25
129:7	134:8 135:4 136:7	131:5 135:4,8	134:22 136:13,17	picked 104:14
ongoing 130:25	136:9 140:8	141:12	139:1 141:24	picking 107:24
open 66:12 72:24	142:23	PacifiCorp' 69:12	144:13	place 89:25 120:9
73:2,10 86:6 88:1	ordering 99:1	69:19,22 71:10	parties' 76:23	122:5 125:21
88:11 98:5 115:17	Oregon 67:22	PacifiCorp's 74:17	party 121:9 136:4	126:7 135:13
119:2,16 121:9	68:12 76:2 78:8	98:11 121:24	passed 102:5	138:19
126:22 128:8	78:14,19,25 83:9	123:4 124:13	103:15 119:21	plan 69:13,23
133:19 134:8	91:15 92:3 101:10	128:23 129:19	path 95:6 109:10	70:14,16,19 71:8
135:3 136:3,13	101:11,25 131:11	130:3 142:24	109:23 136:1	71:11 74:17 75:13
137:9 138:16,19	organized 100:11	Packaging 77:23	pathway 115:5	76:12 77:7 81:22
138:20,24 140:7	100:12	page 85:3 86:11	patience 69:6	83:22 84:23 85:1
140:13,21 143:3,7	original 77:2,23	113:21,25 114:2	pause 109:14,14	87:7 88:1 89:9
operate 95:19	78:24 84:4 85:23	PAGES 66:10	110:23	91:5,6 93:25
102:17	86:6 94:15 118:7	pandemic 79:16	paying 101:14	102:17 106:23
operations 75:10	120:9 122:9	parallel 109:10	penalties 71:23	142:24
92:21 101:8	originally 78:2 99:9	part 71:18,19 77:25	73:22 74:6,23	planning 100:10
opining 142:21	111:7	91:3,3 95:15	87:6,21 88:5	108:4,6,25 116:9
opinion 110:23	ought 142:13	105:6 109:13	97:13 99:1 106:16	132:5 139:9
opportunities	outcome 144:14	115:11 118:10	124:15 140:2,3,4	plant 81:2,3
95:14 97:23	outreach 84:8	121:7,16 122:16	140:6	plate 133:21
102:24	outside 74:7 95:9	124:23 126:15	penalty 72:6,11,14	playing 93:6
opportunity 72:23	overall 72:13	128:4	87:23 134:4,18	please 76:10 77:10
74:1 76:7 91:7	115:19	partial 134:7,8,21	139:15 144:5	77:11
96:17 101:16	overseeing 118:16	136:6,9	pending 102:6	plenty 140:6
117:13 120:16	overwhelmed 95:12	participating	people 137:10	PO 67:6
121:24 128:19	ozone 105:10	122:13	percent 70:5,6,7,8	point 79:18 91:21
130:16 135:17	109:11,12 110:6	participation 69:23	85:12 88:19,22,25	94:18,25 96:12
141:2,23	110:20	70:19 77:6 84:11	92:1,2 93:10	108:19 116:5
opposed 108:17	P	84:19 85:1 88:1	95:22,24 97:15	118:19 122:12
opposite 141:16		105:17	104:10,13,14	126:11 140:15,24
option 71:12,25	P 67:1,1 68:1,1 P a 74:7	particular 76:20	111:14 112:19,20	pointed 87:20
73:14 81:3 94:2	Pac 74:7	79:24 80:3 85:1	112:24 114:9,10	92:10 94:4 118:15
101:3 112:6,8	Pacific 66:8 77:14 Pacifica 124:14	91:23 117:21	115:3,15 125:19	points 107:16
	1 aciiica 124:14			

Page	155
------	-----

99:2,3 139:2 140:22 producing 91:1 93:16 99:11 0 possible 93:21 price 80:7,16 81:6 production 83:23 production 83:23 117:11 127:5 qualify 103:20 potential 97:6 93:4 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 program 126:21,23 provided 82:2 128:3,19 129:18 qualify 103:20 93:8 94:5 100:5 86:25 110:21 program 70:16 135:8 74:14 82:16 88:16 power 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 122:1 126:16,17 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 86:22 90:18 probably 91:23 progress 114:14,16 provides 116:6 117:24 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 progress 114:14,16 provides 116:6 117:24 provides 116:6 117:24 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 practical 119:18 99:19 112:12,14 118:2 119:5 120:5 proxision 136:5,6 proxi 127:3 questions 71:13,16 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prodect 68:2 12 88:18 123:7,10 127:7,10 preceding 122:21 procedural 136:1,8 projert 105:17					1 490 100
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	policies 94·19	69.11 15 89.8	124.6 9 125.14	proposed 70.3 7 8	nurchase 80·1 88·8
policy 75:10 76:3.4 75:12 121:17 138:16,20 140:20 130:22 purpose 115:19 78:8.9 83:4 94:24 presentel 117:3 processes 138:19 processes 138:19 proposes 112:24 138:15 142:13,16 114:11 125:5 presents 114:17 procurement 140:2 proposing 113:1,24 pursuant 126:17 pollations 122:8 presents 114:17 procurement 109:15,23 110:8 protect 104:1 pursuant 126:17 portion 109:15 pretty 100:24 procurements 109:17,25 proves 140:14 pursus 129:10 possible 93:21 previous 74:22 producting 91:1 portion 83:23 protis 139:12 90:21 117:2 121:9 possible 93:21 prices 80:24 81:7 position 87:38:6 proing 81:21 90:17 program 70:16 135:5 135:8 qualify 103:20 postion 87:28:16 prices 80:24 81:7 postial 87:6 93:4 sc:7 110:17 program 70:16 135:8 question 71:19,19 proses 119:19 proses 114:14,16 program 70:16 135:8 question 71:19,19 prose 119:19 proses 114:14,16 propice 110:19 providia 136:5,9	-		-		-
78:8,9 98:34:94:24 presented 117:3 process 138:19 proposes 12:24 purposes 125:3 103:16 104:3,5 118:18 procure 110:12,19 140:2 138:15 142:13,16 political 102:4 presenting 76:7 124:11 127:15 presents 114:17 procure ment 109:15,23 110:8 proposing 113:1,24 pursual 126:17 portion 109:15 presiden 75:9 100:1,112 111:3 protect 104:1 pursual 126:17 pursual 126:17 postion 87:3 88:6 provent 15:9 procurements 77:23 79:12 90:22 172:12 90:22 99:2,3 139:2 prevent 115:9 producing 91:1 provide 78:38:424 putting 100:16 postion 87:3 88:6 proces 80:24 81:7 postion 87:3 88:6 producing 91:1 provide 78:38:424 potential 87:6 93:4 grides 80:25 110:21 program 126:17,12 provide 80:22 110:51 102:1 praces 68:24 81:7 96:19 provide 82:2 139:2 quality 103:20 protext 119:12 program 126:17,12 provide 81:12 115:8 14:21 praces 68:02 prolean 13:12:12 program 70:16		-			-
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		1	-		
political 102:4 proprietal 102:4 progener 139:20 preserve 139:20 109:15,23 10:8 proteol 77:15,20 protion 109:15 preserve 139:20 proprietal 77:22 proteol 77:15,20 proteol 77:15,20 proteol 77:15,20 putsing 129:10 puts 88:6 89:25 68:12 postion 87:3 88:6 postion 87:3 88:6 potential 87:6 93:4 potential 87:6 93:4 prote 81:21 poilt productive 79:9 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 provide 87:22 provide 78:3 84:24 provide 88:22 putting 110:16 puts 81:21 poilt 93:16 9portical 90:11 possible 93:21 postible 93:21 potential 87:6 93:4 proteing 80:16 provides 87:22 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 97:22 provide 97:22 provide 82:2 provide 97:22 putting 110:16 provide 97:22 provide 97:22 93:16 9portical 90:11 pragmatical 119:18 preceding 122:11 predem 100:1 projeten 100:1 projetem 100:1 projetem 100:1 projetem 101:10 providing 136:9 providing 136:9 prov	,		-		,
