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| 1 | the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. | 1 | this sort of thing and that everyone can simply |
| 2 | MR. GOLTZ: Jeffrey Goltz, Cascadia Law | 2 | stipulate that Mr. McGuire is an expert and adequately |
| 3 | Group. I represent NW Energy Coalition, Renewable | 3 | equipped to adopt that testimony without further adieu. |
| 4 | Northwest and Natural Resources Defense Council. | 4 | So unless there is an objection? Hearing no objections, |
| 5 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you. | 5 | that substitution is made. Thank you, Mr. McGuire. We |
| 6 | MR. FFITCH: Simon ffitch, representing | 6 | appreciate you picking up the baton on that. |
| 7 | The Energy Project. | 7 | All right. I don't think there are any other |
| 8 | ALJ MOSS: It's hard to get out of these | 8 | substitutions, none that l'm aware of, except the |
| 9 | habits. | 9 | witness who is not appearing here today. All right. |
| 10 | MR. RITCHIE: Travis Ritchie with | 10 | And that's not a problem, unless it becomes evident that |
| 11 | Sierra Club. | 11 | we need to know. |
| 12 | ALJ MOSS: Okay. | 12 | I think that may be all I have that -- oh, yes, |
| 13 | MS. CAMERON-RULKOWSKI: Jennifer | 13 | preliminary. The next point, though, is the exhibits. |
| 14 | Cameron-Rulkowski, assistant attorney general | 14 | This is also a preliminary matter. We want to -- I |
| 15 | representing commission staff. | 15 | prefer in these type of proceedings to stipulate the |
| 16 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you. | 16 | exhibits into the record, rather than introducing them |
| 17 | MS. THOMAS: Liz Thomas, representing | 17 | in a more laborious fashion. |
| 18 | Hydro One, and I would like to introduce Jamie Scarlett | 18 | I circulated previously an exhibit list. It has |
| 19 | the general counsel with Hydro One is with me and my | 19 | since been admitted to include the bench exhibits, |
| 20 | partner Kari Vander Stoep is also with me. | 20 | including the public comment exhibit, with which you |
| 21 | ALJ MOSS: Welcome. | 21 | are -- most you at least are well familiar -- and also |
| 22 | MS. GAFKEN: Good morning. Lisa Gafken, | 22 | the company's response to bench request number one which |
| 23 | assistant attorney general, appearing on behalf of | 23 | will be made a bench exhibit as well. Typically, those |
| 24 | public counsel. And with me is Nina Suetake, who is our | 24 | are admitted without objection. |
| 25 | newest AAG. | 25 | So let me ask Ms. Gafken: Will public counsel be |
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| 1 | ALJ MOSS: Welcome. Is this your first | 1 | able to take the lead on getting that public comment |
| 2 | hearing? | 2 | exhibit organized and into the Commission? |
| 3 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes, it is. | 3 | MS. GAFKEN: Yes, of course. Would you |
| 4 | MS. GAFKEN: She did file a notice of | 4 | like it in about a week? |
| 5 | appearance. | 5 | ALJ MOSS: About a week would be fine. |
| 6 | ALJ MOSS: All right. We will try to make | 6 | Yes. I'll take "about a week" as an accurate enough |
| 7 | it an enjoyable experience for you. | 7 | description. |
| 8 | MS. SUETAKE: Thank you. | 8 | MS. GAFKEN: I don't have any calendar on |
| 9 | MS. FRANCO-MALONE: Good morning. | 9 | me. So... |
| 10 | Danielle Franco-Malone, counsel for the Washington | 10 | ALJ MOSS: That's fine. Seriously. |
| 11 | Northern Idaho District Council of Laborers. | 11 | That's quite fine. |
| 12 | ALJ MOSS: Welcome. Others? Are there | 12 | MS. GAFKEN: Thank you. |
| 13 | any counsel appearing on the conference bridge line this | 13 | ALJ MOSS: And, of course, you'll work |
| 14 | morning? Apparently not. | 14 | with our consumer affairs and records staff to make sure |
| 15 | So thank you, all. And I think we have accounted | 15 | it's a complete exhibit when we receive it. And, of |
| 16 | for everybody by recollection, although it's hard to | 16 | course, we have the transcripts of the prior public |
| 17 | keep up with 13 witnesses and all the counsel in my | 17 | comment hearings. |
| 18 | head, but I do have a cheat sheet so that will help. | 18 | So, with that, are we prepared, parties, to |
| 19 | A couple of things, preliminary things. One is that | 19 | stipulate all the exhibits? My intention is to have all |
| 20 | the -- Mr. Hancock, who was the staff settlement witness | 20 | the exhibits that were on that exhibit list part of the |
| 21 | in this case, has left the commission for other | 21 | record. |
| 22 | opportunities. And Mr. McGuire of our staff will be | 22 | Yes, sir, Mr. Oshie. |
| 23 | adopting his testimony for purposes of our hearing and | 23 | MR. OSHIE: Thank you, Your Honor. I just |
| 24 | subsequently. I'm thinking that we don't need to have | 24 | want to make it clear that we filed a revised witness |
| 25 | the qualifying questions that might typically accompany | 25 | statement of Mr. Hellman. |
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| 1 | ALJ MOSS: Okay. | 1 | will be no advocacy here, but I think it's good to |
| 2 | MR. OSHIE: And it is in the record as | 2 | level-set on a few things. |
| 3 | MMH1Tr, small R. | 3 | But right off the bat, I would like to thank the |
| 4 | ALJ MOSS: Yes. | 4 | commission and you, Your Honor, for arranging a panel |
| 5 | MR. OSHIE: That's not reflected on the | 5 | setup here. I think it should hopefully further better |
| 6 | exhibit list. And I wanted to make sure both the | 6 | the record because it will allow for some interchange |
| 7 | commission and Your Honor are aware of that. | 7 | and maybe facilitate that process. I know it's a bit |
| 8 | ALJ MOSS: Yes, and I did not take the | 8 | inconvenient, but I hope this will pay dividends. So |
| 9 | time to reflect all the revised testimonies. There were | 9 | thank you. |
| 10 | quite a few revisions along the way, particularly with | 10 | Secondly, I would like to thank all the parties, and |
| 11 | respect to the amendment to the settlement stipulation | 11 | there are many parties that joined in this settlement |
