# Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V

# WUTC v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation

June 1, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

COURT REPORTING AND LEGAL VIDEO

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 www.buellrealtime.com email: info@buellrealtime.com



| Dave 1   |   |
|--|---|
| Page 1   | Page 3  |
| BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION   | 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED   |
| COMMISSION   | 2 For AWEC:   |
|  | 3 CHAD STOKES   |
|  | Cable Huston, LLP   |
|  | 4 1455 Southwest Broadway<br>Suite 1500   |
| Plaintiffs, ) No. UG-210755  | 5 Portland, Oregon 97201  |
| )  | 503.224.3092  |
| vs. )  | 6 Cstokes@cablehuston.com   |
| )  | 7   |
| CASCADE NATURAL GAS )  | For The Energy Project:   |
| CORPORATION, )   | 8<br>YOCHI ZAKAI  |
| Defendants.  | 9 Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, LLC   |
| Defendants. )  | 396 Hayes Street  |
| VIDEOCONFERENCE EVIDENTIARY HEARING - VOLUME IV  | 10 San Francisco, California 94102  |
| BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE SAMANTHA DOYLE   | 415.552.7272  |
|  | 11 Yzakai@smwlaw.com  |
|  | 12 * * * * *  |
| (All participants appearing via videoconference.)  | 13<br>14  |
|  | 15  |
|  | 16  |
|  | 17  |
|  | 18  |
|  | 19  |
|  | 20<br>21  |
|  | 21 22   |
|  | 23  |
| DATE TAKEN: JUNE 1, 2022   | 24  |
| REPORTED BY: LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186   | 25  |
|  |   |
| Page 2   | Page 4  |
| 1 APPEARANCES  | 1 EXAMINATION INDEX   |
| 2 Administrative Law Judges:   | 2 WITNESS NAME PAGE   |
| 3 SAMANTHA DOYLE<br>RAYNE PEARSON  | 3 MARK CHILES   |
| 4  | Cross-examination by Ms. Paisner 23<br>4 Cross-examination by Mr. Stokes 32   |
| 5 WUTC Chair:<br>6 DAVE DANNER   | Redirect examination by Ms. Barnett 50  |
| 7  | 5 Questioning by Chair Danner 52  |
| WUTC Commissioner:   | Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl 58<br>6 Questioning (continued) by Chair Danner 70  |
| ° ANN RENDAHL  | Questioning (continued) by Chair Danner 76  |
| 9<br>10 - Fax Occase day   | 7 Questioning (continued) by Commissioner Rendahl 77  |
| 10 For Cascade:<br>11 DONNA BARNETT  | 8 JOANNA HUANG  |
| MEGAN LIN  | Questioning by Chair Danner 74<br>9 Questioning (continued) by Chair Danner 79  |
| 12 Perkins Coie LLP<br>10885 Northeast 4th Street  | 10 MARK CHILES and JOANNA HUANG   |
| 13 Suite 700   | Joint questioning by Commissioner Rendahl 79  |
|  | 11  |
| Bellevue, Washington 98004   | MARK GARRETT  |
| 14 425.635.1419<br>Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com  | MARK GARRETT<br>12 Questioning by Chair Danner 87   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com   | 12Questioning by Chair Danner8713BRADLEY MULLINS  |
| 14 425.635.1419<br>Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com  | 12Questioning by Chair Danner8713BRADLEY MULLINSQuestioning by Chair Danner91   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16       For Staff:       17  | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS  |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16       For Staff:       17       NASH CALLAGHAN   | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       91         14       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93   |
| 14       425.635.1419         Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com         15       MLin@perkinscoie.com         16       For Staff:         17       NASH CALLAGHAN         18       Washington State Attorney General's Office         P.O. Box 40128  | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       91         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16     For Staff:       17     NASH CALLAGHAN       18     Washington State Attorney General's Office       19     Olympia, Washington 98504  | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       91         14       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16       For Staff:       17       NASH CALLAGHAN       18     Washington State Attorney General's Office       P.O. Box 40128       19     Olympia, Washington 98504       360.915.4521       20     Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov   | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       91         14       91         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       102   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16     For Staff:       17     NASH CALLAGHAN       18     Washington State Attorney General's Office       19     Olympia, Washington 98504       360.915.4521     20       20     Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov   | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102   |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16       For Staff:       17       NASH CALLAGHAN       18     Washington State Attorney General's Office       P.O. Box 40128       19     Olympia, Washington 98504       360.915.4521       20     Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov   | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102         18       19   |
| 14       425.635.1419         Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com         15       MLin@perkinscoie.com         16         For Staff:         17       NASH CALLAGHAN         18       Washington State Attorney General's Office         P.O. Box 40128       0         19       Olympia, Washington 98504         360.915.4521       20         Vash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov         21       Public Counsel:         22       ANN PAISNER   | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102         18       19         20       21   |
| 14       425.635.1419         Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com         15       MLin@perkinscoie.com         16       For Staff:         17       NASH CALLAGHAN         18       Washington State Attorney General's Office         19       Olympia, Washington 98504         360.915.4521       Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov         20       Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov         21       Public Counsel:         22       ANN PAISNER         23       Washington State Attorney General's Office  | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102         18       19         20       21         22       22                     |
| 14       425.635.1419         Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com         15       MLin@perkinscoie.com         16       For Staff:         17       NASH CALLAGHAN         18       Washington State Attorney General's Office         P.O. Box 40128       Olympia, Washington 98504         360.915.4521       Olympia, Washington 98504         20       Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov         21       Public Counsel:         22       ANN PAISNER         23       Washington State Attorney General's Office         8025 36th Avenue Northeast       24         24       Seattle, Washington 98115 | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         19       20         21       22         23       23  |
| 14     425.635.1419       Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com       15     MLin@perkinscoie.com       16     For Staff:       17     NASH CALLAGHAN       18     Washington State Attorney General's Office       19     Olympia, Washington 98504       360.915.4521     Outropia, Washington 98504       20     Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov       21     Public Counsel:       22     ANN PAISNER       23     Washington State Attorney General's Office       8025 36th Avenue Northeast       24     Seattle, Washington 98115       941.356.4851  | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102         18       19         20       21         22       22                     |
| 14       425.635.1419         Dbarnett@perkinscoie.com         15       MLin@perkinscoie.com         16       For Staff:         17       NASH CALLAGHAN         18       Washington State Attorney General's Office         P.O. Box 40128       Olympia, Washington 98504         360.915.4521       Olympia, Washington 98504         20       Nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov         21       Public Counsel:         22       ANN PAISNER         23       Washington State Attorney General's Office         8025 36th Avenue Northeast       24         24       Seattle, Washington 98115 | 12       Questioning by Chair Danner       87         13       BRADLEY MULLINS       Questioning by Chair Danner       91         14       SHAWN COLLINS       93         15       Questioning by Chair Danner       93         Questioning by Commissioner Rendahl       95         16       TAMMY NYGARD         17       Questioning by Chair Danner       102         18       19         20       21         22       23         24       24 |

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

## Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|  | Page 5   |  | Page 7   |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | LACEY, WASHINGTON; JUNE 1, 2022  | 1  | Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger here today representing The   |
| 2  | 9:30 A.M.  | 2  | Energy Project. I use he/him pronouns.   |
| 3  | -000-  | 3  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, all.   |
| 4  |  | 4  | Let's start with a little housekeeping and   |
| 5  | JUDGE DOYLE: Good morning. Today is  | 5  | preliminary matters for the record.  |
| 6  | Wednesday, June 1st, 2022. It's approximately 9:30   | 6  | I will ask the parties if they're willing to   |
| 7  | a.m.   | 7  | stipulate to the admission of all the pre-filed exhibits   |
| 8  | We're here today for an evidentiary hearing in   | 8  | and testimony up to and including the cross-examination  |
| 9  | Docket UG-210 or 210755, which is captioned  | 9  | exhibits that were filed.  |
| 10   | Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission   | 10   | MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, Cascade does have   |
| 11   | versus Cascade Natural Gas Corporation.  | 11   | some objections to the both the initial well, I  |
| 12   | My name is Samantha Doyle. I'm the   | 12   | think it's just the initial exhibits filed by the  |
| 13   | administrative law judge with the Commission. I use  | 13   | AWEC and Public Counsel, and it's mainly just because  |
| 14   | she/her and they/them pronouns. I'm joined by Judge  | 14   | they are appear to be incomplete, not including  |
| 15   | Rayne Pearson, Chair Dave Danner, and Commissioner   | 15   | attachments. So I can go through those, if you would   |
| 16   | Rendahl.   | 16   | like, at this time.  |
| 17   | Let's begin by taking short form appearances   | 17   | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, what do you find  |
| 18   | from the parties. We'll begin with Cascade.  | 18   | incomplete?  |
| 19   | Please state your name, and feel free to provide   | 19   | MS. BARNETT: Let's see, just so for Exhibit  |
| 20   | your pronouns as well.   | 20   | NEG-16, that is a data request response to AWEC Data   |
| 21<br>22   | MS. BARNETT: Good morning. Thank you, Your<br>Honor.   | 21<br>22   | Request No. 65, and it it appears to include only the<br>initial response to the data request, but that data   |
| 23   | Donna Barnett, I use pronouns she/her, and I'm   | 23   | request was supplemented, so we would ask before it's  |
| 23   | with Perkins Coie, representing Cascade. And with me is  | 24   | admitted to include the supplement to it. So it's  |
| 25   | Megan Lin, also she/her pronouns, they/them from Perkins   | 25   | incomplete right now.  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Page 6   |  | Page 8   |
| 1  | Coie.  | 1  | And similarly, NEG-17c, that confidential  |
| 2  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.  | 2  | exhibit did not include Attachment A, which was part of  |
| 3  | And for Staff, please.   | 3  | that data request, so we would ask that the Attachment A   |
| 4  | MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning, Your Honor.   | 4  | be included. I understand the Attachment A to several  |
| 5  | This is Nash Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General on  | 5  | of these exhibits were a large Excel file, so they may   |
| 6  | behalf of commissioned staff. My pronouns are he/him.  | 6  | not have included that for for space, but for  |
| 7  | And joining me today is staff member Joanna Huang.   | 7  | admission, we don't object to admission as long as they  |
| 8  | JUDGE DOYLE: All right.  | 8  | are complete including the supplement and all  |
| 9  | And Public Counsel?  | 9<br>10  | attachments. So that would be for NEG-16, NEG-17c,<br>NEG-18. That was also including excluding Attachment   |
| 10   |  | 1 10   |  |
| 10<br>11   | MS. PAISNER: Good morning. This is Ann<br>Paisner. My propouns are sho/hor. I'm the assistant  | 1 11   |  |
| 11   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant  | 11<br>12   | Α.   |
| 11<br>12   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of   | 12   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a  |
| 11<br>12<br>13   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington Attorney General's office.   | 12<br>13   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,  |
| 11<br>12   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of   | 12   | <ul> <li>A.</li> <li>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br/>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br/>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete</li> </ul>  |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I m the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so   | 12<br>13<br>14   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,  |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I m the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.  |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include  |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad<br>Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of   | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include<br>Attachment A.   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad<br>Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of<br>Western Energy Consumers. And my pronouns are he/him.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.   | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include<br>Attachment A.<br>AWEC-38, that only included I think one page   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad<br>Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of<br>Western Energy Consumers. And my pronouns are he/him.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for The Energy Project?  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include<br>Attachment A.<br>AWEC-38, that only included I think one page<br>of it included one tab of Attachment A but not the<br>full Attachment A.<br>AWEC-63 included only one page of attachment for   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad<br>Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of<br>Western Energy Consumers. And my pronouns are he/him.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for The Energy Project?<br>MR. ZAKAI: Good morning, Your Honor. My | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include<br>Attachment A.<br>AWEC-38, that only included I think one page<br>of it included one tab of Attachment A but not the<br>full Attachment A.<br>AWEC-63 included only one page of attachment for<br>C-1, but it did not include Attachments A-1 and B-1, |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Paisner. My pronouns are she/her. I'm the assistant<br>attorney general on behalf of the Public Counsel Unit of<br>the Washington Attorney General's office.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thanks. Great. Thank you so<br>much.<br>And for the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers<br>or AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning. This is Chad<br>Stokes from Cable Huston on behalf of the Alliance of<br>Western Energy Consumers. And my pronouns are he/him.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for The Energy Project?  | 12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | A.<br>And moving on to AWEC's exhibits, BGN-4 was a<br>or is a compilation of several data request responses,<br>and they were partial, so we would ask that the complete<br>response be admitted into evidence.<br>So the data request response to AWEC-4 did not<br>include Attachment A.<br>To Data Request Response AWEC-05 did not include<br>Attachment A.<br>AWEC-38, that only included I think one page<br>of it included one tab of Attachment A but not the<br>full Attachment A.<br>AWEC-63 included only one page of attachment for   |

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

|  | Page 9  | Page 11  |
|--|---|--|
| 1  | Attachments AWEC-67 also included only  | 1 our witness, Joanna Huang, and so unless there are any   |
| 2  | Attachment A.   | 2 questions that the bench intends to ask her, we ask that   |
| 3  | And the final one, AWEC-100 also did not include  | 3 she be excused and can be called back later if anything  |
| 4  | Attachment A, and so we would ask that to be included.  | 4 comes up over the course of the hearing.   |
| 5  | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.  | 5 JUDGE DOYLE: The Commissioners do have some  |
| б  | MS. BARNETT: Thank you.   | 6 questions for her later in the hearing, so if she can  |
| 7  | JUDGE DOYLE: Do any of the other parties  | 7 if if you want to keep her on standby, that's one  |
| 8  | have any other objections or responses to those   | 8 thing. Also, this is rather short, so it might be more   |
| 9  | inclusions?   | 9 prudent to keep her on hand, but we do have questions  |
| 10   | MS. PAISNER: Your Honor, this is Ann  | 10 for her.  |
| 11   | Paisner for Public Counsel. I guess I would just like   | 11 MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Thank you, Your  |
| 12   | some clarification.   | 12 Honor.  |
| 13   | We have no objection to providing the full data   | 13JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.  |
| 14   | request responses, but we are wondering if it's needed,   | 14 MR. CALLAGHAN: The other thing I would like   |
| 15   | if it's not something that is part of what we've  | 15 to raise is Staff would like to make an oral motion to  |
| 16   | referenced for support. We're happy to provide it, but  | 16 strike the terms sheets that were filed on March 15th.  |
| 17   | it just isn't part of the support for the propositions  | 17 This isn't a major issue for Staff, but we just   |
| 18   | we've referenced it for.  | 18 think for the sake of the record, that the term sheet   |
| 19   | MS. BARNETT: And to respond to that, I  | 19 that was filed in the record in order to give the   |
| 20   | think the Commission has always preferred the complete  | 20 non-settling parties a sense of the substance of the  |
| 21   | response rather than pieces of it and let the   | 21 settlement as soon as possible normally wouldn't be   |
| 22<br>23   | commissioners decide whether it's needed or not. I  | 22 included in the official record because a term sheet is   |
|  | understand the parties' position, that they want to   | a settlement negotiation document. So we think it would  |
| 24<br>25   | focus on certain pieces of it, but for context and for  | 24 be appropriate to strike that, but it's not a crucial   |
| 20   | understanding, I think the entire response and the  | 25 issue for staff, otherwise, we would have made a written  |
|  | Page 10   |  |
|  | rage 10   | Page 12  |
| 1  |   | Page 12  |
| 1<br>2   | supplemental response has always been the final and full exhibit.   | 1 motion to strike it.   |
|  | supplemental response has always been the final and full  | 1 motion to strike it.   |
| 2  | supplemental response has always been the final and full exhibit.   | <ol> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> </ol>   |
| 2<br>3   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,   | <ol> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only  | <ol> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to   | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)   | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to   | <ol> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9  | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.  | <ol> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?   | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> <li>anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?<br>MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> <li>anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by</li> <li>the raise hand feature.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?<br>MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Staff does have two preliminary matters to  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> <li>anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by</li> <li>the raise hand feature.</li> <li>Based on the parties' time estimates, we'll</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?<br>MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Staff does have two preliminary matters to<br>raise.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> <li>anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by</li> <li>the raise hand feature.</li> <li>Based on the parties' time estimates, we'll</li> <li>be we'll likely conclude before lunch, but if we do</li> </ul> |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?<br>MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Staff does have two preliminary matters to<br>raise.<br>First is, yesterday, we heard from Public | 1motion to strike it.2JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties3have an objection to striking the term sheet from the4record?5I don't see any hands or hear any voices.6Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to7strike them from the record. Thank you.8And with that, we will look into what we're9going to do today.10We'll first hear a brief opening statement from11the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of12Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then13pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,14the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel15and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,16finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn17Collins.18We will plan to take a short break between19cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite20anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by21the raise hand feature.22Based on the parties' time estimates, we'll23be we'll likely conclude before lunch, but if we do24not conclude by noon, we'll discuss whether to proceed  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | supplemental response has always been the final and full<br>exhibit.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And, well, Mr. Stokes,<br>do you want to speak to this quickly before we move on?<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. We only<br>provided the files relevant to our testimony, so if<br>Cascade would like the full data response, then maybe<br>they can provide the information. We wouldn't object to<br>that, if it's necessary, so (Pause.)<br>MS. BARNETT: We have no problem with that.<br>We've got those handy and can file those today.<br>MS. PAISNER: Public Counsel also would not<br>object to that if Cascade wants to provide the<br>remainder.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, with that, we are<br>going to admit them to the record.<br>I will provide a copy of the exhibit list to the<br>court reporter so it can be made part of the record.<br>Are there any other preliminary matters before<br>we get started?<br>MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Staff does have two preliminary matters to<br>raise.  | <ul> <li>motion to strike it.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties</li> <li>have an objection to striking the term sheet from the</li> <li>record?</li> <li>I don't see any hands or hear any voices.</li> <li>Okay. With that, we'll grant the motion to</li> <li>strike them from the record. Thank you.</li> <li>And with that, we will look into what we're</li> <li>going to do today.</li> <li>We'll first hear a brief opening statement from</li> <li>the parties. Then we will hear cross-examination of</li> <li>Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles. Commissioners will then</li> <li>pose questions to the settlement panel, and, finally,</li> <li>the non-settling parties, beginning with Public Counsel</li> <li>and their witness, Mark Garrett, and The Energy and,</li> <li>finally, The Energy Project and their witness Shawn</li> <li>Collins.</li> <li>We will plan to take a short break between</li> <li>cross-examination and the settlement panel, but I invite</li> <li>anyone who needs a break to just please let me know by</li> <li>the raise hand feature.</li> <li>Based on the parties' time estimates, we'll</li> <li>be we'll likely conclude before lunch, but if we do</li> </ul> |

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

# Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|   | Page 13  |  | Page 15  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1   | the estimated time remaining.  | 1  | staff is presenting a full multiparty settlement for   |
| 2   | Are there any questions?   | 2  | your consideration.  |
| 3   | MS. PAISNER: Excuse me. May I ask a  | 3  | And the settlement, as Mr. Callaghan said, it  |
| 4   | clarifying question? I did not see a time estimate for   | 4  | represents a compromised resolution of all the issues in   |
| 5   | Mark Garrett.  | 5  | this rate case, following careful vetting and thorough   |
| 6   | JUDGE DOYLE: There's there's no cross  | 6  | investigation of Cascade's operations.   |
| 7   | time estimate Mark Garrett. The commissioners just have  | 7  | No party disputes that Cascade has a revenue   |
| 8   | a few questions.   | 8  | deficiency, and the non-settling parties cannot show   |
| 9   | MS. PAISNER: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.  | 9  | that the settlement conflicts with the public interest.  |
| 10  | MR. ZAKAI: Same same clarification for   | 10   | Instead, the non-settling parties present various  |
| 11  | Mr. Collins.   | 11   | alternatives aimed solely at lowering at Cascade's   |
| 12  | Do the commissioners have questions for him?   | 12   | revenue requirement such as terminating the cost revenue   |
| 13  | JUDGE DOYLE: Apologies, yeah.  | 13   | mechanism or modifying Cascade's modifying the   |
| 14  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, we do.  | 14   | company's treatment of protected excess deferred income  |
| 15  | JUDGE DOYLE: I have a dog at my side here.   | 15   | tax or in Public Counsel's case, creating a different  |
| 16  | Yes, there are.  | 16   | case using a completely different test year.   |
| 17  | MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.  | 17   | Cascade filed its initial case in this   |
| 18  | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great. So let's begin   | 18   | proceeding on September 30th, 2021, approximately four   |
| 19  | with opening statements beginning with the settling  | 19   | months after the Commission issued its final order in  |
| 20  | parties.   | 20   | Cascade's 2020 general rate case. For this proceeding,   |
| 21  | MR. CALLAGHAN: Ms. Barnett, I can go first,  | 21   | Cascade had the benefit of the Commission's clear  |
| 22  | if you would like.   | 22   | direction in that final order and Cascade has attempted  |
| 23  | MS. BARNETT: Yes, that's fine.   | 23   | to address every concern the Commission has raised in  |
| 24  | Thank you.   | 24   | it.  |
| 25  | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.  | 25   | For just a few examples, Cascade maintained the  |
|   | Page 14  |  | Page 16  |
| 1   | Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, Your  | 1  | same capital structure approved by the Commission in   |
| 2   | Honors. Judge Doyle informed the parties that opening  | 2  | that last rate case, thereby providing rate stability.   |
| 3   | statements should be brief, so I'll make this quick.   | 3  |  |
| 4   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |  | And Cascade considered the average of monthly averages   |
| 4   | Staff conducted an extensive discovery in this   | 4  | And Cascade considered the average of monthly averages rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment  |
| 4<br>5  | Staff conducted an extensive discovery in this<br>case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial   |  |  |
|   | •  | 4  | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment   |
| 5   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial   | 4<br>5   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment approved by the Commission just months before, and  |
| 5<br>6  | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement   | 4<br>5<br>6  | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment   |
| 5<br>6<br>7   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement with the company.   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to<br>accept a settlement proposal based on the public   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to<br>accept a settlement proposal based on the public<br>interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to<br>accept a settlement proposal based on the public<br>interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the<br>public interest.  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of<br>evidence, specifically presenting important testimony   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just, and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital additions that went into service during or prior to the test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many parties as possible in the settlement, in this case, staff seriously considered the positions of the non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to accept a settlement proposal based on the public interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the public interest.<br>Thank you.   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of<br>evidence, specifically presenting important testimony<br>and rebuttal when other parties could not respond.   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just, and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital additions that went into service during or prior to the test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many parties as possible in the settlement, in this case, staff seriously considered the positions of the non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to accept a settlement proposal based on the public interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the public interest.<br>Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judges Doyle and   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of<br>evidence, specifically presenting important testimony<br>and rebuttal when other parties could not respond.<br>Cascade corrected this, formally revising and updating   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial<br>filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement<br>with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just,<br>and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue<br>requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital<br>additions that went into service during or prior to the<br>test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These<br>increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many<br>parties as possible in the settlement, in this case,<br>staff seriously considered the positions of the<br>non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to<br>accept a settlement proposal based on the public<br>interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the<br>public interest.<br>Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judges Doyle and<br>Pearson, and good morning, Commissioners. | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of<br>evidence, specifically presenting important testimony<br>and rebuttal when other parties could not respond.<br>Cascade corrected this, formally revising and updating<br>its testimony several months before response testimony |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | case. It found some adjustments to Cascade's initial filing and ultimately were able to reach a settlement with the company.<br>We believe that the settlement is fair, just, and reasonable. The majority of the increased revenue requirement is due to two factors: First, the capital additions that went into service during or prior to the test year; and, second, the 2021 wage increases. These increases are real and should be reflected in rates.<br>While Staff always prefers to include as many parties as possible in the settlement, in this case, staff seriously considered the positions of the non-settling parties but found them unpersuasive.<br>Ultimately, Staff decides whether or not to accept a settlement proposal based on the public interest and whether or not the settlement reflects the public interest.<br>Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Judges Doyle and   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | rate treatment as well as end of period rate treatment<br>approved by the Commission just months before, and<br>Cascade determined that the end of period rate treatment<br>was still appropriate for this case. But instead of<br>filing no supporting testimony like it did in its 2020<br>case, Cascade filed substantial direct and rebuttal<br>testimony justifying EOP rate treatment plus exhibits<br>supporting it. Cascade filed a complete and accurate<br>commission basis report this year. It filed progress<br>report and written plan for its load study. And Cascade<br>removed from its revenue requirement the cost and<br>revenues related to depreciation and supplemental<br>schedules as directed by the Commission. And Cascade<br>also improved transparency and communication with other<br>parties, as I'm sure Staff can corroborate.<br>In Staff's last rate case, the Commission<br>expressed concern over Cascade's presentation of<br>evidence, specifically presenting important testimony<br>and rebuttal when other parties could not respond.<br>Cascade corrected this, formally revising and updating   |

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

|  | Page 17  |  | Page 19   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  | I believe you will agree that the result is a  | 1  | file another rate case in the very near future.   |
| 2  | clean rate case focused on just a few adjustments  | 2  | It's also important to note when looking at the   |
| 3  | allowing for a thorough investigation and resulting in a   | 3  | size of this rate case, which is a limited rate case,   |
| 4  | full settlement that is in the public interest.  | 4  | that if you look at Cascade's last general rate case in   |
| 5  | Thank you.   | 5  | Docket 200568, they asked for a \$13.8 million increase,  |
| 6  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.  | 6  | which is very similar to the amount asked for here.   |
| 7  | And for Public Counsel?  | 7  | This case is significant and requires scrutiny  |
| 8  | MS. PAISNER: Good morning, Judge Doyle,  | 8  | to determine if the rates are fair, just, and   |
| 9  | Judge Pearson, and Judge Danner or Chair Danner,   | 9  | reasonable.   |
| 10   | Commissioner Rendahl.  | 10   | AWEC believes, after review of the record, that   |
| 11   | Public Counsel is here today to opposed the full   | 11   | the rates provided in the multiparty settlement will not  |
| 12   | multiparty settlement filed on March 22nd, 2022, that is   | 12   | produce rates that are fair, just, and reasonable, and,   |
| 13   | proposed to Cascade Natural Gas Corporation and the AGG  | 13   | therefore, ask the commission to reject the settlement  |
| 14   | staff.   | 14   | or approve it with modifications.   |
| 15   | As discussed in the testimony of Public Counsel  | 15   | Thank you.  |
| 16   | Witness Mark E. Garrett filed on April 25th, 2022, the   | 16   | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Stokes.   |
| 17   | proposed settlement does not comply with the law because   | 17   | And finally from The Energy Project?  |
| 18   | it is excessive and would give Cascade an annual revenue   | 18   | MR. ZAKAI: Thank you.   |
| 19   | increase that is unreasonably large and that it is not   | 19   | Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioner  |
| 20   | justified. The proposed settlement is, therefore, not  | 20   | Rendahl, Judge Pearson and Judge Doyle.   |
| 21   | consistent with the public interest and, thus, fails to  | 21   | In this general rate case, you're asked by  |
| 22   | comply with the Commission's requirements stated in WAC  | 22   | Cascade and Staff to consider a settlement that will  |
| 23   | 480-07-740.  | 23   | unreasonably increase customers' rates.   |
| 24   | The record will show that based on the company's   | 24   | TEP opposes the settlement because many low   |
| 25   | own filings for 2021, the revenue increase proposed in   | 25   | income customers cannot afford such an increase.  |
|  | Page 18  |  | Page 20   |
|  |  |  | Page 20   |
| 1  | the settlement of approximately \$10.7 million is an   | 1  |   |
| 1<br>2   | the settlement of approximately \$10.7 million is an unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not  | 1  | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle income customers' finances.   |
|  | the settlement of approximately \$10.7 million is an unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not need.  |  | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle income customers' finances.   |
| 2  | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not   | 2  | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a  |
| 2<br>3   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not need.   | 2<br>3   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle income customers' finances.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,  | 2<br>3<br>4  | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all<br>customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their<br>settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all<br>customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.<br>The multiparty settlement, if approved, will  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their<br>settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which<br>unnecessarily compressed the timeline for response and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all<br>customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.<br>The multiparty settlement, if approved, will<br>allow Cascade to increase revenues by \$10.6 million,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their<br>settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which<br>unnecessarily compressed the timeline for response and<br>reply testimony. Second, Cascade refused to extend the  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all<br>customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.<br>The multiparty settlement, if approved, will  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their<br>settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which<br>unnecessarily compressed the timeline for response and  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | unnecessarily excessive amount that the company does not<br>need.<br>Lastly, separate from the proposed settlement,<br>Public Counsel does not object to the low income program<br>proposals that were submitted and testimony filed by The<br>Energy Project on April 25th, 2022. That concludes my<br>opening remarks.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And for AWEC?<br>MR. STOKES: Good morning, Commissioner<br>Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, Judges Doyle and Pearson.<br>Cascade has repeatedly called this case a<br>limited issue rate case, presumably in order to maintain<br>a narrow scope of review. In its original filing,<br>however, Cascade asked for more than \$13.7 million,<br>which which if approved, would have been<br>approximately an 11.1 percent margin increase to all<br>customers if spread on an equal percentage margin basis.<br>The multiparty settlement, if approved, will<br>allow Cascade to increase revenues by \$10.6 million,<br>which is an 8.64 percent margin increase and will have | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | The pandemic has wreacked havoc on low and middle<br>income customers' finances.<br>While many Washingtonians are now living in a<br>post-pandemic life, the economic recovery has not been<br>equal. Many low and middle income excuse me, many<br>low and middle income customers' finances are in a worse<br>position today than they were before the pandemic.<br>Moreover, it's clear that the settlement does not<br>adequately consider customers' interests because no<br>party passed exclusively with represented interests of<br>customers supports the settlement. And the settlement,<br>as well as the settling parties' testimony in support of<br>the settlement do not mention the rate or bill impact on<br>customers.<br>Throughout this case, Cascade's decision to<br>hamper the Commission's ability to efficiently consider<br>and resolve the issues before it in this general rate<br>case and related proceedings: First, Cascade and staff<br>waited an unreasonably long time between reaching their<br>settlement and filing the terms of the settlement, which<br>unnecessarily compressed the timeline for response and<br>reply testimony. Second, Cascade refused to extend the<br>suspension date in this proceeding to accommodate the |

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

|  | Page 21  |  | Page 23   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  | Because of these decisions about the timing of   | 1  | And yesterday, Cascade filed and served one   |
| 2  | this proceeding made by Cascade, the Commission should   | 2  | errata on your testimony.   |
| 3  | hold customers harmless in the event that there are any  | 3  | Do you have, other than that errata, do you have  |
| 4  | negative impacts prom Cascade's decision not to address  | 4  | any other changes or corrections to your testimony or   |
| 5  | certain issues in a timely manner.   | 5  | exhibits?   |
| 6  | Now, I would like to turn your attention to  | 6  | THE WITNESS: I have no other changes or   |
| 7  | Cascade's low income assistant program called the  | 7  | corrections to my testimony.  |
| 8  | Washington Energy Assistance Fund, or WEAF.  | 8  | MS. BARNETT: Thank you.   |
| 9  | In this case, TEP proposes three improvements:   | 9  | At this time, we present Mark Chiles for cross.   |
| 10   | One: Increasing the income eligibility threshold to  | 10   | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.   |
| 11   | enable WEAF to reach more customers. Two, establishing   | 11   | And I believe apologies. Public Counsel,  |
| 12   | detailed dedicated low income outreach effort using  | 12   | would like you to   |
| 13   | trusted messengers and community-based outreach. And   | 13   | MS. PAISNER: Yes. Thank you.  |
| 14   | three, requiring the low income advisory group to  | 14   | CROSS-EXAMINATION   |
| 15   | annually review funding levels.  | 15   | BY MS. PAISNER:   |
| 16   | In their rebuttal testimony, Cascade and Staff   | 16   | Q. Good morning, Mr. Chiles.  |
| 17   | indicate they support tax proposals, which no party  | 17   | A. Good morning.  |
| 18   | opposes and thanks Cascade and Staff for their support.  | 18<br>19   | Q. Do you have copies of all the exhibits and cross in this case?   |
| 19   | In addition, Cascade continues to make good  | 20   | A. I do.  |
| 20   | faith efforts to serve its low income customers, and TEP   | 20   | <b>Q. Thanks.</b>   |
| 21<br>22   | thanks the company for its collaboration with its low<br>income advisory group and respectfully requests that the  | 22   | Okay. If you would please turn to page 29 of  |
| 23   | Commission approve these three improvements to the WEAF  | 23   | your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit MAC-4T  |
| 23   | program and reject the rate increase included in the   | 24   | starting on line 5.   |
| 25   | settlement.  | 25   | A. Sorry. That was page?  |
|  | Southernern.   |  |   |
|  | Page 22  |  | Page 24   |
| 1  | Thank you.   | 1  | Q. 29.  |
| 2  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Zakai.   | 2  | A. Yes. I'm there.  |
| 3  | And with that, thank you all the parties for   | 3  | Q. Okay. Starting on line 5, you state: Because   |
| 4  | your statements.   | 4  | Cascade has a decoupling mechanism, the company's test  |
| 5  | Let's first call Cascade's witness, Mark Chiles.   | 5  | year is already weather normalized.   |
| 6  | Would you please turn on your camera if you're   | 6  | Is that an accurate statement?  |
| 7  | able to do so.   | 7  | A. That is an accurate statement.   |
| 8  | THE WITNESS: I can.  | 8  | Q. Okay. So now if you would please go to exhibit   |
| 9  | JUDGE DOYLE: There you are. All right.   | 9  | MAC-15X, which is the commission basis report for 2021  |
|  |  | 10   |   |
| 10   | Thank you.   |  | filed by Cascade with work papers.  |
| 10<br>11   | And can you please raise your right hand.  | 11   | A. Yes.   |
| 10<br>11<br>12   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give   | 11<br>12   | <ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its</li></ul>   |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and   | 11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting</li> </ul>   |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.  | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.  | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test</li> </ul>  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Mr. Chiles, will you please state your full name  | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test year was weather normalized.</li> </ul>   |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Mr. Chiles, will you please state your full name<br>and your position and your employer for the record.   | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test year was weather normalized.<br/>Was that weather normalize normalization embedded in the information reported to the Commission in this 2021 commission basis report for Cascade?</li> </ul>   |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Mr. Chiles, will you please state your full name<br>and your position and your employer for the record.<br>THE WITNESS: Mark Chiles, Vice President of<br>Regulatory Affairs and Customer Service for Cascade<br>Natural Gas Corporation. | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test year was weather normalized.<br/>Was that weather normalize normalization embedded in the information reported to the Commission in this 2021 commission basis report for Cascade?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?</li> </ul> |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | And can you please raise your right hand.<br>Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give<br>here today will be the truth, the whole truth, and<br>nothing but the truth?<br>THE WITNESS: I do.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>Cascade, would you like to introduce your<br>witness and make them available for cross.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.<br>Mr. Chiles, will you please state your full name<br>and your position and your employer for the record.<br>THE WITNESS: Mark Chiles, Vice President of<br>Regulatory Affairs and Customer Service for Cascade                             | 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with this exhibit and its contents?</li> <li>A. I am familiar, yes.</li> <li>Q. Does this exhibit describe the reporting information required under WAC 480-90-257 that Cascade submitted to the Commission for 2021?</li> <li>A. To the yes, to my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Just now, you confirmed that the company's test year was weather normalized.<br/>Was that weather normalize normalization embedded in the information reported to the Commission in this 2021 commission basis report for Cascade?</li> </ul>   |