populations 122:8 122:15 preserve 139:20 president 75:9 108:25 109:15,23 110:8 110:11,12 111:3 132:5 proprietary 144:11 protect 104:1 pursuit 92:12 pushing 129:10 portfolio 100:3.3 portfolio 100:3.3 108:25 108:25 132:5 procurements 77:23 79:12 90:22 117:2 121:9 Portand 67:22 107:16 123:22 procurements 109:17,25 proves 140:14 putting 110:16 position 87:3 88:6 precent 115:9 producting 91:1 proves 140:14 putting 110:16 postion 87:3 88:6 price 80:7,16 81:6 productive 79:9 128:3,19 129:18 putting 110:16 postion 87:3 88:6 price 80:7,16 81:6 productive 79:9 128:3,19 129:14 putting 110:16 prose 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 126:18 115:8 provides 97:22 141:20 pragmatically problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 producting 136:9 provision 136:5,6 provedury 132:14 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 product 79:2 139:16 74:19 23 139:16 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 project 68:2 71:1 propoer 105:					-
122:15 president 75:9 110:11,12 111:3 proiect 104:1 pushing 129:10 portion 100:3,3 prevent 100:24 procurements 132:5 protecol 77:15.22 protest 86:89:25 Portland 67:22 prevent 115:9 procuring 109:11 prover 40:14 prover 40:14 prover 40:14 protest 86:89:25 99:2,3 139:2 prevent 115:9 producting 91:1 producting 91:1 prover 40:14 prover 40:14 putting 110:16 93:8 94:5 100:5 price 80:24 81:7 proigrams 70:16 122:1 126:16.17 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 135:8 provide 82:2 10:8 114:15 93:8 94:5 100:5 price 80:24 81:7 programs 70:16 122:1 126:16.17 provide 82:2 135:8 74:14 82:16 88:16 prover 66:8 74:6 probably 91:23 progress 114:14,16 provide 97:22 10:8 114:15 115:8 118:21.23 practical 19:18 problematic 123:25 12:25 12:6;2.4 project 68:2 71:1 prodect 79:9;2.3 10:18 114:15 preceding 122:21 12:6:19 project 10:17 project 68:2 71:1 prolematic 123:5;2 12:2; 12:25	-	-	-		-
portfolio 100:3,3 portfolio 100:3,3 portfolio 100:3,3 portfolio 100:3,3 portfolio 100:15 portfy 100:24 prostuce 30:12 99:2,3 139:2 possible 93:21 possible 93:22 possible 93:22 100:23 106:8,10 pore 66:8 74:6 poro 86:27 10:22 prodectins 80:20 problematic 123:25 prodectins 69:21 prodectins 69:21 prodectins 69:21 proceeding 136:3 proper 105:17 profeer 71:23,20 providing 136:9 providing 136:9 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 71:12,25 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 71:12,25 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 71:12,25 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 103:13 proper 105:17 profer 100:15 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 profeer 30:16 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 proceed 133:12,15 pr		1	,	I I V	_ ▲
portion 109:15 pretty 100:24 procurements 77:23 79:12 90:22 117:2 121:9 Portland 67:22 107:16 123:22 procuring 109:11 proves 140:14 putting 110:16 position 87:3 88:6 prevent 115:9 producing 91:1 provide 78:3 84:24 putting 110:16 possible 93:21 price 80:7,16 81:6 producing 91:1 producing 91:1 provide 78:3 84:24 putting 110:16 potential 87:6 93:4 prices 80:7,16 81:6 producing 91:1 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 possible 93:21 prices 80:24 81:7 porgrams 70:16 135:8 porvide 82:2 provide 97:22 qualify 103:20 power 66:8 74:6 probably 91:23 profes 81:21 90:17 126:16,17 provide 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 PAS 82:23 probem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 provide 79:20 proxision 136:5,6 prozeder 113:3:126:19 procedures 12:2:5 prose 108:11 prodect 69:21 prose 69:21 prose 69:21 prose 111:15:21 13:20 13:2:0 predeced 84:16 procedure 140:9 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 project 68:2 71:1 prud		-	,	-	- 0
Portland 67:22 68:12 107:16 123:22 prevent 115:9 108:13 procuring 109:11 109:17,25 101:5,22 proves 140:14 proviex 106:14 128:21 putting 110:16 position 87:3 88:6 99:2,3 139:2 previously 74:22 previously 74:22 producting 109:11 109:17,25 proves 140:14 proviex 109:11 proves 140:14 proviex 109:11 putting 110:16 possible 93:21 potential 87:6 93:4 price 80:7,16 81:6 82:17 110:18 producting 91:1 productive 79:9 130:5 138:20 qualify 103:20 question 71:19,19 potential 87:6 93:4 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 96:19 130:5 138:20 qualify 103:20 question 71:19,19 potential 87:6 93:4 prices 80:24 81:7 program 126:21,23 productive 79:9 130:5 138:20 74:14 82:16 88:16 power 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 122:1 126:16,17 142:11 114:21 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 progress 114:14,16 providen 79:20 94:16,23 96:2 pratices 80:24 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 115:8 118:21,23 preceding 122:21 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 98:10,129:6 preceding 122:21 proced 133:12,5 procedura 136:1,8 project 6				÷	_ ▲
68:12 prevent 115:9 procuring 109:11 proves 140:14 putting 110:16 position 87:3 88:6 previously 74:22 producing 91:1 provide 78:3 84:24 point 115:9 producing 91:1 provide 78:3 84:24 point 115:7 point 115:7 point 115:7 point 115:7 producing 91:1 provide 78:3 84:24 provide 78:3 84:24 point 115:7 provide 78:3 84:24 provide 78:3 84:24 provide 78:3 84:24 provide 78:3 84:24 point 115:7 point 115:7 point 115:7 provide 79:9 provide 79:9 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 82:2 provide 97:22 provide 97	-		-		
position 87:3 88:6 99:2,3 139:2 possible 93:21 potential 87:6 93:4 22:17 110:18 protential 90:11 93:8 94:5 100:5 105:23 106:8,10 power 66:8 74:6 power 66:8 74:6 proto 23 105:10 previously 74:22 140:22 producting 91:1 productive 79:9 96:19 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 provided 82:2 provide 78:3 84:24 93:16 90:11 116:7 126:9 99:2,3 139:2 potential 90:11 93:8 94:5 100:5 86:22 90:18 price 80:7,16 81:6 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 96:19 production 83:23 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 provide 78:3 84:24 production 83:23 production 83:23 production 83:23 production 83:23 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 116:7 126:9 90:19 11 23:12 90:17 production 83:23 program 126:21,23 program 126:21,23 project 68: 71:1 production 93:22 provide 78:3 84:24 production 83:23 production 83:23 production 80:21 program 126:21,23 prosed 114:14.16 provide 78:3 84:24 production 83:23 production 83:23 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 procedura 136:19 project 68:2 71:1 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 product 79:20 procedura 136:1,8 projections 69:21 project 101:10 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:11,12 128:12,12 project 101:10 128:11,12 98:20,1130:6.9 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:11,12 128:12,0 128:11,11 proper 105:17 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:15,22,24 quickl 20:25 139:16 <			· -		