| 12 | that was filed late. The final exhibit list, which I | 12 | agreement. Typically, in doing general rate case work, |
| 13 | will prepare after this hearing, will reflect -- and in | 13 | you don't have quite the variety of interests |
| 14 | fact I've already updated it, but I didn't bother to | 14 | represented. You don't have Sierra Club. You don't |
| 15 | send you all another copy -- to reflect the date of the | 15 | have NRDC, NWAC. You don't have a union group. And I |
| 16 | revisions. | 16 | found that it really provided for a productive |
| 17 | I think I may abandon the little-R nomenclature, | 17 | discussion of a lot of issues that usually don't |
| 18 | simply because that looked too much like the revision we | 18 | percolate up in a general rate case. So this is good |
| 19 | use for transcript. So we'll just have a parenthetical | 19 | because it brought us all together for extended |
| 20 | noting the revision testimony. So I appreciate that. | 20 | settlement discussions. And we learned a lot about what |
| 21 | And, as always, I will ask counsel to bring to my | 21 | their interests are, and I think they hopefully learned |
| 22 | attention any errors or omissions in the final exhibit | 22 | a little bit about what our concerns and ambitions are. |
| 23 | list and we'll get that corrected. All right? | 23 | So it was, It think, a settlement process. It was |
| 24 | All right. Are there -- well, so we will stipulate | 24 | settlement at its best. There was good faith all the |
| 25 | into the record the exhibits -- let me see. Well, l'm | 25 | way around the table. |
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| 1 | not going to number them for you. I'll give you an | 1 | And I would like to single out staff in particular |
| 2 | exhibit list -- speaking to the court reporter -- and | 2 | for doing a wonderful job, of Jennifer of working with |
| 3 | then we'll have -- I don't see the point in separately | 3 | the other parties and helping consolidate positions so |
| 4 | identifying them at this point. Everybody is aware of | 4 | we can make this process run even more smoothly. And |
| 5 | them. | 5 | there were some wonderful ideas that originated within |
| 6 | All right. So the process for today that I | 6 | staff to resolve certain issues. So I know the |
| 7 | previously circulated to you all by email, we will have | 7 | applicants are very appreciative of all of that work. |
| 8 | an opening statement. I believe Mr. Meyer volunteered | 8 | And it's not just staff, everyone did something to |
| 9 | to give an opening statement on behalf of the settling | 9 | contribute. So thank you, all. |
| 10 | parties, who are all of you. And, of course, the | 10 | Now, the advantage of having this many participants |
| 11 | opportunity would be available if anyone else wishes to | 11 | on this many issues hopefully will give the commission |
| 12 | speak. You just let me know and we'll offer that. And | 12 | some comfort that the broad spectrum of interests have |
| 13 | then we'll have the settlement witness panel for | 13 | been represented, have been heard, and that hopefully |
| 14 | inquiries from the bench and take it from there. | 14 | will provide that level of comfort. And they are here |
| 15 | First off, l'll need to swear you. At the risk of | 15 | today, of course, to answer all of your questions. |
| 16 | creating a mess with all of you sitting so close | 16 | Logistically, we couldn't put everyone up here that |
| 17 | together, I am going to ask that you stand and raise | 17 | pre-filed direct testimony way back in September. But |
| 18 | your right hands. | 18 | just as resources, l'll let you know that, for Avista's |
| 19 | (Witnesses sworn.) | 19 | purposes, we have in the audience ready to be sworn and |
| 20 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you very much. | 20 | speak if necessary -- they know they have been |
| 21 | All right. Mr. Meyer, proceed. | 21 | volunteered, so it shouldn't come as a surprise -- we |
| 22 | MR. MEYER: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll | 22 | have Kevin Christie. And he is prepared to speak if |
| 23 | keep my remarks brief because the people you really want | 23 | there is further interest in some Colstrip issues. |
| 24 | to hear from are sitting to my left and right. But just | 24 | We have Linda Gervais, who, as always, is very |
| 25 | a few things, matter of factly. I'm not going -- there | 25 | knowledgeable about customer issues, low income issues. |
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| 1 | And we have Pat Ehrbar, who seems to know everything | 1 | to 4-and-a-half million. And our witnesses are prepared |
| 2 | there is about rates and rate credits and tariffs. And | 2 | to speak to what that is and provide whatever |
| 3 | so he will be a good resource as well. And Mark Thies, | 3 | documentation you want. |
| 4 | our CFO, and he knows what CFOs know. So that is our | 4 | So those are the jurisdictions. But let's put |
| 5 | group of supporting cast -- and I'm sure the other | 5 | checkmarks by the following four other things that need |
| 6 | parties have similar people -- but they are at the ready | 6 | to happen. Hart Scott-Rodino, that period expired on |
| 7 | if need be. | 7 | April 6th. FERC, for its part, issued its order on |
| 8 | Lastly, if you think it's worthwhile, I would like | 8 | January 16th. The FCC, transfer of licenses, that sort |
| 9 | to level-set where we're at with all jurisdictions at | 9 | of thing, that was on May 4th. And CFIUS, the Committee |
| 10 | this point in time as we speak, just process-wise. | 10 | on Foreign Investment in the US, we just received that |
| 11 | ALJ MOSS: Sure. | 11 | yesterday. So those are all of the other non-retail |
| 12 | MR. MEYER: Where do you fit in the bigger | 12 | rate-making approvals that we've requested and now that |
| 13 | scheme of things. | 13 | we've received them all. |
| 14 | ALJ MOSS: Please do that. | 14 | ALJ MOSS: You said CFIUS? Could you give |
| 15 | MR. MEYER: Okay. Thank you. First of | 15 | the acronyms to the court reporter for the purpose of |