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|   | Page 25  |   | Page 27  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1   | You just now discussed weather normalization for   | 1   | A. Yes.  |
| 2   | the test year, so my question is if that same weather  | 2   | Q. Thank you.  |
| 3   | normalization is embedded in the information in the  | 3   | There's another percentage on that page just   |
| 4   | commission basis report for 2021.  | 4   | below the 6.14 percent, and that percentage is 6.95  |
| 5   | A. The decoupling is embedded in the Commission  | 5   | percent.   |
| 6   | basis report.  | 6   | Is that the rate of return authorized in   |
| 7   | Q. Thank you.  | 7   | Cascade's last Washington rate case UG-200568?   |
| 8   | Okay. If you would please turn to page 5 of  | 8   | A. I would have to verify that, but I I actually   |
| 9   | this exhibit, 5 of 22.   | 9   | don't know off the top of my head.   |
| 10  | A. I'm there.  | 10  | Q. Okay. So subject to check, would you accept   |
| 11  | Q. Please look at Column B on the left side of the   | 11  | that the project of multiplying the rate base amount on  |
| 12  | page.  | 12  | line 26, Column F by the authorized return rate of   |
| 13  | What is the amount of net operating income on  | 13  | return, 6.95, would give you the amount needed for the   |
| 14  | line 18?   | 14  | company to earn its approved rate of return?   |
| 15  | A. Net operating income on line 18 is \$28,636,318.  | 15  | A. Yes.  |
| 16  | Q. Is that the amount of net operating income  | 16  | Q. Okay. So then subject to check, the product of  |
| 17  | reported for 2021?   | 17  | the rate base of 488,393,608 and the 6.95 rate of  |
| 18  | A. It is, yes, if I believe it is.   | 18  | return, subject to check, would be 33,943,356 and  |
| 19  | Q. Okay. And did that operating income increase  | 19  | change?  |
| 20  | shareholder equity by that amount?   | 20  | A. Yes.  |
| 21  | A. Yes.  | 21  | Q. So, again, subject to check, would you accept   |
| 22  | Q. Did that net operating income include accruals  | 22  | that subtracting restated net operating income from line   |
| 23  | for unbilled revenue?  | 23  | 18 from the amount needed for the company to earn its  |
| 24  | A. It would have.  | 24  | approved rate of return would equal an amount of revenue   |
| 25  | Q. As we look at the columns across the page on Row  | 25  | deficiency for the company?  |
|   |  |   |  |
|   | Page 26  |   | Page 28  |
| 1   | 18, we see what appear to be adjustment amounts.   | 1   | A. Well, that could all be true. The issue is that   |
| 2   | Are these adjustments that were approved by the  | 2   | there are other adjustments that would that would  |
| 3   | Commission in Cascade's most recent rate case in Docket  | 3   | need to be made to these numbers to complete a 2021  |
| 4   | UG-200568?   |   |  |
| -   | 06-200568?   | 4   | case, and that's the company's intention with Public   |
| 5   | A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to  | 4<br>5  | case, and that's the company's intention with Public<br>Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test  |
|   |  | 1   |  |
| 5   | A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to  | 5   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test  |
| 5<br>6  | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6  | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we  |
| 5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test year. There are there are all the things you know, all the different adjustments that take place   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.</li> <li>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.</li> <li>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public  |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage, 6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've<br>demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18 by the rate base amount on line 26?</li> </ul>  | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've<br>demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few<br>hundred-plus data requests and all the analyses that our   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18 by the rate base amount on line 26?</li> <li>A. I believe it is.</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've<br>demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few<br>hundred-plus data requests and all the analyses that our<br>case is appropriate. 2021 hasn't gone through that   |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18</li> <li>by the rate base amount on line 26?</li> <li>A. I believe it is.</li> <li>Q. So subject to check, 29,979,637 divided by</li> </ul> | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've<br>demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few<br>hundred-plus data requests and all the analyses that our<br>case is appropriate. 2021 hasn't gone through that<br>analysis, and just it doesn't seem appropriate without |
| 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. Those are different adjustments that yes, to advertising incentives and B&amp;O.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now please look at Column F on the right side of the page.<br/>What is the restated net operating income found on line 18?</li> <li>A. \$29,979,637.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>What is the amount of rate base on line 26 of that page?</li> <li>A. Rate base on line 26, column well, I guess they're the same, \$488,393,608.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.<br/>On line 27 in Column F, there is a percentage,</li> <li>6.14 percent listed as the rate of return.<br/>Subject to check, is that percentage the result of dividing restated net operating income from line 18 by the rate base amount on line 26?</li> <li>A. I believe it is.</li> </ul>   | 5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Counsel's suggestion that we should move to a 2021 test<br>year. There are there are all the things you<br>know, all the different adjustments that take place<br>within the within a case that Cascade did when we<br>submitted our original case based on the 2020 test year<br>that that aren't accounted for specifically in the<br>commission basis report, so I don't think that provides<br>an accurate picture of of what an appropriate 2021<br>test year case would be, so I think if all the<br>appropriate adjustments were made, then it's an entirely<br>different case. And I think if Cascade were to have<br>suggested that we move to a 2021 test year, even if we<br>made all the appropriate adjustments, in May, as Public<br>Counsel has, that it just wouldn't it wouldn't seem<br>appropriate, and that's you know, our our case has<br>been fully vetted through the course of time and we've<br>demonstrated that be it through, you know, a few<br>hundred-plus data requests and all the analyses that our<br>case is appropriate. 2021 hasn't gone through that   |

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

|  | Page 29   |  | Page 31   |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1  | be warranted.   | 1  | A. Conversion factor, yes.  |
| 2  | Q. So maybe I can ask it a different way.   | 2  | Q. Thanks.  |
| 3  | So assuming a 2020 test year assuming a 2020  | 3  | On line 19, where it states "Conversion Factor,"  |
| 4  | test year, which is the test year the company has   | 4  | is this number 0.75506 the revenue conversion factor  |
| 5  | proposed, and assuming appropriate adjustments, subject   | 5  | used by the company for 2020?   |
| 6  | to check, the 33 the approximately 33.9 million,  | 6  | A. Yes.   |
| 7  | which is the amount you just testified would be needed  | 7  | Q. Subject to check, would you accept that dividing   |
| 8  | for the company to earn its rate of return I  | 8  | the 3,963,719 deficiencies stated a moment ago by   |
| 9  | apologize so if you assume the 2020 test year and   | 9  | Cascade's 2020 revenue conversion factor of 0.75506   |
| 10   | appropriate adjustments, subject to check, that 33.9  | 10   | would be 5,249,541?   |
| 11   | million \$33,943,356 that the company would need to   | 11   | A. Um (pause.)  |
| 12   | earn its return minus the 29 million reported,  | 12   | Q. Subject to check.  |
| 13   | \$29,979,637, which is net operated income restated, the  | 13   | A. Yes.   |
| 14   | 33.9 million minus the 29 million, approximately, would   | 14   | Q. Okay. Do you know the conversion factor for  |
| 15   | be \$3,963,719, subject to check?   | 15   | 2021?   |
| 16   | A. I would say your math is correct.  | 16   | A. I do not know the conversion factor for 2021.  |
| 17   | Q. Okay. Okay. Yeah, I just okay. Thank you.  | 17   | Q. Okay. Now I would like to ask you about your   |
| 18   | So if you would please turn back to your  | 18   | end of period analysis for the 2020 test year.  |
| 19   | rebuttal testimony at page 30 and starting on line 7,   | 19   | In your analysis, to which accounts did you   |
| 20   | starting on line 7, you state in your rebuttal testimony  | 20   | apply an end of period analysis?  |
| 21   | that: Public Counsel uses the 2020 test year conversion   | 21   | A. Which would be applied end of period?  |
| 22   | factor instead of adjusting the conversion factor to be   | 22   | Q. Yes.   |
| 23   | based on the underlying revenue sensitive costs in 2020.  | 23   | A. In particular or in broad, you know, sort of   |
| 24   | Is that correct?  | 24   | the   |
| 25   | A. That is correct.   | 25   | Q. I think I can restate the question maybe to  |
|  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  |   |
|  | Page 30   |  | Page 32   |
| 1  |   |  |   |
| 1  | Q. You then describe this on line 10 as a minor   | 1  | to be a little more clear.  |
| 1<br>2   | impact?   | 1<br>2   | to be a little more clear.<br>So did you use a monthly averages approach for  |
|  | impact?<br>A. Yes.  |  |   |
| 2  | impact?<br>A. Yes.<br>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue  | 2<br>3<br>4  | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | impact?<br>A. Yes.<br>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue<br>conversion factor versus what you describe here be due  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | impact?<br>A. Yes.<br>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue<br>conversion factor versus what you describe here be due<br>to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br><b>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working</b><br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16                                     | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16                                     | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                               | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                               | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                         | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                         | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                   | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit JT-2, which is the</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                   | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br><b>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working</b><br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br><b>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.</b><br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Go ahead.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20             | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit JT-2, which is the joint settlement exhibit, and Tab MCG-4, conversion</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20             | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Go ahead.<br>Thank you.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit JT-2, which is the joint settlement exhibit, and Tab MCG-4, conversion factor. I think it was labelled in the upper header.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21       | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Go ahead.<br>Thank you.<br>C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N                   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | <ul> <li>impact?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the difference between the 2020 revenue conversion factor versus what you describe here be due to the difference in uncollectible accounts rate for each year?</li> <li>A. I guess I couldn't say. I couldn't tell you off the top of my head all the different items that might be adjusted or might impact that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But you do describe it as minor?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And I think minor just to the point that there are issues in Public Counsel's suggestion that we should use the 2021 test year. There are small things, there are large things, and and that's really the point of that.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Please turn to Exhibit JT-2, which is the joint settlement exhibit, and Tab MCG-4, conversion factor. I think it was labelled in the upper header. It says MCP-4, but the tab, it says MCG-4. And let me</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22 | So did you use a monthly averages approach for<br>any accounts?<br>A. We I think we used average monthly<br>averages for one item. I think we used end of period<br>for everything. There might be one, and I just don't<br>recall.<br>Q. Do you did you use end of period for working<br>capital or inventory?<br>A. I think we might have used I we might have<br>used an average and monthly averages for that one.<br>Again, I'm just not sure.<br>Q. Okay. I have no further questions.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.<br>And would AWEC like their opportunity to cross<br>Mr. Chiles.<br>MR. STOKES: Yes, Your Honor.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Go ahead.<br>Thank you.<br>C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N<br>BY MR. STOKES: |

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

|          | Page 33   |          | Page 35   |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 1        | case, as you mentioned in your direct testimony, MAC-1T,  | 1        | Is that your understanding?   |
| 2        | on page 3?  | 2        | A. That is my understanding, yes.   |
| 3        | A. I think Cascade will be evaluating I mean,   | 3        | Q. Okay. And Cascade's filing in UG-220198 was in   |
| 4        | we're evaluating now the need for it as soon as we get  | 4        | response to a private letter ruling, 101961-21,   |
| 5        | through this particular case, know where we've landed.  | 5        | identified in Puget Sound Energy Docket UG or   |
| 6        | Certainly, we're looking for the conclusion of, you   | 6        | UE-190529; is that correct?   |
| 7        | know, the PSE cases case, and possibly the Avista   | 7        | A. That's correct.  |
| 8        | case.   | 8        | MR. STOKES: Okay. To the extent it's  |
| 9        | It's a new world with the multiyear, and we want  | 9        | necessary, I would like to move for the Commission to   |
| 10       | to make sure that we're prepared for that, so, again,   | 10       | take official notice of the private letter ruling   |
| 11       | evaluating, I would imagine it will, you know, be 2023  | 11       | 101961-21 under WAC 480-07-495. It's been referenced,   |
| 12       | at this point in time.  | 12       | but the actual private letter ruling is not in the  |
| 13       | Q. Okay. But this case is supposed to be, in your   | 13       | record at this point in time.   |
| 14       | words, a stopgap between this case and then the time  | 14       | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do any of the parties  |
| 15       | when you file a new rate case with a multiyear rate   | 15       | have any objections to taking notice of that?   |
| 16       | plan?   | 16       | MS. BARNETT: No objection.  |
| 17       | A. Yes. But this case is looking at recovery of   | 17       | MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor.  |
| 18       | plant through 2020. We're through 2021 and well into  | 18       | MS. PAISNER: No objection from Public   |
| 19       | 2022 at this point, and with the the amount of  | 19       | Counsel. Thanks.  |
| 20       | capital we're spending with the increase in the   | 20       | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.  |
| 21       | inflationary pressures in costs, I mean, all of those   | 21       | MR. ZAKAI: No objection. Thank you.   |
| 22       | are impacting us as well as every other company.  | 22       | BY MR. STOKES:  |
| 23<br>24 | Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.  | 23       | Q. Mr. Chiles, is it your understanding that one of   |
| 24<br>25 | I would like to talk to you for a second about the protected plus excess deferred income tax issue. | 24<br>25 | Cascade's proposed normalization corrections was to<br>eliminate rate schedule 581 credit rate and roll the |
| 25       | the protected plus excess deletted income tax issue.  | 25       | enninate rate schedule sor credit rate and roll the   |
|          | Page 34   |          | Page 36   |
| 1        | Does the multiparty stipulation address the   | 1        | amortization rate into base rates?  |
| 2        | proper treatment of protected plus EDIT under the IRS   | 2        | A. I'm sorry. Can you can you say that again?   |
| 3        | normalization requirements?   | 3        | Q. So is it in your filing, in order to correct   |
| 4        | A. Does the I'm sorry. Can you  | 4        | potential normalization violation, was it Cascade's   |
| 5        | Q. Does the multiparty stipulation that you entered   | 5        | proposal to eliminate Rate Schedule 581 and roll the  |
| 6        | into with staff address proper treatment of protected   | 6        | amortization rate into base rates?  |
| 7        | plus EDIT?  | 7        | A. I believe that's correct.  |
| 8        | A. I I don't know that it specifically does   | 8        | Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that one of   |
| 9        | address the EDIT issue.   | 9        | the adjustments is to make that correction in this  |
| 10       | Q. Okay.  | 10       | docket on a going forward basis?  |
| 11       | A. Specific inherent in the settlement, itself, is,   | 11       | A. I think I do believe that's correct. We've   |
| 12       | you know, all all items have been addressed.  | 12       | got that that separate case, and I think I mean,  |
| 13       | Q. Okay. So the multiparty stipulation was filed  | 13<br>14 | the timing of the company's file, I mean, we we filed   |
| 14<br>15 | on March 22nd, 2022; correct?<br>A. Correct.  | 15       | our rate base September 30th, and that was a short time   |
| 15       | Q. Okay. So the day after the multiparty  | 16       | after everyone found out about PSE's private letter<br>ruling. You know, there wasn't enough time for us to |
| 17       | stipulation was filed, Cascade made a filing in Docket  | 17       | bring that into this case and give it justice. You  |
| 18       | UG-220198 where Cascade proposed to make a correction to  | 18       | know, the one thing that Cascade has been scrutinized   |
| 19       | prevent a potential normalization violation; is that  | 19       | for in the past is not having a clean, complete case,   |
| 20       | correct?  | 20       | and so our goal here was to do that, to abide by the  |
| 21       | A. That's correct.  | 21       | the ruling that the Commission issued in our last case,   |
| 22       | Q. Okay. And when I talk about the potential  | 22       | and and not bring in items like this at the last  |
| 23       | normalization violation, in general, it relates to the  | 23       | minute, and so we felt that the best course of action   |
| 24       | amortization of protected plus excess deferred income   | 24       | was that we treat this the way we have, so (Pause.)   |
| 25       | taxes.  | 25       | Q. So in your opinion, if the Commission does not   |
| 1        |   | 1        |   |

|                            | Page 37  |                | Page 39  |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| 1                          | eliminate Rate Schedule 581 and roll the amortization  | 1              | in process over a long course of time, so (Pause.)   |
| 2                          | into base rates, will Cascade continue to be in  | 2              | Q. Okay. Thank you.  |
| 3                          | violation of the normalization requirements?   | 3              | So switching topics, I would like to talk to you   |
| 4                          | A. Well, I mean, based on our consultation right   | 4              | about unbilled revenues.   |
| 5                          | now with our tax and the county personnel and outside  | 5              | A. Yeah.   |
| 6                          | auditors, we're currently not at risk for normalization  | 6              | Q. So are the billing determinates that Cascade  |
| 7                          | violation, given we've got the plan for correction,  | 7              | uses to calculate rates based on volumes consumed or   |
| 8                          | which is incorporated in in the other docket, the  | 8              | volumes billed in the test period?   |
| 9                          | 220198. So as long as we follow that plan, we're not   | 9              | A. Are?  |
| 10                         | we're not at risk for normalization violation. If the  | 10             | Q. Are the billing determinates that Cascade uses  |
| 11                         | Commission allows the approach to zero out 581 and get   | 11             | to calculate rates based on the volumes consumed or  |
| 12                         | rid of the deferral, we could still be in a violation  | 12             | volumes billed in the test period?   |
| 13                         | position.  | 13             | A. I actually do not know that. I would have to  |
| 14                         | Q. Well, there's two there's two proposals you   | 14             | defer to our other witness on that.  |
| 15                         | have: One is to fix things going forward on a going  | 15             | Q. Okay. I'll move on.   |
| 16                         | forward basis, and one is to fix things that happened in   | 16             | So I would like you to look at your Chiles   |
| 17                         | the past; is that correct?   | 17             | exhibit MAC-4T, the errata filing on page 6, lines 13 to   |
| 18                         | A. That's correct.   | 18             | 14.  |
| 19                         | Q. Okay. So on September 15th, 2021, and   | 19             | So in your errata filing, you acknowledge that   |
| 20                         | subsequent to the issuance of the private letter ruling,   | 20             | the margin revenue requirement in this case has been   |
| 21                         | Cascade made a filing in Docket UG-210709 where you  | 21             | increased by a 1.413 million, 568,000 of net unbilled  |
| 22                         | updated Schedule 581 rates; is that correct?   | 22             | revenues from the 2020 test period; is that correct?   |
| 23                         | A. Which docket is that?   | 23             | A. That is correct.  |
| 24                         | Q. 210709. It's where Cascade updates its Schedule   | 24             | Q. Okay. Would you agree that the 1.4 million  |
| 25                         | 581 rates.   | 25             | referenced in your errata filing is the amount that AWEC   |
|                            |  |                |  |
|                            | Page 38  |                | Page 40  |
| 1                          | A. Okay.   | 1              | is proposing to remove from revenue requirement in this  |
| 2                          | Q. Okay. Did Cascade indicate to the parties in  | 2              | case?  |
| 3                          | this case that the rates it was proposing might be   | 3              | A. Originally, I I believe that the amount was   |
| 4                          | inconsistent with the IRS normalization requirements?  | 4              | being suggested as 2.9 million. I don't have the exact   |
| 5                          | A. I could not speak to that. I don't have enough  | 5              | number if the number has changed to the 1.4. I would   |
| б                          | knowledge to speak to that.  | 6              | agree that the amount of remaining unbilled in the   |
| 7                          | Q. Okay. So when did Cascade become aware that the   | 7              | revenue requirement is the 1.4 million.  |
| 8                          | continued use of Schedule 581 might violate the IRS's  | 8              | Q. Okay. Would you agree that AWEC is not  |
| 9                          | normalization requirements?  | 9              | proposing to remove the 15,909,204 balance of unbilled   |
| 10                         | A. Well, I would have to defer to someone with more  | 10             | revenues that the settling parties included in working   |
| 11                         | information on that particular question.   | 11             | capital and rate base?   |
| 12                         | Q. Okay. So one final question on this topic: Can  | 12             | A. The 15 million of   |
| 13                         | you explain why Cascade filed waited until the day   | 13             | Q. Of working capital  |
| 14                         | after filing the settlement stipulation to file to   | 14             | A. Oh. Of working capital?   |
| 15                         | make its file in Docket UG-220198?   | 15             | Q. Yeah.   |
| 16                         | A. Well, a part of it was just the timing of   | 16             | A. I believe that's correct.   |
| 17                         | getting all the information. The circumstances of that   | 17             | Q. Okay. So in your exhibit MAC-4T, page 8, line 6   |
| 18                         | filing were we went through a process of finding out,  | 18             | and 7, you state that shareholders had advanced the cash   |
| 19                         | you know, what the well, getting the private letter  | 19             | necessary to fund the cost of the service represented by   |
|                            | ruling that was issued to PSE, evaluating whether it   | 20             | the unbilled revenues.   |
| 20                         |  |                |  |
| 20<br>21                   | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate  | 21             | Would you agree that AWEC is not contesting  |
| 20<br>21<br>22             | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate parties to determine our best course of action, and once   | 22             | Cascade's ability to earn a return through working the   |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate<br>parties to determine our best course of action, and once<br>we had all that information, we filed that. We that   | 22<br>23       | Cascade's ability to earn a return through working the capital on cash advanced to fund unbilled revenues?                                 |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate<br>parties to determine our best course of action, and once<br>we had all that information, we filed that. We that<br>filing was planned not in conjunction with the | 22<br>23<br>24 | Cascade's ability to earn a return through working the capital on cash advanced to fund unbilled revenues?<br>A. I believe that's correct. |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | applied to us, and working with all the appropriate<br>parties to determine our best course of action, and once<br>we had all that information, we filed that. We that   | 22<br>23       | Cascade's ability to earn a return through working the capital on cash advanced to fund unbilled revenues?                                 |

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

|  | Page 41   |  | Page 43  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Cascade's total unbilled revenue balance will increase  | 1  | is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue  |
| 2  | or decrease on a normalized basis?  | 2  | requirement?   |
| 3  | A. Well, annually, you would expect if you have   | 3  | A. Yes.  |
| 4  | customer growth there are a lot of variables to   | 4  | Q. Okay. Thank you.  |
| 5  | factor into unbilled revenue, right, and it can go up or  | 5  | All right. Moving on, I would like to talk to  |
| 6  | down  | 6  | you about the COVID savings, refer to your testimony   |
| 7  | Q. Okay.  | 7  | MAC-4T, page 13, line 5.   |
| 8  | A on in any given year, and I think that  | 8  | A. Just one moment.  |
| 9  | the the case here is that Cascade has been consistent   | 9  | Q. Okay. Yeah.   |
| 10   | in how we treated unbilleds. The only difference in   | 10   | A. Let me get there. Lots of lots of paper.  |
| 11   | this particular case is that Cascade followed the   | 11   | Q. Lots of paper. I understand.  |
| 12   | Commission's order to remove supplemental schedules, and  | 12   | A. So I'm sorry. You said page 13?   |
| 13   | so in in the past, we would have removed the  | 13   | Q. Yeah. Line 5.   |
| 14   | decoupling fees. Because of the recent order in our   | 14   | A. 13, line 5, yes.  |
| 15   | last case, we would have removed the supplemental   | 15   | Q. Okay. So in your testimony, you acknowledge   |
| 16   | schedules. But after that, Cascade has been consistent  | 16   | that the test period results include 635,000 of deferred   |
| 17   | in all of its cases in how it's treated unbilleds,  | 17   | COVID savings; is that correct?  |
| 18   | whether it's been to the detriment or the benefit. And  | 18   | A. That is correct.  |
| 19   | I think having that consistency from year to year in  | 19   | Q. Okay. And the effect of the 635,000 deferred  |
| 20   | each case is important. And for us to to try and  | 20   | COVID savings is an increase to revenue requirement;   |
| 21   | remove or or keep in in any given year or in any  | 21   | correct?   |
| 22   | particular case would be a departure from from sound  | 22   | A. That would be correct.  |
| 23   | judgment.   | 23   | Q. Okay. Would you agree that the savings  |
| 24   | Q. Okay. But you would agree that unbilled revenue  | 24   | represent a number of saving items such as, you know,  |
| 25   | balance the unbilled revenue balance is influenced by   | 25   | reduced meals and entertainment expenses, employee lodge   |
|  | Page 42   |  | Page 44  |
| 1  | rate changes that occur in the test period?   | 1  | expenses, travel expenses, that sort of thing?   |
| 2  | A. Could be, yes.   | 2  |  |
|  |   |  | A. Yup.  |
| 3  | Q. Yeah.  | 3  | A. Yup.<br>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral   |
| 3<br>4   | Q. Yean.<br>A. It could be impacted there.  | 3<br>4   | •  |
|  |   |  | Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral  |
| 4  | A. It could be impacted there.  | 4  | Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral<br>in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that   |
| 4<br>5   | <ul><li>A. It could be impacted there.</li><li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue</li></ul>  | 4<br>5   | Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral<br>in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that<br>things will return to pre-pandemic levels?   |
| 4<br>5<br>6  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6  | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10  | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18  | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Well, in general, no. I'm sorry. 1</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?</li> </ul>  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if things do return to normal</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Well, in general, no. I'm sorry. 1</li> </ul>   | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. And if things do return to normal and there's no more virtual meetings, won't Cascade have</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Well, in general, no. I'm sorry. I misunderstood that in</li> <li>Q. Yeah, so so let me let me state that again.</li> </ul> | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. And if things do return to normal and there's no more virtual meetings, won't Cascade have the ability to consider that in its next rate case that it sounds like it's going to be filed in the very near future?</li> </ul> |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. It could be impacted there.</li> <li>Q. And isn't the whole point of a normalize revenue forecast to eliminate the impact of rate changes in the test period?</li> <li>A. Isn't the whole point of?</li> <li>Q. Normalized revenue forecast.</li> <li>A. Well, to to the whole point of normalize revenue forecasting would be yes, need to get to to get to a baseline revenue, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So unbilled revenue balances are also impacted by year to year changes and throughput; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Throughput</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A and the customer growth, due to weather.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if throughput is increasing, would unbilled revenues reduce revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Well, in general, no. I'm sorry. I misunderstood that in</li> <li>Q. Yeah, so so let me let me state that</li> </ul>        | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So by keeping the COVID savings deferral in revenue requirement, isn't Cascade assuming that things will return to pre-pandemic levels?</li> <li>A. Things are returning slowly. I do the the costs are returning, meaning lots of businesses getting more back to normal, so I think it is a safe assumption to to say that, yes, we will be returning to business as as normal and have been over time.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that the hearings like this one would typically have been done in person pre-pandemic?</li> <li>A. Typically, yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you also agree there's a pretty widespread use of virtual meetings at this point?</li> <li>A. Oh, there are.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And those have replaced in-person meetings over this</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Okay. And if things do return to normal and there's no more virtual meetings, won't Cascade have the ability to consider that in its next rate case that it sounds like it's going to be filed in the very near</li> </ul>         |

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

|          | Page 45  |    | Page 47  |
|----------|--|----|--|
| 1        | of different costs in there. You know, if you're   | 1  | happened in the last rate case and what is being   |
| 2        | you're talking about the cost specifically to rate cases   |    | proposed in this case.   |
| 3        | or something like that, you know, there are, one,  | 3  | A. It is confusing. It's confusing to me. I I  |
| 4        | offsetting costs, but there are additional costs, and  | 4  | can walk you through this. I don't know that I can   |
| 5        | there's the impact of inflation on everything also, so   |    | provide more explanation than what than what is  |
| 6        | there's a lot of different variables there that can  |    | included in the timeline that's shared on page 23.   |
| 7        | impact this, but certainly as the impacts of COVID have  | 7  | Q. Okay. Well, if you can't if you can't   |
| 8        | lessened and continue to lessen, we are headed back to a   | 8  | elaborate on that, then I'll just move on.   |
| 9        | more normal experiencing more normal the   | 9  | So when Cascade is performing the evaluation   |
| 10       | normal-type costs that we experienced before.  | 10 | that you describe in your testimony, how does Cascade  |
| 11       | Q. I would like to switch topics again to the cost   | 11 | determine what plant additions were included included  |
| 12       | recovery mechanism, so I would like to reference you to  | 12 | in the rates and what were excluded from rates?  |
| 13       | your testimony MAC-4T page 24. It looks like lines 9   | 13 | A. Well, if a plant was placed in service during   |
| 14       | through 18.  | 14 | you know, during the end of that that test year, it  |
| 15       | A. Okay. I'm there.  | 15 | should be in in the plan.  |
| 16       | Q. Okay. So if I understand your testimony   | 16 | Q. Okay. So but aren't multiple things changing  |
| 17       | correctly, Cascade did not present for recovery in this  |    | subsequent to the test period such as accumulated  |
| 18       | case any cost recovery mechanism plant additions other   | 18 | depreciation and increase in revenues that might offset  |
| 19       | than those included in the test period; is that correct?   | 19 | the need for the CRM plant additions?  |
| 20       | A. That's correct.   | 20 | A. I'm sorry. I hate   |
| 21       | Q. Okay. Would you agree that Cascade is still   | 21 | Q. So if you have a rate case  |
| 22       | proposing an after-the-fact adjustment to its margin   | 22 | A. Yeah.   |
| 23       | revenues in its compliance filing for CRM additions that   | 23 | Q that includes certain things and certain   |
| 24       | weren't identified in the initial filing in this case?   |    | plants and then you're making a later CRM filing, that's   |
| 25       | A. Well, specifically, what we've included in this   | 25 | kind of like a single issue rate filing, so aren't other   |
|          | Page 46  |    | Page 48  |
| 1        | case and what we're filing for is similar to I mean,   | 1  | things happening that could offset the need for the CRM?   |
| 2        | again, the treatment has been the same. Our treatment  | 2  | A. Well, you know, depending on the timing of  |
| 3        | of what we brought into this case from this CRM  | 3  | everything. I mean, the CRM is in there for a specific   |
| 4        | standpoint has been consistent with how we've been   | 4  | purpose. You know, the mechanism was was put in  |
| 5        | filing this over the course of time, so there has been   | 5  | place to address specific issues. And from our   |
| б        | no departure from from how we've been treating this  | 6  | standpoint, it's working as the Commission intended.   |
| 7        | in this case from any any prior cases.   | 7  | And so until there is an alternative and, you know,  |
| 8        | Q. Okay. So given the Commission's use and useful  |    | possibly the multiyear rate base, the CRM is is  |
| 9        | policy statement and Docket U-190531, could Cascade have   |    | working and it's been a an appropriate tool for the  |
| 10       | included all the potential CRM plant additions and   |    | company, and I think it's accomplishing what again,  |
| 11       | service through the rate year in this case?  |    | what the Commission intended when it was put in place.   |
| 12       | A. Sorry. One more time for me.  | 12 | Q. Okay. Thank you.  |
| 13       | Q. Okay. Given the Commission's use and useful   | 13 | Just one final question: If you could turn to  |
| 14<br>15 | policy statement in Docket U-190531, could Cascade have  |    | page 3 of your testimony, MAC-4T, lines 12 through 14,   |
| 15       | included all the potential CRM plants additions and<br>service through the rate year in this case? |    | can you tell me what you meant by the statement that if  |
| 17       | A. Yes.  |    | AWEC chose not to participate in settlement<br>negotiations, that does not mean the negotiations did |
| 18       | Q. Okay. So if Cascade had done that and included  |    | not occur?   |
| 19       | the plant additions and service to the rate year, would  | 19 | A. Yeah, well, I mean, Cascade went into the   |
| 20       | Cascade need to seek recovery through the CRM?   |    | initial settlement, January 10th, if I have the date   |
| 21       | A. Well, if we brought it in this case, we wouldn't  |    | right, expecting a negotiation to take place. My   |
| 22       | bring be bringing it in the CRM.   |    | recollection of that meeting is negotiations really  |
| 23       | Q. Okay. So turn to page 23 of your testimony.   |    | didn't seem to take place, that it was essentially   |
|          |  |    |  |
| 24       | Can you walk me through the timeline that starts   |    | punted to a  |
|          |  |    |  |

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|                   | Page 49   |          | Page 51  |
|-------------------|---|----------|--|
| 1 0               | conference that was canceled and rescheduled and we   | 1        | what adjustments from what rate case? Are you aware?   |
| 2 0               | convened to discuss schedules?  | 2        | A. Commission basis report?  |
| 3                 | A. The January  | 3        | Q. Yes.  |
| 4                 | MS. BARNETT: I'll object here. This is  | 4        | A. Well, the commission basis report, what are the   |
| 5 g               | going into this was a settlement negotiation as   | 5        | adjustments based on?  |
| 6 s               | scheduled by the prehearing conference, and those are   | 6        | Q. Uh-huh.   |
| 7 t               | hose are confidential and shall not be used as evidence   | 7        | A. The adjustments are based on the our last   |
| 8 i               | n this case.  | 8        | full litigated general rate case, 200568, I believe is   |
| 9                 | MR. STOKES: I'm not asking for anything   | 9        | the number.  |
| 10 <b>c</b>       | confidential. I'm just asking what he means my the  | 10       | Q. Okay. Would you would are you aware of  |
| 11 s              | statement that he says in his testimony that we so I  | 11       | the Commission, if the the rate base was based on the  |
| 12 V              | vanted to know if he's saying that AWEC didn't attend a   | 12       | commission basis report.   |
| 13 s              | scheduled settlement conference.  | 13       | Is that an AMA basis or an EOP?  |
| 14                | THE WITNESS: AWEC was in attendance at that   | 14       | A. I believe that's AMA in that.   |
| 15 s              | settlement conference.  | 15       | Q. And this case is EOP that you presented;  |
| 16 <b>E</b>       | BY MR. STOKES:  | 16       | correct?   |
| 17                | Q. And all the other conferences that all the   | 17       | A. That's correct. So but the reasoning for that   |
| 18 <b>p</b>       | parties were invited to?  | 18       | being the the you know, the amount the plant that  |
| 19                | A. They were, yes.  | 19       | the company has been placing in service, you know, there   |
| 20                | Q. Okay. Thank you.   | 20       | are the the four factors that the Commission looks   |
| 21                | MR. STOKES: Nothing further, Your Honor.  | 21       | at, and I think that the circumstances of this case when   |
| 22                | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.   | 22       | compared to the prior case that had just closed, well,   |
| 23                | Cascade, would you like to proceed with any   | 23       | about a year ago at this point, but roughly four months  |
| 24 r              | edirect?  | 24       | from when we filed this case, those circumstances hadn't   |
| 25                | MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor.   | 25       | really changed and they haven't changed since then. We   |
|                   | Page 50   |          | Page 52  |
|                   |   |          |  |
| 1                 | REDIRECTEXAMINATION   | 1        | are spending a lot of capital to serve our customers and   |
|                   | 3Y MS. BARNETT:   | 2        | provide that safe, reliable service that we need to  |
| 3                 | Q. Working backward, I would just like to begin   | 3        | provide. We're in high inflationary periods. We  |
|                   | vith let me turn on my video here.  | 4        | haven't been earning our rate of return. And so you  |
| 5                 | Regarding the rate case, Mr. Stokes made a point  | 5        | the circumstances that were in place before are still in   |
|                   | o, I guess, imply that rate case costs such as travel   | 6        | place now, and that's why we're seeking end of period.   |
|                   | vould be included in a rate case adjustment.  | 7        | And, again, we didn't take end of period for   |
| 8<br>9 r          | And did you include is Cascade including any  | 8        | granted. We included that as a well, provided  |
|                   | ate case adjustment in this rate case?  | -        | extensive support for that in our original filing, and   |
| 10                | A. Is Cascade including any rate specific to  | 10       | that would have been in my testimony specifically.   |
| 11                | Q. Right. Does it include any rate case cost  |          | Q. Thank you.  |
|                   | adjustment? Does it have a rate case cost adjustment in   | 12<br>13 | And just just to clarify on the commission   |
|                   | his case?   | 14       | basis report, the 2021 commission basis report   |
| 14                | A. I don't believe so.  | 15       | adjustments are based on the 2019 GRC outcomes; is that  |
| 15<br>16          | Q. Thank you.   | 16       | right? Is that how that works? So your GRC I think<br>it was UG-190210 for your 2021 CBR; is that correct? |
|                   | And back to the CBR, I think that the you<br>vere asked about the commission basis report's               | 17       | •  |
|                   | -   | 18       | A. I believe so, yeah.   |
| 18 <b>a</b><br>19 | adjustments.  | 19       | Q. Okay. No further redirect.  |
|                   | Are you aware of what those adjustments, what<br>what rate case your 2022 commission basis report filing, | 20       | JUDGE DOYLE: All right. Thank you.<br>Do either of the commissioners have any                              |
|                   | vour last one, what rate case those were based on?  | 20       | questions before we take a short break?  |
| 21 <b>y</b><br>22 | A. I'm sorry. Could you ask that a different way,   | 21       | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, I do.  |
|                   | or I'm not  | 23       | QUESTIONING  |
| 23 0              | Q. Yeah. Yeah. I'm sorry for the confusion.   | 24       | BY CHAIR DANNER:   |
| 25                | So the 2022 commission basis report is based on   | 25       | Q. Yeah, I do. I just want to let me let me  |
|                   |   |          |  |