99:2,3 139:2 140:22 price 80:7,16 81:6 producing 91:1 93:16 99:11 17:11 127:5 possible 93:21 price 80:7,16 81:6 82:17 110:18 production 83:23 117:11 127:5 qualify 103:20 potential 90:11 price 80:7,16 81:6 82:17 110:18 productive 79:9 128:3,19 129:18 130:5 138:20 question 71:19,19 93:8 94:5 100:5 b6:25 110:21 prices 80:24 81:7 proise 80:24 81:7 program 126:21,23 provided 82:2 74:14 82:16 88:16 power 66:8 74:6 prio 81:21 90:17 126:18 provides 97:22 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 PA 80:7,12 82:16 probably 91:23 profore 81:21 90:17 126:18 provision 136:5,6 provision 136:5,6 127:3 questions 71:13,16 PA 80:7,12 82:16 probem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prodect 82: 71:1 139:16 precedent 142:7 procedural 136:1,8 project 80:21 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 123:1,12:11 139:16 prefer 71:12.25 procedura 136:1,8 project 80:21 project 83:21:1 121:21 122:12 122:24 121		-		-	
possible 93:21 potential 87:6 93:4 potential 87:6 93:4 price 80:7,16 81:6 82:17 110:18 production 83:23 productive 79:9 117:11 127:5 128:3,19 129:18 Q qualify 103:20 potential 97:6 93:4 sc:2 10:21 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 96:19 130:5 138:20 question 71:19,19 poser 66:8 74:6 pricing 80:16 programs 70:16 135:8 74:14 82:16 88:16 power 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 122:1 126:16,17 135:8 74:14 82:16 88:16 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 programs 10:10 126:18 142:11 101:8 114:15 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 probably 91:23 probably 91:23 project 68:2 71:1 providen 97:22 101:8 114:15 practical 119:18 99:19 112:12,14 118:2 119:5 120:5 proxision 136:5,6 proxy 132:14 139:16 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 questions 71:13,16 prefer 71:12,25 procedures 142:2 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:9,11 130:6,9 prefer 71:12,25 procedures 142:2 propert 105:17 public 67:9,13 138:20 profer 71:12,25	position 87:3 88:6	L V	,	provide 78:3 84:24	116:7 126:9
potential 37:6 protectial 83:7:6 protectial 83:7:7 protectial 93:7:7 protectia 93:7:7 protectia 93:7:7 <t< td=""><td>99:2,3 139:2</td><td>140:22</td><td>producing 91:1</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	99:2,3 139:2	140:22	producing 91:1		
protentially 90:11 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 prices 80:24 81:7 profes 80:24 81:7 93:8 94:5 100:5 brior 81:21 90:17 130:5 138:20 provided 82:2 130:5 138:20 power 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 122:1 126:16,17 130:5 138:20 provided 82:2 141:18 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 propses 114:14,16 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 practices 80:20 112:24 116:6 117:24 provides 97:22 100:81 14:15 practices 80:20 112:24 116:6 117:24 provides 97:22 101:8 114:15 practices 80:20 112:24 141:20 provides 97:22 100:81 13:16 preceding 12:21 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 provides 97:20 109:16 110:19 preceding 12:21 126:10 project 68:2 71:1 prodency 13:13:16 139:16 procedura 13:6:18 project s0:10:10 project s0:21 project s0:21 109:16 110:19 74:19,23 80:18 proceeding 12:21 126:10 project s0:10:10 98:20 125:16 139:16 128:7,10 127:7,10 prefer	possible 93:21	price 80:7,16 81:6	production 83:23	117:11 127:5	
93:8 94:5 100:5 pricing 80:16 program 126:21,23 provided 82:2 72:3 73:21 74:13 105:23 106:8,10 pricing 80:16 program 126:21,23 provided 82:2 135:8 provides 97:22 10:6:8 114:16 20:23 105:10 122:1 126:16,17 122:11 126:16,17 142:11 provides 97:22 10:8 114:15 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 probably 91:23 116:6 117:24 provides 97:22 10:8 114:15 practices 80:20 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 provides 97:22 10:8 114:15 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 provides 97:22 10:8 114:15 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 139:16 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudent 79:20 139:16 preceding 122:21 126:10 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 113:2 14 project 68:2 71:1 prolematic 123:25 project 10:10 project 10:10 98:20 125:16 123:7,10 127:7,10 preference 103:13 proceeding 76:17 properly 115:13 project 67:9,13 138:20 proference 103:16 proceeding 144:6 proceeding 14	potential 87:6 93:4	82:17 110:18	productive 79:9	128:3,19 129:18	
93:8 94:5 100:5 105:23 106:8,10 power 66:8 74:6 86:22 90:18 86:25 110:21 pricing 80:16 prior 81:21 90:17 program 126:21,23 programs 70:16 provided 82:2 135:8 72:3 73:21 74:13 74:14 82:16 88:16 PA 80:7,12 82:16 probably 91:23 practical 119:18 probably 91:23 protedet 142:7 probably 91:23 project 68: 27:11 provides 97:22 provides 97:22 101:8 114:15 PA 80:7,12 82:16 problem 100:1 programs 126:21,23 provides 97:22 provides 97:22 101:8 114:15 practices 80:20 112:24 141:20 provides 68:2 71:1 project 68:2 71:1 providen 79:20 project 68:2 71:1 109:16 110:19 precedent 142:7 problem 100:1 113:3 126:19 projections 69:21 project 133:12,15 project 67:9,13 109:16 110:19 74:19,23 80:18 precedent 142:7 procedural 136:1,8 procedural 136:1,8 projections 69:21 project 101:10 PSE 86:12 88:18 123:7,10 127:7,10 128:27,10 127:7,10 131:20 132:20 preference 103:13 136:3 propertion 78:5 project 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 projecting 144:6 proceeding 76:17 propertion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 preference 103:16 proceeding 144:6 proportion 78:5 92:29:6:13 97:5 80:14 88:2 90:14 78:17,17 81:7 preference 87:8,8 p	potentially 90:11	prices 80:24 81:7	96:19	130:5 138:20	
105:23 106:8,10 pricing 80:16 programs 70:16 135:8 74:14 82:16 88:16 power 66:8 74:6 prior 81:21 90:17 100:23 105:10 122:1 126:16,17 provides 97:22 94:16,23 96:2 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 programs 70:16 142:11 provides 97:22 101:8 114:15 PPA 82:23 probably 91:23 919 112:12,14 116:6 117:24 provision 136:56 provision 136:56 practices 80:20 112:24 141:20 prodematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 questionable preceding 122:21 probematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 PSE 86:12 88:18 98:11,12 96:5 preceding 122:21 126:10 procedure 140:9 project 105:17 public 67:9,13 132:1,10:27,10 prefer net 03:16 proceeding 76:17 propertion 78:5 propertion 78:5 propertion 78:5 95:18 77:24 88:1,2 quickly 84:17 preferences 103:16 proceedings 144:6 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 propertion 18:7 138:20 90:2 96:13 97:5 proces 77:5 80:1 moropose 81:1 publicly 110:15 R 67:1 68:1 144:1 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 <		-	program 126:21,23		72:3 73:21 74:13