| 16 | all, just a reminder that our hope was that by | 16 | the transcript? |
| 17 | October 1st we would be able to close this transaction, | 17 | MR. MEYER: I'll be careful CIFIUS (sic). |
| 18 | assuming all approvals were obtained. And that | 18 | Did I get that right? I got it wrong. CFIUS. Sorry |
| 19 | October 1st date assumed schedules that called for | 19 | about that. |
| 20 | litigating in every state. Well, as you see, or you | 20 | ALJ MOSS: I'm glad I asked. Thank you. |
| 21 | will see, we've had great success in reaching | 21 | MR. MEYER: Okay. Now, the last item is I |
| 22 | settlements or settlements in principle. And it is our | 22 | know that all jurisdictions, all jurisdictions want to |
| 23 | hope that in all jurisdictions we can expedite that | 23 | make sure that whatever arrangements have been agreed to |
| 24 | date. | 24 | in other jurisdictions are carried forward to their |
| 25 | Alaska. That's in no order of size or importance. | 25 | jurisdiction if they are more favorable. So every |
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| 1 | Alaska has a statutory deadline of June 4th to issue | 1 | jurisdiction has or will have a most-favored nations |
| 2 | their order. There was on the 1st an order accepting a | 2 | clause that is identical or nearly identical. And the |
| 3 | settlement stipulation with the City and Bureau of | 3 | idea is that after an order issues in a state, we -- |
| 4 | Juneau, but that isn't the end of the story. They still | 4 | let's say it's Oregon, just to use an example. So once |
| 5 | have to approve the transaction. So look for that on or | 5 | the settlement agreement, if it's -- and it will be |
| 6 | before June 4th. | 6 | acted upon in some fashion, if it's approved in Oregon, |
| 7 | Idaho. An all-party settlement was filed in Idaho | 7 | within five days the applicants file that with this |
| 8 | on April 13th. There will be no evidentiary hearing in | 8 | jurisdiction. |
| 9 | that case. The commission has decided to accept written | 9 | That triggers a ten-day period within which any |
| 10 | comments instead. And those written comments are due on | 10 | party to this proceeding may request MFN treatment of |
| 11 | June 20th. They will have public hearings, however, in | 11 | any particular Oregon provisions. That then triggers a |
| 12 | three locations in north Idaho, and those will be | 12 | five-day follow-on period for applicants to respond, and |
| 13 | scheduled -- are scheduled for the second week of June. | 13 | then it's back in your lap for any improvements, if you |
| 14 | Oregon. Oregon has a settlement in principle that | 14 | will, in the Washington settlement based on what's been |
| 15 | was announced on May 8th. We've adjusted the schedule | 15 | negotiated elsewhere. And this works both ways, of |
| 16 | for the actual filing of the stipulation that would | 16 | course. So it is a bit of an iterative process. |
| 17 | reflect that settlement in principle, and that should | 17 | But I think that in the settlements -- and I'll |
| 18 | happen on or about this Friday, May 25th. There may or | 18 | probably overstate this a bit -- but in the settlements |
| 19 | may not be subsequent oral argument or testimony given | 19 | that either have been agreed to already or are agreed to |
| 20 | on the 21st of June. | 20 | in principle, we've been quite careful to make sure that |
| 21 | Montana. Montana happened just last week, hearings | 21 | the financial benefits are fairly distributed across the |
| 22 | in Helena. On the eve of the hearings the applicants | 22 | jurisdictions. Every state, of course, will |
| 23 | entered into an MOU, let's just call it a settlement, if | 23 | characterize ring fencing provisions somewhat |
| 24 | you will, with the City of Colstrip, increasing the | 24 | differently, and that's up to the parties to argue |
| 25 | level of the community transition fund overall from 3- | 25 | whether those should or should not be imported into |
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| 1 | whatever order we finally issue settlement. That is the | 1 | are not statutory deadlines. Some would argue that |
| 2 | process to follow. | 2 | there might be a 10-month or an 11-month or a 7-month. |
| 3 | And with that, I have nothing more to add. I should | 3 | But we haven't treated it that way. We think the way |
| 4 | get out of the way. Okay? | 4 | this has laid itself out procedurally we're well within |
| 5 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you very much. You're | 5 | that window to allow for an October close. So we |
| 6 | hardly in the way, Mr. Meyer. We appreciate that. And | 6 | haven't seen the need to argue that point. |
| 7 | I want to -- while you're still sitting there, I want to | 7 | ALJ MOSS: I will mention that we |
| 8 | ask the commissioners if they have any questions they | 8 | recognized an August 14th statutory deadline in this |
| 9 | may wish to direct to counsel, I think particularly | 9 | jurisdiction. So I don't have a statutory cite, but |
| 10 | perhaps with respect to the most-favored nations since | 10 | that's what we recognized in the procedural schedule. |
| 11 | that's pretty much a legal provision that triggers -- | 11 | We will be, I think, complete well in advance of that |
| 12 | potentially triggers further activity. So I want to | 12 | date. That's my anticipation. |
| 13 | make that opportunity available if any of the | 13 | MR. MEYER: Sure. |
| 14 | commissioners wish to inquire of you about that. | 14 | ALJ MOSS: All right. With that then, I |
| 15 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Just quickly I wanted to | 15 | guess we can ask you to relinquish your seat to |
| 16 | ask for Montana, so what was the nature of the hearing | 16 | Ms. Andrews, and we will be ready for questions from the |
| 17 | that was held last week? Was that an evidentiary | 17 | bench. |
| 18 | hearing? | 18 | And I'll note that Ms. Andrews was among those who |
| 19 | MR. MEYER: Yes, it was. It was the only | 19 | were previously sworn. All right. |