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

### Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|  | Page 53  |  | Page 55   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  | start good morning, Mr. Chiles.  | 1  | I did not see anything in the settlement about  |
| 2  | A. Good morning.   | 2  | equity, yet, we have a state law, RCW 80.28.425, that   |
| 3  | Q. You received a guestion from Donna Barnett about  | 3  | has requirements regarding equity, and I was wondering  |
| 4  | the AMA versus the EOP, but let me just ask, it appears  | 4  | if you want to explain whether the settlement does or   |
| 5  | in the settlement that you're excluding EOP revenue  | 5  | doesn't comply with those provisions.   |
| 6  | growth, although, you're including EOP treatment for   | 6  | A. So I'm not specifically familiar with that, but  |
| 7  | rate base and depreciation expense and tax expense and   | 7  | when you refer to equity, in what regard, I guess, if I   |
| 8  | interest synchronization.  | 8  | could get some clarification there.   |
| 9  | Did the 2020 test year experience customer   | 9  | Q. Well, I can tell you, we have we have a state  |
| 10   | growth as compared to prior years, and if so, how much   | 10   | law that expands public interest to include equity as   |
| 11   | in percentage terms?   | 11   | well as environmental health and greenhouse gas emission  |
| 12   | A. We did experience customer growth in 2020. We   | 12   | reductions and so forth in determining the law  |
| 13   | have been Cascade service territory has gradually  | 13   | states, "In determining the public interest, the  |
| 14   | been growing, so we did experience customer growth in  | 14   | Commission may consider such factors including but not  |
| 15   | 2020, yes.   | 15   | limited to environmental health and greenhouse gas  |
| 16   | Q. So but you excluded customer growth from the EOP  | 16   | emission reductions, health and safety concerns,  |
| 17   | treatment; is that correct?  | 17   | economic development, and equity to the extent such   |
| 18   | A. We I don't know that we excluded EOP customer   | 18   | factors affect the rate services and practices of the   |
| 19   | growth   | 19   | gas or electrical company regulated by the Commission."   |
| 20   | Q. From growth. So so you think you have EOP   | 20   | A. Okay. And how did we address that,   |
| 21   | treatment for customer growth as well?   | 21   | specifically? Cascade has been on I mean, we  |
| 22   | A. I believe so, yes.  | 22   | certainly feel that we've been good stewards and are  |
| 23   | Q. All right. Okay. Thank you.   | 23   | striving to continue to be good stewards for the  |
| 24   | A. I believe. I mean, specifically, I think  | 24   | overall, you know, benefit of our customers and the   |
| 25   | customer accounts were updated and revenue was accounted   | 25   | citizens that live you know, whether they use natural   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  | Page 54  |  | Page 56   |
| 1  | for when we when we calculated end of period.  | 1  | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,   |
| 2  | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br><b>Q. Okay.</b>   | 2  | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote   |
| 2<br>3   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br><b>Q. Okay.</b><br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.   | 2<br>3   | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4  | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more<br>efficient equipment. This is an area that the company   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more<br>efficient equipment. This is an area that the company<br>has been fully supportive of in that regard.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more<br>efficient equipment. This is an area that the company<br>has been fully supportive of in that regard.<br><b>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity</b>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more<br>efficient equipment. This is an area that the company<br>has been fully supportive of in that regard.<br>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity<br>in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement</li> <li>negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in</li> <li>April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know,<br>green energy and what we can do there to to promote<br>that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint,<br>we've seen great success there in conversions to more<br>efficient equipment. This is an area that the company<br>has been fully supportive of in that regard.<br>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity<br>in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's<br>in the number it's viewed in the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.<br/>And I too had a question about the settlement<br/>negotiation process.<br/>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br/>April.<br/>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br/>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?<br>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?<br>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I<br>would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?<br>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?<br>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I<br>would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the<br>timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | for when we when we calculated end of period.<br>Q. Okay.<br>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.<br>Q. No, that's all right.<br>And I too had a question about the settlement<br>negotiation process.<br>There was a settlement conference scheduled in<br>April.<br>Did the settling parties bring their agreement<br>terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity<br>to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule?<br>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I<br>would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the<br>timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't<br>know.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the weatherization programs in community color</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the weatherization programs in community color communities of color or tribal or immigrant or other</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the weatherization programs in community color communities of color or tribal or immigrant or other marginalized communities? Have you looked at that?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: If that's all right.</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the weatherization programs in community color communities of color or tribal or immigrant or other marginalized communities? Have you looked at that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We obviously have, you know, worked</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>for when we when we calculated end of period.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I didn't mean to interrupt you.</li> <li>Q. No, that's all right.</li> <li>And I too had a question about the settlement negotiation process.</li> <li>There was a settlement conference scheduled in April.</li> <li>Did the settling parties bring their agreement terms to the other parties and give them an opportunity to respond and participate prior to the e-mail that staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural schedule?</li> <li>A. Oh, you're testing my memory. I would I would have to ask. I don't specifically recall the timing of all of that in the April meeting. I don't know.</li> <li>Q. Okay. If you can't recall, I may ask Judge Doyle. We might want a bench request on that.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: If that's all right.</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>gas or not, and so we've been looking at, you know, green energy and what we can do there to to promote that. Certainly from an energy efficiency standpoint, we've seen great success there in conversions to more efficient equipment. This is an area that the company has been fully supportive of in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So there's nothing specific about equity in the settlement your am I hearing that somehow it's in the number it's viewed in the</li> <li>A. Well, inherent you know, I would somewhat defer to staff, but inherent in our settlement, you know, all issues have been addressed.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Also, you saw the proposal from The Energy Project regarding the Washington Energy Assistance program and you seem to be supportive of that.</li> <li>Can you tell me how that program identified an increase participation in the in the WEAF and the weatherization programs in community color communities of color or tribal or immigrant or other marginalized communities? Have you looked at that?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We obviously have, you know, worked worked close with The Energy Project and all the</li> </ul> |

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

|  | Page 57  |  | Page 59   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  |  | 1  | settlement?   |
| 2  | specifically target segments that, you know, we would<br>we would want them to and on their own have done you  | 2  |   |
|  | -  | 3  | A. How much of what's (Pause.)  |
| 3  | know, created new programs, you know, the big art  |  | Q. If you could explain the amount of the unbilled  |
| 4  | (phonetic) program to to help in trying to reach out   | 4  | revenues that's included in the 15.9 million working  |
| 5  | to those groups. So, again, The Energy Project   | 5  | capital allowance provided in the settlement.   |
| 6  | proposals we're very supportive of and, you know, look   | 6  | A. Well, it would   |
| 7  | forward to working with them going forward to address  | 7  | Q. And specifically why this doesn't include go   |
| 8  | the issues that you specifically mention.  | 8  | ahead.  |
| 9  | Q. But you are I mean, we're talking about 5   | 9  | A. Oh, no, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.   |
| 10   | percent of the 22/23 program funding.  | 10   | Q. If you could specifically explain why this   |
| 11   | Have you done any kind of cost benefit analysis  | 11   | amount doesn't include the .6 million in unbilled   |
| 12   | or any planning on how that money would be spent?  | 12   | revenues that the company claims should be recovered in   |
| 13   | A. I don't have all the all the details of that.   | 13   | the revenue requirement.  |
| 14   | We can provide that to you in the information  | 14   | Is my question making sense to you?   |
| 15   | additional information that we have on that.   | 15   | A. Not entirely. Ann, I believe that the .6   |
| 16   | Q. Yeah. I would appreciate that, if you would,  | 16   | million is the 637,000, if that's what you're   |
| 17   | and then any projections for how much participation  | 17   | Q. Yes.   |
| 18   | would increase as a result of that. That would that  | 18   | A referencing.  |
| 19   | would be very helpful for me.  | 19   | So that number has actually been corrected to be  |
| 20   | A. Okay.   | 20   | 1.4 million, \$1,413,568, and which would be the  |
| 21   | Q. Thank you.  | 21   | remaining unbilled revenue included in our revenue  |
| 22   | I think let me see if my colleague has any   | 22   | requirement, so that was  |
| 23   | other questions before I ask more.   | 23   | Q. Okay. So let's okay. So let's talk about   |
| 24   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. Thank you. I  | 24   | that.   |
| 25   | do have any I have questions.  | 25   | Can you explain the math that justifies the   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  | Page 58  |  | Page 60   |
|  |  |  | 5   |
| 1  | Can you hear me?   | 1  | errata that Cascade filed yesterday that indicates the  |
| 1<br>2   | Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.   | 1<br>2   | errata that Cascade filed yesterday that indicates the company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in  |
|  |  |  |   |
| 2  | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.   | 2  | company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in   |
| 2<br>3   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.   | 2<br>3   | company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio  | 2<br>3<br>4  | company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in<br>unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled<br>revenue?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul><li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li><li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul><li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li><li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li><li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul><li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li><li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit,</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15  | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million.</li> <li>Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me<br>know when you're there.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to get that now.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>QUESTIONING<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me<br>know when you're there.<br>A. 3 through 14, yes, I'm I'm there.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to get that now.</li> <li>So the total unbilled revenue in 2020 was</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me<br>know when you're there.<br>A. 3 through 14, yes, I'm I'm there.<br>Q. Okay. So could you please explain the amount of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to get that now.</li> <li>So the total unbilled revenue in 2020 was 2,129,998, and that was out of the general ledger</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me<br>know when you're there.<br>A. 3 through 14, yes, I'm I'm there.<br>Q. Okay. So could you please explain the amount of<br>the unbilled revenue that's included in the 15.9 million | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li><b>0. You can see why I'm confused.</b></li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to get that now.</li> <li>So the total unbilled revenue in 2020 was 2,129,998, and that was out of the general ledger unbilled revenue. From there, if you adjust off of the</li> </ul> |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I'm having some audio<br>issues.<br>Can you hear me?<br>THE WITNESS: You cut out for a bit and then<br>I gotcha back, and so (Pause.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you hear<br>me now?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yes.<br>THE WITNESS: I can hear you now, yes.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I was going to<br>say, otherwise, we can take a break and I can reconnect,<br>but if this is working, I'll just keep going.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Thank you, Mr. Chiles, for your testimony this<br>morning. Let's talk about unbilled revenue a bit.<br>So if you look at your testimony, your rebuttal<br>testimony, MAC-4T on page 8, lines 3 through 14, let me<br>know when you're there.<br>A. 3 through 14, yes, I'm I'm there.<br>Q. Okay. So could you please explain the amount of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>company should be allowed to recover 1.4 million in unbilled revenue instead of the .6 million in unbilled revenue?</li> <li>A. So what was included so the the original unbilled revenue included was the 2 2.1 million. Let me get my papers here. And from that, we would then adjust out or make an adjustment for both the decoupling which was 637,000. That actually would increase the unbilled or, yes, the unbilled, and then removing the supplemental schedules was a would be a decrease of 1 million, and that's over on line 9 of page 7, but I guess by referencing, I guess for your benefit, the the numbers within the testimony, the original unbilled again, I'm (Pause.)</li> <li>Q. You can see why I'm confused.</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>There's a great schedule that comes from from AWEC's testimony that we actually made an adjustment to to point this out, and forgive me. I'm trying to to get that now.</li> <li>So the total unbilled revenue in 2020 was 2,129,998, and that was out of the general ledger</li> </ul>   |

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

|  | Page 61  |  | Page 63   |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  | 7 776,556, and because of the decoupling, a reverse,   | amount. You know, that cha   | anged from year to year   |
| 2  | that would be in addition to the unbilled revenue. And   | 2 Those billing determinants a   |   |
| 3  | then when you back out the supplemental schedules, it's  | <sup>3</sup> Customer growth is part of t  |   |
| 4  | an adjustment of 1,492,986, which would offset that, so  | all of those things factor in, a   | -   |
| 5  | it would be a negative 2.1 million, a negative 776,000,  | =  | standpoint, again, our we're  |
| 6  | and a positive 1,414,000 gets you to the adjustment  | 5 trying to be consistent in ho  |   |
| 7  | or the remaining unbilled that factors into the revenue  | 7 know, at the end of any give   | • •   |
| 8  | requirement of \$1,414,000.  | And this certainly by  | if we were to remove  |
| 9  | Does that help?  | 9 those, it would it could have  | ve, in most years, a  |
| 10   | Q. Okay. Well, thank you.  | positive impact to the revenue   | ue requirement and require  |
| 11   | l guess, why why did can you explain why   | 1 more and or so, again, t   | o me, consistency has been  |
| 12   | in your rebuttal testimony you deducted the .8 million   | 2 the key here, you know, in h   | ow we treated things.   |
| 13   | related to decoupling from AWEC's figure and does the  | -  | question on this topic, and   |
| 14   | why does the errata reverse that from your rebuttal  |  | stimony and to Ms. Nygard's   |
| 15   | testimony?   |  | n't answer this in part or in   |
| 16   | A. Right. In the rebuttal testimony well,  | full, I can defer to to her,   |   |
| 17   | the the way it's written the way it is presented   | 7 your testimony, rebuttal tes   | stimony on page 8, lines 5  |
| 18   | in the in the errata is correct. It's an judgment  | B through 9.   |   |
| 19   | to and when you say you know, when we refer to it  |  | money that you stated that  |
| 20   | as saying subtract from, it would be a subtraction that  | shareholders advanced to   |   |
| 21<br>22   | results in an addition, if that makes sense, because of<br>the it's a reversal or it reverses the negative   | <ol> <li>represented by the unbilled</li> <li>the equity infusion that are</li> </ol>  | mentioned in Ms. Nygard's   |
| 23   | back out, and so built into the original, you know,  | 2 the equity infusion that are<br>3 testimony?   | mentioned in Ms. Nygard S   |
| 24   | total unbilled revenue of 2.1 million was the decoupling   | A. I think it would be part  | of the  |
| 25   | adjustment, and it would have reversed or it would   | 5 Q. Do you want me to re  |   |
|  |  |  |   |
|  | Page 62  |  |   |
|  |  |  | Page 64   |
| 1  | have reduced that unbilled revenue to begin with, so   | A. Sure.   |   |
| 2  | added it adding that negative would then increase  | Q. Okay. So was the amo  | ount of money that you state  |
| 2<br>3   | added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.   | Q.         Okay. So was the amount           3         in your testimony that share  | ount of money that you state holders advanced to fund the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | added it adding that negative would then increase<br>the the unbilled amount.<br><b>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general</b>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount<br>in your testimony that share<br>cost of the services represent   | ount of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>nted by the unbilled revenue  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | added it adding that negative would then increase<br>the the unbilled amount.<br>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general<br>concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use   | Q.Okay. So was the amongin your testimony that sharecost of the services represepart of the equity infusions to  | ount of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>nted by the unbilled revenue  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | added it adding that negative would then increase<br>the the unbilled amount.<br>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general<br>concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use<br>unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the   | Q.Okay. So was the amongin your testimony that sharecost of the services representpart of the equity infusions theNygard's testimony?  | ount of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>nted by the unbilled revenue<br>hat are mentioned in Ms.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | added it adding that negative would then increase<br>the the unbilled amount.<br>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general<br>concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use<br>unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the<br>normalized revenue requirement?  | Q.Okay. So was the amongin your testimony that sharecost of the services representpart of the equity infusions theNygard's testimony?A.It would be part of the equity of the equi  | ount of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>nted by the unbilled revenue<br>hat are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we</li> </ul>  | Q. Okay. So was the amount<br>in your testimony that share<br>cost of the services represent<br>part of the equity infusions to<br>Nygard's testimony?<br>A. It would be part of the end<br>would be part of overall working   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>nted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>equity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean,</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So was the and<br/>in your testimony that share<br/>cost of the services represent<br/>part of the equity infusions to<br/>Nygard's testimony?</li> <li>A. It would be part of the end<br/>would be part of overall working<br/>company uses to fund those in</li> </ul>   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the and<br>in your testimony that share<br>cost of the services represe<br>part of the equity infusions to<br>Nygard's testimony?<br>A. It would be part of the e<br>would be part of overall worki<br>company uses to fund those i<br>infusion would be included in   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean,</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So was the amount of the services represent part of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?</li> <li>A. It would be part of the environment of</li></ul> | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity  |
| 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase<br/>the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general<br/>concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use<br/>unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the<br/>normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we<br/>made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean,<br/>once we've taken out the the decoupling and the<br/>supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So was the amount of the services represent part of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?</li> <li>A. It would be part of the environment of</li></ul> | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So was the amount of the services represent part of the services represent part of the equity infusions to hygard's testimony?</li> <li>A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RE</li> </ul>  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a</li> </ul>  | Q. Okay. So was the and<br>in your testimony that share<br>cost of the services represent<br>part of the equity infusions to<br>Nygard's testimony?A. It would be part of the e<br>would be part of overall workit<br>company uses to fund those in<br>infusion would be included in<br>Q. Okay. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RE<br>additional questions, but if you<br>in.  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase<br/>the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general<br/>concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use<br/>unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the<br/>normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we<br/>made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean,<br/>once we've taken out the the decoupling and the<br/>supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment<br/>there has been consistent to include that remaining<br/>unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a<br/>consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes</li> </ul>  | Q. Okay. So was the and<br>in your testimony that share<br>cost of the services represent<br>part of the equity infusions to<br>Nygard's testimony?A. It would be part of the e<br>would be part of overall workit<br>company uses to fund those in<br>infusion would be included in<br>Q. Okay. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RE<br>additional questions, but if you<br>in.  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>equity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement</li> </ul>  | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: With the test of test of test of the test of the test of test  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whe services represent to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference.  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. So was the and<br/>in your testimony that share<br/>cost of the services represent<br/>part of the equity infusions to<br/>Nygard's testimony?</li> <li>A. It would be part of the end<br/>would be part of overall working<br/>company uses to fund those in<br/>infusion would be included in<br/>Q. Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RE<br/>additional questions, but if you<br/>in.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: White<br/>We we may want to take and<br/>done, or we before we're do<br/>Mr. Chiles. What is your prefi-<br/>Would you like to just plow and</li> </ul>   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>nead?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to hygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whe we may want to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference         Would you like to just plow an COMMISSIONER RE   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>hy don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>nead?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could</li> </ul>  | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to hygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Why We we may want to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference         Would you like to just plow and COMMISSIONER RE         It can take a break now, and the company was to be a company was to the company was the company was to the company wa  | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ng capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>nead?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break<br>hen if we take maybe five,  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could explain.</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whe we may want to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your prefive Would you like to just plow an COMMISSIONER RE         Would you like to just plow an COMMISSIONER RE         Description   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>equity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>hy don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>head?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break<br>hen if we take maybe five,<br>udge Doyle, what your                       |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could explain.</li> <li>A. Well, no, certainly unbilled is going to be</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whete would you like to just plow and to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference is I don't know, Just and the services of the services of the minutes I can fix my   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>equity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>hy don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>head?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break<br>hen if we take maybe five,<br>udge Doyle, what your                       |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could explain.</li> <li>A. Well, no, certainly unbilled is going to be impacted by that. Again, there are a variety of factors</li> </ul> | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whether we may want to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference is I don't know, Ju preference is I can fix my meantime.   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>nead?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break<br>hen if we take maybe five,<br>udge Doyle, what your<br>fix my audio in the |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>added it adding that negative would then increase the the unbilled amount.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And just going back to some general concepts, can you explain why it's appropriate to use unbilled revenue that has not been normalized in the normalized revenue requirement?</li> <li>A. Unbilled that hasn't been I mean, we we made the appropriate adjustments to normalize. I mean, once we've taken out the the decoupling and the supplemental, it would it you know, our treatment there has been consistent to include that remaining unbilled in the revenue requirement, and so from a consistent consistency standpoint, you know, it makes sense to me that we would go ahead and include that as we have in the past.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so do you agree with AWEC's statement that unbilled revenue entries are sensitive to the specific rate changes and changes in actual billing determinates that occurred over the course of the historical accounting period? And if not, if you could explain.</li> <li>A. Well, no, certainly unbilled is going to be</li> </ul>   | Q. Okay. So was the amount in your testimony that share cost of the services represent part of the equity infusions to Nygard's testimony?         A. It would be part of the end would be part of overall working company uses to fund those in infusion would be included in Q. Okay. Thank you.         COMMISSIONER RE         additional questions, but if you in.         CHAIR DANNER: Whete would you like to just plow and to take a done, or we before we're do Mr. Chiles. What is your preference is I don't know, Just and the services of the services of the minutes I can fix my   | bunt of money that you state<br>holders advanced to fund the<br>inted by the unbilled revenue<br>that are mentioned in Ms.<br>quity infusion. It<br>ing capital that the<br>tems, so yes, the equity<br>that.<br>NDAHL: Dave, I have a few<br>u have a few, please jump<br>my don't you go ahead.<br>break before Mr. Chiles is<br>one with our questions with<br>erence, Commissioner?<br>nead?<br>NDAHL: I can take a break<br>hen if we take maybe five,<br>udge Doyle, what your<br>fix my audio in the |

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

|  | Page 65   |  | Page 67  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Do the commissioners want a five- or ten-minute   | 1  | its compliance filing.   |
| 2  | break?  | 2  | Are you aware of that or not?  |
| 3  | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. Can we take a   | 3  | A. I believe that we did. I mean, it's been our  |
| 4  | five-minute break?  | 4  | standard practice that we have done that. I can't say  |
| 5  | JUDGE DOYLE: Great. It's 11:07. Wow.  | 5  | specifically that it was mentioned in that rate case or  |
| 6  | Math is hard apparently. Let's do 11:12   | 6  | in that filing that we would be adjusting rates for the  |
| 7  | MS. CHAIR DANNER: Why don't we call it  | 7  | C CRM as we did and have in the past.  |
| 8  | 11:15.  | 8  | Q. So do you think that companies should be allowed  |
| 9  | JUDGE DOYLE: Love it. Make it simple.   | 9  | to make changes to rates that have not been granted  |
| 10   | CHAIR DANNER: All right.  | 10   | explicit authorization from the Commission or otherwise  |
| 11   | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. We'll be off the  | 11   | been allowed to take effect by operation of law?   |
| 12   | record until 11:15.   | 12   | A. Well, in general, no. I mean, we should not be  |
| 13   | (A break was taken from   | 13   | changing our rates without the proper authorization. I   |
| 14   | 11:07 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)   | 14   | think our understanding of this is that we would have,   |
| 15   | JUDGE DOYLE: Welcome back, everyone. It is  | 15   | through the various mechanisms, had the approval to make   |
| 16   | 11:15. We've just been on a break. Let's be back on   | 16   | the changes appropriately as we did.   |
| 17   | the record, and I believe, Commissioner Rendahl, you  | 17   | Q. Okay. So in in the rebuttal testimony, your   |
| 18   | still have some questions for Mr. Chile.  | 18   | rebuttal testimony in this case, you stated that that  |
| 19   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.  | 19   | the company plans to make the CRM rate changes in its  |
| 20   | Maybe let me verify you can hear me maybe   | 20   | compliance filing consistent with the last case.   |
| 21   | better.   | 21   | So how will the company address the change in  |
| 22   | THE WITNESS: I can hear you.  | 22   | this case to ensure the filing is clear as to what   |
| 23   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: All right. Always a   | 23   | changes are being made and under what authority?   |
| 24   | good thing.   | 24   | A. Specific to that, maybe they should make the  |
| 25   | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:  | 25   | request that that is stated in the order that we would   |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Page 66   |  | Page 68  |
|  | Page 66   |  | Page 68  |
| 1  | Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions  | 1  | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.   |
| 2  | Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.  | 2  | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.   |
| 2<br>3   | Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions<br>about the CRM refund.<br>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and   | 2<br>3   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br><b>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions<br>about the CRM refund.<br>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and<br>24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it   | 2<br>3<br>4  | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br><b>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br><b>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions<br>about the CRM refund.<br>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and<br>24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it<br>appears that when the company filed its compliance<br>filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that<br>it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized<br>in the final order; would you agree?  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br><b>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br><b>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.<br>(Telephonic interruption.)  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.<br>(Telephonic interruption.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process,</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.<br>(Telephonic interruption.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.<br>Q. Okay. I'll move on.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you<br>have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep<br>going?<br>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless<br>you want me to. I see where you're going with these<br>questions, and just if you have more, go for it.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.<br>(Telephonic interruption.)<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.<br>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:<br>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process,</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13,</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know,</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. (Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our compliance filing did follow the established rules.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> <li>A. I am there, yes.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our compliance filing did follow the established rules.</li> <li>Getting into the details of that, I actually would not</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. (Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> <li>A. I am there, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Great.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our compliance filing did follow the established rules. Getting into the details of that, I actually would not be the best witness to do that, so we could provide</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. (Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> <li>A. I am there, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Great.</li> <li>So you make the statement that the trend</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our compliance filing did follow the established rules. Getting into the details of that, I actually would not be the best witness to do that, so we could provide follow-up on that.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.</li> <li>(Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> <li>A. I am there, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Great.</li> <li>So you make the statement that the trend suggests that business operations are returning to</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. I'm going to return to ask some questions about the CRM refund.</li> <li>And in your rebuttal testimony on pages 23 and 24, you address this issue that AWEC raised, and so it appears that when the company filed its compliance filing in its last general rate case in UG-200568, that it proposed rate changes in addition to those authorized in the final order; would you agree?</li> <li>A. I would yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you believe this is the appropriate compliance filing process after a final order has been issued? And if what is that process, if you</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q can explain?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I do believe, you know, again, that we followed all the all of the appropriate, you know, steps in filing that, and so and our our compliance filing did follow the established rules.</li> <li>Getting into the details of that, I actually would not be the best witness to do that, so we could provide follow-up on that.</li> <li>Q. Well, let me just ask if you know whether in</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>make the changes as appropriate to that mechanism.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll move on.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you have questions you want to ask, or I can just keep going?</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: You can keep going, unless you want me to. I see where you're going with these questions, and just if you have more, go for it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. (Telephonic interruption.)</li> <li>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think not.</li> <li>BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mr. Chiles, now turning to the issue of the COVID-19 savings revenue or the savings, can you can you turn to your rebuttal testimony at page 13, specifically lines 13 through 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Are you there?</li> <li>A. I am there, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Great.</li> <li>So you make the statement that the trend suggests that business operations are returning to pre-pandemic levels, and you spoke a bit to AWEC's</li> </ul> |

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

|                            | Page 69   |                      | Page 71   |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| 1                          | COVID-19 accounting deferral going forward and what are   | 1                    | issuance?   |
| 2                          | the company's plans regarding that deferral?  | 2                    | A. Oh, I can get that for you. I'm not exactly  |
| 3                          | A. Well, I would say that we were working through   | 3                    | sure.   |
| 4                          | all the different plans. As far as the deferral,  | 4                    | Q. Okay. And, again, what was the amount of the   |
| 5                          | itself, you know, we have those still tracking all of   | 5                    | long-term debt? Can you get that for us?  |
| 6                          | those costs and will continue to treat those as we're   | 6                    | A. I believe it was 50 million. I can follow up on  |
| 7                          | treating them now; although, I would say very minimal on  | 7                    | that.   |
| 8                          | our part at this point.   | 8                    | Q. Okay. And so in Tammy Nygard's testimony, I  |
| 9                          | Q. So are there any savings that you're still   | 9                    | believe it was 35 million.  |
| 10                         | tracking in addition to costs?  | 10                   | So are there some updates that needed need to   |
| 11                         | A. I think well, we're we're still seeing   | 11                   | be made?  |
| 12                         | I mean, there are some savings in addition to the cost,   | 12                   | A. I well, certainly what we're seeing is, and  |
| 13                         | yes.  | 13                   | as, you know, you may be aware, gas prices have been  |
| 14                         | Q. Okay. And one last question and this, again,   | 14                   | significantly higher than what we would have  |
| 15                         | your rebuttal testimony on page 10 relating to  | 15                   | anticipated, and so we're you know, the additional  |
| 16                         | uncollectible expenses, and this is at lines 1 and 2.   | 16                   | amounts there would be covering those gas costs.  |
| 17                         | A. Yes.   | 17                   | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. I think I would like  |
| 18                         | Q. Where you testify that the current 2020 test   | 18                   | to have on the record the actual dates and the actual   |
| 19                         | year's uncollectible amount is representative of past   | 19                   | amount and then any updates that need to be made that   |
| 20                         | amounts and doesn't reflect an elevated level due to the  | 20                   | could affect the settlement, and so maybe we could we   |
| 21                         | coronavirus pandemic.   | 21                   | could do a bench request for that.  |
| 22                         | So did the uncollectible amounts identified in  | 22                   | BY CHAIR DANNER:  |
| 23                         | this case or included in this case include amounts that   | 23                   | Q. Also in her testimony on page 4, can you speak   |
| 24                         | are deferred under the mechanism and Docket U-200281  | 24                   | to what was Cascade's actual debt percentage in 2020?   |
| 25                         | that deals with COVID disconnection moratorium?   | 25                   | A. The actual debt percentage in 2020, I would  |
|                            | Page 70   |                      | Page 72   |
| 1                          | A. It would include all all uncollectibles,   | 1                    | refer to sorry it would be Exhibit 8-X, which   |
| 2                          | anything that we've written off as an uncollectible   | 2                    | would be our reply to AWEC Data Request No. 119, where  |
| 3                          | account, so any of those customers that were protected  | 3                    | we illustrate the the capital structure with and  |
| 4                          | would not include those balances.   | 4                    | without the impacts of the normalization, so at the end   |
| 5                          | Q. Okay. I don't think I understand, so from  | 5                    | of 12 12/31 of 2020, without the impacts, we would be   |
| 6                          | your answer, so does the uncollectible amounts in this  | 6                    | in debt of 53 and equity of 47.   |
| 7                          | case include those amounts deferred related to those  | 7                    | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So we yeah, we  |
| 8                          | disconnection, those customers  | 8                    | we may follow up with a bench request to get precise  |
| 9                          | A. No.  | 9                    | numbers on that, but I'll but thank you.  |
| 10                         | Q that you have not collected money from?   | 10                   | I have no further questions.  |
| 11                         | A. Yeah, I don't believe they do, no.   | 11                   | Commissioner Rendahl, do you?   |
| 12                         | Q. Okay. All right. Thank you.  | 12                   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have nothing  |
| 13                         | I don't have any further questions. Thank you   | 13                   | further for Mr. Chiles. Thank you.  |
| 14                         | very much for your patience.  | 14                   | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.   |
| 15                         | QUESTIONING (CONTINUED)   | 15                   | Mr. Chiles, you may be excused.   |
| 16                         | BY CHAIR DANNER:  | 16                   | As we didn't exactly do this as a panel forum as  |
| 17                         | Q. So I just want to ask some questions. These are  | 17                   | usually intended, we do, however, still have questions  |
| 18                         | in Tammy Nygard's testimony, and I'm hoping that you can  | 18                   | for the settling parties for Staff's witness, Joanna  |
|                            | answer these, but basically, in her exhibit, TJM-1T, on   | 19                   | Huang. Are you still available?   |
| 19                         |   | 20                   | And if not, would Staff please make your witness  |
| 20                         | page 5 at the top of the page, just was wondering I   | 1                    |   |
| 20<br>21                   | just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt   | 21                   | available.  |
| 20<br>21<br>22             | just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt been issued yet?  | 21<br>22             | available.<br>There you are.  |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul><li>just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt</li><li>been issued yet?</li><li>A. The new long-term debt has been issued, yes.</li></ul>                                      | 21<br>22<br>23       | available.<br>There you are.<br>And I will swear you in.  |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul><li>just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt</li><li>been issued yet?</li><li>A. The new long-term debt has been issued, yes.</li><li>Q. It has been issued, okay.</li></ul> | 21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | available.<br>There you are.<br>And I will swear you in.<br>Can you please raise your right hand. |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul><li>just want to nail this down: Has the new long-term debt</li><li>been issued yet?</li><li>A. The new long-term debt has been issued, yes.</li></ul>                                      | 21<br>22<br>23       | available.<br>There you are.<br>And I will swear you in.  |