power 66:8 74:6 86:22 90:18 prior 81:21 90:17 100:23 105:10 122:1 126:16,17 126:18 provides 97:22 142:11 94:16,23 96:2 101:8 114:15 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 probably 91:23 99:19 112:12,14 project 68:2 71:1 13:3 126:19 provides 97:22 142:11 142:11 101:8 114:15 practices 80:20 problem 100:1 112:24 project 68:2 71:1 13:3 126:19 project 68:2 71:1 95:22 103:5 prodent 79:20 questionable precedent 142:7 preceding 122:21 problem 100:1 126:10 project 68:2 71:1 95:22 103:5 project 68:2 71:1 95:22 103:5 prodent 79:20 questions 71:13,16 preference 112:2:5 procedural 136:1,8 procedure 140:9 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:11,11 139:16.9 preference 103:13 136:3 project 105:17 project 105:17 project 103:10 126:4,7 131:20 132:20 preference 8103:16 proceeding 76:17 proportion 78:5 project 103:13 122:2 123:1,11 138:20 138:20 preference 8103:16 proceedings 144:6 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 138:20 124:10 preference 87:5,80:1 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:14,17,17 81:7 <	105:23 106:8.10	pricing 80:16		-	74:14 82:16 88:16
86:22 90:18 100:23 105:10 126:18 142:11 101:8 114:15 PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 probably 91:23 protecl 61:17:24 providing 136:9 127:3 practical 119:18 99:19 112:12,14 116:6 117:24 provision 136:5,6 provi		1 0			94:16,23 96:2
PPA 80:7,12 82:16 114:21 progress 114:14,16 providing 136:9 115:8 118:21,23 PPA 88 2:23 probably 91:23 99:19 112:12,14 116:6 117:24 provision 136:5,6 127:3 practices 80:20 112:24 113:3 126:19 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 questionable precedent 142:7 problematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 114:11 15:23 preceding 122:21 procedural 136:1,8 project 68:2 71:1 prodematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 74:19,23 80:18 predated 84:16 procedural 136:1,8 project of 80:21 psE 86:12 88:18 123:7,10 127:7,10 prefer 71:12,25 procedure 140:9 project 101:10 98:20 125:16 139:15,22,24 proference 103:13 136:3 projerly 15:13 projerly 15:13 126:4,7 131:20 132:20 proference 8103:16 proceeding 76:17 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 proference 87:8,8 proceeding 144:6 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 proference 87:8,8 proceeding 144:6 proposal 72:6 publicl 110:15 R 67:1 68:1	-	-	· · · · ·	-	101:8 114:15
PPAs 82:23 probably 91:23 program (11:11) program (11:11) program (11:11) provision 136:5.6 provision 136:5.6<					115:8 118:21,23
practical 119:18 99:19 112:12,14 118:2 119:5 120:5 proxy 132:14 questionable practices 80:20 112:24 141:20 protect 68:2 71:1 prodem 100:1 139:16 114:17 113:3 126:19 project 68:2 71:1 prodem 179:20 109:16 110:19 139:16 precedent 142:7 problematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 88:11,12 96:5 14:11 115:23 preceding 122:21 126:10 project on 69:21 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 123:7,10 127:7,10 preference 103:13 136:3 procedura 142:2 proper 105:17 public 67:9,13 13:20 132:20 preference 103:13 136:3 116:9,9 99:22 70:18,24 138:20 13:20 132:20 property 115:13 proceeding 76:17 property 115:13 77:5,6 84:11,18 138:20 preference 103:16 126:14 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 protect 31:11 138:20 protect 129:21 80:14 88:2 90:14 78:17,17 81:7 PUC 131:11 124:10 quickly 84:17 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposal 126:24 96:21 96:21 96:21 138:144:11 <t< td=""><td>,</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td></t<>	,				,
practices 80:20 112:24 141:20 problem 100:1 139:16 pragmatically 112:24 problem 100:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudency 108:11 prudency 108:11 precedent 142:7 problematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 109:16 110:19 139:16 preceding 122:21 126:10 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 88:11,12 96:5 predated 84:16 procedural 136:1,8 project s 09:21 project s 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:9,11 130:6,9 97:20 99:3 106:9 Procedures 142:2 prolong 116:3 proper 105:17 public 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 97:20 99:3 106:9 Proceeding 76:17 proper 105:17 public 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 preference 103:13 136:3 116:9,9 77:5,6 84:11,18 138:20 preferences 103:16 proceeding 76:17 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 profeerence 8103:16 proceedings 144:6 122:2 103:17 127:13,23 124:10 proceed 77:5 80:1 proposal 72:6 problicly 110:15 PUC 131:11 publicly 110:15 present 68:20 116:9 177:14,14 proposal 126:24 96:21 88:18 93:4				-	
practices 00.20 problem 102.24 problem 100:1 product y 100:11 product y 100:11 114:17 113:3 126:19 problem 100:1 113:3 126:19 project 68:2 71:1 prudent 79:20 precedent 142:7 problematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 prudent 79:20 111:2 questions 71:13,16 preceding 122:21 126:10 procedural 136:1,8 project 68:2 71:1 project 68:2 71:1 project 68:2 71:1 project 68:2 71:1 prudent 79:20 111:2 questions 71:13,16 predated 84:16 procedural 136:1,8 project 68:2 71:1 project 69:2 70:18,24 123:10 127:7,10 129:12:20 139:15,22:20 139:15,22:24 139:15,22:24 139:15,22:24 139:15,22:24 139:15,22:24 138:20 138:20 138:20 138:20 138:20 124:10 124:10 124:10 124:10 124:10 124:10 124:10	-	· · · · ·			-
114:17 113:3 126:19 problematic 123:25 problematic 123:25 109:16 110:19 74:19,23 80:18 preceding 122:21 problematic 123:25 12:5 122:6,24 111:2 111:2 predetd 84:16 procedural 136:1,8 procedural 136:1,8 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 123:7,10 127:7,10 prefer 71:12,25 Procedures 142:2 projects 101:10 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:9,11 130:6,9 preference 103:13 136:3 proceed 133:12,15 proper 105:17 public 67:9,13 69:22 70:18,24 preferences 103:16 126:14 proceeding 144:6 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 preferend 87:8,8 proceeding 144:6 proposal 72:6 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 14:11 12:2 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 96:21 proposal 126:24 proposal 126:24 p6:21 p11:11 139:16	-				