| 20 | hearing on the record we will have over there. It was | 20 | CHAIR DANNER: Good morning, everyone. |
| 21 | on last Thursday. And it was attended, of course, by | 21 | Thank you for being here. So my first question, I want |
| 22 | the five commissioners and the applicant's witnesses. | 22 | to talk a little bit about the net benefits standard. |
| 23 | CHAIR RENDAHL: And so that is then -- you | 23 | This is a proceeding, the first proceeding in which the |
| 24 | are now pending, waiting for a decision from the Montana | 24 | commission is going to apply the net benefits standard |
| 25 | commission after that hearing? | 25 | that's required under Washington state law. So this is |
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| 1 | MR. MEYER: That is correct. | 1 | a case of first impression. We don't have a body of |
| 2 | CHAIR RENDAHL: All right. In terms of | 2 | case law here. And we really don't have a definition in |
| 3 | the most-favored nation if, for example, Oregon issues | 3 | the statute of what net benefit means. So I would like, |
| 4 | an order that modifies the provisions in this state that | 4 | if you would, to give me your definition of net benefit |
| 5 | have not agreed to the commitments, the parties have ten | 5 | so we can get a handle on really what the standard is |
| 6 | days to respond to that once it's been filed here, and | 6 | that we have to apply in this case. And I know that |
| 7 | then the applicants have ten days to respond to any -- | 7 | public counsel was an advocate of putting this in law. |
| 8 | MR. MEYER: Five. I'm sorry, I think it's | 8 | So, Mr. Woolridge, I'm going to start with you if you |
| 9 | five days. Ten and then five, and then it ends up in | 9 | don't mind. Can you give me your thoughts on what is |
| 10 | your lap. | 10 | the definition of the standard of net benefit and how do |
| 11 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Okay. So that would be | 11 | we apply it? |
| 12 | the time at which we would understand if there was any | 12 | MR. WOOLRIDGE: Is that on? |
| 13 | disagreement among parties about adopting it here in | 13 | CHAIR DANNER: Yes, it is. |
| 14 | Washington? | 14 | MR. WOOLRIDGE: I filed a document -- l've |
| 15 | MR. MEYER: Yes. | 15 | testified in a number of different states, and I |
| 16 | CHAIR RENDAHL: All right. That's all I | 16 | filed -- I forget which exhibit it was, I guess it was |
| 17 | have. | 17 | JRW -- oh, I'm sorry, Exhibit JRW3, where I laid out |
| 18 | ALJ MOSS: Commissioner Balasbas. | 18 | some of the ones I'm familiar with. And, you know, the |
| 19 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Thank you. Mr. Meyer, | 19 | net benefit standards have kind of become universal in |
| 20 | you mentioned the statutory deadline in Alaska was | 20 | like states where we've seen a lot of acquisitions, like |
| 21 | June 4th? | 21 | Maryland, New Jersey, D.C., that sort of thing. |
| 22 | MR. MEYER: Yes. | 22 | And obviously, it's -- and as in any merger, it's |
| 23 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Do you have the statutory | 23 | tough to define what all the benefits are because a lot |
| 24 | deadlines, if applicable, in any of the other states? | 24 | of those benefits are down the road and that sort of |
| 25 | MR. MEYER: Well, it's -- arguably there | 25 | thing. And -- but I think what's happened, you know, |
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| 1 | going from the no-harm to net benefit, is that it's | 1 | about this. I think, you know, you'll note in my |
| 2 | really forced utilities and merger discussions to be | 2 | testimony that I referred to some testimony before the |
| 3 | more -- and other parties to be much more digging in to | 3 | senate Environment, Water \& Energy Committee back in |
| 4 | what the benefits are and trying to lay them out. You | 4 | 2009 when the legislature was actually considering the |
| 5 | know, it was a different standard to just say, Look, we | 5 | net benefit standard. And I would say that our -- our |
| 6 | don't think there is enough commitments here and that | 6 | joint party position on the net benefit standard is very |
| 7 | sort of thing so there wouldn't be a harm. So now in | 7 | close to that testimony that Senator Brown set forth in |
| 8 | any type -- in cases l've been involved with, laying out | 8 | that hearing on that day in January 2009. |
| 9 | specifically what the benefits are so that a commission | 9 | I think what we're looking at, particularly from the |
| 10 | can look at it and decide, yes, there is a benefit. So | 10 | perspective of our intervention, is the environmental |
| 11 | I don't know the legal term. Net benefit, meaning is | 11 | and low income benefits and public policies of |
| 12 | there a benefit? And our testimony for public counsel, | 12 | Washington state. And so when we came into this case |
| 13 | I had talked a little bit about some of the net | 13 | looking at what would be included in the net benefit |
| 14 | benefits. Mr. Dahl talks about a lot of the other | 14 | standard, we were looking for appreciable benefits in |
| 15 | benefits that move the needle from just being a no-harm | 15 | those areas. |
| 16 | to a net benefit. | 16 | And, in particular, what we tried to do was look at |
| 17 | So I think most -- what it's done in merger cases, | 17 | areas where perhaps the state is having more trouble |
| 18 | it's really forced the applicants and the intervening | 18 | making progress. So you'll see in the settlement a |
| 19 | parties to really try to flesh out what the benefits | 19 | particular focus on areas such as manufactured housing, |
| 20 | are. We can talk about down the road what some things | 20 | low income weatherization, renewable energy benefits for |
| 21 | can develop, whether it's technology, innovation, that | 21 | low-income customers, and then Transportation |
| 22 | sort of thing. But I think it's more specifically | 22 | Electrification with specific conditions asking to reach |
| 23 | trying to flesh out what these benefits are. And in | 23 | out and ensure that low-income customers are served. |