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

|  | Page 73   | Page 75  |
|--|---|--|
| 1  | will give today is the full truth, nothing but the  | 1 Q. Okay. But it doesn't sound like you're sure   |
| 2  | whole truth and nothing but the truth?  | 2 what that procedure is?  |
| 3  | MS. HUANG: I do.  | A. I provide an analysis, but I don't deal too much  |
| 4  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.   | 4 with the exact date or which settlement. I don't get   |
| 5  | And commissioners?  | 5 too much involved with the procedure.  |
| 6  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So, actually, Judge   | 6 Q. Okay. And so are you aware of how this would  |
| 7  | Doyle, if you wouldn't mind, I think there was some I   | 7 have been communicated to the other parties, if it was?  |
| 8  | was thinking we were doing a settlement panel, so I   | 8 A. Usually by e-mail, and I was included. I just   |
| 9  | think there are some questions that maybe   | 9 can't remember exact date.   |
| 10   | JUDGE DOYLE: Sure.  | 10 <b>Q. Okay. Okay.</b>   |
| 11   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: that Mr. Chiles   | 11 A. And I'm working on two general rate cases at the   |
| 12   | may want to be available, so I'm not sure he's actually   | 12 same time, so   |
| 13   | excused yet.  | 13 Q. I understand. I understand.  |
| 14   | JUDGE DOYLE: My apologies.  | 14 Let me ask again another question that I've   |
| 15   | So if we could keep Mr. Chiles in then.   | 15 already asked Mr. Chiles, and that's with regard to the   |
| 16   | Ms. Barnett, do you have any other witnesses  | 16 Washington Energy Assistance program.   |
| 17   | that you were anticipating bringing into the settlement   | 17 Was there you are agreeing to what The Energy   |
| 18   | panel?  | 18 Project is proposing?   |
| 19   | MS. BARNETT: No. Mr. Chiles is the only   | 19 A. Yes.   |
| 20   | witness supporting the settlement, and as far as  | 20 Q. And so just wanted to know, we're talking about  |
| 21   | other and this is the only one that was identified by   | 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding, which is a   |
| 22   | any parties or the Commission, was Mr. Chiles, so but we  | million and a half. Have you completed or undertaken   |
| 23   | do have other people available if if it's appropriate   | any kind of cost benefit analysis? Can you do you  |
| 24   | or welcomed.  | 24 know how this money will be spent and what it will  |
| 25   | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. All right. With that,  | 25 achieve?  |
|  |   |  |
| 1  | Page 74<br>Commissioners, is there any anyone else that   | Page 76<br>1 A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my   |
| 1<br>2   | Page 74<br>Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?   |  |
|  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that  | 1 A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my  |
| 2  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?  | 1 A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br>2 rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree   |
| 2<br>3   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can  | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> </ol>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.   | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> </ol>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?   | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> </ol>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:   | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions   | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> <li>interrupt for a moment?</li> </ol>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.   | <ol> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> </ol>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> <li>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> <li>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14  | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my</li> <li>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree</li> <li>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis</li> <li>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might</li> <li>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on</li> <li>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to   | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions</b><br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q. I just want to start with a follow-up questions</b><br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)<br><b>Q.</b> And so that would have been that your lawyer  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that<br/>correct?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)<br><b>Q.</b> And so that would have been that your lawyer<br>brought the agreement terms to the other parties to give  | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a</li> <li>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that<br/>correct?</li> <li>A. It is not in this docket.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)<br><b>Q.</b> And so that would have been that your lawyer<br>brought the agreement terms to the other parties to give<br>them an opportunity to respond            | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that<br/>correct?</li> <li>A. It is not in this docket.</li> <li>But you're saying that it's directly relevant to</li> </ul>                                  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>9.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)<br><b>9.</b> And so that would have been that your lawyer<br>brought the agreement terms to the other parties to give<br>them an opportunity to respond<br>A. Yes. | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that<br/>correct?</li> <li>A. It is not in this docket.</li> <li>Q. But you're saying that it's directly relevant to<br/>the questions I'm asking?</li> </ul> |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | Commissioners, is there any anyone else that<br>anything else before you would like to continue?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. I think we can<br>go forward.<br>Dave, do you want to go ahead?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Sure.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br><b>Q.</b> I just want to start with a follow-up questions<br>that I asked Mr. Chiles, and this is for Joanna Huang.<br>There was another settlement conference<br>scheduled in April, and I'm asking, did you bring that<br>agreement, the agreement terms to the other parties to<br>give them an opportunity to respond to this you know,<br>prior to the e-mail that you sent on February 18th to<br>suspend the procedural schedule?<br>A. It has been a while. I cannot remember all the<br>detail, but I believe that our lawyer followed the<br>procedure and did the right thing, so (pause.)<br><b>Q.</b> And so that would have been that your lawyer<br>brought the agreement terms to the other parties to give<br>them an opportunity to respond            | <ul> <li>A. I didn't do analysis on that part, but in my<br/>rebuttal testimony, we do address that staff does agree<br/>what The Energy Project request.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But there was no independent analysis<br/>done</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, but we agree.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>MR. CHILES: Chair Danner, if I might<br/>interrupt for a moment?</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G (C O N T I N U E D)</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. You may.</li> <li>A. We did file our disconnection reduction plan on<br/>May 18th this year, and it should it provides details<br/>on the path that we're working on to help address that<br/>low income segment of our customer base, and<br/>specifically those of color, so we we do have a<br/>filing out there that would provide information on that.</li> <li>Q. All right. That is not in this docket; is that<br/>correct?</li> <li>A. It is not in this docket.</li> <li>But you're saying that it's directly relevant to</li> </ul>                                  |

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

|                            | Page 77  |                                  | Page 79  |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 1                          | getting that into the record, so thank you.  | 1                                | into Chair Danner's questions, so I just wanted to   |
| 2                          | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, may I  | 2                                | follow up on that, so Chair Danner, go ahead.  |
| 3                          | ask a follow-up?   | 3                                | CHAIR DANNER: And I appreciate you doing   |
| 4                          | CHAIR DANNER: Of course.   | 4                                | so. Thank you.   |
| 5                          | QUESTIONING (CONTINUED)  | 5                                | QUESTIONING (CONTINUED)  |
| 6                          | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:   | 6                                | BY CHAIR DANNER:   |
| 7                          | Q. So if the Commission were to approve this   | 7                                | Q. So, Joanna, I want to ask you questions about   |
| 8                          | proposal, is it the parties' intent that the low income  | 8                                | equity.  |
| 9                          | advisory group would work with the company to figure out   | 9                                | We have direction from state law that we are to  |
| 10                         | how best and most efficiently and most cost effectively  | 10                               | consider equity, and it was not addressed specifically   |
| 11                         | to implement this proposal?  | 11                               | in the settlement.   |
| 12                         | A. Yes. That's certainly our goal, is, again,  | 12                               | Can you tell me if it was if I'm missing it?   |
| 13                         | working closely with Staff, working closely with the   | 13                               | Is it there? Can you speak to that?  |
| 14                         | individual agencies to see how we can best serve this  | 14                               | A. Whether the settlement addressed that portion of  |
| 15                         | segment of our population of our customer base to make   | 15                               | the I just can't address to that issue. I'm sorry.   |
| 16                         | sure that they're getting the help that they need during   | 16                               | Q. All right. Thank you.   |
| 17                         | some really trying times. That is our goal.  | 17                               | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Commissioner  |
| 18                         | Q. Okay. Because I think Chair Danner had asked  | 18                               | Rendahl, I don't have any further questions right now  |
| 19                         | you some specific questions about if you have specific   | 19                               | for the panel.   |
| 20                         | activities or specific funding proposals in mind within  | 20                               | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a couple of   |
| 21                         | this proposal, and and so it sounds like it is not   | 21                               | more, and so to both Staff and Cascade witnesses.  |
| 22                         | it's still in the proposed it's still a proposal that  | 22                               | In the joint testimony, JT-1T at page 5, lines 2   |
| 23                         | could be funded, but the details need to be addressed.   | 23                               | through 8, relating to depreciation, the testimony is  |
| 24                         | A. Well, I think there are details within this plan  | 24                               | that you've analyzed depreciation expenses using end of  |
| 25                         | that we filed that I couldn't couldn't specifically  | 25                               | period depreciation, 2020 actual depreciation, and 2021  |
|                            | Page 78  |                                  | Page 80  |
| 1                          | provide to you at this time, so I think the document   | 1                                | actual depreciation, and that each methodology includes  |
| 2                          | would speak much better to the plans of the company than   | 2                                | benefits and drawbacks, but no methodology is clearly  |
| 3                          | I would be able to at this point at this point in  | 3                                | better or more appropriate than the other.   |
| 4                          | time.  | 4                                | Can you identify which method was used in  |
| 5                          | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So, Judge  | 5                                | actually arriving at the number in the settlement?   |
| б                          | Doyle, maybe we want to take notice of that filing in  | 6                                | MS. HUANG: I believe that we used a 2021   |
| 7                          | this docket.   | 7                                | actual depreciation expense.   |
| 8                          | JUDGE DOYLE: And, Mr. Chiles, can you  | 8                                | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.   |
| 9                          | please state the the name of that filing again and if  | 9                                | Mr. Chiles, would you do you have any changes  |
| 10                         | you have the docket number.  | 10                               | to that?   |
| 11                         | MR. CHILES: Let me I don't specifically  | 11                               | MR. CHILES: Yeah, I can't specifically say   |
| 12                         | have that in front of me. I will get it and provide it   | 12                               | that it was the 2021. I'm not not disputing, but it  |
| 13                         | to you.  | 13                               | would be you know, the depreciation was a compromised  |
| 14                         | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.  | 14                               | on behalf of the parties, and in general, I mean, a \$3  |
| 15                         | MS. BARNETT: I have that, if you want it.  | 15                               | million reduction, can't wouldn't be specific to a   |
| 16                         | I know I'm not a witness, but if it would help, I do   | 16                               | particular depreciation number, but, in general, it  |
| 17                         | have that handy if you would like that.  | 17<br>18                         | it was a compromised position by the company and I guess   |
| 18                         |  | 1 18                             | by Staff also.   |
| 10                         | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, if you could quickly.   |                                  |  |
| 19<br>20                   | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection   | 19                               | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. So for   |
| 20                         | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.  | 19<br>20                         | purposes of in the next general rate case that the   |
| 20<br>21                   | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection<br>reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.   | 19<br>20<br>21                   | purposes of in the next general rate case that the company will bring, how does the commission or other  |
| 20<br>21<br>22             | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection<br>reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Uh-huh.   | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | purposes of in the next general rate case that the<br>company will bring, how does the commission or other<br>parties address the change between this settlement black   |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection<br>reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Uh-huh.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead, Commissioner                        | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | purposes of in the next general rate case that the<br>company will bring, how does the commission or other<br>parties address the change between this settlement black<br>box number and going forward? How do we how do we  |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection<br>reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Uh-huh.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead, Commissioner<br>Rendahl, thank you. | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | purposes of in the next general rate case that the<br>company will bring, how does the commission or other<br>parties address the change between this settlement black<br>box number and going forward? How do we how do we<br>have a baseline going forward if we're not using an |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MS. BARNETT: Sure. The disconnection<br>reduction plan is filed under UG-200568.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.<br>MS. BARNETT: Uh-huh.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead, Commissioner                        | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | purposes of in the next general rate case that the<br>company will bring, how does the commission or other<br>parties address the change between this settlement black<br>box number and going forward? How do we how do we  |

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

## Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|   | Page 81  |   | Page 83   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1   | MR. CHILES: For depreciation in  | 1   | look at Column I.   |
| 2   | specifically?  | 2   | MR. CHILES: Correct, yes.   |
| 3   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes.   | 3   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you   |
| 4   | MR. CHILES: Well, I mean, our our goal   | 4   | confirm that Adjustment R-7 removes all of the  |
| 5   | is to use, you know, the you know, the test year   | 5   | supplemental schedules from base rates, including   |
| 6   | depreciation to make the appropriate adjustments so that   | 6   | Schedule 581, protected plus excess deferred income   |
| 7   | we're filing specifically on, you know, a a number.  | 7   | taxes from the general rate case?   |
| 8   | In this case, in terms of the settlement, it was   | 8   | MR. CHILES: If I look here, go from that  |
| 9   | to get to an agreed-upon position by by both parties   | 9   | particular number over to because that links over to  |
| 10  | that you know, an amount that we could both live   | 10  | the operating report, and I'm going to move to the  |
| 11  | with, given the different methods of calculating   | 11  | operating report, but it does remove all the  |
| 12  | depreciation.  | 12  | supplemental adjustments, yes, so it would remove the   |
| 13  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. I  | 13  | Schedule 581.   |
| 14  | appreciate I appreciate your response.   | 14  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.  |
| 15  | Unless you have something else, Chair Danner,  | 15  | And then next there's a spreadsheet named   |
| 16  | I'm going to move on to one other line of questions  | 16  | sup s-u-p-p-l, s-c-h, so supplemental schedule, and   |
| 17  | related to the protected plus excess deferred income   | 17  | the a-d-g [sic], so supplemental schedule adjustment.   |
| 18  | tax.   | 18  | Do you see that spreadsheet name?   |
| 19  | CHAIR DANNER: No, go right ahead.  | 19  | MR. CHILES: I do, yes.  |
| 20  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. And I realize  | 20  | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Can you   |
| 21  | that counsel for AWEC already asked a number of  | 21  | confirm that Column C removes all amounts associated  |
| 22  | questions about this, but I'm hoping that my questions   | 22  | with Washington State's allocated protected plus excess   |
| 23  | are not repeating.   | 23  | deferred income taxes Schedule 581 for the 2020 test  |
| 24  | So do you have the Excel workbook, Exhibit JT-2,   | 24  | year?   |
| 25  | both witnesses?  | 25  | MR. CHILES: Yes.  |
|   |  |   |   |
|   | Page 82  |   | Page 84   |
| 1   | MR. CHILES: I do have that, yes.   | 1   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Thank you.  |
| 2   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Ms. Huang, do you  |   | COMMISSIONER RENDATE. ORay. Thank you.  |
| 2   | COMMICCIONER RENDANCE. Mis. Huang, do you  | 2   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up   |
| 3   | have access to that?   | 2<br>3  |   |
|   |  | 1   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up   |
| 3   | have access to that?   | 3   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I  |
| 3<br>4  | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?   | 3<br>4  | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.   | 3<br>4<br>5   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?  | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witnesss.   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.  | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.<br>So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a   | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if<br>people don't object. I'm sorry.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.<br>So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a<br>spreadsheet name Exhibit MCG-5, summary of adjustments.  | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if<br>people don't object. I'm sorry.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, let's take a   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.<br>So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a<br>spreadsheet name Exhibit MCG-5, summary of adjustments.<br>Do you have that, Mr. Chiles?                                     | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if<br>people don't object. I'm sorry.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, let's take a<br>quick five-minute break. We'll be off the record and                     |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.<br>So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a<br>spreadsheet name Exhibit MCG-5, summary of adjustments.<br>Do you have that, Mr. Chiles?<br>MR. CHILES: I do have that, yes. | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if<br>people don't object. I'm sorry.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, let's take a<br>quick five-minute break. We'll be off the record and<br>return at 11:50. |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | have access to that?<br>THE WITNESS: Is that Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes. JT-2.<br>THE WITNESS: Can you tell me the name of<br>the Excel file?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: The spreadsheet name?<br>MR. CHILES: If I may?<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Go right ahead.<br>MR. CHILES: It's<br>210755-CascadeExh-JT-2-3-22-2.<br>THE WITNESS: I don't have that file.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Well, I'll ask<br>my questions and you can answer them<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Subject to check<br>MS. HUANG: Okay.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: and, Mr. Chiles,<br>you can go ahead with your understanding.<br>So referring to the Excel workbook, there's a<br>spreadsheet name Exhibit MCG-5, summary of adjustments.<br>Do you have that, Mr. Chiles?                                     | 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | And, Ms. Huang, you're welcome to follow up<br>subject to check once you get the transcript, but I<br>believe Mr. Chiles has answered the questions.<br>And I do not have any further questions for the<br>panel.<br>Chair Danner, if you have any, please go ahead.<br>CHAIR DANNER: No, thank you. I don't have<br>any more questions for this panel.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, thank you to the<br>panel of witnesses. We appreciate you being here and<br>giving your testimony, so with that, I believe we are<br>now excused.<br>I believe we've got a question for Public<br>Counsel's witness.<br>Is Mark Garret available?<br>MS. PAISNER: I believe he is.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. And while we're waiting<br>for Mr. Garrett Mr. Barnett, do you have a question?<br>MS. BARNETT: I could use a bio break if<br>people don't object. I'm sorry.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Well, let's take a<br>quick five-minute break. We'll be off the record and                     |

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

# Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|  | Page 85  | Page 8  | 87  |
|--|--|---|-----|
| 1  | (A break was taken from  | 1 cases.  |     |
| 2  | 11:46 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.)  | 2 MS. PAISNER: Is Public Counsel opposing the   |     |
| 3  | JUDGE DOYLE: We've just returned from a  | 3 settlement?   |     |
| 4  | short break, and we'll turn it back over to the  | 4 MR. GARRETT: Yes.   |     |
| 5  | Commissioners.   | 5 MS. PAISNER: Okay. Thank you.   |     |
| 6  | CHAIR DANNER: All right.   | 6 Our witness is available for questions.   |     |
| 7  | JUDGE DOYLE: Apologies. I just realized I  | 7 CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.   |     |
| 8  | didn't get a chance to swear in our witness.   | 8 QUESTIONING   |     |
| 9  | CHAIR DANNER: Yes. I was going to ask you,   | 9 BY CHAIR DANNER:  |     |
| 10   | who is the witness right now.  | 10 Q. And it's still morning, so good morning, Mr.  |     |
| 11   | We have excused Joanna Huang and Mr. Chiles;   | 11 Garrett.   |     |
| 12   | correct?   | 12 A. Good morning.   |     |
| 13   | JUDGE DOYLE: Yes.  | 13 Q. So in your testimony in MEG-1T on page 8, you   |     |
| 14   | CHAIR DANNER: Okay.  | are recommending a 2021 test year, but you have an  |     |
| 15   | JUDGE DOYLE: So we're bringing up Public   | 15 exhibit MEG-3, on page 2, you refer to the twelve mont   | ths |
| 16   | Counsel.   | 16 ending September 31st, 2020, so can you clarify, are y   | vou |
| 17   | Mr. Garrett, have you been able to bring   | 17 recommending a calendar year, a calendar test year of  | f   |
| 18   | yourself up?   | 18 <b>2020 or 2021?</b>   |     |
| 19   | MR. GARRETT: Yes, I'm here.  | 19 A. No. I think this that needs to be cleared   |     |
| 20   | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. Can you please   | 20 up. I think there's some confusion about the way we  |     |
| 21   | raise your right hand.   | 21 presented the testimony, the opposition testimony.   |     |
| 22   | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony that   | 22 What I was really trying to do is show that the  |     |
| 23   | you'll give today is the truth, the whole truth, and   | 23 stipulation of increase of 10.7 million was too high   |     |
| 24   | nothing but the truth?   | based upon actual results in 2021, so the stipulation   |     |
| 25   | MR. GARRETT: I do.   | came out of the 2020 results because it was filed in  |     |
|  |  |   |     |
|  | Page 86  | Page 8  | 88  |
|  |  |   | 00  |
| 1  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you.  | 1 2021, the case was filed in 2021, so they didn't have   | 00  |
| 1<br>2   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your   | 2 2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate   | 00  |
|  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your witness?  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> </ul>   | 00  |
| 2  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> </ul>   | 00  |
| 2<br>3   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> </ul>  | 00  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> </ul>  | 00  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> </ul>  | 00  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-re-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-re-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> </ul>  |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> </ul>  |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> </ul>  |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15  | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> </ul>  |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> </ul>   |     |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> </ul>   | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> </ul>   | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> </ul>  | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.<br>MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> <li>million difference; it's about \$5.2 million.</li> </ul>   | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.<br>MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education<br>and experience.  | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> <li>million difference; it's about \$5.2 million.</li> </ul>   | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.<br>MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education<br>and experience.<br>MR. GARRETT: So I'm a CPA and an attorney   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> <li>million difference; it's about \$5.2 million.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So just to clarify then, you are you</li> <li>looking you would like the Commission to use the 20</li> </ul> | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.<br>MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education<br>and experience.<br>MR. GARRETT: So I'm a CPA and an attorney<br>and I have about 20 years in public utility regulation | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> <li>million difference; it's about \$5.2 million.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So just to clarify then, you are you</li> <li>looking you would like the Commission to use the 20</li> </ul> | r   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Public Counsel, would you like to introduce your<br>witness?<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, please.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thanks.<br>Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett, please state your<br>name for the record and spell your last name.<br>MR. GARRETT: Mark E. Garrett,<br>G-a-r-r-e-t-t.<br>MS. PAISNER: What is your place of<br>employment?<br>MR. GARRETT: Garrett Group Consulting, Inc.<br>MS. PAISNER: Thank you.<br>What is your occupation?<br>MR. GARRETT: I am a consultant expert<br>witness in the area of utility regulation, mainly.<br>MS. PAISNER: On whose behalf are you<br>testifying?<br>MR. GARRETT: Public Counsel.<br>MS. PAISNER: Please describe your education<br>and experience.<br>MR. GARRETT: So I'm a CPA and an attorney   | <ul> <li>2021, but the test year is supposed to predict the rate</li> <li>affected period, which is typically the next year, close</li> <li>to the next year, and so by the time we actually got the</li> <li>settlement and filed testimony, we had the actual</li> <li>results for the next year.</li> <li>We didn't have a commission basis report at that</li> <li>time, so we didn't have a clean version of the results,</li> <li>but but we did ask for the financial results for</li> <li>2021, and so the point of our testimony was just to show</li> <li>based on actual results in 2021, the stipulation was too</li> <li>high.</li> <li>And since our testimony was filed, we actually</li> <li>now have the commission basis report with all the proper</li> <li>adjustments that the Commission requires in it, and it</li> <li>shows the same about the same thing. It shows \$5.2</li> <li>million deficiency, so we were fairly close, but we made</li> <li>some mistakes in our in our adjustments, but the</li> <li>commission basis report is probably the best evidence of</li> <li>what happened in 2021, and it doesn't show a \$10.7</li> <li>million difference; it's about \$5.2 million.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So just to clarify then, you are you</li> <li>looking you would like the Commission to use the 20</li> </ul> | r   |

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

|    | Page 89  |    | Page 91  |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1  | to make is that the company's adjustments for 2020 were  | 1  | MR. MULLINS: I do.                                       |
| 2  | supposed to predict what would happen in 2021. We        | 2  | JUDGE DOYLE: Mr. Stokes, would you please                |
| 3  | actually know now what happened in 2021. It's nowhere    | 3  | introduce your witness.                                  |
| 4  | near what the company predicted, and so I'm just showing | 4  | MR. STOKES: Good morning. Would you please               |
| 5  | that the settlement is too high based upon what's really | 5  | state your full name for the record and who you're       |
| 6  | going on at the company.                                 | 6  | representing.  |
| 7  | Q. All right. Thank you for that.                        | 7  | THE WITNESS: Brad Mullins, spelled                       |
| 8  | CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner Rendahl, if you               | 8  | M-u-I-I-i-n-s, representing AWEC, the Alliance of        |
| 9  | don't have any follow-up on that, I'm going to ask some  | 9  | Western Energy Consumers.                                |
| 10 | other questions then.                                    | 10 | MR. STOKES: And who employs you right now?               |
| 11 | Okay. Thank you.   | 11 | MR. MULLINS: I am a self-employed                        |
| 12 | BY CHAIR DANNER:   | 12 | consultant.  |
| 13 | Q. So I also want to turn to The Energy Project's        | 13 | MR. STOKES: Okay. If you had to file your                |
| 14 | proposal. It sounds like Public Counsel is okay with     | 14 | same testimony today, would you file the same testimony? |
| 15 | that proposal, but the question I asked to the other     | 15 | MR. MULLINS: Yes.  |
| 16 | witnesses I also ask to you: Did you do any kind of      | 16 | MR. STOKES: Okay. I will open up this                    |
| 17 | analysis or did you see any plan about how that money    | 17 | witness for questions.                                   |
| 18 | would actually be spent, how it would attract new users, | 18 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Well, thank you.                |
| 19 | participants into the WEAF program?                      | 19 | l just have  |
| 20 | A. No.   | 20 | QUESTIONING  |
| 21 | Q. Okay. Okay. And, finally, the same question I         | 21 | BY CHAIR DANNER:   |
| 22 | asked others about equity: We do have a state law        | 22 | Q. For Mr. Mullins, good afternoon, just the same        |
| 23 | that's directing us to focus on equity. Did you          | 23 | questions that I've asked before about equity: Were you  |
| 24 | is from your point of view, do you see anything in       | 24 | involved in when you look at the settlement, are         |
| 25 | the settlement regarding equity?                         | 25 | you do you believe the settlement does or does not       |
|    |  |    |  |
|    | Page 90  |    | Page 92  |
| 1  | A. Well, I apologize for not knowing what the            | 1  | comply with the equity provisions in the state laws      |
| 2  | what the statute is referring to when it talks about     | 2  | 80.28.425.   |
| 3  | equity. My entire testimony was really about was         | 3  | A. Well, yeah, I don't know whether if it complies       |
| 4  | about the equity of the settlement, you know, about the  | 4  | or not, but, you know, it at least in my reading of      |
| 5  | fairness of the settlement, but I don't know what the    | 5  | it, it doesn't specifically address, you know, issues of |
| 6  | statute is really contemplating when it included that.   | 6  | underserved communities and things like that, so, you    |
| 7  | CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. I have no further               | 7  | know   |
| 8  | questions.   | 8  | Q. Okay.   |
| 9  |  | 9  | A it's obviously not a, you know yeah                    |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I have no further              | 10 | Q. Not an explicit term?                                 |
| 11 | questions for Mr. Garrett.                               | 11 | A. Right, right.   |
| 12 | Thank you, Mr. Garrett.                                  | 12 | Q. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.                                |
| 13 | MR. GARRETT: Thank you.                                  | 13 | CHAIR DANNER: That's all the questions I                 |
| 14 | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. I believe, with that,                 | 14 | have Mr. Mullins.  |
| 15 | we can dismiss Mr. Garrett. Thank you for your           | 15 | Commissioner Rendahl, do you have any follow-up?         |
| 16 | testimony today.   | 16 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have no follow-up.               |
| 17 | MR. GARRETT: Thank you.                                  | 17 | Thank you.   |
| 18 | JUDGE DOYLE: And I believe we would like to              | 18 | MR. MULLIN: Thank you very much.                         |
| 19 | bring up Bradley Mullins for AWEC.                       | 19 | JUDGE DOYLE: All right. Speed round.                     |
| 20 | Are you available?                                       | 20 | Thank you, Mr. Mullins, for being available to testify   |
| 21 | There you are. Thank you. That was my error.             | 21 | today.   |
| 22 | Can you please raise your right hand?                    | 22 | And finally for The Energy Project is Shawn              |
| 23 | Do you swear or affirm the testimony you give            | 23 | Collins.   |
| 24 | today is the truth the full truth and nothing but the    | 24 | MR. COLLINS: Yes. Hello. Good afternoon.                 |
|    |  |    |  |
| 25 | truth.   | 25 | JUDGE DOYLE: Good afternoon.                             |

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

|  | Page 93   |  | Page 95  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Can you please raise your right hand.   | 1  | populations throughout the state in order to achieve   |
| 2  | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you   | 2  | greater as I said, trust and communication.  |
| 3  | will give today is the whole truth and nothing but the  | 3  | You know, we're seeing this now with a lot of  |
| 4  | truth?  | 4  | the accounts in arrears across the state and people not  |
|  | THE WITNESS: I do.  | 5  |  |
| 5  |   | 6  | reaching out for that assistance, and so this effort, I  |
| 6  | JUDGE DOYLE: Great. Thank you.  |  | believe, would help increase the number of households  |
| 7  | And please introduce your witness.  | 7  | served as well as the budget utilized for the assistance   |
| 8  | MR. ZAKAI: Thank you, Judge Doyle.  | 8  | program.   |
| 9  | Mr. Collins, could you please state your name,  | 9  | Q. Okay. But there's no there's no written plan  |
| 10   | position, and employer?   | 10   | that says: Here's how we're going to spend the   |
| 11   | THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Shawn  | 11   | additional \$73,000?   |
| 12   | Collins. I'm director of The Energy Project, a program  | 12   | A. No. So, you know, the approach we took here was   |
| 13   | about opportunity counsel located in Bellingham,  | 13   | a conversation with the utility and agencies and other   |
| 14   | Washington.   | 14   | stakeholders about this effort, and so if it were to be  |
| 15   | MR. ZAKAI: Do you have any changes or   | 15   | approved, then we would begin the nuts and bolts of this   |
| 16   | corrections to your pre-filed testimony?  | 16   | effort, and so what we have on paper is really what was  |
| 17   | MR. COLLINS: I do not.  | 17   | in our testimony at this point.  |
| 18   | MR. ZAKAI: At this time, The Energy Project   | 18   | Q. All right. Thank you. I have no further   |
| 19   | presents Mr. Collins for the Commissions' questions.  | 19   | questions.   |
| 20   | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.   | 20   | QUESTIONING  |
| 21   | QUESTIONING   | 21   | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:   |
| 22   | BY CHAIR DANNER:  | 22   | Q. So I guess I would just have one follow-up, and   |
| 23   | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Collins.   | 23   | I did ask that of Mr. Chiles, that the assumption is if  |
| 24   | So, again, some of the questions I've asked to  | 24   | the Commission were to approve this proposal that you've   |
| 25   | others: This is you're asking for basically an  | 25   | made and that the other parties do not seem to object  |
|  |   |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |
| _  | Page 94   |  | Page 96  |
| 1  | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's   | 1  | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income  |
| 2  | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about  | 2  | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to  |
| 2<br>3   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?  | 2<br>3   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you  | 2<br>3<br>4  | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder<br>if you can describe basically what are you going to get?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder<br>if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder<br>if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the<br>calculations. That would be the maximum available   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder<br>if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the<br>calculations. That would be the maximum available<br>budget for the for the effort. In terms of the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's<br>going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about<br>73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you<br>would do with this additional money? Have you done a<br>cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about,<br>you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder<br>if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the<br>calculations. That would be the maximum available<br>budget for the for the effort. In terms of the<br>community-based social marketing concept and the way it  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing<br>and outreach efforts.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know,</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, online search optimization expenses that promote the</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, online search optimization expenses that promote the program now. And so we would essentially compliment</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, online search optimization expenses that promote the program now. And so we would essentially compliment those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, online search optimization expenses that promote the program now. And so we would essentially compliment those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you know, essentially you know, a potential pay point</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?</li> <li>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?</li> <li>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.</li> <li>And the idea here really is to build trust in the local communities served by the utilities so that people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>to, that the discussions would go on and the low income advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and would there be a way to bring that back to the Commission, or is that just what is the process that you envision going forward, if we were to approve this and to implement it?</li> <li>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company, agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific proposal would be put together much like we have worked with the company in the past on their existing marketing and outreach efforts.</li> <li>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know, online search optimization expenses that promote the program now. And so we would essentially compliment those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you know, essentially you know, a potential pay point contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?</li> <li>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?</li> <li>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.</li> <li>And the idea here really is to build trust in the local communities served by the utilities so that people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and to agencies for assistance. And while I don't have a</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it? A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing<br>and outreach efforts. There's some radio ads, there's some, you know,<br>online search optimization expenses that promote the<br>program now. And so we would essentially compliment<br>those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you<br>know, essentially you know, a potential pay point<br>contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would<br>be made available to participate in community-based   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.<br>And the idea here really is to build trust in the local communities served by the utilities so that people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and to agencies for assistance. And while I don't have a specific percentage increase in participation that we   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it? A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing<br>and outreach efforts. There's some radio ads, there's some, you know,<br>online search optimization expenses that promote the<br>program now. And so we would essentially compliment<br>those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you<br>know, essentially you know, a potential pay point<br>contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would<br>be made available to participate in community-based<br>organizations, so we would outline that, have a scope of   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?</li> <li>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?</li> <li>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.</li> <li>And the idea here really is to build trust in the local communities served by the utilities so that people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and to agencies for assistance. And while I don't have a specific percentage increase in participation that we would expect, it is a longer-term effort to build</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it?<br>A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing<br>and outreach efforts.<br>There's some radio ads, there's some, you know,<br>online search optimization expenses that promote the<br>program now. And so we would essentially compliment<br>those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you<br>know, essentially you know, a potential pay point<br>contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would<br>be made available to participate in community-based<br>organizations, so we would outline that, have a scope of<br>work and outcomes or work projects associated with |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | additional 5 percent of the 22/23 program funding. It's going to come out, my back of the envelope math is about 73,000?<br>Have you done any kind of planning, what you would do with this additional money? Have you done a cost benefit analysis? Have you done projections about, you know, how it will increase participation? I wonder if you can describe basically what are you going to get?<br>A. Certainly. Yeah, approximately 73,000 is the calculations. That would be the maximum available budget for the for the effort. In terms of the community-based social marketing concept and the way it would apply to Cascade's WEAF program, this is a similar approach to what we have worked with Avista on and the agencies there that's currently underway and has worked in some of the previous efforts I've led before with energy efficiency improvements in a multicounty area for modern income households.<br>And the idea here really is to build trust in the local communities served by the utilities so that people feel comfortable reaching out to the utility and to agencies for assistance. And while I don't have a specific percentage increase in participation that we   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | to, that the discussions would go on and the low income<br>advisory group with Cascade to flesh out the details to<br>make sure that the plan is acceptable to everyone, and<br>would there be a way to bring that back to the<br>Commission, or is that just what is the process that<br>you envision going forward, if we were to approve this<br>and to implement it? A. Yeah, sure. So the WEAF advisory committee<br>staff participates in that Public Counsel. The company,<br>agencies, and some other parties, what I envision there<br>is if this was an allowed expense, the up to you<br>know, up to 5 percent would be available and a specific<br>proposal would be put together much like we have worked<br>with the company in the past on their existing marketing<br>and outreach efforts. There's some radio ads, there's some, you know,<br>online search optimization expenses that promote the<br>program now. And so we would essentially compliment<br>those efforts, come up with a plan for well, you<br>know, essentially you know, a potential pay point<br>contract or look at how structurally the knowledge would<br>be made available to participate in community-based<br>organizations, so we would outline that, have a scope of   |