precedent 142:7 problematic 123:25 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 111:2 88:11,12 96:5 preceding 122:21 126:10 121:25 122:6,24 111:2 111:2 88:11,12 96:5 predated 84:16 procedural 136:1,8 projections 69:21 PSE 86:12 88:18 123:7,10 127:7,10 prefer 71:12,25 Procedures 142:2 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:9,11 130:6,9 97:20 99:3 106:9 Procedures 142:2 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 128:9,11 130:6,9 prefer 71:12,25 proceed 133:12,15 project 105:17 public 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 preference 103:13 136:3 projection 78:5 69:22 70:18,24 138:20 preferences 103:16 126:14 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 preference 87:8,8 proceedings 144:6 122:2 128:1,11 publicly 110:15 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 104:25 114:11 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 96:21 104:25 114:11 139:16		-	1 0		
proceeding 122:21 procedural 136:1,8 procedural 136:1,8 projections 69:21 PSC 126:5 114:11 115:23 prefer 71:12,25 procedural 136:1,8 projections 69:21 projections 69:21 psE 86:12 88:18 123:7,10 127:7,10 97:20 99:3 106:9 Procedures 142:2 projects 101:10 ps2:0 125:16 131:20 132:20 131:20 132:20 123:1 132:14 projects 101:10 ps2:0 125:16 131:20 132:20 139:15,22,24 preference 103:13 136:3 projections 78:5 ps2:0 70:18,24 139:15,22,24 preferences 103:16 126:14 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 preferend 87:8,8 proceedings 144:6 122:2 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 124:10 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 ps2:3 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 139:16 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 proposal 126:24 96:21 pol:21 139:16					,
preceding 122.21 1120.110 1120.110 1120.111 1120.110 1		-	-		
prefer 71:12,25 Procedure 140:9 projections 0.121 1051:00:12:00:10 128:9,11 130:6,9 97:20 99:3 106:9 Procedures 142:2 projects 101:10 98:20 125:16 131:20 132:20 123:1,2 137:19 proceed 133:12,15 projects 105:17 public 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 139:15,22,24 preference 103:13 136:3 projection 78:5 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 103:17 128:1,11 138:20 preference 87:8,8 proceedings 144:6 proportion 78:5 proposal 72:6 103:17 128:1,11 124:10 90:2 96:13 97:5 100:2,3 117:22,25 80:14 80:14 82:20:12 128:1,11 124:10 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 proposal 72:6 Puget 75:25 81:13 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposal 126:24 96:21 96:21 139:16 present 68:20 118:4 118:4 122:24 96:21 96:21 139:16	. 0				
97:20 99:3 106:9 123:1,2 137:19Procedures 142:2 proceed 133:12,15prolong 116:3 proper 105:17126:4,7131:20 132:20preference 103:13 119:8,8 125:22136:3 proceeding 76:17proper 105:17 136:3public 67:9,13 69:22 70:18,24138:20preferences 103:16 128:22126:14 proceedings 144:6 proceedings 144:6proportion 78:5 proportion 78:569:22 70:18,24 77:5,6 84:11,18138:20preferences 103:16 90:2 96:13 97:5 100:2,3 117:22,25proceedings 144:6 proceedings 144:6proportion 78:5 proportion 78:585:1 87:24 88:1,2 103:17 127:13,23124:10 quickly 84:17preferences 103:16 90:2 96:13 97:5proceedings 144:6 procees 77:5 80:1proposal 72:6 80:14 88:2 90:14proposal 72:6 78:17,17 81:7publicly 110:15 PUC 131:11R 67:1 68:1 144:1 raise 80:18 93:4preparing 109:8 present 68:20116:9 117:14,14 118:4 10 122:14proposals 126:24 propose 81:196:21 pull 79:2096:21 pull 79:20139:16	L	– <i>i</i>			, , ,
123:1,2 137:19 proceed 133:12,15 proper 105:17 public 67:9,13 139:15,22,24 preference 103:13 136:3 proper 105:17 116:9,9 public 67:9,13 138:20 preferences 103:16 proceeding 76:17 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 138:20 preferences 103:16 126:14 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 124:10 poise 77:5 80:1 proceedings 144:6 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 124:10 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 87:24 125:24 86:14 88:7 89:12,12 86:18 93:4 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 96:21 104:25 114:11 139:16	-				· · · ·
preference 103:13 136:3 116:9,9 69:22 70:18,24 quick 120:25 preferences 103:16 proceeding 76:17 proportion 78:5 proportion 78:5 guick 120:25 preferences 103:16 126:14 proceedings 144:6 proportion 78:5 103:17 127:13,23 124:10 90:2 96:13 97:5 proceedings 144:6 proposal 72:6 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 quick 120:25 119:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 R preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 104:25 114:11 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 publicly 20 139:16			- 0		
119:8,8 125:22 128:22proceeding 76:17 87:12,17 116:21 126:14properly 115:13 proportion 78:5 proportionally77:5,6 84:11,18 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 103:17 127:13,23138:20 quickly 84:17 124:10prefered 87:8,8 90:2 96:13 97:5 100:2,3 117:22,25 119:24proceedings 144:6 process 77:5 80:1 90:15,21 98:10,20proportion 78:5 proposal 72:677:5,6 84:11,18 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 103:17 127:13,23138:20 quickly 84:17 124:10premature 126:1 preparing 109:8 present 68:2098:23 101:1 103:3 116:9 117:14,14122:2 proposal 72:6 78:17,17 81:7 140:1PUC 131:11 Puget 75:25 81:13 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 pointRR 67:1 68:1 144:1 raise 80:18 93:4 104:25 114:11 139:16		-		-	
119.6,6 125.22 proceeding 76.17 property 115.15 77.5,6 64.11,16 128:22 87:12,17 116:21 proportion 78:5 85:1 87:24 88:1,2 124:10 preferences 103:16 proceedings 144:6 proportionally 122:2 103:17 127:13,23 124:10 90:2 96:13 97:5 proceedings 144:6 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 124:10 quickly 84:17 19:24 points 77:5 80:1 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 PUC 131:11 R 67:1 68:1 144:1 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 104:25 114:11 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 139:16	-		,	· · · · ·	-
preferences 103:16 126:14 proportionally 103:17 127:13,23 124:10 preferred 87:8,8 proceedings 144:6 proposal 72:6 128:1,11 101:15 124:10 90:2 96:13 97:5 80:14 88:2 90:14 proposal 72:6 proposal 72:6 128:1,11 101:15 19:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 Puget 75:25 81:13 86:7 89:12,12 R preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 104:25 114:11 104:25 114:11 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 139:16	,	proceeding 76:17		77:5,6 84:11,18	