| 24 | public counsel's testimony, that's what we've tried to | 24 | When we looked at what are the potential areas for |
| 25 | do. | 25 | making greater progress on Washington's public policy |
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| 1 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So you still -- I | 1 | laws in these areas, those are some of the areas that we |
| 2 | mean, it's subjective then? I mean, there is no way to | 2 | identify for potential progress in the settlement. And |
| 3 | precisely measure, even though the word "net" suggests | 3 | we believe that this settlement does make substantial |
| 4 | to me that we're looking at both the downsides and the | 4 | progress for -- in Avista's territory in those areas and |
| 5 | upsides. And I haven't heard much discussion of the | 5 | think that therefore the settlement will leave the net |
| 6 | downsides. So l'm still eager to hear that. But this | 6 | benefit standard. |
| 7 | isn't any kind of formula, this is really just, We'll | 7 | CHAIR DANNER: Even in your testimony you |
| 8 | know it when we see it? | 8 | cited Senator Brown's statements, and she talked about |
| 9 | MR. WOOLRIDGE: Yeah, and I think if you | 9 | net benefits without really defining them. She did give |
| 10 | look at our testimony, we really have tried to flesh out | 10 | some examples of things, low income, clean energy fund, |
| 11 | what are the benefits, really specifying them. And I | 11 | that kind of thing. But, once again, it seems that what |
| 12 | think that's where l've seen this evolve over the last | 12 | we're dealing with here is a judgment call and no set |
| 13 | decade or so in hearings like this is that you have to | 13 | definition. So really we just know it's something |
| 14 | be much more precise and really detail more of the | 14 | higher than no harm, but there is no test on how much |
| 15 | benefits so that you can take away. Obviously, there is | 15 | higher than no harm. |
| 16 | a judgment call at the end. | 16 | MS. GERLITZ: Well, so I think if you're |
| 17 | ALJ MOSS: I think Ms. Gerlitz had some | 17 | asking me do you need to do some sort of quantification |
| 18 | testimony on this subject, is that correct, on the net | 18 | of what net benefit standard means, I think that would |
| 19 | benefit standard, and perhaps Mr. McGuire for staff as | 19 | be very difficult to do. And the circumstances in |
| 20 | well, if you wish further response. | 20 | different cases obviously might differ in terms of |
| 21 | CHAIR DANNER: I do wish further response. | 21 | quantification. |
| 22 | I would like to actually hear from anyone who wants to | 22 | So I would say that yes, to a certain extent there |
| 23 | opine on this. Ms. Gerlitz, go ahead. | 23 | will have to be some level of non-quantification of net |
| 24 | MS. GERLITZ: Thank you. Yeah. So I did | 24 | benefits, which would require a judgment. And this is |
| 25 | touch on this in my testimony and can say a few words | 25 | the first case, so I -- you know, I would discourage |


|  | Page 262 |  | Page 264 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | against trying to quantify in any precise way what we | 1 | MR. MCGUIRE: Yes. Although, I am not |
| 2 | have done here, but rather, point to the progress that | 2 | prepared to enumerate all of the specific potential |
| 3 | is being made in the different arenas involving the | 3 | risks associated with a transaction such as this. But |
| 4 | public policy laws of Washington state and look at it | 4 | it is true that on the other side of the coin, the first |
| 5 | more in a broader context than trying to come to a | 5 | side of the coin being the net benefits, you must also |
| 6 | particular percent or dollar figure. Is that helpful? | 6 | put protections in place to avoid the potential risks |
| 7 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. | 7 | associated with an acquisition of a utility. And in |
| 8 | MS. GERLITZ: Sorry. | 8 | this settlement agreement, there are numerous |
| 9 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you. Anyone else? | 9 | commitments related to financial ring fencing. The |
| 10 | MR. MCGUIRE: Sure. I will. | 10 | objective of those commitments being to protect |
| 11 | Chris McGuire with commission staff. So in considering | 11 | ratepayers from any risks associated with the activities |
| 12 | the net benefit standard, staff is basically asking | 12 | of the parent company. |
| 13 | itself the question are -- or will ratepayers be better | 13 | So we spent a significant amount of time in |
| 14 | off than they would otherwise be. And better off can be | 14 | discussions laying out those ring-fencing provisions to |
| 15 | both quantitative and qualitative. | 15 | ensure that all parties were comforted that financial |
| 16 | For example, in this transaction, the quantitative | 16 | protections were put in place, such that Avista's |
| 17 | benefits would include a rate credit of greater than | 17 | ratepayers would be entirely shielded from financial |
| 18 | \$30 million. It would include protections for some of | 18 | risk associated with the parent company. |
| 19 | the more vulnerable members of the community, such | 19 | ALJ MOSS: Chairman Danner, I might point |
| 20 | as there is \$11 million set aside for low-income | 20 | out that Dr. Hellman testified specifically with respect |
| 21 | customers in this settlement. | 21 | to the importance of taking care and paying attention to |
| 22 | But better off, as I said, would also include some | 22 | the harm side if you would like to hear from him. |
| 23 | qualitative things. And in this case, we have | 23 | CHAIR DANNER: So -- sure. |
| 24 | established a mechanism for handling accelerated | 24 | DR. HELLMAN: The comment made about us |
| 25 | depreciation of Colstrip units 3 and 4. Avista will | 25 | setting a risk or potential risk with benefits is |
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| 1 | provide home energy audits to roughly 2,000 homes in its | 1 | exactly right. It's not a quantified level. |