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

|  | Page 97   |  | Page 99  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | through the advisory committee.   | 1  | CHAIR DANNER: Yes. That is correct. Thank  |
| 2  | And, you know, I think I would expect this would  | 2  | you.   |
| 3  | show up in the next rate case as an expense, for  | 3  | JUDGE DOYLE: And then for Bench Request No.  |
| 4  | example, for a review, not necessarily anticipating   | 4  | 3, we're looking at I'm looking at my notes here, the  |
| 5  | submitting it in a docket for, you know, additional   | 5  | cost and benefits analysis and projections, and based on   |
| 6  | approval. Though, that you know, I certainly leave  | 6  | that analysis for The Energy Project's proposal, I   |
| 7  | that to your discretion to do so.   | 7  | believe that was for the settling parties.   |
| 8  | Q. Thank you. That's that's a helpful   | 8  | Was that a request that you wanted to make, or   |
| 9  | explanation.  | 9  | did I maybe mis-note?  |
| 10   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Chair Danner, do you  | 10   | CHAIR DANNER: It's my recollection that Mr.  |
| 11   | have anything else, or is there another question I can  | 11   | Chiles said that there was such a document or such a   |
| 12   | ask?  | 12   | plan and that he would share it with us.   |
| 13   | CHAIR DANNER: Go ahead. I have no further   | 13   | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great.  |
| 14   | questions at this time.   | 14   | And then for Bench Request No. 4, the date and   |
| 15   | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay.   | 15   | amount of the long-term debt issuance, including any   |
| 16   | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:  | 16   | updates that would affect the settlement.  |
| 17   | Q. And I guess I would ask the question of you that   | 17   | CHAIR DANNER: Again, that was my request.  |
| 18   | Chair Danner asked of the others, and that relates to   | 18   | Yes, that's basically we know that the long-term debt  |
| 19   | and I think you addressed this in your testimony as   | 19   | has been issued. We wanted to know the date of that  |
| 20   | well, as to how the settlement does or doesn't address  | 20   | issuance, the actual amount, and the reasons for any   |
| 21   | or comply with the equity provision in RCW 80.28.425.   | 21   | differences from what was reported in Tammy Nygard's   |
| 22   | A. Yes. I would my opinion is it does not.  | 22   | testimony.   |
| 23<br>24   | We you know, in our settlement negotiations and then  | 23   | And then there was some follow-up: What was the  |
| 24<br>25   | in our testimony and then what was reflected in the   | 24<br>25   | actual debt percentage for 2022, so that's what<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.  |
| 20   | testimony I think of both Staff and the company contain   | 23   | JUDGE DUTLE. Okay.   |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | Page 98   |  | Page 100   |
| 1  |   | 1  | Page 100<br>CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like   |
| 1<br>2   | Page 98<br>elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.   | 1 2  |  |
|  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement  |  | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like   |
| 2  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.   | 2  | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like to see.   |
| 2<br>3   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br>Q. Okay. Thank you.   | 2<br>3   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's   | 2<br>3<br>4  | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's   |
| 2<br>3<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that<br>this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one one  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically<br>too after the what occurred prior to the e-mail that  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that<br>this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one one<br>witness called to address all the issues, we do have, I   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically<br>too after the what occurred prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that<br>this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one one<br>witness called to address all the issues, we do have, I<br>think response or another witness available that   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically<br>too after the what occurred prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural<br>schedule. Is that is that the clarification? | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that<br>this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one one<br>witness called to address all the issues, we do have, I<br>think response or another witness available that<br>could address quickly one of the bench requests if |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | elements that address equity; however, in the settlement<br>itself, I do not believe it meets that standard.<br><b>Q. Okay. Thank you.</b><br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that's that's<br>all the questions I have, Judge Doyle. And thank you,<br>Mr. Collins.<br>MR. COLLINS: You're welcome.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Collins. You<br>may be excused. We appreciate your testimony today.<br>MR. COLLINS: Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. With that, I'm going to<br>go over the bench requests the bench requests that I<br>took note of, so I want to clarify.<br>So for the Request No. 2 to the settling<br>parties, please provide the dates and methods of<br>communication regarding the settlement process between<br>the parties, was that the accurate follow-up?<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah. I think I asked that<br>and I think you have captured it. Thank you.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I think specifically<br>too after the what occurred prior to the e-mail that<br>staff sent on February 18th to suspend the procedural   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | CHAIR DANNER: what I would actually like<br>to see.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. The debt percentage for<br>2022.<br>Okay. So essentially the follow-up the Bench<br>Request No. 5 was requesting an update to Nygard's<br>testimony in TJN-2 to follow up those amounts; that's<br>essentially that same request?<br>Okay.<br>CHAIR DANNER: Yeah.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: I believe that was all I had.<br>Commissioners, was there anything that you had<br>noted that I have missed or it looks like we have<br>three bench requests from today's hearing.<br>CHAIR DANNER: I think you've captured it.<br>Thank you.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Great.<br>MS. BARNETT: And I will I know it's<br>unusual. I do have but but understanding that<br>this was an evidentiary hearing and we have one one<br>witness called to address all the issues, we do have, I<br>think response or another witness available that   |

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

|   | Page 101  |  | Page 103  |
|---|---|--|---|
|   |   |  |   |
| 1   | we could take that off the table, if if you would   | 1  | Q. And that is due to what?   |
| 2   | like that, but but we could also respond in that  | 2  | A. An increase need when we did request the put   |
| 3   | bench request. We just have that witness available, if  | 3  | our form our request with the Commission, we did  |
| 4   | you would like.   | 4  | request to issue debt up to 50 million, where we were   |
| 5   | CHAIR DANNER: Well, since basically what  | 5  | initially projecting 35. We did take advantage of that  |
| 6   | I'm asking for is numbers, I'm agnostic whether it's a  | 6  | 50 million that was available based on the interest   |
| 7   | bench request, or I assume you're talking about bringing  | 7  | rates today and the need we see going forward.  |
| 8   | Tammy Nygard forward?   | 8  | Q. Can you be specific about the needs you see  |
| 9   | MS. BARNETT: That's correct. Yeah, she's  | 9  | going forward?  |
| 10  | right here. She's listening in. She can address your  | 10   | A. The  |
| 11  | concerns now if that would be more more helpful than  | 11   | Q. The more specific  |
| 12  | waiting for a bench request response.   | 12   | A. The capital, to fund the capital program.  |
| 13  | JUDGE DOYLE: Would you like me to swear in  | 13   | Q. Okay. And can you tell me what your actual debt  |
| 14  | the witness?  | 14   | percentage was for 2020?  |
| 15  | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, why don't you. We can   | 15   | A. Let's see if I can. I may need to look at work   |
| 16  | do this quickly.  | 16   | papers. I'm assuming we have work papers filed in the   |
| 17  | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay.  | 17   | case for that.  |
| 18  | And if you are available to come on the screen.   | 18   | Q. Okay. So we may have to do a bench request   |
| 19  | Great.  | 19   | anyway, and and then I would also like to see, you  |
| 20  | Can you raise your right hand.  | 20   | know, if you could lay around the 2022 debt issuance and  |
| 21  | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you'll  | 21   | the equity infusions and get us to a new debt percentage  |
| 22  | give today is the full truth and nothing but the truth?   | 22   | estimate, that would be I would like to see that too,   |
| 23  | MS. NYGARD: I do.   | 23   | if that's possible.   |
| 24  | JUDGE DOYLE: Thank you. And   | 24   | A. Sure.  |
| 25  | MS. BARNETT: Oh, sorry.   | 25   | Q. That's all I have.   |
|   | Page 102  |  | Page 104  |
| -   |   |  |   |
| 1   | JUDGE DOYLE: Go ahead.  | 1  | CHAIR DANNER: Back to you, Judge Doyle.   |
| 2   | MS. BARNETT: I was going to introduce.  | 2  | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Nygard.   |
| 3   | Could you please state your name and spell your   | 3  | You may be excused.   |
| 4   | last name for the record and provide your position at   | 4  | THE WITNESS: Thank you.   |
| 5   | Cascade?  | I  |   |
|   |   | 5  | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.   |
| 6   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm  | 6  | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like   |
| 7   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.  | 6<br>7   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final  |
|   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.  | 6<br>7<br>8  | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?   |
| 7<br>8<br>9   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>QUESTIONING   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br>issuance.   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br>issuance.<br>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br>issuance.<br>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that<br>will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.<br>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.<br>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.<br>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.<br>Q U E S T I O N I N G<br>BY CHAIR DANNER:<br>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.<br>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br>issuance.<br>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that<br>will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been<br>funded.   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.</li> <li>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.</li> <li>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.</li> <li>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that issuance.</li> <li>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been funded.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So so it has not yet been issued?</li> </ul>   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from<br>now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.</li> <li>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.</li> <li>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.</li> <li>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that issuance.</li> <li>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been funded.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So - so it has not yet been issued?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>  | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from<br>now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which<br>is a Friday as a filing date for those briefs.   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br/>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.</li> <li>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.</li> <li>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.</li> <li>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br/>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br/>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br/>issuance.</li> <li>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that<br/>will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been<br/>funded.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So – so it has not yet been issued?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But June 15th.</li> </ul>   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from<br>now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which<br>is a Friday as a filing date for those briefs.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And what is the  |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br/>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.</li> <li>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.</li> <li>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.</li> <li>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br/>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br/>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br/>issuance.</li> <li>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that<br/>will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been<br/>funded.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So so it has not yet been issued?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But June 15th.</li> <li>And it's \$50 million, not \$35 million?</li> </ul> | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from<br>now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which<br>is a Friday as a filing date for those briefs.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And what is the<br>I'm sorry, but what is the suspension date for this |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>MS. NYGARD: Tammy Nygard, N-y-g-a-r-d. I'm<br/>the controller for Cascade Natural Gas.</li> <li>MS. BARNETT: Thank you.</li> <li>I present Tammy Nygard for questions.</li> <li>CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Q U E S T I O N I N G</li> <li>BY CHAIR DANNER:</li> <li>Q. So you heard the questions I asked of Mr.</li> <li>Chiles, and just let me repeat them, so I had asked him<br/>whether the long-term debt had been issued. He said<br/>yes, and I asked him what was the actual date of that<br/>issuance.</li> <li>A. Yes, we have 50 million of long-term debt that<br/>will be funded June 15th of 2022, so it has not yet been<br/>funded.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So – so it has not yet been issued?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. But June 15th.</li> </ul>   | 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | JUDGE DOYLE: So I was just reviewing.<br>Do the Commissioners know what we would like<br>to it looks like we would like to limit the final<br>briefs to 60 pages and only one round; is that correct?<br>CHAIR DANNER: That works for me.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And that works for me<br>as well.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Do the parties have any<br>questions regarding those final briefs?<br>Ms. Paisner.<br>MS. PAISNER: Yes, I'm not I believe<br>there wasn't a date set for that filing, so I was<br>wondering which date we are to file the briefs. And if<br>I may submit a request or suggestion, I know there are<br>other cases proceeding at the same time right now and<br>there are testimony filings happening about a month from<br>now. I'm wondering if we could request July 15th, which<br>is a Friday as a filing date for those briefs.   |

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

|  | Page 105  |                                  | Page 107   |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 1                                      | preparing this final order. I appreciate the need to  | 1                                | MS. PAISNER: So the last thing I had to ask              |
| 2                                      | to we've all got multiple cases going, and so I'm   | 2                                | about, for the public comment exhibit, we would like to  |
| 3                                      | just trying to make sure we don't get compressed in the   | 3                                | get an exhibit number so we may file that, and I believe |
| 4                                      | end, Judge Doyle.   | 4                                | at the public comment hearing that was held on May 25th, |
| 5                                      | JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, September 1st, I've  | 5                                | I think on the record it was stated that it would be one |
| 6                                      | confirmed. I believe we're considering June 29th. That  | 6                                | week from June 2nd, since, at that point, we weren't     |
| 7                                      | would allow the parties four weeks, and if Public   | 7                                | sure whether this hearing would conclude on the 1st or   |
| 8                                      | Counsel wants to submit theirs on the 15th, there's   | 8                                | the 2nd, and so I guess the first request is for an      |
| 9                                      | nothing restricting you from doing it sooner.   | 9                                | exhibit number to file it and if we may file that on     |
| 10                                     | How do the commissioners feel about that?   | 10                               | Thursday, June 9th, 2022.                                |
| 11                                     | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I guess I would  | 11                               | JUDGE DOYLE: Great. June 9th sounds great,               |
| 12                                     | just ask Ann Paisner what if there's specific dates   | 12                               | and I believe pardon me for the delay. I'm pulling       |
| 13                                     | that are problematic, and how does the 29th work in   | 13                               | up the exhibit list.                                     |
| 14                                     | terms of the other schedules going on?  | 14                               | That would be BR-5.                                      |
| 15                                     | MS. PAISNER: In the Avista case, so that's  | 15                               | MS. PAISNER: I apologize. Did you say                    |
| 16                                     | the 220053 and 54 cases, there's testimony filing due   | 16                               | BR-5?  |
| 17                                     | July 6th, which is a Wednesday, and so it looks like  | 17                               | JUDGE DOYLE: Yes. I had to double check.                 |
| 18                                     | so I believe you just said June 29th, which is the  | 18                               | I had a couple of changes in my notes.                   |
| 19                                     | Wednesday prior to that. I suppose I would maybe ask  | 19                               | And with that, Mr. Stokes, your hand is raised.          |
| 20                                     | for Friday, the 1st, if that's possible, just that would  | 20                               | MR. STOKES: Just a quick clarification: It               |
| 21                                     | allow a little bit more time, you know, for doing both  | 21                               | sounds like we're supposed to file a brief as soon as we |
| 22                                     | of these things, helping to prepare testimony in that   | 22                               | can. I just want to clarify that parties will not be     |
| 23                                     | case and also file briefing in this one.  | 23                               | able to respond to the opening brief of other parties if |
| 24                                     | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That's fine with me.  | 24                               | they filed early.  |
| 25                                     | CHAIR DANNER: So I am very concerned about  | 25                               | CHAIR DANNER: So I was thank you, Mr.                    |
| 2.5                                    | CHAIR DANNER. SUT all very concerned about  | 23                               | CHAIR DANNER. 301 was thank you, Mr.                     |
|  | Page 106  |                                  | Page 108   |
| 1                                      | how compressed this is going to be. I'm okay with those   | 1                                | Stokes. I was just expressing a you know, something      |
| 2                                      | dates, but I would encourage all the parties to submit  | 2                                | aspirational on my part. I don't I fully expect that     |
| 3                                      | their briefs as early as possible.  | 3                                | everybody's briefs will come in on the same day, so I    |
| 4                                      | JUDGE DOYLE: It sounds like we have the   | 4                                | will amend my remarks accordingly.                       |
| 5                                      | deadline of the close of business on Friday, July 1st,  | 5                                | MR. STOKES: Okay. Thank you.                             |
| 6                                      | the page limit being 60 pages.  | 6                                | JUDGE DOYLE: Okay. Great. If there's no                  |
| 7                                      | Are there any other matters before we conclude?   | 7                                | other housekeeping?                                      |
| 8                                      | MS. PAISNER: I do have a couple.  | 8                                | I'm giving it a short pause.                             |
| 9                                      | I'm wondering if it would be possible it  | 9                                | Okay. That concludes the evidentiary hearing             |
| 10                                     | sounds as though, not certain, so perhaps you could   | 10                               | and settlement hearing today. We are now adjourned and   |
| 11                                     | confirm whether the Cascade witness and Staff witness   | 11                               | off the record. Thank you all for your participation.    |
| 12                                     | were not sworn prior to giving their testimony, and I'm   | 12                               | (Proceedings concluded at 12:25 p.m.)                    |
| 13                                     | wondering if it's possible that they could be sworn   | 13                               |  |
| 14                                     | retroactively here today so that we may assume that   | 14                               |  |
| 15                                     | their testimony was true and accurate as if they were   | 15                               |  |
| 16                                     | under oath, so that's the first thing.  | 16                               |  |
|  | JUDGE DOYLE: I'm sorry. Which?  | 17                               |  |
| 17                                     | •   |                                  |  |
| 17<br>18                               | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.   | 18                               |  |
|  | •   | 18<br>19                         |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20                         | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.   | 19<br>20                         |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms.<br>Huang was under oath as well.<br>MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay.  | 19                               |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20                         | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms.<br>Huang was under oath as well.<br>MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay.<br>For some reason, I wasn't sure that that  | 19<br>20                         |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms.<br>Huang was under oath as well.<br>MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay.<br>For some reason, I wasn't sure that that<br>happened. Okay.                                     | 19<br>20<br>21                   |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms.<br>Huang was under oath as well.<br>MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay.<br>For some reason, I wasn't sure that that<br>happened. Okay.<br>JUDGE DOYLE: Yeah, thank you for | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MS. BARNETT: Mr. Chiles was under oath.<br>COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: And I believe Ms.<br>Huang was under oath as well.<br>MS. PAISNER: She was? Okay.<br>For some reason, I wasn't sure that that<br>happened. Okay.                                     | 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       |  |

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

# Docket No. UG-210755 - Vol. V - 6/1/2022

| Image: Provide the set of the source of   |    | Page 109                      |  |
|--|----|-------------------------------|--|
| <ul> <li>STATE OF WASHINGTON</li> <li>COUNTY OF KING</li> <li>I, Laura L. Ohman, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and</li> <li>for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the</li> <li>foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and</li> <li>accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>My commission expires:</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>24</li> </ul>   | 1  | CERTIFICATE                   |  |
| <ul> <li>STATE OF WASHINGTON</li> <li>COUNTY OF KING</li> <li>I, Laura L. Ohman, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and</li> <li>for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the</li> <li>foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and</li> <li>accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> </ul>   |    |                               |  |
| CUUNTY OF KING<br>CUUNTY OF KING<br>Laura L. Ohman, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.<br>N WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 2nd day of June, 2022.<br>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186<br>MARCH 2023<br>AMARCH 2023<br>AMARCH 2023<br>CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI   | 3  | STATE OF WASHINGTON           |  |
| <ul> <li>I, Laura L. Ohman, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and</li> <li>for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the</li> <li>foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and</li> <li>accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>24</li> </ul>  | 4  |                               |  |
| <ul> <li>for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the</li> <li>foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and</li> <li>accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>A</li> </ul>   | 5  |                               |  |
| <ul> <li>foregoing transcript commencing on June 1, 2022, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>My commission expires:</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>Automatical and and and and and and and and and and</li></ul>  | 6  |                               |  |
| <ul> <li>accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.</li> <li>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>this 2nd day of June, 2022.</li> <li>Laura L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>MARCH 2023</li> <li>4</li> <li>4<!--</td--><td></td><td></td><td></td></li></ul> |    |                               |  |
| 10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal   11 this 2nd day of June, 2022.   13 Image: Constraint of the second s   |    |                               |  |
| 11       this 2nd day of June, 2022.         12  |    |                               |  |
| 12         13         14         15         LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186         16         17       My commission expires:         18       MARCH 2023         19         20         21         22         23         24   |    |                               |  |
| 13   14   15   LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186   16   17   18   MARCH 2023   19   20   21   22   23   24   |    | this 2nd day of June, 2022.   |  |
| 14   15   16   17   18   MARCH 2023   19   20   21   22   23   24  |    | and a                         |  |
| 15 LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186   16 17   17 My commission expires:   18 MARCH 2023   19 20   20 21   21 22   23 24   |    |                               |  |
| LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186<br>16<br>17 My commission expires:<br>18 MARCH 2023<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24  |    |                               |  |
| 1617My commission expires:18MARCH 2023192021222324   | -  | LAURA L. OHMAN, RPR, CCR 3186 |  |
| 18       MARCH 2023         19   | 16 |                               |  |
| 19       20       21       22       23       24  | 17 |                               |  |
| 20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24   |    | MARCH 2023                    |  |
| 21<br>22<br>23<br>24   |    |                               |  |
| 22<br>23<br>24   |    |                               |  |
| 23<br>24   |    |                               |  |
| 24   |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  | 23 |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |
|  |    |                               |  |

28 (Page 109)

|                            | •                      | 1                         | •                          | U                      |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| A                          | 61:21 66:7 69:10       | advertising 26:6          | <b>allows</b> 37:11        | apparently 65:6        |
| <b>A-1</b> 8:24            | 69:12                  | advisory 21:14,22         | alternative 48:7           | appear 7:14 26:1       |
| <b>a-d-g</b> 83:17         | additional 45:4        | 77:9 96:2,8 97:1          | alternatives 15:11         | appearances 5:17       |
| <b>a.m</b> 5:2,7 65:14,14  | 57:15 64:13 71:15      | Affairs 22:23             | <b>AMA</b> 51:13,14        | appearing 1:13         |
| 85:2,2                     | 94:1,5 95:11 97:5      | affect 55:18 71:20        | 53:4                       | appears 7:21 53:4      |
| <b>abide</b> 36:20         | additions 14:11        | 99:16                     | amend 108:4                | 66:5                   |
| <b>ability</b> 20:16 40:22 | 45:18,23 46:10,15      | <b>affirm</b> 22:12 72:25 | amortization 34:24         | applied 31:21          |
| 44:22 109:9                | 46:19 47:11,19         | 85:22 90:23 93:2          | 36:1,6 37:1                | 38:21                  |
| <b>able</b> 14:6 22:7 78:3 | address 15:23 21:4     | 101:21                    | amount 18:2 19:6           | apply 31:20 94:13      |
| 85:17 107:23               | 34:1,6,9 48:5          | afford 19:25              | 25:13,16,20 26:13          | appreciate 57:16       |
|                            | 55:20 57:7 66:4        | after-the-fact            | 26:22 27:11,13,23          | 79:3 81:14,14          |
| accept 14:19 27:10         | 67:21 76:2,15          | 45:22                     | 27:24 29:7 33:19           | 84:11 98:9 105:1       |
| 27:21 31:7                 | 79:15 80:22 92:5       | afternoon 86:7            | 39:25 40:3,6               | approach 32:2          |
| acceptable 96:3            | 97:20 98:1 100:21      | 91:22 92:24,25            | 51:18 58:23 59:3           | 37:11 94:14 95:12      |
| access 82:3                | 100:23 101:10          | 93:23                     | 59:11 62:3 63:1            | appropriate 11:24      |
| accommodate                | addressed 34:12        | <b>agencies</b> 77:14     | 63:19 64:2 69:19           | 16:7 28:12,14,17       |
| 20:23                      | 56:12 77:23 79:10      | 94:15,22 95:13            | 71:4,19 81:10              | 28:19,23,24 29:5       |
| accomplishing              | 79:14 97:19            | 94.13,22 95.13<br>96:10   | 99:15,20 100:25            | 29:10 38:21 48:9       |
| 48:10                      | adequately 20:9        | <b>AGG</b> 17:13          | <b>amounts</b> 26:1        | 62:5,9 66:11,17        |
| account 70:3               | adjourned 108:10       | <b>agnostic</b> 101:6     | 69:20,22,23 70:6           | 68:1 73:23 80:3        |
| accounted 28:10            | adjust 60:8,24         | ago 31:8 51:23            | 70:7 71:16 83:21           | 81:6                   |
| 53:25                      | <b>v</b>               | 0                         | 100:7                      |                        |
| accounting 62:21           | adjusted 30:10         | <b>agree</b> 17:1 39:24   |                            | appropriately<br>67:16 |
| 69:1                       | adjusting 29:22        | 40:6,8,21 41:24           | analyses 28:22             |                        |
| accounts 30:6              | 67:6                   | 43:23 44:11,14            | analysis 28:24             | approval 67:15         |
| 31:19 32:3 53:25           | <b>adjustment</b> 26:1 | 45:21 62:17 66:8          | 31:18,19,20 57:11          | 97:6                   |
| 95:4                       | 45:22 50:7,9,12        | 76:2,6                    | 75:3,23 76:1,4             | approve 19:14          |
| accruals 25:22             | 50:12 60:8,19,25       | agreed-upon 81:9          | 89:17 94:6 99:5,6          | 21:23 77:7 95:24       |
| accumulated 47:17          | 61:4,6,25 83:4,17      | agreeing 75:17            | analyzed 79:24             | 96:6                   |
| accurate 16:11             | 98:24                  | agreement 54:9            | Ann 2:8,22 6:10            | approved 16:1,5        |
| 24:6,7 28:12               | adjustments 14:5       | 74:13,13,21               | 9:10 59:15 105:12          | 18:18,21 26:2          |
| 98:17 106:15               | 17:2 26:2,5 28:2,7     | ahead 32:19 59:8          | Annhove@gmail              | 27:14,24 95:15         |
| 109:9                      | 28:14,17,25 29:5       | 62:15 64:15,19            | 2:25                       | approximately 5:6      |
| achieve 75:25 95:1         | 29:10 36:9 50:18       | 74:5 78:23 79:2           | annual 17:18               | 15:18 18:1,19          |
| acknowledge 39:19          | 50:19 51:1,5,7         | 81:19 82:10,20            | annually 21:15             | 29:6,14 94:9           |
| 43:15                      | 52:14 62:9 81:6        | 84:7 97:13 102:1          | 41:3                       | April 17:16 18:7       |
| action 36:23 38:22         | 82:22 83:12 88:15      | <b>aimed</b> 15:11        | answer 63:15 70:6          | 54:8,16 74:12          |
| activities 77:20           | 88:18 89:1             | Alliance 6:16,19          | 70:19 82:15                | <b>area</b> 56:5 86:17 |
| actual 35:12 62:19         | administrative         | 91:8                      | answered 84:4              | 94:17                  |
| 70:25 71:18,18,24          | 1:11 2:2 5:13          | allocated 83:22           | anticipated 71:15          | arrears 95:4           |
| 71:25 79:25 80:1           | admission 7:7 8:7,7    | <b>allow</b> 18:22 105:7  | anticipating 73:17         | arriving 80:5          |
| 80:7,25 87:24              | <b>admit</b> 10:16     | 105:21                    | 97:4                       | <b>art</b> 57:3        |
| 88:5,11 99:20,24           | admitted 7:24 8:15     | allowance 58:25           | <b>anyway</b> 103:19       | asked 18:17 19:5,6     |
| 102:16 103:13              | <b>ads</b> 96:16       | 59:5                      | apologies 13:13            | 19:21 50:17 74:10      |
| added 62:2                 | advanced 40:18,23      | allowed 60:2 67:8         | 23:11 73:14 85:7           | 75:15 77:18 81:21      |
| adding 62:2                | 63:20 64:3             | 67:11 96:11               | <b>apologize</b> 29:9 90:1 | 89:15,22 91:23         |
| addition 21:19 61:2        | advantage 103:5        | allowing 17:3             | 107:15                     | 93:24 97:18 98:18      |
|                            |                        |                           |                            |                        |

|                          |                          |                          |                            | i ago i i i                |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 102:13,14,16             | averages 16:3 32:2       | 84:19,20,25              | believes 19:10             | 96:4                       |
| asking 49:9,10           | 32:5.11                  | 100:18 101:9,25          | Bellevue 2:13              | bringing 46:22             |
| 74:12 76:23 93:25        | <b>Avista</b> 33:7 94:14 | 102:2,8 106:18           | Bellingham 93:13           | 73:17 85:15 101:7          |
| 101:6                    | 105:15                   | <b>base</b> 26:13,15,22  | <b>bench</b> 11:2 54:19    | broad 31:23                |
| aspirational 108:2       | aware 38:7 50:19         | 27:11,17 36:1,6          | 71:21 72:8 98:12           | Broadway 3:4               |
| assistance 21:8          | 51:1,10 67:2             | 36:14 37:2 40:11         | 98:12 99:3,14              | brought 46:3,21            |
| 56:15 75:16 94:22        | 71:13 75:6               | 48:8 51:11 53:7          | 100:5,14,23 101:3          | 74:21                      |
| 95:5,7                   | <b>AWEC</b> 3:2 6:17     | 76:16 77:15 83:5         | 101:7,12 103:18            | <b>budget</b> 94:11 95:7   |
| assistant 6:5,11         | 7:13,20 18:11            | based 12:22 14:19        | <b>benefit</b> 15:21 41:18 | <b>build</b> 94:19,24      |
| 21:7                     | 19:10 32:16 39:25        | 17:24 28:9 29:23         | 55:24 57:11 60:13          | <b>built</b> 61:23         |
| associated 83:21         | 40:8,21 48:16            | 37:4 39:7,11             | 75:23 94:6                 | <b>business</b> 44:9 68:22 |
| 96:24                    | 49:12,14 66:4            | 50:21,25 51:5,7          | <b>benefits</b> 80:2 99:5  | 106:5                      |
| assume 29:9 101:7        | 72:2 81:21 90:19         | 51:11 52:14 87:24        | <b>best</b> 36:23 38:22    | businesses 44:7            |
| 106:14                   | 91:8                     | 88:11 89:5 99:5          | 66:21 77:10,14             |                            |
| <b>assuming</b> 29:3,3,5 | AWEC's 8:12              | 103:6                    | 88:19 109:9                | C                          |
| 44:4 103:16              | 60:19 61:13 62:17        | baseline 42:12           | <b>better</b> 65:21 78:2   | <b>C</b> 2:1 3:1,1 23:14   |
| assumption 44:8          | 68:23                    | 80:24                    | 80:3                       | 32:21 50:1 67:7            |
| 95:23                    | AWEC-05 8:18             | basically 70:19          | BGN-4 8:12                 | 70:15 76:10 77:5           |
| attachment 8:2,3,4       | AWEC-100 9:3             | 93:25 94:8 99:18         | <b>big</b> 57:3            | 79:5 83:21 109:1           |
| 8:10,17,19,21,22         | AWEC-38 8:20             | 101:5                    | <b>bill</b> 20:13          | 109:1                      |
| 8:23 9:2,4               | AWEC-4 8:16              | <b>basis</b> 16:12 18:20 | <b>billed</b> 39:8,12      | <b>C-1</b> 8:24            |
| attachments 7:15         | AWEC-63 8:23             | 24:9,23 25:4,6           | <b>billing</b> 39:6,10     | Cable 3:3 6:19             |
| 8:9,24 9:1               | AWEC-67 9:1              | 28:11 36:10 37:16        | 62:19 63:2                 | <b>calculate</b> 39:7,11   |
| attempted 15:22          |                          | 41:2 50:17,20,25         | <b>bio</b> 84:20           | calculated 54:1            |
| <b>attend</b> 49:12      | <u> </u>                 | 51:2,4,12,13             | <b>bit</b> 58:6,18 68:23   | calculating 81:11          |
| attendance 49:14         | <b>B</b> 25:11           | 52:13,13 88:7,14         | 105:21                     | calculations 94:10         |
| attention 21:6           | <b>B-1</b> 8:24          | 88:19                    | <b>black</b> 80:22         | <b>calendar</b> 87:17,17   |
| <b>attorney</b> 2:18,23  | <b>B&amp;O</b> 26:6      | beginning 12:14          | <b>bolts</b> 95:15         | California 3:10            |
| 6:5,12,13 86:23          | back 11:3 29:18          | 13:19                    | <b>box</b> 2:18 80:23      | call 22:5 65:7             |
| attract 89:18            | 44:8 45:8 50:16          | <b>behalf</b> 6:6,12,19  | <b>BR-5</b> 107:14,16      | Callaghan 2:17 6:4         |
| <b>audio</b> 58:3 64:23  | 58:7 61:3,23 62:4        | 80:14 86:18              | <b>Brad</b> 91:7           | 6:5 10:21 11:11            |
| auditors 37:6            | 65:15,16 85:4            | <b>believe</b> 14:8 17:1 | Bradley 4:13 90:19         | 11:14 13:21,25             |
| authority 67:23          | 94:2 96:4 104:1          | 23:11 25:18 26:23        | break 12:18,20,25          | 15:3 35:17                 |
| authorization            | <b>backward</b> 50:3     | 36:7,11 40:3,16          | 52:21 58:13 64:16          | <b>called</b> 11:3 18:14   |
| 67:10,13                 | <b>balance</b> 40:9 41:1 | 40:24 50:14 51:8         | 64:20,21 65:2,4            | 21:7 100:21                |
| authorized 27:6,12       | 41:25,25                 | 51:14 52:17 53:22        | 65:13,16 84:20,23          | <b>camera</b> 22:6         |
| 66:7                     | <b>balances</b> 42:13    | 53:24 59:15 65:17        | 85:1,4                     | <b>canceled</b> 49:1       |
| available 22:18          | 70:4                     | 66:10,16 67:3            | <b>brief</b> 12:10 14:3    | <b>capital</b> 14:10 16:1  |
| 72:19,21 73:12,23        | Barnett 2:11 4:4         | 70:11 71:6,9             | 107:21,23                  | 32:9 33:20 40:11           |
| 84:16 87:6 90:20         | 5:21,23 7:10,19          | 74:18,25 76:6,24         | briefing 105:23            | 40:13,14,23 52:1           |
| 92:20 94:10 96:12        | 9:6,19 10:10             | 80:6 84:4,12,14          | <b>briefs</b> 104:8,13,17  | 58:25 59:5 64:8            |
| 96:22 100:22             | 13:21,23 14:23           | 84:17 90:14,18           | 104:22 106:3               | 72:3 103:12,12             |
| 101:3,18 103:6           | 22:19,25 23:8            | 91:25 95:6 98:2          | 108:3                      | captioned 5:9              |
| Avenue 2:23              | 35:16 49:4,25            | 99:7 100:11              | <b>bring</b> 36:17,22      | captured 98:19             |
| average 16:3 32:4        | 50:2 53:3 73:16          | 104:15 105:6,18          | 46:22 54:9 74:12           | 100:15                     |
| 32:11                    | 73:19 78:15,19,22        | 106:19 107:3,12          | 80:21 85:17 90:19          | careful 15:5               |
|                          | I                        |                          | I                          | l                          |

