

**AVISTA CORP.**  
**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

|               |                       |                |                              |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| JURISDICTION: | WASHINGTON            | DATE PREPARED: | 07/06/2015                   |
| CASE NO.:     | UE-150204 & UG-150205 | WITNESS:       | Don Kopczynski               |
| REQUESTER:    | Public Counsel        | RESPONDER:     | Linda Gervais                |
| TYPE:         | Data Request          | DEPT:          | State & Federal Regulation   |
| REQUEST NO.:  | PC – 079              | TELEPHONE:     | (509) 495-4975               |
|               |                       | EMAIL:         | linda.gervais@avistacorp.com |

**REQUEST:****RE: Exhibit No. DFK-1T, pp. 23-24.**

Mr. Kopczynski states that Avista is not proposing changes to its LIRAP program as of the time of the filing because “The Settlement, and the Commission’s Order in ou[r] last rate case...required parties to meet no later than 30 days after the effective date of the order, and at least every other month thereafter, to explore additional program options. The first workshop to discuss any additions or modifications to the LIRAP program was held on January 30, 2015. Additional monthly workshops are scheduled within a time frame to allow a filing my June 1, 2015 to propose changes to the existing LIRAP that may augment or modify the program.”

According to the Joint Petition parties filed May 29, 2015, “The Workgroup also discussed the overall level of LIRAP funding, and ultimately agreed that this issue is better addressed in Avista’s current electric and natural gas general rate case. Therefore this Petition does not include any request for additional or multi-year funding for general LIRAP purposes.” (Joint Petition, p. 13)

Considering the statement in the Joint Petition, does Avista plan to supplement its testimony to include a proposal for LIRAP funding? If yes, when will Avista provide this proposal? If no, why not?

**RESPONSE:**

No, the Company does not plan to supplement its testimony to include a proposal for LIRAP funding. One of the primary reasons why LIRAP funding was not ultimately addressed in the LIRAP Workgroup (with the exception of the increased funding for the rate discount pilot) was because there was no general agreement among the participants regarding whether funding should be increased, and by how much. Therefore, the Parties will have the ability in this general rate to propose changes to LIRAP in their responsive testimony.