| 2 | service territory. We have established reliability | 2 | CHAIR RENDAHL: I'm sorry, Mr. Hellman, |
| 3 | standards. And beyond those qualitative and | 3 | but is your microphone on? |
| 4 | quantitative benefits there could also be benefits that | 4 | DR. HELLMAN: Seems like I can hear it. |
| 5 | extend beyond the ratepayer population. And in this | 5 | CHAIR RENDAHL: That is much better. |
| 6 | case, we have an increase of, next year, of | 6 | Thank you. |
| 7 | approximately \$7 million in charitable contributions | 7 | DR. HELLMAN: Sorry. And, typically, in |
| 8 | that will be dedicated to the communities that Avista | 8 | cases of mergers like this one, where the utility is |
| 9 | serves. | 9 | being purchased for a premium and so that investment |
| 10 | And there are some financial commitments to the | 10 | needs to be recovered, you're having a change in |
| 11 | community of Colstrip, Montana included in the | 11 | management in the sense of having a new ownership, and |
| 12 | settlement. And there are also some, you know, more | 12 | that gives rise to risks that people perceive that |
| 13 | nebulous societal benefits associated with additional | 13 | either are real or not real. |
| 14 | acquisition of renewable resources. | 14 | But in the end, you look at the potential risk and |
| 15 | So given all of these quantitative and qualitative, | 15 | you look at the benefits being offered. And in our |
| 16 | and as well as benefits extended beyond Avista's | 16 | conclusion, the benefits offset the risks such that |
| 17 | ratepayers, staff was convinced that indeed ratepayers | 17 | there is a net benefit. |
| 18 | and the community at large will be better off under the | 18 | And I would say that -- I would not say that there |
| 19 | proposed arrangement. | 19 | is a guarantee that customers will always benefit no |
| 20 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Again, the second | 20 | matter what happens. In Oregon, the commission approved |
| 21 | part of the question that I posited with Mr. Woolridge | 21 | a merger with Enron purchasing PGE. No one could |
| 22 | was basically the word "net" to me suggests you're | 22 | perceive the events that transpired at that time. |
| 23 | netting out negatives and positives. | 23 | There were minimum equity provisions that helped |
| 24 | Did you identify potential downsides or risks in | 24 | prevent PGE being drawn into a bankruptcy. But I think |
| 25 | this non-proposed transaction? | 25 | if everyone saw everything that was going to happen with |
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| 1 | Enron, I don't know that that transaction would have | 1 | effect that the Energy Project did not regard the |
| 2 | been approved. | 2 | original application as having met the standard, but |
| 3 | But I would say that I -- I do agree with the point | 3 | based on the settlement commitments expanding the |
| 4 | that under all reasonable foreseen circumstances that | 4 | benefits perhaps, and perhaps improving the protections, |
| 5 | customers should be expected to receive a net benefit is | 5 | Energy Project is satisfied the net benefit standard is |
| 6 | correct. And we try and include provisions that protect | 6 | met? |
| 7 | from harms, which are the minimum equity and dividends | 7 | MR. COLLINS: That's correct. The initial |
| 8 | and other kind of provisions like that, to address | 8 | final settlement we would arguably say it might have met |
| 9 | problems that potentially come up, even though we don't | 9 | the no-harm requirements. However, as filed, we do |
| 10 | think that they will come up. But you still have a | 10 | believe it meets the net benefit standard. |
| 11 | parent that wants to make sure that its investment pays | 11 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you very much. |
| 12 | off, and it's a reasonable expectation on their part. | 12 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. I |
| 13 | So you have these provisions that we see as net | 13 | believe Commissioner Rendahl has a follow-up. |
| 14 | benefits, one of them being the rate credit that was | 14 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Yes. As a follow-up, and |
| 15 | significantly increased from what the company proposed, | 15 | this question really, I guess, will go to any witness |
| 16 | and being provided over five years instead of ten, along | 16 | who wishes to respond to this. So this has to do a bit |
| 17 | with provisions that staff has mentioned that reviewed | 17 | with the rate credit commitment, which allows for an |
| 18 | in its totality perceived risks. All parties signed off | 18 | offset of 1.02 million of realized savings. And the |
| 19 | that they believe that this transaction does provide net | 19 | parties have acknowledged that these synergies might |
| 20 | benefit to consumers in a general interest. | 20 | take some years to come to fruition. So these are sort |
| 21 | CHAIR DANNER: Well, again, what I'm | 21 | of the unknowable, not knowing what might happen. But |
| 22 | trying to make sure is that there is a legal standard | 22 | also in the near future, you've got two companies that |
| 23 | that we have to meet, and I want to make sure that we're | 23 | are merging. And there will be, I assume, an additional |
| 24 | meeting that. And, again, this is a case of first | 24 | layer of allocated costs that Avista ratepayers might be |
| 25 | impression. So it's going to depend, it seems, more on | 25 | picking up, that are at some undefined level of expense |
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| 1 | the facts than the definition in my opinion. | 1 | for wages, incentives, overhead, et cetera. |
| 2 | Is there anybody else on the panel who wishes to | 2 | So how are we going to know -- how do we know there |
| 3 | opine? | 3 | is a verifiable or a viable net benefit, given the |
| 4 | MR. COLLINS: Shawn Collins with the | 4 | possibility of some costs that may be coming from |
| 5 | Energy Project, and l'll refer to my testimony with | 5 | Hydro One to Avista ratepayers? And I guess that's |