| <b>Cascade</b> 1:7 2:10 | 47:1,2,21 49:8             | chance 85:8                | 106:25                     | 95:24 96:5 103:3        |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5:11,18,24 7:10         | 50:5,6,7,9,9,11,12         | change 27:19 67:21         | <b>clean</b> 17:2 36:19    | 109:17                  |
| 10:7,13 14:25           | 50:13,20,21 51:1           | 80:22                      | 88:8                       | Commission's            |
| 15:7,17,21,22,25        | 51:8,15,21,22,24           | <b>changed</b> 40:5 51:25  | <b>clear</b> 15:21 18:25   | 15:21 17:22 20:16       |
| 16:3,6,9,11,13,16       | 66:6,24 67:5,18            | 51:25 63:1                 | 20:8 32:1 67:22            | 41:12 46:8,13           |
| 16:23 17:13,18          | 67:20,22 68:25             | <b>changes</b> 23:4,6      | cleared 87:19              | commissioned 6:6        |
| 18:14,17,22,25          | 69:23,23 70:7              | 42:1,6,14 62:19            | clearly 80:2               | 14:25                   |
| 19:22 20:18,22          | 80:20 81:8 83:7            | 62:19 66:7,25              | <b>close</b> 56:23 88:3,17 | <b>Commissioner</b> 2:7 |
| 21:2,16,18,19           | 88:1 97:3 103:17           | 67:9,16,19,23              | 106:5                      | 4:5,7,10,15 5:15        |
| 22:17,23 23:1           | 104:25 105:15,23           | 68:1 80:9 93:15            | <b>closed</b> 51:22        | 13:14 17:10 18:12       |
| 24:4,10,16,23           | cases 33:7 41:17           | 107:18                     | closely 77:13,13           | 18:13 19:19 57:24       |
| 28:8,15 32:25           | 45:2 46:7 75:11            | changing 47:16             | <b>Coie</b> 2:12 5:24 6:1  | 58:3,8,12,16            |
| 33:3 34:17,18           | 87:1 104:19 105:2          | 67:13                      | collaboration              | 64:12,18,20 65:17       |
| 36:18 37:2,21,24        | 105:16                     | <b>check</b> 26:20,24      | 21:21                      | 65:19,23,25 68:3        |
| 38:2,7,13 39:6,10       | cash 40:18,23              | 27:10,16,18,21             | colleague 57:22            | 68:9,11,12 72:11        |
| 41:9,11,16 44:4         | <b>CBR</b> 50:16 52:16     | 29:6,10,15 31:7            | collected 70:10            | 72:12 73:6,11           |
| 44:21 45:17,21          | CCR 1:25 109:15            | 31:12 82:17 84:3           | Collins 4:14 12:17         | 74:3 77:2,6 78:5        |
| 46:9,14,18,20           | certain 9:24 21:5          | 107:17                     | 13:11 92:23,24             | 78:23,25 79:17,20       |
| 47:9,10 48:19           | 47:23,23 106:10            | <b>Chile</b> 65:18         | 93:9,12,17,19,23           | 80:8,19 81:3,13         |
| 49:23 50:8,10           | certainly 33:6 45:7        | Chiles 4:3,10 12:12        | 98:6,7,8,10                | 81:20 82:2,5,8,10       |
| 53:13 55:21 60:1        | 55:22 56:3 62:23           | 22:5,20,22 23:9            | <b>color</b> 56:19,20      | 82:14,17,19,25          |
| 79:21 96:2 102:5        | 63:2,8 71:12               | 23:16 32:17,23             | 76:17                      | 83:3,14,20 84:1         |
| 102:7 106:11            | 77:12 94:9 97:6            | 35:23 39:16 53:1           | column 25:11 26:7          | 89:8 90:10 92:15        |
| Cascade's 12:12         | Certified 109:6            | 58:17 64:16,18             | 26:15,18 27:12             | 92:16 95:21 97:10       |
| 14:5 15:6,11,13         | certify 109:7              | 68:13 72:13,15             | 83:1,21                    | 97:15,16 98:4,20        |
| 15:20 16:20 19:4        | Chad 3:3 6:18              | 73:11,15,19,22             | columns 25:25              | 104:10,23 105:11        |
| 20:15 21:4,7 22:5       | <b>Chair</b> 2:5 4:5,6,6,8 | 74:10 75:15 76:8           | come 94:2 96:19            | 105:24 106:19           |
| 26:3 27:7 31:9          | 4:9,12,13,15,17            | 78:8,11 80:9,11            | 101:18 108:3               | commissioners           |
| 35:3,24 36:4            | 5:15 17:9 19:19            | 81:1,4 82:1,9,11           | comes 11:4 60:18           | 9:22 11:5 12:12         |
| 40:22 41:1 71:24        | 52:22,24 54:22,23          | 82:19,23,24 83:2           | comfortable 94:21          | 13:7,12 14:1,24         |
| 94:13                   | 58:10 64:15 65:3           | 83:8,19,25 84:4            | commencing 109:8           | 52:20 65:1 73:5         |
| case 14:5,15 15:5       | 65:7,10 68:3,6             | 85:11 95:23 99:11          | <b>comment</b> 107:2,4     | 74:1 85:5 100:12        |
| 15:15,16,17,20          | 70:16 71:17,22             | 102:14 106:18              | commission 1:2,4           | 104:6 105:10            |
| 16:2,7,9,19 17:2        | 72:7 74:6,8 76:8           | <b>chose</b> 48:16         | 5:10,13 9:20               | Commissions'            |
| 18:14,15 19:1,3,3       | 76:11 77:2,4,18            | circumstances              | 15:19,23 16:1,5            | 93:19                   |
| 19:4,7,21 20:15         | 79:1,2,3,6,17              | 38:17 51:21,24             | 16:12,16,19 19:13          | committee 96:8          |
| 20:18 21:9 23:19        | 81:15,19 84:7,8            | 52:5                       | 21:2,23 24:9,17            | 97:1                    |
| 26:3 27:7 28:4,8,9      | 85:6,9,14 87:7,9           | citizens 55:25             | 24:22,23 25:4,5            | communicated            |
| 28:13,15,19,23          | 89:8,12 90:7               | <b>claims</b> 59:12        | 26:3 28:11 35:9            | 75:7                    |
| 33:1,5,7,8,13,14        | 91:18,21 92:13             | clarification 9:12         | 36:21,25 37:11             | communication           |
| 33:15,17 36:12,17       | 93:20,22 97:10,13          | 13:10 55:8 98:23           | 48:6,11 50:17,20           | 16:17 95:2 98:16        |
| 36:19,21 38:3           | 97:18 98:18 99:1           | 107:20                     | 50:25 51:2,4,11            | communities 56:20       |
| 39:20 40:2 41:9         | 99:10,17 100:1,10          | <b>clarify</b> 52:12 87:16 | 51:12,20 52:12,13          | 56:21 92:6 94:20        |
| 41:11,15,20,22          | 100:15 101:5,15            | 88:22 98:13                | 55:14,19 67:10             | community 56:19         |
| 44:22 45:18,24          | 102:10,12 104:1,9          | 107:22                     | 73:22 77:7 80:21           | community-based         |
| 46:1,3,7,11,16,21       | 105:25 107:25              | clarifying 13:4            | 88:7,14,15,19,23           | 21:13 94:12 96:22       |
|                         |                            |                            |                            |                         |

| companies 67:8           | 108:9                  | context 9:24               | <b>costs</b> 29:23 33:21   | 94:15                     |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| company 14:7 18:2        | conclusion 33:6        | <b>continue</b> 37:2 45:8  | 44:7 45:1,4,4,10           | customer 22:23            |
| 21:21 27:14,23,25        | conducted 14:4         | 55:23 69:6 74:2            | 50:6 69:6,10               | 41:4 42:18 53:9           |
| 29:4,8,11 31:5           | conference 49:1,6      | <b>continued</b> 4:6,6,7,9 | 71:16                      | 53:12,14,16,18,21         |
| 33:22 48:10 51:19        | 49:13,15 54:7          | 38:8                       | <b>counsel</b> 2:21 6:9,12 | 53:25 63:3 76:16          |
| 55:19 56:5 59:12         | 74:11                  | continues 21:19            | 7:13 9:11 10:12            | 77:15                     |
| 60:2 63:5 64:9           | conferences 49:17      | contract 96:21             | 10:25 12:14 17:7           | customers 18:20           |
| 66:5,24 67:19,21         | confidential 8:1       | controller 102:7           | 17:11,15 18:5              | 19:25 20:11,14            |
| 77:9 78:2 80:17          | 49:7,10                | convened 49:2              | 23:11 28:18 29:21          | 21:3,11,20 52:1           |
| 80:21 89:4,6 96:9        | <b>confirm</b> 83:4,21 | conversation 95:13         | 35:19 68:24 81:21          | 55:24 70:3,8              |
| 96:14 97:25              | 106:11                 | conversion 29:21           | 85:16 86:2,20              | customers' 19:23          |
| company's 15:14          | confirmed 24:19        | 29:22 30:5,20,25           | 87:2 89:14 93:13           | 20:2,6,9                  |
| 17:24 24:4,19            | 105:6                  | 31:1,3,4,9,14,16           | 96:9 105:8                 | <b>cut</b> 58:6           |
| 28:4 36:13 68:25         | conflicts 15:9         | conversions 56:4           | Counsel's 15:15            |                           |
| 69:2 89:1                | confused 60:16         | <b>copies</b> 23:18        | 28:5 30:15 84:15           | D                         |
| compared 51:22           | confusing 47:3,3       | <b>copy</b> 10:17          | <b>county</b> 37:5 109:4   | <b>D</b> 3:1 50:1 70:15   |
| 53:10                    | confusion 50:24        | coronavirus 69:21          | <b>couple</b> 79:20 106:8  | 76:10 77:5 79:5           |
| compilation 8:13         | 87:20                  | <b>Corporation</b> 1:7     | 107:18                     | <b>Danner</b> 2:6 4:5,6,6 |
| complete 8:8,14          | conjunction 38:24      | 5:11 17:13 22:24           | course 11:4 28:20          | 4:8,9,12,13,15,17         |
| 9:20 16:11 28:3          | consider 19:22         | <b>correct</b> 29:16,24,25 | 36:23 38:22 39:1           | 5:15 17:9,9 18:13         |
| 36:19                    | 20:9,16 44:22          | 34:14,15,20,21             | 46:5 62:20 77:4            | 19:19 52:22,24            |
| completed 75:22          | 55:14 79:10            | 35:6,7 36:3,7,11           | <b>court</b> 10:18         | 54:22,23 58:10            |
| completely 15:16         | consideration 15:2     | 37:17,18,22 39:22          | covering 71:16             | 64:15 65:3,7,10           |
| compliance 45:23         | considered 14:16       | 39:23 40:16,24             | <b>COVID</b> 43:6,17,20    | 68:3,6 70:16              |
| 66:5,11,19 67:1          | 16:3                   | 42:15 43:17,18,21          | 44:3 45:7 69:25            | 71:17,22 72:7             |
| 67:20                    | considering 18:24      | 43:22 45:19,20             | COVID-19 68:14             | 74:6,8 76:8,11            |
| complies 92:3            | 105:6                  | 51:16,17 52:16             | 69:1                       | 77:2,4,18 79:2,3,6        |
| compliment 96:18         | consistency 41:19      | 53:17 61:18 76:20          | <b>CPA</b> 86:23           | 79:17 81:15,19            |
| comply 17:17,22          | 62:14 63:11            | 83:2 85:12 98:25           | created 57:3               | 84:7,8 85:6,9,14          |
| 55:5 92:1 97:21          | consistent 17:21       | 99:1 101:9 102:22          | creating 15:15             | 87:7,9 89:8,12            |
| compress 104:25          | 41:9,16 46:4           | 102:25 104:8               | <b>credit</b> 35:25        | 90:7 91:18,21             |
| compressed 20:21         | 62:12,14 63:6          | corrected 16:23            | <b>CRM</b> 45:23 46:3      | 92:13 93:20,22            |
| 105:3 106:1              | 67:20                  | 59:19                      | 46:10,15,20,22             | 97:10,13,18 98:18         |
| compromised 15:4         | consolidation          | correcting 20:24           | 47:19,24 48:1,3,8          | 99:1,10,17 100:1          |
| 80:13,17                 | 20:24                  | correction 34:18           | 66:2,25 67:7,19            | 100:10,15 101:5           |
| concept 94:12            | consultant 86:16       | 36:9 37:7                  | cross 13:6 22:18           | 101:15 102:10,12          |
| concepts 62:5            | 91:12                  | corrections 23:4,7         | 23:9,18 32:16              | 104:1,9 105:25            |
| concern 15:23            | consultation 37:4      | 35:24 93:16                | cross-examination          | 107:25                    |
| 16:20                    | Consulting 86:13       | correctly 45:17            | 4:3,4 7:8 12:11,19         | <b>Danner's</b> 79:1      |
| concerned 105:25         | consumed 39:7,11       | corroborate 16:18          | cross-examine              | <b>data</b> 7:20,20,22,22 |
| concerns 55:16           | Consumers 6:16,20      | <b>cost</b> 15:12 16:14    | 10:25                      | 8:3,13,16,18 9:13         |
| 101:11                   | 91:9                   | 40:19 45:2,11,18           | crucial 11:24              | 10:7 28:22 72:2           |
| <b>conclude</b> 12:23,24 | contain 97:25          | 50:11,12 57:11             | Cstokes@cableh             | <b>date</b> 1:24 20:23    |
| 106:7 107:7              | contemplating 90:6     | 63:20 64:4 69:12           | 3:6                        | 48:20 70:25 75:4          |
| concluded 108:12         | contents 24:13         | 75:23 77:10 94:6           | current 69:18              | 75:9 99:14,19             |
| concludes 18:7           | contesting 40:21       | 99:5                       | currently 37:6             | 100:25 102:16             |
|                          | -                      |                            |                            |                           |

| <b></b>                              |  |  |                                   | T age 114   |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 104:16,17,22,24                      | depending 12:25                        | 25:1                                       | 101:13,17,24                      | eligibility 21:10                                     |
| dates 71:18 98:15                    | 48:2                                   | discussions 96:1                           | 102:1 104:1,2,5                   | eliminate 35:25                                       |
| 105:12 106:2                         | depreciation 16:15                     | dismiss 90:15                              | 102:1101:1,2,5                    | 36:5 37:1 42:6  |
| Dave 2:6 5:15                        | 47:18 53:7 79:23                       | disputes 15:7                              | 106:4,17,24                       | embedded 24:22  |
| 64:12 74:5 98:25                     | 79:24,25,25 80:1                       | disputing 80:12                            | 107:11,17 108:6                   | 25:3,5  |
| day 34:16 38:13                      | 80:7,13,16 81:1,6                      | divided 26:24                              | drawbacks 80:2                    | emission 55:11,16                                     |
| 108:3 109:11                         | 81:12                                  | dividing 26:21 31:7                        | due 14:10 16:25                   | employee 43:25  |
| Dbarnett@perki                       | describe 24:15 30:1                    | docket 5:9 19:5                            | 30:5 42:18 69:20                  | employee 43.25<br>employer 22:21                      |
| 2:14                                 | 30:5,11 47:10                          | 20:24 26:3 34:17                           | 103:1 105:16                      | 93:10   |
| <b>deadline</b> 106:5                | 86:21 94:8                             | 35:5 36:10 37:8                            | 105.1 105.10                      | <b>employment</b> 86:12                               |
| <b>deal</b> 75:3                     | detail 74:18                           | 37:21,23 38:15                             | E                                 | employs 91:10   |
| deals 69:25                          | detailed 21:12                         | 46:9,14 69:24                              | <b>E</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1,1            | <b>enable</b> 21:11                                   |
| <b>debt</b> 70:21,23,25              | details 57:13 66:20                    | 76:19,21 78:7,10                           | 17:16 23:14 32:21                 | encourage 106:2                                       |
| 71:5,24,25 72:6                      | 76:14 77:23,24                         | 97:5                                       | 50:1,1,1 52:23                    | e   |
| 99:15,18,24 100:3                    | 96:2                                   | <b>document</b> 11:23                      | 58:15 70:15,15                    | <b>encouraging</b> 56:25<br><b>energy</b> 3:7 6:16,20 |
| 100:25 102:15,18                     | determinants 63:2                      | 78:1 99:11                                 | 74:7 76:10,10                     | 6:23 7:2 12:15,16                                     |
| ,                                    | determinants 63:2<br>determinates 39:6 |  | 77:5,5 79:5,5 86:9                | 18:7 19:17 21:8                                       |
| 103:4,13,20,21<br><b>decide</b> 9:22 | 39:10 62:20                            | <b>dog</b> 13:15<br><b>doing</b> 73:8 79:3 | 87:8 91:20 93:21                  | 35:5 56:2,3,14,14                                     |
|                                      |  | 105:9,21                                   | 95:20 102:11                      |   |
| <b>decides</b> 14:18                 | <b>determine</b> 19:8                  | dollars 96:25                              | 109:1,1                           | 56:23 57:5 75:16<br>75:17 76:3 89:13                  |
| <b>decision</b> 20:15 21:4           | 38:22 47:11                            |  | <b>e-mail</b> 54:11 74:15         |   |
| decisions 21:1                       | determined 16:6                        | <b>Donna</b> 2:11 5:23                     | 75:8 98:21                        | 91:9 92:22 93:12                                      |
| <b>decoupling</b> 24:4               | determining 55:12                      | 53:3                                       | early 106:3 107:24                | 93:18 94:17 99:6                                      |
| 25:5 41:14 60:9                      | 55:13                                  | <b>double</b> 107:17                       | earn 27:14,23 29:8                | <b>ensure</b> 67:22                                   |
| 60:25 61:1,13,24                     | detriment 41:18                        | <b>Doyle</b> 1:11 2:3 5:5                  | 29:12 40:22                       | entered 34:5  |
| 62:10                                | development 55:17                      | 5:12 6:2,8,14,22                           | earning 52:4                      | entertainment   |
| decrease 41:2                        | <b>difference</b> 30:4,6               | 7:3,17 9:5,7 10:3                          | economic 20:4                     | 43:25   |
| 60:12                                | 41:10 88:21                            | 10:15 11:5,13                              | 55:17                             | entire 9:25 90:3                                      |
| dedicated 21:12                      | differences 99:21                      | 12:2 13:6,13,15                            | <b>EDIT</b> 34:2,7,9              | entirely 28:14  |
| deducted 61:12                       | <b>different</b> 15:15,16              | 13:18 14:2,23                              | education 86:21                   | 59:15   |
| Defendants 1:8                       | 26:5 28:7,15 29:2                      | 17:6,8 18:10,13                            | effect 43:19 67:11                | entries 62:18   |
| <b>defer</b> 38:10 39:14             | 30:9 45:1,6 50:22                      | 19:16,20 22:2,9                            |                                   | envelope 94:2   |
| 56:11 63:16                          | 69:4 81:11                             | 22:16 23:10 32:15                          | effectively 77:10                 | environmental   |
| deferral 37:12 44:3                  | direct 16:9 33:1                       | 32:19 35:14,20                             | <b>efficiency</b> 56:3<br>94:17   | 55:11,15  |
| 69:1,2,4                             | directed 16:16                         | 49:22 52:19 54:19                          | <b>efficient</b> 56:5             | <b>envision</b> 96:6,10                               |
| deferred 15:14                       | directing 89:23                        | 54:21 64:22,25                             |                                   | <b>EOP</b> 16:10 51:13                                |
| 33:25 34:24 43:16                    | direction 15:22                        | 65:5,9,11,15                               | <b>efficiently</b> 20:16<br>77:10 | 51:15 53:4,5,6,16                                     |
| 43:19 69:24 70:7                     | 79:9                                   | 72:14 73:4,7,10                            |                                   | 53:18,20  |
| 81:17 83:6,23                        | directly 76:22                         | 73:14,25 78:6,8                            | <b>effort</b> 21:12 94:11         | equal 18:20 20:5                                      |
| deficiencies 31:8                    | director 93:12                         | 78:14,18,21,23                             | 94:24 95:5,14,16                  | 27:24 42:25   |
| deficiency 15:8                      | disconnection                          | 84:10,18,22 85:3                           | <b>efforts</b> 21:20 94:16        | equipment 56:5  |
| 27:25 88:17                          | 69:25 70:8 76:13                       | 85:7,13,15,20                              | 96:15,19                          | equity 25:20 55:2,3                                   |
| <b>delay</b> 107:12                  | 78:19                                  | 86:1,5 90:14,18                            | either 52:20                      | 55:7,10,17 56:7                                       |
| demonstrated                         | discovery 14:4                         | 91:2 92:19,25                              | elaborate 47:8                    | 63:22 64:5,7,9  |
| 28:21                                | discretion 97:7                        | 93:6,8 98:5,8,11                           | electrical 55:19                  | 72:6 79:8,10  |
| departure 41:22                      | <b>discuss</b> 12:24 49:2              | 98:24 99:3,13,25                           | elements 98:1                     | 89:22,23,25 90:3                                      |
| 46:6                                 | discussed 17:15                        | 100:3,11,17                                | elevated 69:20                    | 90:4 91:23 92:1                                       |
|                                      | l                                      | l  | l                                 | l   |

| [   |                            |                                      |                                  | -                          |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 97:21 98:1 103:21                                   | 24:8,12,15 25:9            | factors 14:10 51:20                  | 78:6,9 81:7                      | forward 36:10              |
| errata 23:2,3 39:17                                 | 30:19,20 39:17             | 55:14,18 61:7                        | 104:16,22 105:16                 | 37:15,16 57:7,7            |
| 39:19,25 60:1                                       | 40:17 70:19 72:1           | 62:24                                | filings 17:25                    | 69:1 74:4 80:23            |
| 61:14,18  | 81:24 82:22 87:15          | fails 17:21                          | 104:20                           | 80:24 96:6 101:8           |
| <b>error</b> 90:21                                  | 107:2,3,9,13               | fair 14:8 19:8,12                    | final 9:3 10:1 15:19             | 103:7,9                    |
| especially 18:24                                    | exhibits 7:7,9,12          | fairly 88:17                         | 15:22 38:12 48:13                | found 14:5,17 26:9         |
| essentially 48:23                                   | 8:5,12 16:10 23:5          | fairness 90:5                        | 66:8,11 104:7,13                 | 36:15                      |
| 96:18,20 100:5,8                                    | 23:18                      | faith 21:20                          | 105:1                            | four 15:18 51:20,23        |
| established 66:19                                   | existing 96:14             | familiar 24:12,14                    | finally 12:13,16                 | 105:7                      |
| establishing 21:11                                  | expands 55:10              | 55:6                                 | 19:17 89:21 92:22                | Francisco 3:10             |
| estimate 13:4,7                                     | expect 41:3 94:24          | far 69:4 73:20                       | finances 20:2,6                  | <b>free</b> 5:19           |
| 40:25 103:22  | 97:2 108:2                 | feature 12:21                        | financial 88:9                   | Friday 104:22              |
| estimated 13:1                                      | expecting 48:21            | February 54:12                       | <b>find</b> 7:17                 | 105:20 106:5               |
| estimates 12:22                                     | <b>expense</b> 53:7,7 80:7 | 74:15,24 98:22                       | <b>finding</b> 38:18             | <b>front</b> 78:12         |
| evaluating 33:3,4                                   | 96:11 97:3                 | feel 5:19 55:22                      | fine 13:23 105:24                | full 8:22 9:13 10:1        |
| 33:11 38:20   | expenses 43:25             | 94:21 105:10                         | <b>firm</b> 6:25                 | 10:7 15:1 17:4,11          |
| evaluation 47:9                                     | 44:1,1 69:16               | <b>fees</b> 41:14                    | first 10:24 12:10                | 22:20 51:8 63:16           |
| <b>event</b> 21:3                                   | 79:24 96:17                | <b>felt</b> 36:23                    | 13:21 14:10 20:18                | 73:1 90:24 91:5            |
| everybody's 108:3                                   | experience 53:9,12         | figure 61:13 77:9                    | 22:5 106:16 107:8                | 101:22                     |
| evidence 8:15                                       | 53:14 86:22,25             | file 8:5 10:11 19:1                  | <b>five</b> 64:21                | fully 28:20 56:6           |
| 16:21 49:7 88:19                                    | experienced 45:10          | 32:25 33:15 36:13                    | <b>five-</b> 65:1                | 108:2                      |
| evidentiary 1:10                                    | experiencing 45:9          | 38:14,15 76:13                       | five-minute 65:4                 | <b>fund</b> 21:8 40:19,23  |
| 5:8 100:20 108:9                                    | expert 86:16               | 82:4,7,13 91:13                      | 84:23                            | 63:20 64:3,9               |
| exact 40:4 75:4,9                                   | expires 109:17             | 91:14 104:17                         | <b>fix</b> 37:15,16 64:23        | 103:12                     |
| exactly 71:2 72:16                                  | explain 38:13 55:4         | 105:23 107:3,9,9                     | 64:23                            | <b>funded</b> 77:23        |
| examination 4:1,4                                   | 58:23 59:3,10,25           | 107:21                               | <b>flesh</b> 96:2                | 102:19,20                  |
| example 97:4  | 61:11 62:5,22              | <b>filed</b> 7:9,12 11:16            | focus 9:24 89:23                 | funding 21:15              |
| examples 15:25                                      | 66:15                      | 11:19 15:17 16:9                     | focused 17:2                     | 57:10 75:21 77:20          |
| <b>Excel</b> 8:5 81:24                              | explanation 47:5           | 16:11,12 17:12,16                    | <b>follow</b> 37:9 66:19         | 94:1                       |
| 82:4,7,21   | 97:9                       | 18:6 23:1 24:10                      | 71:6 72:8 79:2                   | <b>further</b> 32:13       |
| excess 15:14 33:25                                  | <b>explicit</b> 67:10      | 34:13,17 36:13                       | 84:2 100:7                       | 49:21 52:18 70:13          |
| 34:24 81:17 83:6                                    | 92:10                      | 38:13,23 44:23                       | follow-up 66:22                  | 72:10,13 79:18             |
| 83:22   | expressed 16:20            | 51:24 60:1 66:5                      | 74:9 77:3 89:9                   | 84:5 90:7,10               |
| excessive 17:18                                     | expressing 108:1           | 77:25 78:20 87:25                    | 92:15,16 95:22                   | 95:18 97:13                |
| 18:2  | extend 20:22               | 88:1,5,13 103:16                     | 98:17 99:23 100:5                | future 19:1 44:24          |
| <b>excluded</b> 47:12                               | <b>extensive</b> 14:4 52:9 | 107:24                               | followed 41:11                   | G                          |
| 53:16,18  | extent 35:8 55:17          | <b>files</b> 10:6                    | 66:17 74:18,25                   | <b>G</b> 52:23 58:15       |
| excluding 8:10                                      | F                          | <b>filing</b> 14:6 16:8              | following 15:5                   | 70:15 74:7 76:10           |
| 53:5  | <b>F</b> 26:7,18 27:12     | 18:16 20:20 34:17                    | forecast 42:6,9                  | 77:5 79:5 87:8             |
| <b>exclusively</b> 20:10<br><b>excuse</b> 13:3 20:5 | 109:1                      | 35:3 36:3 37:21                      | forecasting 42:11                | 91:20 93:21 95:20          |
| excuse 13:3 20:5<br>excused 11:3 72:15              | fact 18:25                 | 38:14,18,24 39:17                    | foregoing 109:8<br>forgive 60:20 | 102:11                     |
| 73:13 84:13 85:11                                   | factor 29:22,22            | 39:19,25 45:23,24<br>46:1,5 47:24,25 | form 5:17 103:3                  | <b>G-a-r-r-e-t-t</b> 86:10 |
| 98:9 104:3  | 30:5,21,25 31:1,3          | 40:1,5 47:24,25<br>50:20 52:9 66:6   | <b>formally</b> 16:23            | <b>Garret</b> 84:16        |
| <b>exhibit</b> 7:19 8:2                             | 31:4,9,14,16 41:5          | 66:11,18,19 67:1                     | forth 55:12                      | Garrett 4:11 12:15         |
| 10:2,17 23:23                                       | 63:4                       | 67:6,20,22 76:18                     | forum 72:16                      | 13:5,7 17:16               |
| 10.2,17 25.25                                       | 3011                       | 07.0,20,22 70.10                     | 101 uiii / 2.10                  | 1010,7 17.10               |
| 1   | I                          | I                                    | I                                | 1                          |

|                           |                     |                        |                        | 1 490 110                  |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 84:19 85:17,19,25         | 94:2,8 95:10 96:6   | 90:22 93:1 101:20      | 11:12 22:19 32:18      | <b>include</b> 7:21,24 8:2 |
| 86:7,9,9,13,13,16         | 98:11 102:2 103:7   | 107:19 109:10          | 35:17 49:21,25         | 8:17,18,24 9:3             |
| 86:20,23 87:4,11          | 103:9 105:2,14      | hands 12:5             | Honors 14:2            | 14:14 25:22 43:16          |
| 90:11,12,13,15,17         | 106:1               | handy 10:11 78:17      | hoping 70:18 81:22     | 50:8,11 55:10              |
| gas 1:7 5:11 17:13        | good 5:5,21 6:4,10  | happen 89:2            | hour 12:25             | 59:7,11 62:12,15           |
| 22:24 55:11,15,19         | 6:18,24 14:1,1,24   | happened 37:16         | households 94:18       | 69:23 70:1,4,7             |
| 56:1 71:13,16             | 17:8 18:12 19:19    | 47:1 88:20 89:3        | 95:6                   | <b>included</b> 8:4,6,20   |
| 102:7                     | 21:19 23:16,17      | 106:23                 | housekeeping 7:4       | 8:21,23 9:1,4              |
| general 6:5,12            | 32:23,24 53:1,2     | happening 48:1         | 108:7                  | 11:22 21:24 40:10          |
| 15:20 19:4,21             | 55:22,23 65:24      | 104:20                 | Huang 4:8,10 6:7       | 45:19,25 46:10,15          |
| 20:17 34:23 42:21         | 86:7 87:10,12       | happy 9:16             | 11:1 72:19 73:3        | 46:18 47:6,11,11           |
| 51:8 60:23 62:4           | 91:4,22 92:24,25    | hard 46:25 65:6        | 74:10 80:6 82:2        | 50:7 52:8 58:24            |
| 66:6 67:12 75:11          | 93:23               | harmless 21:3          | 82:16,18 84:2          | 59:4,21 60:5,6             |
| 80:14,16,20 83:7          | gotcha 13:9 58:7    | hate 47:20             | 85:11 106:20           | 64:10 69:23 75:8           |
| <b>General's</b> 2:18,23  | gradually 53:13     | havoc 20:1             | hundred-plus           | 90:6                       |
| 6:13                      | grant 12:6          | Hayes 3:9              | 28:22                  | <b>includes</b> 47:23 80:1 |
| getting 38:17,19          | granted 52:8 67:9   | he/him 6:6,20 7:2      | Huston 3:3 6:19        | including 7:8,14           |
| 44:7 66:20 77:1           | <b>GRC</b> 52:14,15 | head 27:9 30:9         |                        | 8:8,10 50:8,10             |
| 77:16                     | great 6:14 13:18    | headed 45:8            | I                      | 53:6 55:14 83:5            |
| give 11:19 17:18          | 56:4 60:18 65:5     | header 30:21           | <b>idea</b> 94:19      | 99:15                      |
| 22:12 27:13 36:17         | 68:20 78:21 93:6    | health 55:11,15,16     | identified 35:5        | inclusions 9:9             |
| 54:10 73:1 74:14          | 99:13 100:17        | hear 12:5,10,11        | 45:24 56:17 69:22      | <b>income</b> 15:14 18:5   |
| 74:21 85:23 90:23         | 101:19 107:11,11    | 58:1,2,5,8,11          | 73:21                  | 19:25 20:2,5,6             |
| 93:3 101:22               | 108:6               | 65:20,22               | identify 80:4          | 21:7,10,12,14,20           |
| given 37:7 41:8,21        | greater 95:2        | heard 10:24 102:13     | illustrate 72:3        | 21:22 25:13,15,16          |
| 46:8,13 63:7              | <b>green</b> 56:2   | hearing 1:10 5:8       | imagine 33:11          | 25:19,22 26:9,21           |
| 81:11                     | greenhouse 55:11    | 11:4,6 56:8            | immigrant 56:20        | 27:22 29:13 33:25          |
| giving 84:12              | 55:15               | 100:14,20 107:4,7      | impact 18:24 20:13     | 34:24 76:16 77:8           |
| 106:12 108:8              | group 21:14,22      | 108:9,10               | 30:2,10 42:6 45:5      | 81:17 83:6,23              |
| <b>go</b> 7:15 13:21 24:8 | 77:9 86:13 96:2     | hearings 44:11         | 45:7 62:25 63:10       | 94:18 96:1                 |
| 32:19 41:5 59:7           | groups 57:5         | <b>held</b> 107:4      | 68:25                  | incomplete 7:14,18         |
| 62:15 64:15 68:8          | growing 53:14       | Hello 92:24            | impacted 42:4,14       | 7:25                       |
| 74:4,5 78:23 79:2         | growth 41:4 42:18   | help 57:4 61:9         | 62:24                  | inconsistent 38:4          |
| 81:19 82:10,20            | 53:6,10,12,14,16    | 76:15 77:16 78:16      | impacting 33:22        | incorporated 37:8          |
| 83:8 84:7 96:1,25         | 53:19,20,21 63:3    | 95:6                   | impacts 21:4 45:7      | increase 17:19,25          |
| 97:13 98:12 102:1         | guess 9:11 26:15    | helpful 57:19 97:8     | 72:4,5                 | 18:19,22,23 19:5           |
| goal 36:20 77:12,17       | 30:8 50:6 55:7      | 101:11                 | implement 77:11        | 19:23,25 21:24             |
| 81:4                      | 60:13,13 61:11      | helping 105:22         | 96:7                   | 25:19 33:20 41:1           |
| going 10:16 12:9          | 80:17 95:22 97:17   | <b>hereunto</b> 109:10 | <b>imply</b> 50:6      | 43:20 47:18 56:18          |
| 36:10 37:15,15            | 105:11 107:8        | high 52:3 87:23        | important 16:21        | 57:18 60:10 62:2           |
| 44:23 49:5 57:7           |                     | 88:12 89:5             | 19:2 41:20             | 87:23 94:7,23              |
| 58:12,14 62:4,23          | <u> </u>            | higher 71:14           | improved 16:17         | 95:6 103:2                 |
| 62:25 66:1,25             | half 75:22          | historical 62:21       | improvements 21:9      | increased 14:9             |
| 68:5,6,7 69:1             | hamper 20:16        | hold 21:3              | 21:23 94:17            | 39:21                      |
| 80:23,24 81:16            | hand 11:9 12:21     | Honor 5:22 6:4,24      | <b>in-person</b> 44:17 | increases 14:12,13         |
| 83:10 85:9 89:6,9         | 22:11 72:24 85:21   | 7:10 9:10 10:5,21      | incentives 26:6        | increasing 21:10           |
|                           |                     |                        |                        |                            |
|                           |                     |                        |                        |                            |