preferred 87:8,8 proceedings 144:6 proportionally 123:17 127:13,23 90:2 96:13 97:5 proceedings 144:6 122:2 128:1,11 100:2,3 117:22,25 80:14 88:2 90:14 78:17,17 81:7 publicly 110:15 119:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 Puget 75:25 81:13 R 67:1 68:1 144:1 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 104:25 114:11	128:22	87:12,17 116:21	proportion 78:5	85:1 87:24 88:1,2	· ·
90:2 96:13 97:5 process 77:5 80:1 proposal 72:6 publicly 110:15 100:2,3 117:22,25 80:14 88:2 90:14 78:17,17 81:7 publicly 110:15 119:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 Puget 75:25 81:13 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 pull 79:20	preferences 103:16	126:14	proportionally	103:17 127:13,23	
90:2 96:13 97:5 100:2,3 117:22,25 process 77:5 80:1 80:14 88:2 90:14 proposal 72:6 78:17,17 81:7 publicly 110:15 PUC 131:11 R 90:2 96:13 97:5 119:24 90:14 88:2 90:14 90:15,21 98:10,20 97:5 80:1 87:24 125:24 publicly 110:15 PUC 131:11 R 90:2 96:13 97:5 119:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 Puget 75:25 81:13 R 67:1 68:1 144:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 104:25 114:11 preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 104:25 114:11	preferred 87:8,8	proceedings 144:6	122:2	128:1,11	quite 114:7 128:20
100:2,3 117:22,25 80:14 88:2 90:14 78:17,17 81:7 PUC 131:11 119:24 90:15,21 98:10,20 87:24 125:24 Puget 75:25 81:13 R 67:1 68:1 144:1 premature 126:1 98:23 101:1 103:3 140:1 88:7 89:12,12 96:21 104:25 114:11 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 139:16	▲ ,		proposal 72:6		
119:2490:15,21 98:10,2087:24 125:24Puget 75:25 81:13R 67:1 68:1 144:1premature 126:198:23 101:1 103:3140:188:7 89:12,12104:25 114:11preparing 109:8116:9 117:14,14proposals 126:2496:21104:25 114:11present 68:20118:4 10 122:14propose 81:1pull 79:20139:16		I ▲			
premature 126:1 preparing 109:898:23 101:1 103:3 116:9 117:14,14140:1 proposals 126:2488:7 89:12,12 96:21raise 80:18 93:4 104:25 114:11 139:16present 68:20118:4 10 122:14propose 81:1pull 79:20					
preparing 109:8 116:9 117:14,14 proposals 126:24 96:21 104:25 114:11 present 68:20 118:4 10 122:14 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 139:16				0	raise 80:18 93:4
present 68:20 118:4:10:122:14 propose 81:1 pull 79:20 139:16	-				104:25 114:11
raised 73:20 77:1		,			139:16
	present 00.20	110.4,10 122.14	highose of the		raised 73:20 77:1
		l	l	l	l

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC

	-			<u> </u>
79:5 85:19 97:8	reasoning 73:1,9	126:12	requests 121:9	139:22 141:2
139:4	reasons 70:10	relatedly 126:12	require 128:2	responded 117:4
raising 111:18	119:14	relates 113:17	136:21	Respondent 66:10
127:3	REC 81:16	relating 70:15	required 120:7	response 84:1,3,9
ramifications 91:10	received 80:22 82:5	relationship 100:17	136:25	116:11 120:25
ramp 114:20	109:12 144:11	relative 132:20	requirement 85:11	132:10
116:13	RECESSED 66:12	144:12	92:11 99:24	responsibility
ran 81:6 99:12	recommendation	reliability 86:20	119:10,12	135:6
Randy 68:23	71:20 86:4 87:16	reliance 111:7	requirements 115:6	responsive 69:17
106:11,24 107:2	116:24 137:3	rely 115:4 124:25	124:18,20 125:1	83:17
107:19 110:5	recommendations	140:2	129:19 135:6	rest 130:15 134:8
rate 80:23,25 93:20	74:18 82:9 139:3	remind 103:7	requires 138:16	135:18 137:16,17
96:25	recommended 70:2	remove 93:16	141:14	138:1 143:6
rates 89:17 99:17	131:2 137:15	125:10 140:4	reset 134:8	restarting 82:9
104:10	recommending	Rendahl 66:22	resolution 99:10	138:6
rating 82:6 93:14	139:5	71:17,18 72:2	119:2 138:21	result 101:2 110:20
93:24 94:13	recommends 71:6	73:16 74:11,12	141:24	resulting 140:15
ratings 82:5	record 74:15 75:9	75:8 98:2,3	resolve 73:11 96:6	return 93:5,21
rational 125:25	87:19 116:8 125:7	100:19 102:11	128:22 133:19	revenue 85:11
reach 101:19 113:9	128:19,22 131:17	103:6 113:25	140:19	review 69:19 80:13
119:14 141:24	recording 144:11	114:3 118:15,23	resolved 112:12	126:23 138:15
reached 117:6	recordings 144:7	119:25 120:3,14	138:24	140:10
ready 140:25	recovery 104:12	120:18 121:3	resource 69:21	reviewing 144:10
142:19	126:13	123:14 127:22	79:25 80:5,8 85:4	revise 82:25
real 95:21 100:1	RECs 79:25 80:1,4	130:20 132:1	89:19 90:3 92:1,1	revised 69:19 77:7
114:15	80:6,10 82:1	133:16 135:10,25	92:2 105:19,22,24	92:24,24
really 82:14,16	86:23 88:8	136:20 137:2,4,16	108:4,5,25 109:22	revisions 77:9
86:21 88:9 90:24	reduce 88:18	137:18,23 138:2,7	133:5	revisit 133:14
93:17 94:17 95:2	reducing 114:6	139:25 141:3	resources 77:16	RFP 79:15,21 82:9
95:10 98:13	reduction 70:3	142:18	78:3,7,11,20,24	109:9 128:3
100:25 101:7	88:22,25	Rendahl's 142:2	79:1,4,7,7,8,17,23	132:16 138:6
102:25 103:22	reference 141:6	Rendhal 69:9	80:17 81:4 82:3	rhetorical 88:15
104:1 105:23	refine 122:14	renewable 71:2	88:10 89:25 90:1	rid 107:7
106:21 111:15	refinement 122:10	78:10 95:22 131:1	90:2 91:8,13,16	right 71:15 74:10
112:3 113:14	reflected 92:24	131:6	91:23 95:18 97:18	85:25 86:13 88:12
114:19,22 115:6	regarding 87:24	repeal 110:7	99:15 101:6,9	89:7 92:8 95:6
115:11 116:25	97:7 131:12	replaced 79:1	103:14,16,19	96:1 98:1 102:24
125:6 126:22,23	regardless 140:14	reply 115:24	104:7 105:18	108:22 110:14
128:6 129:11,22	regards 111:4	123:11 127:11	106:20 108:12	115:22,25 116:22
133:7,10 134:13	regulatory 68:25	128:13 130:11	109:11,17,18	118:11,18 120:8
135:17 140:19	69:10,10 75:10	131:21 133:1	111:5 124:15	121:14,15,19
reason 90:1 115:2	127:23	represent 122:4	131:6 132:14,17	123:12,15 125:20
117:21	reject 120:21	repricing 79:17	138:22	127:8 128:10,14
reasonable 97:7	relate 132:19	request 88:18	respecting 104:17	129:5,18 130:2,12
reasonably 106:7	related 76:20	requested 117:7	respond 121:3	131:19,24 132:23

				ÿ
133:2,22 134:24	second 108:17	136:10 137:25,25	137:24	121:4 135:22
135:23 137:1	113:17 116:24	settle 73:5	simple 74:5	137:21,23
138:10 139:23	143:1	settlement 70:23	simplify 100:14	sort 72:12 73:8
141:1,6,15 142:18	see 75:5 82:1 83:18	73:7,21 74:7	simply 133:8	118:16 123:23
143:2	88:5 93:14 94:8	76:22 77:3 113:12	134:15	124:8 126:11,16
risk 86:22 87:4,6	94:13 102:19	122:9	simultaneously	126:25 133:16
106:15,15 110:18	107:21 108:19	seven 103:4	110:2	134:7,21
112:17 113:1	110:18 123:16,18	shake 126:22	single 99:7	sounds 94:17,24,25
124:16	130:20 135:21	shaky 109:3	single-state 89:12	112:1 141:18