| 6 | respect to the net benefit test. The Energy Project | 6 | directed to the company first and then any other party |
| 7 | believes that the net benefit test establishes a higher | 7 | who wishes to respond. |
| 8 | standard than the no-harm test, allowing the commission | 8 | MR. MORRIS: Good morning, Commissioner. |
| 9 | to be proactive in protecting ratepayers and providing a | 9 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Good morning. |
| 10 | basis for adopting conditions and commitments that | 10 | MR. MORRIS: So around when we -- when |
| 11 | ensure identifiable and significant benefits to | 11 | Mayo and I started to have these conversations around |
| 12 | customers, including benefits that advance state policy | 12 | what made sense, a couple of things that were apparent |
| 13 | goals for low-income customers, energy efficiency, and | 13 | early on, is that just from a geographical perspective, |
| 14 | access to energy alternative resources. | 14 | it's very difficult to consider, I think, some |
| 15 | And so while that's not a specific calculation, I | 15 | synergies, in the traditional sense, when you look |
| 16 | think identifiable and significant benefits, | 16 | around. And we do a neighborhood of a merger of equals |
| 17 | particularly advancing stated policy goals within the | 17 | within the neighborhood, if you will. |
| 18 | state provide some contingencies or reference points for | 18 | So from that perspective, we really pivoted to |
| 19 | the matter. | 19 | thinking about things in the near term that would make |
| 20 | And I think we, as Energy Project, did identify | 20 | sense, that you could perhaps get some benefits of |
| 21 | potential risks in terms of the ownership transfer and | 21 | scale, longer term and near term. Things that we knew |
| 22 | do feel that the settlement as reached does meet the net | 22 | that we needed to have deeper conversations about were |
| 23 | benefit standard. | 23 | in the areas of information technology, as you know, |
| 24 | ALJ MOSS: Mr. Collins, just to follow up | 24 | that both -- in the utility industry itself, with |
| 25 | on that, as I recall your testimony, it was to the | 25 | technology becoming such a huge part of the utility |
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| 1 | operations, and with really the change happening in the | 1 | together really is to maintain Avista's independence, |
| 2 | utility industry around technology, particularly the | 2 | everything from a separate board of directors to |
| 3 | distribution level, there are ample opportunities. And | 3 | currently how we operate the business. So It think |
| 4 | each company, as you know, are doing those types of | 4 | intentionally -- I can let Mayo speak to this -- it has |
| 5 | technological improvements at different paces. | 5 | been kind of imagined that there wouldn't be a lot of |
| 6 | So Mayo and I talked a lot about what his best | 6 | overheads. And everything from -- intentionally on |
| 7 | practices were happening in Toronto versus what we're | 7 | Mayo's part when we -- let me give you one good example, |
| 8 | doing in Spokane. And are there ones initially that we | 8 | is when we thought about a nine-person board of |
| 9 | could at least share with one another, or are there | 9 | directors, five of them being Hydro One, it was Mayo's |
| 10 | opportunities for us to at least jointly think about as | 10 | idea to say, you know what, let's have three independent |
| 11 | we have other technological improvements that we could | 11 | board members from the Pacific Northwest, and only have |
| 12 | work together as a team to make sure that we maximize | 12 | two people from Hydro One, Mayo and one other person |
| 13 | efficiencies. | 13 | sitting on the board of directors. Because his point |
| 14 | From a supply chain perspective, obviously they buy | 14 | being -- I don't want to put words in his mouth -- he |
| 15 | lots of things. They are much larger than we are. So | 15 | said, I don't want my team being distracted. They need |
| 16 | we realize and recognize if we could get in and leverage | 16 | to run their utility in Toronto. They don't need to be |
| 17 | their buying power, that would be really great for our | 17 | worrying about what you're doing in Spokane. So, you |
| 18 | customers. | 18 | know, where we see the benefits really are in ideas |
| 19 | Also, just the sharing of best practices, everything | 19 | around strategy, perhaps, best practices. |
| 20 | from employee safety to operational efficiencies. We | 20 | The other part is, as you know, from every -- |
| 21 | both have joint operations and things like call centers | 21 | assuming that we do file rate cases in the future, that |
| 22 | and other things that we can share best practices on. | 22 | you will have absolute transparency into all of our |
| 23 | So while the number initially is low, and we don't see | 23 | costs. And so you will consistently have the ability to |
| 24 | huge synergies to the future, we do see opportunities to | 24 | audit what we're doing and not have to -- you'll know |
| 25 | share benefits. | 25 | what our costs are, and they will be fully transparently |
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| 1 | The other thing I would just say, as you know, we've | 1 | available to the staff, commission, and intervenors. |
| 2 | had a number of nonregulated businesses. We currently | 2 | So from our perspective, Commissioner, again, while |
| 3 | have Alaska. We have a long history of being able to -- | 3 | there are -- certainly we see some synergies to the |
| 4 | making sure that our current customers do not pay for | 4 | future, this deal was not predicated on synergies and, |
| 5 | those types of -- that type of work. We keep that | 5 | again, was on the idea that, for the most part, it will |
| 6 | separate. And we feel that we've got the policies and | 6 | continue to be run independently. And where there are |
| 7 | principles in place to ensure that customers won't be | 7 | opportunities for best practices, we'd come together and |
| 8 | paying for things that they ought not to be paying for. | 8 | talk about those. But we don't imagine any time having |