| 42:19 43:1                 | <b>invite</b> 12:19       | 19:16,20,20 22:2       | <b>KING</b> 109:4 | lay 103:20               |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| independent 76:4           | invited 49:18             | 22:9,16 23:10          | know 12:20 27:9   | leave 97:6               |
| <b>INDEX</b> 4:1           | involved 75:5             | 32:15,19 35:14,20      | 28:7,19,21 30:23  | <b>led</b> 94:16         |
| indicate 21:17 38:2        | 91:24                     | 49:22 52:19 54:18      | 31:14,16,23 33:5  | ledger 60:23             |
| indicates 60:1             | <b>IRS</b> 34:2 38:4      | 54:21 64:22,25         | 33:7,11 34:8,12   | <b>left</b> 25:11        |
| individual 56:24           | <b>IRS's</b> 38:8         | 65:5,9,11,15           | 36:16,18 38:19    | lessen 45:8              |
| 77:14                      | issuance 37:20 71:1       | 72:14 73:4,6,10        | 39:13 43:24 45:1  | lessened 45:8            |
| inflation 45:5             | 99:15,20 100:25           | 73:14,25 78:5,8        | 45:3 47:4,14 48:2 | let's 5:17 7:4,19        |
| inflationary 33:21         | 102:17 103:20             | 78:14,18,21,23         | 48:4,7 49:12      | 13:18 22:5 58:18         |
| 52:3                       | issue 11:17,25            | 84:10,18,22 85:3       | 51:18,19 53:18    | 59:23,23 65:6,16         |
| influenced 41:25           | 18:15 28:1 33:25          | 85:7,13,15,20          | 54:17 55:24,25    | 84:22 103:15             |
| information 10:8           | 34:9 47:25 66:4           | 86:1,5 90:14,18        | 56:1,10,12,22,25  | <b>letter</b> 35:4,10,12 |
| 24:16,22 25:3              | 68:13,24 79:15            | 91:2 92:19,25          | 57:1,3,3,6 58:21  | 36:15 37:20 38:19        |
| 38:11,17,23 57:14          | 103:4                     | 93:6,8 98:5,8,11       | 61:19,23 62:11,14 | level 69:20              |
| 57:15 76:18                | issued 15:19 36:21        | 98:24 99:3,13,25       | 63:1,3,5,7,12     | levels 21:15 44:5        |
| informed 14:2              | 38:20 66:12 70:22         | 100:3,11,17            | 64:22 66:16,17,23 | 68:23                    |
| infusion 63:22 64:7        | 70:23,24 99:19            | 101:13,17,24           | 69:5 71:13,15     | <b>life</b> 20:4         |
| 64:10                      | 102:15,21                 | 102:1 104:1,2,5        | 74:14 75:20,24    | limit 104:7 106:6        |
| infusions 64:5             | issues 15:4 20:17         | 104:12 105:4,5         | 78:16 80:13 81:5  | limited 18:15 19:3       |
| 103:21                     | 21:5 30:15 48:5           | 106:4,17,24            | 81:5,7,10 89:3    | 55:15                    |
| inherent 34:11             | 56:12 57:8 58:4           | 107:11,17 108:6        | 90:4,5 92:3,4,5,7 | Lin 2:11 5:25            |
| 56:10,11                   | 92:5 100:21               | Judges 2:2 14:23       | 92:9 94:7 95:3,12 | line 23:24 24:3          |
| initial 7:11,12,22         | item 32:5                 | 18:13                  | 96:12,16,20,20    | 25:14,15 26:10,13        |
| 14:5 15:17 45:24           | items 30:9 34:12          | judgment 41:23         | 97:2,5,6,23 99:18 | 26:15,18,21,22           |
| 48:20                      | 36:22 43:24 64:9          | 61:18                  | 99:19 100:18      | 27:12,22 29:19,20        |
| initially 103:5            | <b>IV</b> 1:10            | July 104:21 105:17     | 103:20 104:6,18   | 30:1 31:3 40:17          |
| intend 18:25 32:25         |                           | 106:5                  | 105:21 108:1      | 43:7,13,14 60:12         |
| intended 10:25             | J                         | <b>jump</b> 64:13      | knowing 90:1      | 81:16                    |
| 48:6,11 72:17              | <b>January</b> 48:20 49:3 | jumping 78:25          | knowledge 24:18   | lines 39:17 45:13        |
| intends 11:2               | <b>Joanna</b> 4:8,10 6:7  | <b>June</b> 1:24 5:1,6 | 38:6 96:21 109:9  | 48:14 58:20 63:17        |
| intent 77:8                | 11:1 72:18 74:10          | 102:19,23 105:6        |                   | 68:16 69:16 79:22        |
| intention 28:4             | 79:7 85:11                | 105:18 107:6,10        |                   | <b>links</b> 83:9        |
| interest 14:20,21          | <b>joined</b> 5:14        | 107:11 109:8,11        | L 1:25 109:6,15   | list 10:17 107:13        |
| 15:9 17:4,21 53:8          | joining 6:7               | justice 36:17          | labelled 30:21    | listed 26:19             |
| 55:10,13 103:6             | <b>joint</b> 4:10 30:20   | justified 17:20        | LACEY 5:1         | listening 101:10         |
| interested 100:24          | 79:22                     | justifies 59:25        | landed 33:5       | litigated 51:8           |
| interests 20:9,10          | <b>JT-1T</b> 79:22        | justifying 16:10       | large 8:5 17:19   | little 7:4 32:1          |
| <b>interrupt</b> 54:3 59:9 | <b>JT-2</b> 30:19,24      |                        | 30:17             | 105:21                   |
| 76:9                       | 81:24 82:5                | <u>K</u>               | Lastly 18:4       | live 55:25 81:10         |
| interruption 68:10         | judge 1:11 5:5,13         | keep 11:7,9 41:21      | Laura 1:25 109:6  | <b>living</b> 20:3       |
| introduce 22:17            | 5:14 6:2,8,14,22          | 58:14 68:4,6           | 109:15            | LLC 3:9                  |
| 86:2 91:3 93:7             | 7:3,17 9:5,7 10:3         | 73:15                  | law 1:11 2:2 5:13 | <b>LLP</b> 2:12 3:3      |
| 102:2                      | 10:15 11:5,13             | keeping 44:3           | 17:17 55:2,10,12  | load 16:13               |
| inventory 32:9             | 12:2 13:6,13,15           | <b>key</b> 63:12       | 67:11 79:9 89:22  | <b>local</b> 94:20       |
| investigation 15:6         | 13:18 14:2 17:6,8         | kind 47:25 57:11       | laws 92:1         | located 93:13            |
| 17:3                       | 17:9,9 18:10              | 75:23 89:16 94:4       | lawyer 74:18,20   | <b>lodge</b> 43:25       |
|                            | I                         | l                      | l                 |                          |

| Pa | ge | 1 | 1 | 8 |
|----|----|---|---|---|
|    |    |   |   |   |

|                           |                           |                         |                            | i ago i io              |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| long 8:7 20:19 37:9       | <b>March</b> 11:16 17:12  | mention 20:13 57:8      | monthly 16:3 32:2          | name 4:2 5:12,19        |
| 39:1                      | 34:14 109:18              | mentioned 33:1          | 32:4,11                    | 6:25 22:20 78:9         |
| long-term 70:21,23        | margin 18:19,20,23        | 63:22 64:5 67:5         | months 15:19 16:5          | 82:6,8,22 83:18         |
| 71:5 99:15.18             | 39:20 45:22               | messengers 21:13        | 16:24 51:23 87:15          | 86:8,8 91:5 93:9        |
| 102:15,18                 | marginalized 56:21        | method 80:4             | moratorium 69:25           | 93:11 102:3,4           |
| longer 10:25              | Mark 4:3,10,11            | methodology 80:1        | morning 5:5,21 6:4         | named 83:15             |
| longer-term 94:24         | 12:12,15 13:5,7           | 80:2                    | 6:10,18,24 14:1,1          | narrow 18:16            |
| look 12:8 19:4            | 17:16 22:5,22             | methods 81:11           | 14:24 17:8 18:12           | Nash 2:17 6:5           |
| 25:11,25 26:7             | 23:9 84:16 86:9           | 98:15                   | 19:19 23:16,17             | Nash.callaghan          |
| 39:16 57:6 58:19          | marketing 94:12           | <b>middle</b> 20:1,5,6  | 32:23,24 53:1,2            | 2:20                    |
| 83:1,8 91:24              | 96:14                     | Mihaly 3:9 7:1          | 58:18 87:10,10,12          | <b>natural</b> 1:7 5:11 |
| 96:21 103:15              | math 29:16 59:25          | million 18:1,17,22      | 91:4                       | 17:13 22:24 55:25       |
| looked 56:21              | 65:6 94:2                 | 19:5 29:6,11,12         | <b>motion</b> 11:15 12:1   | 102:7                   |
| looking 19:2 33:6         | matters 7:5 10:19         | 29:14,14 39:21,24       | 12:6                       | near 19:1 44:23         |
| 33:17 56:1 88:23          | 10:22 106:7               | 40:4,7,12 58:24         | <b>move</b> 10:4 28:5,16   | 89:4                    |
| 99:4,4                    | maximum 94:10             | 59:4,11,16,20           | 35:9 39:15 47:8            | necessarily 97:4        |
| looks 45:13 51:20         | MCG-4 30:20,22            | 60:2,3,6,12 61:5        | 68:2 81:16 83:10           | necessary 10:9          |
| 100:13 104:7              | 30:25                     | 61:12,24 71:6,9         | moving 8:12 43:5           | 35:9 40:19              |
| 105:17                    | MCG-5 82:22               | 75:22 80:15 87:23       | MULLIN 92:18               | need 18:3 28:3          |
| lot 41:4 45:6 52:1        | MCP-4 30:22               | 88:17,21,21             | Mullins 4:13 90:19         | 29:11 33:4 42:11        |
| 95:3                      | meals 43:25               | 102:18,24,24            | 91:1,7,11,15,22            | 46:20 47:19 48:1        |
| lots 43:10,10,11          | <b>mean</b> 33:3,21 36:12 | 103:4,6                 | 92:14,20                   | 52:2 71:10,19           |
| 44:7,25                   | 36:13 37:4 44:25          | mind 73:7 77:20         | multicounty 94:17          | 77:16,23 103:2,7        |
| Love 65:9                 | 46:1 48:3,17,19           | minimal 69:7            | multiparty 15:1            | 103:15 105:1            |
| low 18:5 19:24 20:1       | 53:24 54:3 55:21          | <b>minor</b> 30:1,11,14 | 17:12 18:21 19:11          | <b>needed</b> 9:14,22   |
| 20:5,6 21:7,12,14         | 57:9 59:9 62:8,9          | minus 29:12,14          | 34:1,5,13,16               | 27:13,23 29:7           |
| 21:20,21 76:16            | 67:3,12 69:12             | <b>minute</b> 36:23     | multiple 47:16             | 71:10                   |
| 77:8 96:1                 | 80:14 81:4                | minutes 64:22           | 105:2                      | needs 12:20 87:19       |
| lowering 15:11            | meaning 44:7              | <b>mis-note</b> 99:9    | multiplying 27:11          | 103:8                   |
| lunch 12:23,25            | means 49:10               | missed 100:13           | multiyear 33:9,15          | NEG-167:208:9           |
|                           | meant 48:15               | missing 79:12           | 48:8                       | NEG-17c 8:1,9           |
| M                         | mechanism 15:13           | mistakes 88:18          |                            | NEG-18 8:10             |
| <b>M</b> 23:14 32:21 50:1 | 24:4 45:12,18             | misunderstood           | <u> </u>                   | negative 21:4 61:5      |
| <b>M-u-l-l-i-n-s</b> 91:8 | 48:4 60:25 68:1           | 42:22                   | <b>N</b> 2:1 3:1,1,1 23:14 | 61:5,22 62:2            |
| MAC-15X 24:9              | 69:24                     | MLin@perkinsc           | 23:14 32:21,21             | negotiation 11:23       |
| MAC-1T 33:1               | mechanisms 67:15          | 2:15                    | 50:1,1 52:23,23            | 48:21 49:5 54:6         |
| MAC-4T 23:23              | meeting 48:22             | modern 94:18            | 58:15,15 70:15,15          | negotiations 48:17      |
| 39:17 40:17 43:7          | 54:16                     | modifications           | 70:15,15 74:7,7            | 48:17,22 97:23          |
| 45:13 48:14 58:20         | meetings 44:15,18         | 19:14                   | 76:10,10,10,10             | net 25:13,15,16,22      |
| maintain 18:15            | 44:21                     | modifying 15:13,13      | 77:5,5,5,5 79:5,5          | 26:9,21 27:22           |
| maintained 15:25          | <b>meets</b> 98:2         | moment 31:8 43:8        | 79:5,5 87:8,8              | 29:13 39:21             |
| <b>major</b> 11:17        | MEG-1T 87:13              | 76:9                    | 91:20,20 93:21,21          | new 33:9,15 57:3        |
| majority 14:9             | MEG-3 87:15               | money 57:12 63:19       | 95:20,20 102:11            | 70:21,23 89:18          |
| <b>making</b> 47:24       | Megan 2:11 5:25           | 64:2 70:10 75:24        | 102:11                     | 103:21                  |
| 59:14                     | member 6:7                | 89:17 94:5              | N-y-g-a-r-d 102:6          | non-settling 11:20      |
| manner 21:5               | memory 54:14              | month 104:20            | <b>nail</b> 70:21          | 12:14 14:17 15:8        |
|                           |                           |                         |                            |                         |

|                               |                            |                      |                        | 1 490 110            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 15:10                         | <b>000-</b> 5:3            | 54:21 55:20 56:7     | 93:13                  | 10:12 13:3,9 17:8    |
| noon 12:24                    | oath 106:16,18,20          | 56:13 57:20 58:8     | opposed 17:11          | 23:13,15 35:18       |
| normal 44:8,10,20             | object 8:7 10:8,13         | 58:12,23 59:23,23    | opposes 19:24          | 84:17 86:4,6,11      |
| 45:9,9                        | 18:5 49:4 84:21            | 61:10 62:4,17        | 21:18                  | 86:14,18,21 87:2     |
| normal-type 45:10             | 95:25                      | 63:13 64:2,11        | opposing 87:2          | 87:5 104:14,15       |
| normalization                 | <b>objection</b> 9:13 12:3 | 66:1,10 67:17        | opposition 87:21       | 105:12,15 106:8      |
| 20:25 24:21 25:1              | 35:16,17,18,21             | 68:2,9,13,18,20      | optimization 96:17     | 106:21 107:1,15      |
| 25:3 34:3,19,23               | objections 7:11 9:8        | 69:14 70:5,12,24     | oral 11:15             | pandemic 20:1,7      |
| 35:24 36:4 37:3,6             | 35:15                      | 71:4,8,17 72:7,14    | order 11:19 15:19      | 69:21                |
| 37:10 38:4,9 72:4             | obviously 56:22            | 73:25 75:1,6,10      | 15:22 18:15 36:3       | panel 12:13,19       |
| normalize 24:21               | 92:9                       | 75:10 76:4 77:18     | 41:12,14 66:8,12       | 72:16 73:8,18        |
| 42:5,10 62:9                  | occupation 86:15           | 78:5,14 80:8,19      | 67:25 95:1 105:1       | 79:19 84:6,9,11      |
| normalized 24:5,20            | occur 42:1 48:18           | 81:13,20 82:14,16    | Oregon 3:5             | paper 43:10,11       |
| 41:2 42:9 62:6,7              | occurred 62:20             | 82:18,25 83:3,14     | organizations          | 95:16                |
| normally 11:21                | 98:21                      | 83:20 84:1,10,18     | 56:24 96:23            | papers 24:10 60:7    |
| Northeast 2:12,23             | office 2:18,23 6:13        | 84:22 85:14 86:5     | original 18:16 28:9    | 103:16,16            |
| note 19:2 98:13               | official 11:22 35:10       | 87:5 88:22 89:11     | 52:9 60:5,14           | pardon 107:12        |
| noted 100:13                  | offset 47:18 48:1          | 89:14,21,21 90:14    | 61:23                  | part 8:2,25 9:15,17  |
| notes 99:4 107:18             | 61:4                       | 91:13,16 92:8,12     | <b>Originally</b> 40:3 | 10:18 38:16 63:2     |
| notice 35:10,15               | offsetting 45:4            | 95:9 97:15 98:3      | outcomes 52:14         | 63:3,15,21,24        |
| 78:6                          | <b>Oh</b> 40:14 44:16      | 98:11,24 99:13,25    | 96:24                  | 64:5,7,8 69:8 76:1   |
| number 31:4 40:5              | 54:14 59:9 71:2            | 100:3,5,9 101:17     | outline 96:23          | 108:2                |
| 40:5 43:24 51:9               | 101:25                     | 102:21,23 103:13     | outreach 21:12,13      | partial 8:14         |
| 56:9 59:19 78:10              | <b>Ohman</b> 1:25 109:6    | 103:18 104:2,12      | 96:15                  | participants 1:13    |
| 80:5,16,23,25                 | 109:15                     | 106:1,21,23 108:5    | outside 37:5           | 89:19                |
| 81:7,21 83:9 95:6             | okay 9:5 10:3,15           | 108:6,9              | overall 55:24 64:8     | participate 48:16    |
| 107:3,9                       | 11:11 12:2,6 13:9          | Olympia 2:19         |                        | 54:11 96:22          |
| numbers 28:3                  | 13:18 22:16 23:22          | once 38:22 62:10     | P                      | participates 96:9    |
| 60:14 72:9 101:6              | 24:3,8 25:8,19             | 84:3                 | <b>P</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1   | participation 56:18  |
| <b>nuts</b> 95:15             | 26:7 27:10,16              | <b>online</b> 96:17  | <b>p.m</b> 108:12      | 57:17 94:7,23        |
| Nygard 4:16 101:8             | 29:17,17,17 30:11          | <b>open</b> 91:16    | <b>P.O</b> 2:18        | 108:11               |
| 101:23 102:6,6,9              | 30:13,19 31:14,17          | opening 12:10        | page 4:2 8:20,23       | particular 31:23     |
| 104:2                         | 32:13,19 33:13,23          | 13:19 14:2 18:8      | 23:22,25 25:8,12       | 33:5 38:11 41:11     |
| Nygard's 63:14,22             | 34:10,13,16,22             | 107:23               | 25:25 26:8,14          | 41:22 80:16 83:9     |
| 64:6 70:18 71:8               | 35:3,8,14,20 36:8          | operated 29:13       | 27:3 29:19 33:2        | parties 5:18 7:6 9:7 |
| 99:21 100:6                   | 37:19 38:1,2,7,12          | operating 25:13,15   | 39:17 40:17 43:7       | 11:20 12:2,11,14     |
|                               | 39:2,15,24 40:8            | 25:16,19,22 26:9     | 43:12 45:13 46:23      | 13:20 14:2,15,17     |
| $\frac{0}{0 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 0}$ | 40:17,25 41:7,24           | 26:21 27:22 83:10    | 46:25 47:6 48:14       | 15:8,10 16:18,22     |
| <b>O</b> 3:1 23:14,14         | 42:13,17,19 43:4           | 83:11                | 58:20 60:12 63:17      | 22:3 35:14 38:2      |
| 32:21,21 50:1                 | 43:9,15,19,23              | operation 67:11      | 68:15 69:15 70:20      | 38:22 40:10 49:18    |
| 52:23 58:15 70:15             | 44:3,17,20,20              | operations 15:6      | 70:20 71:23 79:22      | 54:9,10 72:18        |
| 70:15 74:7 76:10              | 45:15,16,21 46:8           | 68:22                | 87:13,15 106:6         | 73:22 74:13,21       |
| 76:10 77:5,5 79:5             | 46:13,18,23 47:7           | <b>opinion</b> 36:25 | pages 66:3 104:8       | 75:7 80:14,22        |
| 79:5 87:8 91:20               | 47:16 48:12 49:20          | 97:22                | 106:6                  | 81:9 95:25 96:10     |
| 93:21 95:20                   | 49:22 51:10 52:18          | opportunity 32:16    | Paisner 2:22 4:3       | 98:15,17 99:7        |
| 102:11                        | 53:23 54:2,18,20           | 54:10 74:14,22       | 6:10,11 9:10,11        | 104:12 105:7         |
|                               | l                          | l                    | l                      |                      |

|                            |                           |                            |                             | 5                 |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 106:2 107:22,23            | placed 47:13              | 22:21 37:13 80:17          | prior 14:11 46:7            | <b>prom</b> 21:4  |
| parties' 9:23 12:22        | placing 51:19             | 81:9 93:10 102:4           | 51:22 53:10 54:11           | promote 56:2      |
| 20:12 77:8                 | Plaintiffs 1:5            | <b>positions</b> 14:16     | 74:15,24 98:21              | 96:17             |
| party 15:7 20:10           | <b>plan</b> 12:18 16:13   | <b>positive</b> 61:6 63:10 | 105:19 106:12               | pronouns 5:14,20  |
| 21:17                      | 33:16 37:7,9              | possible 11:21             | private 35:4,10,12          | 5:23,25 6:6,11,20 |
| passed 20:10               | 47:15 76:13 77:24         | 14:15 103:23               | 36:15 37:20 38:19           | 7:2               |
| path 76:15                 | 78:20 89:17 95:9          | 105:20 106:3,9,13          | probably 88:19              | proper 28:25 34:2 |
| patience 70:14             | 96:3,19 99:12             | possibly 33:7 48:8         | problem 10:10               | 34:6 67:13 88:14  |
| pause 10:9 31:11           | planned 38:24             | post-pandemic              | problematic                 | proposal 14:19    |
| 36:24 39:1 58:7            | planning 57:12            | 20:4                       | 105:13                      | 36:5 56:13 77:8   |
| 59:2 60:15 74:19           | 94:4                      | potential 34:19,22         | procedural 54:12            | 77:11,21,22 89:14 |
| 108:8                      | plans 67:19 69:2,4        | 36:4 46:10,15              | 74:16 98:22                 | 89:15 95:24 96:13 |
| pay 96:20                  | 78:2                      | 96:20                      | procedure 74:19             | 99:6              |
| payers 18:24               | <b>plant</b> 33:18 45:18  | practice 67:4              | 74:25 75:2,5                | proposals 18:6    |
| <b>Pearson</b> 2:3 5:15    | 46:10,19 47:11,13         | practices 55:18            | proceed 12:24               | 21:17 37:14 57:6  |
| 14:24 17:9 18:13           | 47:19 51:18               | pre-filed 7:7 93:16        | 49:23                       | 77:20             |
| 19:20                      | <b>plants</b> 46:15 47:24 | pre-pandemic 44:5          | proceeding 15:18            | proposed 17:13,17 |
| people 73:23 84:21         | please 5:19 6:3           | 44:12 68:23                | 15:20 20:23 21:2            | 17:20,25 18:4     |
| 94:21 95:4                 | 12:20 22:6,11,20          | precise 72:8               | 104:19                      | 29:5 34:18 35:24  |
| percent 18:19,23           | 23:22 24:8 25:8           | predict 88:2 89:2          | proceedings 20:18           | 47:2 66:7 77:22   |
| 26:19,25 27:4,5            | 25:11 26:7 29:18          | predicted 89:4             | 108:12                      | proposes 21:9     |
| 57:10 75:21 94:1           | 30:19,23 58:23            | preference 64:18           | process 38:18 39:1          | proposing 38:3    |
| 96:12                      | 64:13 72:20,24            | 64:23,25                   | 54:6 66:11,12               | 40:1,9 45:22      |
| percentage 18:20           | 78:9 84:7 85:20           | preferred 9:20             | 96:5 98:16                  | 75:18             |
| 26:18,20 27:3,4            | 86:4,7,21 90:22           | prefers 14:14              | produce 19:12               | propositions 9:17 |
| 53:11 71:24,25             | 91:2,4 93:1,7,9           | prehearing 49:6            | <b>product</b> 27:16        | protected 15:14   |
| 94:23 99:24 100:3          | 98:15 102:3               | preliminary 7:5            | program 18:5 21:7           | 33:25 34:2,6,24   |
| 103:14,21                  | <b>plow</b> 64:19         | 10:19,22                   | 21:24 56:15,17              | 70:3 81:17 83:6   |
| performing 47:9            | <b>plus</b> 16:10 33:25   | prepare 105:22             | 57:4,10 75:16,21            | 83:22             |
| <b>period</b> 16:4,6 31:18 | 34:2,7,24 81:17           | prepared 33:10             | 89:19 93:12 94:1            | provide 5:19 9:16 |
| 31:20,21 32:5,8            | 83:6,22                   | preparing 105:1            | 94:13 95:8 96:18            | 10:8,13,17 47:5   |
| 39:8,12,22 42:1,7          | <b>point</b> 30:14,17     | present 15:10 23:9         | 103:12                      | 52:2,3 57:14      |
| 43:16 45:19 47:17          | 33:12,19 35:13            | 45:17 102:9                | programs 56:19              | 66:21 75:3 76:18  |
| 52:6,7 54:1 62:21          | 42:5,8,10 44:15           | presentation 16:20         | 57:3                        | 78:1,12 98:15     |
| 79:25 88:3                 | 50:5 51:23 60:20          | presented 51:15            | progress 16:12              | 102:4             |
| periods 52:3               | 69:8 78:3,3 88:10         | 61:17 87:21                | <b>project</b> 3:7 6:23 7:2 | provided 10:6     |
| <b>Perkins</b> 2:12 5:24   | 88:25 89:24 95:17         | presenting 15:1            | 12:16 18:7 19:17            | 19:11 52:8 58:25  |
| 5:25                       | 96:20 107:6               | 16:21                      | 27:11 56:14,23              | 59:5 66:24        |
| <b>person</b> 44:12        | <b>pointing</b> 63:16     | presents 93:19             | 57:5 75:18 76:3             | provides 28:11    |
| personnel 37:5             | <b>policy</b> 46:9,14     | President 22:22            | 92:22 93:12,18              | 76:14             |
| phonetic 57:4              | population 77:15          | pressures 33:21            | <b>Project's</b> 89:13      | providing 9:13    |
| picture 28:12              | populations 95:1          | presumably 18:15           | 99:6                        | 16:2              |
| <b>pieces</b> 9:21,24      | portion 79:14             | <b>pretty</b> 44:14        | projecting 103:5            | provision 97:21   |
| place 28:7 48:5,11         | Portland 3:5              | prevent 34:19              | projections 57:17           | provisions 55:5   |
| 48:21,23 52:5,6            | pose 12:13                | previous 94:16             | 94:6 99:5                   | 92:1              |
| 86:11                      | <b>position</b> 9:23 20:7 | prices 71:13               | projects 96:24              | prudent 11:9      |
|                            |                           |                            |                             |                   |

|   |                                      |  |  | <u> </u>                              |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>PSE</b> 33:7 38:20   | 97:14 98:5 102:9                     | 103:7  | 46:20  | remaining 13:1                        |
| <b>PSE's</b> 36:15  | 102:13 104:13                        | <b>Rayne</b> 2:3 5:15                          | redirect 4:4 49:24                                   | 40:6 59:21 61:7                       |
| <b>public</b> 2:21 6:9,12   | quick 14:3 84:23                     | <b>RCW</b> 55:2 97:21                          | 52:18  | 62:12                                 |
| 7:13 9:11 10:12   | 107:20                               | reach 14:6 21:11                               | reduce 42:20 43:1                                    | remarks 18:8                          |
| 10:24 12:14 14:19   | quickly 10:4 78:18                   | 57:4   | reduced 43:25 62:1                                   | 108:4                                 |
| 14:21 15:9,15   | 100:23 101:16                        | reaching 20:19                                 | reduction 76:13                                      | remember 74:17                        |
| 17:4,7,11,15,21   |                                      | 94:21 95:5                                     | 78:20 80:15  | 75:9                                  |
| 18:5 23:11 28:4   | R                                    | reading 92:4                                   | reductions 55:12                                     | <b>remove</b> 40:1,9                  |
| 28:17 29:21 30:15   | <b>R</b> 2:1 3:1 23:14               | real 14:13                                     | 55:16  | 41:12,21 63:8                         |
| 35:18 55:10,13  | 32:21 50:1,1                         | realize 81:20                                  | refer 43:6 55:7                                      | 83:11,12                              |
| 84:14 85:15 86:2  | 109:1                                | realized 85:7                                  | 61:19 72:1 87:15                                     | removed 16:14                         |
| 86:20,24 87:2   | <b>R-7</b> 83:4                      | really 30:17 48:22                             | reference 45:12                                      | 41:13,15                              |
| 89:14 96:9 105:7  | <b>radio</b> 96:16                   | 51:25 77:17 87:22                              | referenced 9:16,18                                   | removes 83:4,21                       |
| 107:2,4   | raise 10:23 11:15                    | 89:5 90:3,6 94:19                              | 35:11 39:25  | removing 60:11                        |
| <b>Puget</b> 35:5   | 12:21 22:11 72:24                    | 95:16  | referencing 59:18                                    | <b>Rendahl</b> 2:8 4:5,7              |
| pulling 107:12  | 85:21 90:22 93:1                     | reason 106:22                                  | 60:13  | 4:10,15 5:16                          |
| <b>punted</b> 48:24   | 101:20                               | reasonable 14:9                                | referring 82:21                                      | 13:14 17:10 18:13                     |
| purpose 48:4  | raised 15:23 66:4                    | 19:9,12  | 90:2   | 19:20 57:24 58:3                      |
| <b>purposes</b> 80:20   | 107:19                               | reasoning 51:17                                | <b>reflect</b> 69:20                                 | 58:8,12,16 64:12                      |
| <b>put</b> 48:4,11 96:13  | rate 15:5,20 16:2,2                  | reasons 99:20                                  | reflected 14:13                                      | 64:20 65:17,19,23                     |
| 103:2   | 16:4,4,6,10,19                       | rebuttal 16:9,22                               | 97:24  | 65:25 68:3,9,11                       |
|   | 17:2 18:15,24                        | 21:16 23:23 29:19                              | reflects 14:20                                       | 68:12 72:11,12                        |
| $\left  \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q} \\$ | 19:1,3,3,4,21                        | 29:20 58:19 61:12                              | refund 66:2  | 73:6,11 74:3 77:2                     |
| <b>question</b> 13:4 25:2   | 20:13,17 21:24                       | 61:14,16 63:17                                 | refused 20:22  | 77:6 78:5,24,25                       |
| 31:25 38:11,12  | 26:3,13,15,19,22                     | 66:3 67:17,18                                  | regard 55:7 56:6                                     | 79:18,20 80:8,19                      |
| 48:13 53:3 54:5   | 27:6,7,11,12,14                      | 68:15 69:15 76:2                               | 75:15 100:25   | 81:3,13,20 82:2,5                     |
| 59:14 63:13,25<br>68:24 69:14 75:14   | 27:17,17,24 29:8<br>30:6 32:25 33:15 | recall 32:7 54:15                              | regarding 50:5                                       | 82:8,10,14,17,19                      |
| 76:24 84:14,19  | 33:15 35:25,25                       | 54:18  | 55:3 56:14 69:2                                      | 82:25 83:3,14,20                      |
| 89:15,21 97:11,17   | 36:1,5,6,14 37:1                     | received 53:3                                  | 89:25 98:16  | 84:1 89:8 90:10                       |
| questioning 4:5,5,6   | 40:11 42:1,6                         | recollection 48:22                             | 104:13   | 92:15,16 95:21                        |
| 4:6,7,8,9,10,12,13  | 44:22 45:2 46:11                     | 99:10  | regulated 55:19                                      | 97:10,15,16 98:4                      |
| 4:15,15,17  | 46:16,19 47:1,21                     | recommending                                   | regulation 86:17                                     | 98:20 104:10,23                       |
| questions 11:2,6,9  | 47:25 48:8 50:5,6                    | 87:14,17                                       | 86:24<br>Begyulatery 22:22                           | 105:11,24 106:19                      |
| 12:13 13:2,8,12   | 50:7,9,9,10,11,12                    | reconnect 58:13                                | <b>Regulatory</b> 22:23<br><b>reject</b> 19:13 21:24 | <b>repeat</b> 24:24 63:25<br>102:14   |
| 32:13 52:21 57:23   | 50:20,21 51:1,8                      | <b>record</b> 7:5 10:16,18<br>11:18,19,22 12:4 | related 16:15 20:18                                  | repeatedly 18:14                      |
| 57:25 64:13,17  | 51:11 52:4 53:7                      | 12:7 17:24 19:10                               | 61:13 70:7 81:17                                     | repeating 81:23                       |
| 65:18 66:1 68:4,8   | 55:18 62:19 66:6                     | 22:21 35:13 65:12                              | relates 34:23 63:14                                  | replaced 44:17                        |
| 70:13,17 72:10,17   | 66:7,24 67:5,19                      | 65:17 71:18 77:1                               | 97:18  | reply 20:22 72:2                      |
| 73:9 74:9 76:23   | 75:11 80:20 83:7                     | 84:23 86:8 91:5                                | <b>relating</b> 69:15                                | report 16:12,13                       |
| 77:19 79:1,7,18   | 86:25 88:2 97:3                      | 102:4 107:5                                    | 79:23  | 24:9,23 25:4,6                        |
| 81:16,22,22 82:15   | rates 14:13 19:8,11                  | 102.4 107.5                                    | relationships 94:25                                  | 28:11 50:20,25                        |
| 84:4,5,9 87:6   | 19:12,23 36:1,6                      | recover 60:2                                   | relevant 10:6 76:22                                  | 51:2,4,12 52:13                       |
| 89:10 90:8,11   | 37:2,22,25 38:3                      | recovered 59:12                                | 76:24  | 52:13 83:10,11                        |
| 91:17,23 92:13  | 39:7,11 47:12,12                     | recovery 20:4                                  | reliable 52:2  | 88:7,14,19                            |
| 93:19,24 95:19  | 67:6,9,13 83:5                       | 33:17 45:12,17,18                              | remainder 10:14                                      | report's 50:17                        |
|   |                                      |  |  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 1   |                                      |  |  |                                       |

|                      |                           |                            |                        | 1 age 122           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| reported 1:25        | 101:2 107:23              | 40:10,20,23 42:20          | <b>s-c-h</b> 83:16     | seeking 52:6        |
| 24:22 25:17 29:12    | response 7:20,22          | 43:1 45:23 47:18           | <b>s-u-p-p-l</b> 83:16 | seen 56:4           |
| 99:21                | 8:15,16,18,25             | 59:4,12                    | safe 44:8 52:2         | segment 76:16       |
| reporter 10:18       | 9:21,25 10:1,7            | reversal 61:22             | safety 55:16           | 77:15               |
| 109:6                | 16:24 20:21 35:4          | reverse 61:1,14            | sake 11:18             | segments 57:1       |
| reporting 24:15      | 81:14 100:22              | reversed 61:25             | Samantha 1:11 2:3      | self-employed       |
| represent 43:24      | 101:12                    | reverses 61:22             | 5:12                   | 91:11               |
| representative       | responses 8:13 9:8        | review 18:16 19:10         | <b>San</b> 3:10        | sense 11:20 59:14   |
| 69:19                | 9:14                      | 21:15 97:4                 | saving 43:24           | 61:21 62:15         |
| represented 20:10    | restate 31:25             | reviewing 104:5            | savings 43:6,17,20     | sensitive 29:23     |
| 40:19 63:21 64:4     | restated 26:9,21          | revising 16:23             | 43:23 44:3 68:14       | 62:18               |
| representing 5:24    | 27:22 29:13               | rid 37:12                  | 68:14 69:9,12          | sent 54:12 74:15    |
| 7:1 91:6,8           | restricting 105:9         | <b>right</b> 6:8 7:25 22:9 | saw 56:13              | 98:22               |
| represents 15:4      | result 17:1 26:20         | 22:11 26:7 33:23           | saying 49:12 61:20     | separate 18:4       |
| request 7:20,21,22   | 57:18                     | 37:4 41:5 43:5             | 76:22                  | 36:12               |
| 7:23 8:3,13,16,18    | resulting 17:3            | 48:21 50:11 52:15          | says 30:22,22 49:11    | September 15:18     |
| 9:14 54:19 67:25     | results 43:16 61:21       | 52:19 53:23 54:4           | 95:10                  | 36:14 37:19 87:16   |
| 71:21 72:2,8 76:3    | 87:24,25 88:6,8,9         | 54:22 60:17 61:16          | schedule 35:25         | 105:5               |
| 98:14 99:3,8,14      | 88:11                     | 65:10,23 66:14             | 36:5 37:1,22,24        | seriously 14:16     |
| 99:17 100:6,8        | retroactively             | 70:12 72:24 73:25          | 38:8 54:13 60:18       | serve 21:20 52:1    |
| 101:3,7,12 103:2     | 106:14                    | 74:19 76:7,19,25           | 74:16 83:6,13,16       | 77:14               |
| 103:3,4,18 104:18    | return 26:19 27:6         | 79:16,17,18 81:19          | 83:17,23 98:23         | served 23:1 94:20   |
| 104:21 107:8         | 27:12,13,14,18,24         | 82:10 85:6,10,21           | scheduled 49:6,13      | 95:7                |
| requesting 100:6     | 29:8,12 40:22             | 87:7 89:7 90:22            | 54:7 74:12             | service 14:11 22:23 |
| requests 21:22       | 44:5,20 52:4 66:1         | 91:10,18 92:11,11          | schedules 16:16        | 40:19 46:11,16,19   |
| 28:22 98:12,12       | 84:24                     | 92:19 93:1,20              | 41:12,16 49:2          | 47:13 51:19 52:2    |
| 100:14,23            | returned 85:3             | 95:18 101:10,20            | 60:11 61:3 83:5        | 53:13               |
| <b>require</b> 63:10 | <b>returning</b> 44:6,7,9 | 102:10 104:19              | 105:14                 | services 55:18      |
| required 24:16       | 68:22                     | <b>risk</b> 37:6,10        | scope 18:16 96:23      | 63:20 64:4          |
| requirement 14:10    | revenue 14:9 15:7         | roll 35:25 36:5 37:1       | screen 101:18          | set 104:16 109:10   |
| 15:12 16:14 39:20    | 15:12,12 16:14            | roughly 51:23              | scrutinized 36:18      | settlement 11:21    |
| 40:1,7 42:20 43:2    | 17:18,25 25:23            | round 92:19 104:8          | scrutiny 19:7          | 11:23 12:13,19      |
| 43:20 44:4 59:13     | 27:24 29:23 30:4          | <b>Row</b> 25:25           | seal 109:10            | 14:6,8,15,19,20     |
| 59:22 61:8 62:7      | 31:4,9 39:20 40:1         | <b>RPR</b> 1:25 109:15     | search 96:17           | 15:1,3,9 17:4,12    |
| 62:13 63:10          | 40:7 41:1,5,24,25         | rules 66:19                | Seattle 2:24           | 17:17,20 18:1,4     |
| requirements         | 42:5,9,11,12,13           | ruling 35:4,10,12          | second 14:12 20:22     | 18:21 19:11,13,22   |
| 17:22 34:3 37:3      | 42:20 43:1,20             | 36:16,21 37:20             | 33:24                  | 19:24 20:8,11,11    |
| 38:4,9 55:3          | 44:4 53:5,25              | 38:20                      | see 7:19 12:5 13:4     | 20:13,20,20 21:25   |
| requires 19:7 88:15  | 58:18,24 59:13,21         |                            | 26:1 55:1 57:22        | 30:20 34:11 38:14   |
| requiring 21:14      | 59:21 60:3,4,6,22         | S                          | 60:16 68:7 76:25       | 38:25 48:16,20,25   |
| rescheduled 49:1     | 60:24 61:2,7,24           | <b>S</b> 2:1 3:1 23:14,14  | 77:14 83:18 89:17      | 49:5,13,15 53:5     |
| resolution 15:4      | 62:1,6,7,13,18            | 32:21,21 52:23             | 89:24 100:2 103:7      | 54:5,7,25 55:1,4    |
| <b>resolve</b> 20:17 | 63:10,21 64:4             | 58:15 70:15 74:7           | 103:8,15,19,22         | 56:8,11 59:1,5      |
| respectfully 21:22   | 68:14                     | 76:10 77:5 79:5            | seeing 69:11 71:12     | 71:20 73:8,17,20    |
| respond 9:19 16:22   | revenues 16:15            | 87:8 91:20 93:21           | 95:3                   | 74:11 75:4 79:11    |
| 54:11 74:14,22       | 18:22 39:4,22             | 95:20 102:11               | <b>seek</b> 46:20      | 79:14 80:5,22       |
|                      | l                         |                            | l                      | l                   |