risks 87:13	141:24	share 78:3,23 79:9	sitting 134:1	142:9
Roberson 67:10	seeing 76:2 102:23	80:4 104:13	situated 75:24	source 79:15
73:23 74:2,4,13	103:3 107:1 110:7	shares 92:3 104:6	82:24 89:11	southern 90:10
133:24 135:21,25	130:18 131:3	sharing 79:2	situation 81:18	speak 74:1 108:21
136:23 141:2,3	132:18 141:15,16	shift 108:10	82:5,7,12 85:25	132:25
Rogala 67:19	seen 80:24 103:4	shine 110:3	86:2 94:8 103:21	speaking 108:3,8
138:10,11,12,14	126:25 129:21	short 73:12,21	117:7,7	114:17
139:2,11,24	140:21 142:7	75:11 118:20,25	situations 82:14	specific 70:13
room 132:24	self-sufficient 94:20	short-term 81:16	83:3	77:12,18,21 96:21
Rose 68:15 128:16	sellers 89:23	shortfall 115:2	situs 91:7,13,21	98:16 100:5
128:18 130:25	sending 137:5	shortly 76:13	95:18 101:2,11	114:13 132:14
rule 105:11 109:11	sensitivities 100:1	show 79:19 81:23	six 101:17 105:25	139:6,13
109:12 110:6,8,21	separate 77:6	97:17 114:14	110:2	specifics 115:10
121:7,12	126:14	118:1,1,2	six-state 77:14	split 92:3
rulemaking 76:4	serve 81:4 83:11	shows 97:2	79:10 89:15 100:9	Square 66:16
rules 121:5,7 136:2	91:14 99:15 104:9	Shute 68:4	135:16	staff 67:2 69:17
run 82:14 99:11	served 90:18	sic 122:3	sketchy 103:10	70:15,21 71:6,12
100:1,2,5 101:23	serves 104:4	side 83:8	ski 108:7	71:24,25 72:22,25
105:19	service 82:21	Sierra 68:14,16	slide 76:9 77:10	74:16,19,21 76:10
runs 82:12 99:18	103:17	71:2 128:16,18,22	83:13,25 85:17	76:24 77:24 82:9
	services 69:11	130:9 131:2	slides 121:16	85:20 93:3,3,13
S S	servicing 74:22	signal 73:17	smooth 95:6	94:4 97:8 98:5,8
S 67:1 68:1	serving 81:7	signatories 101:20	social 99:13	99:11 111:20
s/144:24	set 103:24 104:3	signed 102:5	solar 90:10 92:1,2	112:1 115:9,17,20
San 68:6	105:21 112:11,23	121:22	94:21 95:22 101:9	117:2,5 119:14,24
savings 83:16	113:7,9,12 119:16	significant 76:16	101:10	124:23 125:14
132:14	121:10,13 124:7	79:17 82:2 91:13	solution 93:20,21	128:2 130:17,19
saying 94:17	136:12,15 137:16	107:16 109:21	116:23	131:9 134:11
123:21 130:25	137:17,19 140:17	114:24 115:2	somewhat 82:24	135:4,7,12 136:17
138:24	144:15	129:12	89:22	136:23 137:24
says 72:17 132:13	sets 72:10 103:15	significantly	soon 110:16	139:5 140:2
scale 105:1 111:13	103:21 113:4	108:10 115:7	sooner 140:24	Staff's 69:19 70:24
scenario 124:14	114:22	similar 78:17 112:3	sorry 70:8,25 75:7	71:20 72:5,10
scheme 98:22	setting 97:12	Simmons 67:11	101:12 107:23	73:9 74:18 87:16
scope 126:16	116:20 119:21	69:6,8,10 71:16	111:12 113:25	87:24 114:25
SE 66:16 68:11	124:5 131:12	72:1 120:2 137:21	114:2 118:22	122:4,17 129:14
Seattle 67:16				

				ŭ
130:5	statutory 71:23	Summer 68:9	100:9 107:15,16	123:6,9,12,18
stakeholder 94:11	72:7 74:6 93:4	123:14,15	112:16 113:4,18	127:8,12 128:10
123:22,25 125:13	98:22 106:15	supply 79:15 111:1	112:10 113:1,10	128:14,15,19
129:6	107:4 115:6	support 71:4	target 70:13 88:18	130:7,8,12,17,19
stakeholders 83:19	118:24	122:17 128:1	88:21 108:14	131:18,19,23,25
102:25	stay 94:23 97:15	134:3 139:7	134:13	132:23 134:24
standard 82:1	105:10 109:12	supportive 122:18	targets 69:19 70:4	135:1 137:1
standards 86:14	110:6,6,9	supports 135:18	70:16,21 76:25	139:11,23 141:7
97:12 116:21	staying 80:11	supposed 100:2	77:12 79:15 81:14	143:3,5
standpoint 124:6	step 95:21	sure 72:15 80:11	81:21 85:16 92:25	thankful 85:21
start 78:1 81:13	Stephanie 68:25	83:6 88:16 94:10	93:1 109:24	thanks 74:22,24
88:14 91:7 92:18	127:13,23	98:7,24 112:7	112:15,19,23	97:25 130:15
93:2,17 105:18	steps 85:3	126:7 129:1 132:8	113:5,23 114:5,7	theme 98:4
117:8 123:20	stipulation 86:6	133:12 135:11	114:13,18,23,24	theoretically
124:11	96:24,25 118:6	137:7,8	115:1 116:11	136:11
started 79:11,20	stop 108:20 139:20	surprised 123:22	120:9 128:6 129:2	thermal 69:21
81:10	straight 138:23	surrounding 79:13	130:4 134:22	70:11
starting 90:24	Strauss 67:3	suspect 108:16	135:18,20 136:22	thing 72:22 98:6
118:19 122:5,10	134:25 135:1	swings 93:11	139:6	111:13 116:14,15
129:6 138:5	streamline 138:22	sympathize 100:19	task 75:18	129:13 131:17
state 68:25 92:18	Street 67:21 68:5	synthesized 107:13	tasks 102:13	134:14 137:20
100:5 103:15,24	68:11,17	system 77:16 78:5	tax 103:25	140:17 142:17
104:2,3 109:25	strides 109:21	78:22,23 79:3,10	team 95:16 105:7	things 77:13 83:1
121:8 122:22	stripped 80:6	80:5 83:8 89:20	106:6 132:4,5	89:7 94:6 95:17
127:24 136:2	strive 104:5 105:14	90:6 91:9,10 92:5	technology 105:22	101:11 108:15
141:14,19 142:3	105:15 106:14	92:19 99:7,15	106:17	109:9 110:15
144:2	striving 84:12	100:3,9 102:18	tell 99:24	111:8,24 112:4
state's 83:4 104:5	107:10 132:8	104:11 105:10,12	tend 96:13	124:1,2,5 133:9
104:17,18 109:22	strong 110:22	106:3 109:13,15	TEP 132:3	think 72:2 73:5,13
state-preferred	139:3	129:20 135:16	term 88:10 89:13	74:4 81:12 87:18
101:2	struggle 100:13		122:1	89:6 91:21 94:2
state-specific 101:5	132:12	$\frac{\mathbf{T}}{\mathbf{T}}$	terms 73:6 95:2	94:17 95:14 96:8
stated 76:24 116:4	stuff 136:11	T 144:1,1	100:21 108:11	96:23 97:4,6,9,20
132:6	subject 71:9	table 142:8	142:11	98:16 99:5 104:23
statement 141:6	submit 135:5	take 71:4 72:23	tested 107:25	105:15,16,18
states 77:17 79:3	submitted 131:2	75:13 79:4 92:2,3	testify 121:22	106:5,11,12,18
80:6 83:2,9 90:19	subsequent 142:12	93:13 94:6 101:8	thank 69:6 71:15	108:7 110:5
90:20 91:1,2,23	succinct 100:25	101:21 104:6	72:20 73:19 74:10	111:13,16 113:7,8
94:20 101:17	sufficient 81:9	109:14 118:18	75:14 83:25 84:10	113:20 115:18
104:4,7 109:10	114:12	137:13 142:8	85:17 98:1,3	116:19,23 117:8
110:2 129:25	suggest 140:23	talk 96:20 106:25	103:6 111:18,23	117:12,12,13
status 100:25	suggestion 137:13	112:4,9 113:20	114:3 115:21,22	119:4,4,5,13,21
statute 72:13 86:19	Suite 67:15,21	116:25 117:16,16 124:2	115:25 118:11	120:5,18 121:11
87:24 94:4 121:6	68:11,17	talked 93:24 117:5	119:11 120:3	123:6,25 124:1,1
140:3	sum 130:3	talking 82:16 99:20	121:14,19,23	124:6,9 125:2,5,9
		taiking 02.10 99.20		
L				

Page	159

[1 age 100
125:18,25 126:4	131:8,17 133:13	120:11 126:3	uniquely 82:24	valuable 118:20
127:3 128:24	137:8 140:16	140:19	Unit 67:13 127:14	119:20
129:16 132:11,12	today's 143:3	turn 98:11 120:12	127:24	value 133:11 137:9
132:17 133:17,22	Tom 68:24 108:19	121:20 127:13	units 84:6 104:8	Van 68:10
132:17 135:17,22	108:23,24 117:17	turned 74:2 107:23	unreasonably	version 86:9
137:6 138:2,15,19	132:5	two 69:24 75:25	81:20 86:25	versus 96:21,21
139:16 140:14,16	ton 105:25	79:12 81:5 82:5,6	unrecovered	vice 75:9 108:25
	tools 94:5	97:20 111:1,24	104:11	
141:3,9,11,17,20		,	unusual 140:20	video 74:3 130:18