| 81:8 87:3 88:5             | <b>soon</b> 11:21 33:4   | 82:22 83:15,18       | stipulate 7:7              | supplement 7:24          |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 89:5,25 90:4,5             | 107:21                   | stability 16:2       | stipulation 34:1,5         | 8:8                      |
| 91:24,25 97:20,23          | sooner 105:9             | staff 2:16 6:3,6,7   | 34:13,17 38:14             | supplemental 10:1        |
| 98:1,16 99:16              | sorry 23:25 24:24        | 10:22 11:15,17,25    | 87:23,24 88:11             | 16:15 41:12,15           |
| 108:10                     | 30:24 34:4 36:2          | 14:4,14,16,18        | stipulations 38:25         | 60:11 61:3 62:11         |
| settling 13:19             | 42:21 43:12 46:12        | 15:1 16:18 17:14     | <b>Stokes</b> 3:3 4:4 6:18 | 83:5,12,16,17            |
| 20:12 40:10 54:9           | 47:20 50:22,24           | 19:22 20:18 21:16    | 6:19 10:3,5 18:12          | supplemented 7:23        |
| 72:18 98:14 99:7           | 59:9 72:1 79:15          | 21:18 34:6 54:12     | 19:16 32:18,22             | support 9:16,17          |
| <b>share</b> 99:12         | 84:21 101:25             | 56:11 72:20 76:2     | 35:8,22 49:9,16            | 20:12 21:17,18           |
| shared 47:6                | 104:24 106:17            | 77:13 79:21 80:18    | 49:21 50:5 91:2,4          | 52:9                     |
| shareholder 25:20          | sort 31:23 44:1          | 96:9 97:25 98:22     | 91:10,13,16                | supporting 16:8,11       |
| shareholders 40:18         | sound 35:5 41:22         | 106:11               | 107:19,20 108:1,5          | 73:20                    |
| 63:20 64:3                 | 75:1                     | Staff's 16:19 72:18  | stopgap 33:14              | supportive 56:6,15       |
| Shawn 4:14 12:16           | sounds 44:23 77:21       | stakeholders 95:14   | Street 2:12 3:9            | 56:24 57:6               |
| 92:22 93:11                | 89:14 106:4,10           | standard 67:4 98:2   | strike 11:16,24            | supports 20:11           |
| <b>she/her</b> 5:14,23,25  | 107:11,21                | standby 11:7         | 12:1,7                     | suppose 105:19           |
| 6:11                       | Southwest 3:4            | standpoint 46:4      | striking 12:3              | supposed 33:13           |
| <b>sheet</b> 11:18,22 12:3 | <b>space</b> 8:6         | 48:6 56:3 62:14      | striving 55:23             | 88:2 89:2 107:21         |
| <b>sheets</b> 11:16        | <b>speak</b> 10:4 38:5,6 | 63:5                 | structurally 96:21         | sure 16:18 24:25         |
| <b>short</b> 5:17 11:8     | 71:23 78:2 79:13         | start 7:4 53:1 74:9  | <b>structure</b> 16:1 72:3 | 32:12 33:10 64:1         |
| 12:18 36:14 52:21          | specific 34:11 48:3      | started 10:20        | study 16:13                | 71:3 73:10,12            |
| 85:4 108:8                 | 48:5 50:10 56:7          | starting 23:24 24:3  | subject 26:20,24           | 74:6 75:1 77:16          |
| Shorthand 109:6            | 62:19 67:24 77:19        | 29:19,20             | 27:10,16,18,21             | 78:19 96:3,8             |
| <b>show</b> 15:8 17:24     | 77:19,20 80:15           | <b>starts</b> 46:24  | 29:5,10,15 31:7            | 103:24 105:3             |
| 87:22 88:10,20             | 94:23 96:12 103:8        | state 2:18,23 5:19   | 31:12 82:17 84:3           | 106:22 107:7             |
| 97:3                       | 103:11 105:12            | 22:20 24:3 29:20     | submit 104:18              | suspend 54:12            |
| showing 89:4               | specifically 16:21       | 40:18 42:23 55:2     | 105:8 106:2                | 74:16 98:22              |
| <b>shows</b> 88:16,16      | 28:10 34:8 45:2          | 55:9 64:2 78:9       | submitted 18:6             | suspension 20:23         |
| <b>Shute</b> 3:9 7:1       | 45:25 52:10 53:24        | 79:9 86:7 89:22      | 24:17 28:9                 | 104:24                   |
| <b>sic</b> 83:17           | 54:15 55:6,21            | 91:5 92:1 93:9       | submitting 97:5            | swear 22:12 72:23        |
| side 13:15 25:11           | 57:1,8 59:7,10           | 95:1,4 102:3         | subsequent 37:20           | 72:25 85:8,22            |
| 26:8                       | 67:5 68:16 76:17         | 109:3,7              | 47:17                      | 90:23 93:2 101:13        |
| significant 19:7           | 77:25 78:11 79:10        | <b>State's</b> 83:22 | substance 11:20            | 101:21                   |
| significantly 71:14        | 80:11 81:2,7 92:5        | stated 17:22 31:8    | substantial 16:9           | switch 45:11             |
| <b>similar</b> 19:6 46:1   | 98:20 100:24             | 63:19 67:18,25       | subtract 61:20             | switching 39:3           |
| 94:13                      | Speed 92:19              | 107:5                | subtracting 27:22          | sworn 106:12,13          |
| similarly 8:1              | <b>spell</b> 86:8 102:3  | statement 12:10      | subtraction 61:20          | synchronization          |
| simple 65:9                | spelled 91:7             | 24:6,7 46:9,14       | success 56:4               | 53:8                     |
| <b>single</b> 47:25        | <b>spend</b> 95:10       | 48:15 49:11 62:17    | suggested 28:16            |                          |
| size 19:3                  | spending 33:20           | 68:21                | 40:4                       |                          |
| skill 109:9                | 52:1                     | statements 13:19     | suggestion 28:5            | <b>T</b> 3:1 23:14 32:21 |
| slowly 44:6                | <b>spent</b> 57:12 75:24 | 14:3 22:4            | 30:15 104:18               | 50:1,1 52:23             |
| small 30:16                | 89:18                    | states 31:3 55:13    | suggests 68:22             | 58:15 70:15,15           |
| social 94:12               | spoke 68:23              | statute 90:2,6       | Suite 2:13 3:4             | 74:7 76:10,10            |
| solely 15:11               | spread 18:20             | steps 66:18          | summary 82:22              | 77:5,5 79:5,5 87:8       |
| somewhat 56:10             | spreadsheet 82:8         | stewards 55:22,23    | <b>sup-</b> 83:16          | 91:20 93:21 95:20        |
|                            |                          |                      |                            | I                        |

| <b></b>                             |                                   |                                      |                             | : «go := :                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 102:11 109:1,1                      | 42:1,7 43:16                      | 32:15,20 33:23                       | 53:24 57:22 63:24           | topics 39:3 45:11                             |
| tab 8:21 30:20,22                   | 45:19 47:14,17                    | 35:21 39:2 43:4                      | 67:8,14 68:11               | total 41:1 60:22                              |
| 30:24                               | 53:9 69:18 81:5                   | 48:12 49:20,22                       | 69:11 70:5 71:17            | 61:24   |
| table 101:1                         | 83:23 87:14,17                    | 50:15 52:11,19                       | 73:7,9 74:3 77:18           | tracking 46:25                                |
| take 12:18,25 28:7                  | 88:2,24                           | 53:23 57:21,24                       | 77:24 78:1 87:19            | 69:5,10                                       |
| 35:10 48:21,23                      | testified 29:7 86:25              | 58:17 61:10 64:11                    | 87:20 88:25,25              | transcript 84:3                               |
| 52:7,21 58:13                       | <b>testify</b> 69:18 92:20        | 65:11 70:12,13                       | 97:2,19,25 98:18            | 109:8   |
| 64:16,20,21,21                      | testifying 86:19                  | 72:9,13,14 73:4                      | 98:19,20 100:15             | transparency                                  |
| 65:3 67:11 78:6                     | <b>testimony</b> 7:8 10:6         | 77:1 78:14,21,24                     | 100:22 107:5                | 16:17   |
| 84:22 101:1 103:5                   | 16:8,10,21,24,24                  | 79:4,16 80:8                         | thinking 73:8               | <b>Transportation</b> 1:1                     |
| taken 1:24 62:10                    | 17:15 18:6 20:12                  | 83:14 84:1,8,10                      | thorough 15:5 17:3          | 1:4 5:10                                      |
| 65:13 85:1                          | 20:22 21:16 22:12                 | 84:25 85:20 86:1                     | <b>three</b> 21:9,14,23     | travel 44:1 50:6                              |
| talk 33:24 34:22                    | 23:2,4,7,23 29:19                 | 86:5,14 87:5,7                       | 100:14                      | treat 36:24 63:6                              |
| 39:3 43:5 58:18                     | 29:20 33:1 43:6                   | 89:7,11 90:7,12                      | threshold 21:10             | 69:6  |
| 59:23                               | 43:15 45:13,16                    | 90:13,15,17,21                       | throughput 42:14            | treated 41:10,17                              |
| talking 45:2 57:9                   | 46:23 47:10 48:14                 | 91:18 92:12,17,18                    | 42:16,19,25                 | 63:12   |
| 75:20 101:7                         | 49:11 52:10 58:17                 | 92:20 93:6,8,20                      | Thursday 107:10             | treating 46:6 69:7                            |
| talks 90:2                          | 58:19,20 60:14,19                 | 95:18 97:8 98:3,5                    | <b>time</b> 7:16 12:22      | treatment 15:14                               |
| <b>Tammy</b> 4:16 70:18             | 61:12,15,16 63:14                 | 98:8,10,19 99:1                      | 13:1,4,7 20:19              | 16:4,4,6,10 34:2,6                            |
| 71:8 99:21 101:8                    | 63:15,17,17,23                    | 100:16 101:24                        | 23:9 28:20 33:12            | 46:2,2 53:6,17,21                             |
| 102:6,9                             | 64:3,6 66:3,25                    | 102:8,10 104:2,4                     | 33:14 35:13 36:14           | 62:11   |
| target 57:1                         | 67:17,18 68:15                    | 106:24 107:25                        | 36:16 39:1 44:10            | <b>trend</b> 68:21                            |
| tax 15:15 21:17                     | 69:15 70:18 71:8                  | 108:5,11                             | 46:5,12,25 75:12            | <b>tribal</b> 56:20                           |
| 33:25 37:5 53:7                     | 71:23 72:25 76:2                  | <b>thanks</b> 6:14 21:18             | 78:1,4 88:4,8               | <b>tried</b> 56:24                            |
| 81:18                               | 79:22,23 84:12                    | 21:21 23:21 31:2                     | 93:18 97:14                 | <b>true</b> 28:1 106:15                       |
| <b>taxes</b> 34:25 83:7,23          | 85:22 87:13,21,21                 | 35:19 86:6                           | 104:19,25 105:21            | 109:8   |
| Telephonic 68:10                    | 88:5,10,13 90:3                   | <b>theirs</b> 105:8                  | timeline 20:21              | trust 94:19 95:2                              |
| tell 30:8 48:15 55:9                | 90:16,23 91:14,14                 | <b>they/them</b> 5:14,25             | 46:24 47:6                  | trusted 21:13                                 |
| 56:17 79:12 82:6                    | 93:2,16 95:17                     | thing 11:8,14 36:18                  | timely 21:5                 | <b>truth</b> 22:13,13,14                      |
| 103:13                              | 97:19,24,25 98:9                  | 44:1 65:24 74:19                     | <b>times</b> 77:17          | 73:1,2,2 85:23,23                             |
| <b>ten</b> 64:22                    | 99:22 100:7                       | 88:16 106:16                         | timing 21:1 36:13           | 85:24 90:24,24,25                             |
| ten-minute 65:1                     | 101:21 104:20                     | 107:1                                | 38:16 48:2 54:16            | 93:3,4 101:22,22                              |
| <b>TEP</b> 19:24 21:9,20            | 105:16,22 106:12                  | things 28:6 30:16                    | <b>TJM-1T</b> 70:19         | <b>try</b> 41:20                              |
| term 11:18,22 12:3                  | 106:15                            | 30:17 37:15,16                       | <b>TJN-2</b> 100:7          | trying 57:4 60:20                             |
| 92:10                               | testing 54:14                     | 42:25 44:5,6,20                      | today 5:5,8 6:7 7:1         | 63:6 77:17 87:22                              |
| terminating 15:12                   | <b>thank</b> 5:21 6:2,14          | 47:16,23 48:1                        | 10:11 12:9 14:25            | 88:25 105:3                                   |
| terms 11:16 20:20                   | 6:21,22 7:3 9:6                   | 63:4,6,12 92:6                       | 17:11 20:7 22:13            | <b>turn</b> 21:6 22:6                         |
| 53:11 54:10 74:13                   | 10:21 11:11,13                    | 105:22                               | 73:1 85:23 90:16            | 23:22 25:8 29:18                              |
| 74:21 81:8 94:11                    | 12:7 13:9,17,24                   | think 7:12 8:20                      | 90:24 91:14 92:21           | 30:19 46:23 48:13                             |
| 105:14                              | 13:25 14:22,23                    | 9:20,25 11:18,23                     | 93:3 98:9 101:22            | 50:4 68:15 85:4                               |
| <b>territory</b> 53:13              | 17:5,6 18:9,10                    | 28:11,13,15 30:14                    | 103:7 106:14                | 89:13   |
| <b>test</b> 14:12 15:16             | 19:15,16,18 22:1                  | 30:21 31:25 32:4                     | 108:10                      | <b>turning</b> 68:13<br><b>twelve</b> 87:15   |
| 24:4,19 25:2 28:5                   | 22:2,3,10,16,19                   | 32:5,10 33:3                         | today's 100:14<br>tool 48:9 | <b>tweive</b> 87:15<br><b>two</b> 10:22 14:10 |
| 28:9,13,16 29:3,4                   | 22:25 23:8,10,13                  | 36:11,12 41:8,19<br>44:8 48:10 50:16 | top 27:9 30:9 70:20         | 21:11 37:14,14                                |
| 29:4,9,21 30:16<br>31:18 39:8,12,22 | 25:7 26:12,17<br>27:2 29:17 32:14 | 51:21 52:15 53:20                    | <b>topic</b> 38:12 63:13    | 75:11   |
| 51.10 57.0,12,22                    | 21.227.11 32.14                   | 51.21 52.15 55.20                    | <b>topic</b> 30.12 03.13    | 13.11   |
|                                     | I                                 | 1                                    | 1                           | 1   |

| Page <sup>2</sup> | 125 |
|-------------------|-----|
|-------------------|-----|

| typically 44:12,13         | 70:5 75:13,13          | <b>vetted</b> 28:20 | 83:22 93:14 109:3   | went 14:11 38:18   |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 88:3                       | understanding          | vetting 15:5        | 109:7               | 48:19              |
|                            | 9:25 35:1,2,23         | Vice 22:22          | Washingtonians      | weren't 45:24      |
| U                          | 36:8 67:14 82:20       | <b>video</b> 50:4   | 20:3                | 107:6              |
| U 3:1 52:23 58:15          | 100:19                 | videoconference     | wasn't 36:16 48:25  | Western 6:16,20    |
| 70:15,15 74:7              | undertaken 75:22       | 1:10,13             | 104:16 106:22       | 91:9               |
| 76:10,10 77:5,5            | underway 94:15         | <b>view</b> 89:24   | way 29:2 36:24      | WHEREOF            |
| 79:5,5 87:8 91:20          | <b>Unit</b> 6:12       | <b>viewed</b> 56:9  | 40:25 50:22 61:17   | 109:10             |
| 93:21 95:20                | unnecessarily 18:2     | violate 38:8        | 61:17 87:20 94:12   | widespread 44:15   |
| 102:11                     | 20:21                  | violation 34:19,23  | 96:4                | <b>willing</b> 7:6 |
| <b>U-190531</b> 46:9,14    | unpersuasive 14:17     | 36:4 37:3,7,10,12   | we'll 5:18 12:6,10  | witness 4:2 11:1   |
| <b>U-200281</b> 69:24      | unreasonably           | violations 20:25    | 12:22,23,24 65:11   | 12:12,15,16 17:16  |
| <b>UE-190529</b> 35:6      | 17:19 19:23 20:19      | virtual 44:15,21    | 84:23 85:4          | 22:5,8,15,18,22    |
| <b>UG</b> 35:5             | unusual 100:19         | <b>voices</b> 12:5  | we're 5:8 9:16 12:8 | 23:6 39:14 49:14   |
| <b>UG-190210</b> 52:16     | update 100:6           | <b>VOLUME</b> 1:10  | 33:4,6,10,18,20     | 58:2,6,11 65:22    |
| <b>UG-200568</b> 26:4      | updated 37:22          | volumes 39:7,8,11   | 37:6,9,10 46:1      | 66:21 72:18,20     |
| 27:7 66:6 78:20            | 53:25                  | 39:12               | 52:3,6 57:6,9 63:5  | 73:20 78:16 82:4   |
| <b>UG-210</b> 5:9          | updates 37:24          | <b>vs</b> 1:6       | 64:17 69:6,11,11    | 82:6,13 84:15      |
| UG-210709 37:21            | 71:10,19 99:16         | vulnerable 94:25    | 71:12,15 75:20      | 85:8,10 86:3,17    |
| <b>UG-210755</b> 1:5       | updating 16:23         |                     | 76:15 80:24 81:7    | 87:6 91:3,7,17     |
| UG-220198 20:24            | <b>upper</b> 30:21     | W                   | 84:18 85:15 95:3    | 93:5,7,11 100:21   |
| 34:18 35:3 38:15           | <b>use</b> 5:13,23 7:2 | WAC 17:22 24:16     | 95:10 99:4 105:6    | 100:22 101:3,14    |
| <b>Uh-huh</b> 51:6 78:22   | 30:16 32:2,8 38:8      | 35:11               | 107:21              | 104:4 106:11,11    |
| ultimately 14:6,18         | 44:15 46:8,13          | wage 14:12          | we've 9:15,18       | 109:10             |
| <b>Um</b> 31:11            | 55:25 62:5 81:5        | waited 20:19 38:13  | 10:11 28:20 33:5    | witnesses 73:16    |
| <b>unbilled</b> 25:23 39:4 | 84:20 88:23            | waiting 84:18       | 36:11 37:7 45:25    | 79:21 81:25 84:11  |
| 39:21 40:6,9,20            | useful 46:8,13         | 101:12              | 46:4,6 55:22 56:1   | 89:16              |
| 40:23 41:1,5,24            | users 89:18            | walk 46:24 47:4     | 56:4 62:10 65:16    | <b>wonder</b> 94:7 |
| 41:25 42:13,20             | uses 29:21 39:7,10     | want 9:23 10:4      | 70:2 84:14 85:3     | wondering 9:14     |
| 43:1 58:18,24              | 64:9                   | 11:7 33:9 52:25     | 105:2               | 55:3 70:20 104:17  |
| 59:3,11,21 60:3,3          | usually 72:17 75:8     | 54:19 55:4 57:2     | WEAF 21:8,11,23     | 104:21 106:9,13    |
| 60:6,10,10,15,22           | utilities 1:1,3 5:10   | 63:25 64:16 65:1    | 56:18 89:19 94:13   | words 33:14        |
| 60:24 61:2,7,24            | 94:20                  | 68:4,7 70:17,21     | 96:8                | work 24:10 77:9    |
| 62:1,3,6,8,13,18           | utility 86:17,24,25    | 73:12 74:5,9        | weather 24:5,20,21  | 96:24,24 103:15    |
| 62:23,25 63:21             | 94:21 95:13            | 76:25 78:6,15       | 25:1,2 42:18        | 103:16 105:13      |
| 64:4                       | utilized 95:7 96:25    | 79:7 89:13 98:13    | weatherization      | workbook 81:24     |
| unbilleds 41:10,17         |                        | 104:25 107:22       | 56:19               | 82:21              |
| uncollectible 30:6         | V                      | wanted 49:12 54:24  | Wednesday 5:6       | worked 56:22,23    |
| 69:16,19,22 70:2           | variables 41:4 45:6    | 75:20 79:1 99:8     | 105:17,19           | 94:14,15 96:13     |
| 70:6                       | variety 62:24          | 99:19               | week 107:6          | working 32:8 38:21 |
| uncollectibles 70:1        | <b>various</b> 15:10   | wants 10:13 105:8   | weeks 105:7         | 40:10,13,14,22     |
| underlying 29:23           | 67:15                  | warranted 29:1      | Weinberger 3:9      | 48:6,9 50:3 57:7   |
| underserved 92:6           | verify 27:8 65:20      | Washington 1:1,3    | 7:1                 | 58:14,25 59:4      |
| 94:25                      | version 88:8           | 2:13,18,19,23,24    | welcome 65:15       | 64:8 69:3 75:11    |
| understand 8:4             | versus 5:11 30:5       | 5:1,10 6:13 21:8    | 84:2 98:7           | 76:15 77:13,13     |
| 9:23 43:11 45:16           | 53:4                   | 27:7 56:14 75:16    | welcomed 73:24      | works 52:15 104:9  |

| 104:10                    | yesterday 10:24            | <b>12:25</b> 108:12                          | 31:15,16 33:18                             | <b>30th</b> 15:18 36:14             |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| world 33:9                | 23:1 60:1                  | <b>13</b> 39:17 43:7,12,14                   | 37:19 52:13,16                             | <b>3186</b> 1:25 109:15             |
| worse 20:6                | <b>Yochanan</b> 6:25       | 68:15,16                                     | 79:25 80:6,12                              | <b>31st</b> 87:16                   |
| wouldn't 10:8             | <b>Yochi</b> 3:8 6:25      | <b>13.7</b> 18:17                            | 87:14,18,24 88:1                           | <b>31</b> 30 07.10<br><b>32</b> 4:4 |
| 11:21 28:18,18            | Yup 44:2                   | <b>13.8</b> 19:5                             | 88:1,2,10,11,20                            | <b>33</b> 29:6                      |
| 46:21 73:7 80:15          | Yzakai@smwla               | <b>14</b> 39:18 48:14                        | 88:23 89:2,3                               | <b>33,943,356</b> 27:18             |
| <b>Wow</b> 65:5           | 3:11                       | 58:20,22                                     | <b>2022</b> 1:24 5:1,6                     | 29:11                               |
| wreacked 20:1             | 5.11                       | <b>1455</b> 3:4                              | 17:12,16 18:7                              | <b>33.9</b> 29:6,10,14              |
| written 11:25             | Z                          | <b>15</b> 40:12                              | 33:19 34:14 50:20                          | <b>35</b> 71:9 102:24               |
| 16:13 61:17 70:2          | Zakai 3:8 6:24,25          | <b>15,909,204</b> 40:9                       | 50:25 99:24 100:4                          | 103:5                               |
| 95:9                      | 13:10,17 19:18             | <b>15.9</b> 58:24 59:4                       | 102:19 103:20                              | <b>360.915.4521</b> 2:19            |
| <b>WUTC</b> 2:5,7         | 22:2 35:21 93:8            | <b>1500</b> 3:4                              | 102.19 103.20                              | <b>36th</b> 2:23                    |
| <b>WOIC</b> 2.3,7         | 93:15,18                   | <b>1500</b> 5.4<br><b>15th</b> 11:16 37:19   | <b>2023</b> 33:11 109:18                   | <b>396</b> 3:9                      |
| X                         | <b>zero</b> 37:11          | 102:19,23 104:21                             | <b>210709</b> 37:24                        | 390 3.9                             |
| <b>X</b> 23:14 32:21 50:1 |                            | 102:19,23 104:21 105:8                       | <b>210709</b> 57:24<br><b>210755</b> 5:9   | 4                                   |
|                           | 0                          | <b>10</b> 5.8<br><b>18</b> 25:14,15 26:1,10  | 210755-Cascade                             | <b>4</b> 71:23 99:14                |
| Y                         | <b>0.614</b> 26:25         | 26:21 27:23 45:14                            | 82:12                                      | <b>40128</b> 2:18                   |
| yeah 7:17 13:13           | <b>0.75506</b> 31:4,9      | 68:16  | <b>22</b> 25:9                             | <b>415.552.7272</b> 3:10            |
| 29:17 39:5 40:15          | ,                          | <b>18th</b> 54:12 74:15                      | <b>22</b> 23.9<br><b>22/23</b> 57:10 75:21 | <b>425.635.1419</b> 2:14            |
| 42:3,23 43:9,13           | 1                          | 74:24 76:14 98:22                            | 94:1                                       | <b>47</b> 72:6                      |
| 44:25 47:22 48:19         | <b>1</b> 1:24 5:1 60:12    | <b>19</b> 31:3                               | <b>220</b> 86:25                           | <b>480-07-495</b> 35:11             |
| 48:25 50:24,24            | 69:16 109:8                |  | <b>220</b> 86:23<br><b>220053</b> 105:16   | <b>480-07-740</b> 17:23             |
| 52:17,22,25 56:22         | <b>1,413,568</b> 59:20     | <b>1st</b> 5:6 105:5,20                      |  | <b>480-90-257</b> 24:16             |
| 57:16 65:3 66:16          | 1,414,000 61:6,8           | 106:5 107:7                                  | <b>220198</b> 37:9                         | <b>488,393,608</b> 26:16            |
| 70:11 72:7 76:24          | 1,492,986 61:4             | 2  | <b>22nd</b> 17:12 34:14                    | 26:25 27:17                         |
| 78:18 80:11 92:3          | <b>1.4</b> 39:24 40:5,7    | <b>2</b> 60:6 69:16 79:22                    | <b>23</b> 4:3 46:23,25                     | <b>4th</b> 2:12                     |
| 92:9,12 94:9 96:8         | 59:20 60:2                 | 87:15 98:14                                  | 47:6 66:3<br><b>24</b> 45:13 66:4          | <b>HUI 2.12</b>                     |
| 98:18 100:10              | <b>1.413</b> 39:21         | <b>2,129,998</b> 60:23                       |  | 5                                   |
| 101:9,15 105:5            | <b>10</b> 30:1 69:15       | <b>2.1</b> 60:6 61:5,24                      | <b>25th</b> 17:16 18:7                     | <b>5</b> 23:24 24:3 25:8,9          |
| 106:24                    | <b>10.6</b> 18:22          | <b>2.9</b> 40:4                              | 107:4                                      | 43:7,13,14 57:9                     |
| year 14:12 15:16          | <b>10.7</b> 18:1 87:23     | <b>20</b> 86:24                              | <b>26</b> 26:13,15,22                      | 63:17 70:20 75:21                   |
| 16:12 24:5,20             | 88:20                      | <b>200568</b> 19:5 51:8                      | 27:12                                      | 79:22 94:1 96:12                    |
| 25:2 28:6,9,13,16         | <b>101961-21</b> 35:4,11   | <b>200308</b> 17:5 51:8<br><b>2019</b> 52:14 | <b>27</b> 26:18                            | 100:6                               |
| 29:3,4,4,9,21 30:7        | <b>102</b> 4:17            | <b>2019</b> 52.14<br><b>2020</b> 15:20 16:8  | <b>28,636,318</b> 25:15                    | <b>5,249,541</b> 31:10              |
| 30:16 31:18 41:8          | <b>10885</b> 2:12          | 28:9 29:3,3,9,21                             | <b>29</b> 23:22 24:1 29:12                 | <b>5.2</b> 88:16,21                 |
| 41:19,19,21 42:14         | <b>10th</b> 48:20          | 29:23 30:4 31:5,9                            | 29:14                                      | <b>50</b> 4:4 71:6 102:18           |
| 42:14 46:11,16,19         | <b>11.1</b> 18:19          | 31:18 33:18 39:22                            | <b>29,979,637</b> 26:11                    | 102:24 103:4,6                      |
| 47:14 51:23 53:9          | <b>11:07</b> 65:5,14       | 53:9,12,15 60:22                             | 26:24 29:13                                | <b>503.224.3092</b> 3:5             |
| 63:1,1,7 76:14            | 11:12 65:6                 | 69:18 71:24,25                               | <b>29th</b> 105:6,13,18                    | <b>503.224.3072</b> 3.3             |
| 81:5 83:24 87:14          | <b>11:15</b> 65:8,12,14,16 | 72:5 79:25 83:23                             | <b>2nd</b> 107:6,8 109:11                  | <b>53</b> 72:6                      |
| 87:17,17 88:2,3,4         | <b>11:46</b> 85:2          | 87:16,18,25 89:1                             | 3  | <b>54</b> 105:16                    |
| 88:6,24                   | <b>11:50</b> 84:24         | 103:14                                       | $\frac{3}{3}33:248:1458:20$                | <b>568,000</b> 39:21                |
| year's 69:19              | <b>11:51</b> 85:2          | <b>2021</b> 14:12 15:18                      | 58:22 80:14 99:4                           | <b>58</b> 4:5                       |
| year-end 62:25            | <b>119</b> 72:2            | 17:25 24:9,17,23                             | <b>3,963,719</b> 29:15                     | <b>581</b> 35:25 36:5 37:1          |
| years 53:10 63:9          | <b>12</b> 48:14 72:5       | 25:4,17 28:3,5,12                            | 31:8                                       | 37:11,22,25 38:8                    |
| 86:24                     | <b>12/31</b> 72:5          | 28:16,23 30:16                               | <b>30</b> 29:19                            | 83:6,13,23                          |
|                           |                            | 20.10,23 30.10                               | 50 27.17                                   | 5510,10,20                          |
|                           | I                          | l  | I  | I                                   |

|                                       |                      |  | 0 |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 6                                     | <b>9th</b> 107:10,11 |  |   |
|                                       | <b>7 m</b> 107.10,11 |  |   |
| <b>6</b> 39:17 40:17 59:11 59:15 60:3 |                      |  |   |
|                                       |                      |  |   |
| <b>6.14</b> 26:19,25 27:4             |                      |  |   |
| <b>6.95</b> 27:4,13,17                |                      |  |   |
| <b>60</b> 104:8 106:6                 |                      |  |   |
| <b>635,000</b> 43:16,19               |                      |  |   |
| <b>637,000</b> 59:16 60:9             |                      |  |   |
| <b>65</b> 7:21                        |                      |  |   |
| <b>6th</b> 105:17                     |                      |  |   |
| 7                                     |                      |  |   |
| 7 29:19,20 40:18                      |                      |  |   |
| 60:13 61:1                            |                      |  |   |
| <b>70</b> 4:6                         |                      |  |   |
| <b>700</b> 2:13                       |                      |  |   |
| <b>73,000</b> 94:3,9 95:11            |                      |  |   |
| <b>74</b> 4:8                         |                      |  |   |
| <b>76</b> 4:6                         |                      |  |   |
| <b>77</b> 4:7                         |                      |  |   |
| <b>776,000</b> 61:5                   |                      |  |   |
| <b>776,556</b> 61:1                   |                      |  |   |
| <b>79</b> 4:9,10                      |                      |  |   |
| 8                                     |                      |  |   |
|                                       |                      |  |   |
| <b>8</b> 40:17 58:20 61:12            |                      |  |   |
| 63:17 79:23 87:13<br><b>8-X</b> 72:1  |                      |  |   |
| <b>8.64</b> 18:23                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>80.28.425</b> 55:2 92:2            |                      |  |   |
| 97:21                                 |                      |  |   |
| <b>8025</b> 2:23                      |                      |  |   |
| <b>87</b> 4:12                        |                      |  |   |
|                                       |                      |  |   |
| 9                                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>9</b> 45:13 60:12 63:18            |                      |  |   |
| <b>9:30</b> 5:2,6                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>91</b> 4:13                        |                      |  |   |
| <b>93</b> 4:15                        |                      |  |   |
| <b>941.356.4851</b> 2:24              |                      |  |   |
| <b>94102</b> 3:10                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>95</b> 4:15                        |                      |  |   |
| <b>97201</b> 3:5                      |                      |  |   |
| <b>98004</b> 2:13                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>98115</b> 2:24                     |                      |  |   |
| <b>98504</b> 2:19                     |                      |  |   |
|                                       |                      |  |   |
|                                       | -                    |  |   |