141:22 142:14	topics 111:25	119:3 136:14		view 98:21 108:11
thinking 96:1	total 69:24 70:7,8	two-year 91:2	update 69:13,13,15	109:22
120:14 135:2	tough 88:6	U	69:17,18 70:3,4	viewed 81:21
third 136:15	track 85:5 129:1	UE-210305 85:2	70:19 71:11 74:16	violation 72:14
thorny 113:14	tracking 122:8,14	UE-210303 85.2 UE-210829 66:7	75:13 76:13,24	VOLUME 66:12
thorough 76:19	traditionally 99:7		82:25 85:9,10	vs 66:7
129:22	training 107:7	69:5,12 71:7,11	86:5 91:1 97:6	vulnerable 122:8
thought 76:18	transcribed 66:24	142:22	105:7 107:17	122:14
118:17 133:16	144:7	UE-230904 70:17	109:20 113:21	
thoughts 72:17	transcript 144:8,10	unable 122:21	114:4 117:18	
133:15 142:4	transcriptionist	133:7	119:19 120:8	WA 68:25
three 69:25 84:7	144:8	uncertainty 112:17	121:5,8,25 123:4	waiting 110:19
throw 142:17	transition 90:7	130:23	124:13 128:3,23	waiving 74:8
throwing 118:13	113:6 115:7	unclear 112:20	142:25	walk 75:11 120:8
tie 88:17	transmission 92:16	113:2	updated 70:12	want 73:17,25
ties 81:12	transparency	uncontested 138:21	76:24 77:12 83:21	75:13 86:22 88:2
time 74:19 76:1,16	131:15	underlie 114:14	84:6 106:23	88:14 94:10 99:2
87:10 90:2 92:19	transparent 95:5	underscore 129:4,9	updates 70:18 77:4	111:22 112:7
92:23 94:7 96:9	97:10 118:2	undersigned 144:5	83:15	113:13,17 116:25
97:14,16 102:8	transport 105:11	understand 74:17	use 70:11 77:14	119:17 121:2
106:19 110:19,25	109:11,12 110:20	84:14 85:19 96:8	89:18 94:5 101:7	127:5 128:6,21
117:15 118:20	transportation	97:22 98:10 99:5	132:15	129:4,9 130:17
119:20 124:1	66:2,5,15 90:4	100:17 106:15	Utah 78:15 79:3	132:8 134:10,10
133:5 134:1	treated 99:7 101:11	111:17 116:5	90:10,18 91:22	139:20,25 141:13
137:10 141:10	treating 101:13	117:23 118:4,4,8	94:19,21,22	141:23 142:1,6,7
142:19	treatment 83:20	126:2 132:17	101:25 102:6	142:15,20
timeline 119:18	trial 144:10	135:10 140:20	103:8,15,17,17,19	wanted 75:11 98:17
times 140:6	tried 84:2	141:11,12	104:15 129:24	99:11 111:24
timing 97:4 98:14	true 144:8	understanding	UTC 67:4	112:1 122:11,23
100:21,22 102:2	try 91:19 100:14	70:24 94:12	utilities 66:2,4,15	126:11 128:1
tips 108:7	102:9,14 113:9,11	140:10	75:16,17,20,23,25	129:13 130:1,24
today 69:11 72:23	trying 83:3,17	unfortunate 112:4	76:6 81:11 87:2	131:17 132:2,2
73:3 74:15 98:7	84:23 85:15 86:13	113:7	133:9 141:19	136:9 141:1
113:1,10 118:25	86:19 87:3,14	unfortunately 81:6	utility 75:21 77:14	wanting 83:6
119:5,10,12 120:5	89:15 92:22 95:10	102:3,7 121:13	88:3 89:12,15	wants 108:19
120:8 123:4 128:4	102:16 104:1	138:18	96:21 104:4,12	136:23
128:8,20 129:3,18	111:3 113:16	unique 77:13 82:5	·	War 77:14
		85:25	V	Ware 68:21 130:14
		I	Ι	I

				•
130:21 131:20	122:12 126:18	worked 98:14	123:10	79:12,15 90:22
Washington 66:1,4	127:1 131:8,24	107:25		101:4,22
66:15,17 67:4,7	132:7,13 135:8	working 84:13,17	Z	2021 70:22 76:13
67:14,16 68:11	137:7 142:9 143:6	91:18 97:16 100:4	Zach 138:10,11	81:10
77:18,19,21 78:9	we've 72:24 80:20	102:9,9,13,14,18	139:24	2022 83:16 109:9
78:19,25 80:4	80:22,24 82:5	122:6 130:19	Zachary 67:19	2023 69:12,16,16
81:4 83:10,10	84:13 85:2,6	workload 141:11	Zakai 68:3 121:22	70:5 71:9 75:12
90:20 91:3,14,16	89:16 90:14,16,21	workshops 122:9	121:23	81:3 90:25 91:1
91:25 93:18 95:23	91:9,18 93:6	122:11	zero 97:15	109:8 123:4
99:16,16,24	95:17 99:6 102:25	world 94:16		2024 66:13 69:2,18
101:18 104:9,9	105:7,9,12 106:17	worried 93:2	0	70:1,5 78:2
111:14 122:22	112:15 113:18	worries 137:24	0.4 85:12	112:11,14 113:4
127:24 129:24	120:6 129:21	worry 108:1,1	1	131:6 138:6
135:15 140:8	139:4	124:20 126:8		144:16
142:3 144:2	web 85:3	worth 137:5	1 69:16 71:8 105:2	2024/2025 70:14
Washington's	Webster 68:17	wouldn't 118:14	107:15 128:2	2025 70:6 83:16
104:13	week 98:12	wrapped 125:4	134:17 136:19	86:8 88:18 107:16
way 76:5,11 86:15	weekend 143:5	wrong 92:19	137:14,25,25	111:10 112:14,20
91:5,6 95:1 97:17	Weinberger 68:4	141:17	138:6,17	113:5 129:4
98:23 101:13	welcome 86:10	Wyoming 90:8	1,000 72:10	130:25 131:16
102:10,17 105:15	went 80:19	91:22 94:19,21	1.1 113:21 114:2,19 1.35 85:12	2026 114:23 115:1
107:12 119:9	weren't 79:18 81:8	101:25 102:6	1.35 85:12 10 105:2 112:13	2029 97:11 114:23
124:16	west 83:8	103:8,10,11,23,24	10 105:2 112:15 10,000 72:14	115:1
ways 100:4	Western 71:1	129:25	10,000 72:14 100 92:2 95:24	2030 81:21,23 89:5
we'll 71:13 106:19	WHEREOF		100 92:2 95:24 137:12	94:17 95:3 104:19
117:17,18,19	144:15	X	1 37:12 107 68:11	105:4,6,15 106:7
we're 76:1,1 81:15	WIJAM 77:18		10 7 08:11 11 69:18 70:1	106:13,14,19
81:23 82:3,6,14	101:18,18	<u>Y</u>	1300 68:17	108:7,14 109:24
82:15 83:3 85:14	willing 97:2 115:17	yeah 73:19 88:20	1300 08.17 144 66:10	114:21 115:4
85:25 86:5,20	wind 90:8,9 94:21	93:23 95:4 107:2	144 00.10 15 125:19 139:13	117:24 132:7
87:13,14 89:7,15	94:21 95:22	107:9 108:3 110:4	15 125.19 159.15 1500 67:21	141:15
90:7,21,24,25	winter 90:12	111:11,17,19	16 70:5	2045 81:24 104:19
91:20 92:6,17,22	wish 121:20	114:4 116:2	10 70.3 19.405.090 72:13	106:17
93:1,5 94:10 95:6	wishes 132:24	117:20 118:13	19.403.090 72.13 1st 110:17	2050 105:9
95:20 96:24 97:3	withheld 80:10	123:16 138:9	180 110.17	2101 68:17
97:16 98:7 100:2	WITNESS 130:15	141:8,9 142:5	2	22 66:13 69:2
100:4 101:10	144:15	year 83:17 85:12	2 72:5,9 107:15	23 109:20
102:1,16,18,23	wondering 133:14	91:19 100:21	114:9 134:5,18	24/25 70:15
103:1 107:15,16	137:13	101:23 112:20	140:3	25 88:21 93:10
108:15 109:21,23	Woodland 66:16	114:10 116:15	20 93:10 97:15	28.3 70:8
111:15 112:13	work 79:23 92:22	131:6	200 92:1	28th 144:16
113:4,16 114:9	93:8,12 94:8,9	years 79:13 80:25	2000 67:15	
116:15 117:14,14	98:9 99:8 111:1	81:5 91:19 97:10	2005 90:16	3
117:17 118:7,16	113:16 126:4,5	100:23 103:5	2015 96:14 103:3	3 129:14
119:4,5 120:4,5,7	134:11 135:14	Yochanan 68:3	2020 77:14,20,23	38 70:6 88:25
		Yochi 121:22		396 68:5
	1	I	I	I

	00504 66.17 67.7	1	l
4	98504 66:17 67:7		
40 112:19,24			
40128 67:6			
430 68:11			
45 70:6 88:22			
5			
5 88:19			
5,000 72:11			
50 70:21			
6			
6 122:4,18 125:11			
139:12			
60 112:20,24			
621 66:16			
66 66:10			
7			
7 122:4,18 125:11			
126:12 127:4			
139:12			
8			
8 92:1 95:21 104:10			
104:12,14 111:14			
112:13 113:21			
114:2 134:17			
136:19 137:14,25			
137:25 138:17			
80 115:3,15			
80.04.380 72:10			
800 67:15			
825 67:21			
9			
9 72:5,12 112:3			
113:18 115:10,10			
115:16,19 124:12			
125:9 134:6 139:5			
139:9 140:5			
94102 68:6			
94612 68:18			
97214 68:12			
97232 67:22			
98104 67:16			
	1		1