| 9 | So we feel confident that we've got that well in hand. | 9 | any type of operational things being done in Canada or |
| 10 | Did I answer your question? | 10 | in having to worry about those allocation of costs. |
| 11 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Yes. But I'm also | 11 | Again, I would point -- I guess a great mental model |
| 12 | thinking of some of those costs, including overhead and | 12 | would be is how we're doing it with Alaska now. Alaska |
| 13 | wages that may -- you know, many of the commitments are | 13 | is running independently. We account -- when we do do |
| 14 | very clear that operations in Spokane will remain | 14 | things in Alaska, we account for those specifically. |
| 15 | separate from operations at Hydro One. But over | 15 | They are called out, they are audited, and I would |
| 16 | time -- and, again, benefits are, you know, hard to | 16 | expect to follow that practice. |
| 17 | determine over time. | 17 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Okay. |
| 18 | How do we know that Avista ratepayers aren't going | 18 | CHAIR DANNER: And just to follow up, you |
| 19 | to be paying for sort of overall company overhead? How | 19 | mentioned IT as an example, could be that some of the |
| 20 | will that be controlled? What controls are there on how | 20 | synergies might be that you combine some of your IT |
| 21 | much Avista ratepayers are going to pay for Hydro One's | 21 | functions? And so what that means is you might, because |
| 22 | costs? | 22 | you want to maintain the staffing levels here, that you |
| 23 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. So, first of all, thank | 23 | would simply assign the IT people in Spokane a lot of |
| 24 | you for recognizing that the governance agreement and | 24 | the work for Hydro One in Toronto, and then basically |
| 25 | really the thought around these companies coming | 25 | put it on the backs of the ratepayers here in |
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| 1 | Washington. | 1 | And our internal auditors, which would, of course, be |
| 2 | Would that be something that we would catch in an | 2 | separate, that would certainly audit the structures. |
| 3 | audit? Is that something that would be transparent to | 3 | In addition, we have an annual budget. We have a |
| 4 | us so we can make allocation decisions? | 4 | five-year business plan, which clearly defined costs or |
| 5 | MR. MORRIS: Absolutely, Chairman. Yes. | 5 | expenses by department, numbers of personnel. And so |
| 6 | Again, going back to our practices, whether it's been | 6 | there is very clear measurement and delineation. And, |
| 7 | with unregulated businesses, Alaska or others, we do | 7 | quite frankly, Ontario would share the same concerns |
| 8 | that now. We absolutely clearly understand that that's | 8 | that you would share here. So they would want to make |
| 9 | important to our customers, to you as commissioners, as | 9 | certain that, in fact, costs and revenues were ring |
| 10 | our regulators and to our intervenors. So we would be | 10 | fenced, and we're prepared to do that. |
| 11 | absolutely transparent. We would make sure that we | 11 | In fact, even whether it's in our transmission |
| 12 | would account for all of those. | 12 | business, which is measured and tested separately by |
| 13 | And, again, I would just -- going back as being | 13 | budgets from our distribution, versus our forestry, and |
| 14 | the -- at one point being the CEO of Ecova and also as | 14 | then again separating fully regulated and unregulated |
| 15 | chairman of the board of Ecova for many years, we made | 15 | businesses, of which we have di minimis -- we have a |
| 16 | sure that if there were ever opportunities to have even | 16 | telecom business, which is separate -- so those are held |
| 17 | discussions about things in the business, we would | 17 | separate and apart and employees of either parties don't |
| 18 | separately account for those. | 18 | cross boundaries because they are held separate and |
| 19 | So we're fully aware of our responsibilities around | 19 | apart. So it's part of the structural DNA of the |
| 20 | accounting for things and not having our customers pay | 20 | organizations. |
| 21 | for those. And I would like to say we've got a great, | 21 | And I think, as Scott has stated, our goals |
| 22 | from my opinion, a good past practice of doing the right | 22 | collectively are define efficiencies and productivities, |
| 23 | thing. | 23 | and then those should go to the appropriate state or |
| 24 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. | 24 | jurisdiction that they apply to for the creativity. |
| 25 | MS. ANDREWS: Can I add something here? | 25 | But, as Scott mentioned, we do have things we can share |
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| 1 | We have existing protocols in place that helps with cost | 1 | together that are going to provide benefits. |
| 2 | allocations and assignments of costs. And, as | 2 | So if in the case of the power poles where we have |
| 3 | Mr. Morris mentioned, we follow those practices with | 3 | 1.6 million and Avista has theirs, when we buy |
| 4 | Alaska and we would use those same type of protocols | 4 | collectively and we get a discount for those, the |
| 5 | between us and Hydro One. | 5 | numbers they buy versus the numbers we buy will apply to |
| 6 | ALJ MOSS: Okay. Let me interrupt half | 6 | the state or the province in which those poles would be |
| 7 | second here. I'm sorry for the technical interruption | 7 | delivered. So that would be the structural competency |
| 8 | if you will, but you used an acronym Ecova, I believe. | 8 | that would be applied to how we would audit internally, |
| 9 | I assumed that is A-c-o-v-a? | 9 | externally, and separate board of directors, separate |
| 10 | MR. MORRIS: No, E-c -- | 10 | management teams. Thank you. |
| 11 | ALJ MOSS: See? I got it wrong. | 11 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Thank you. Are there any |
| 12 | MR. MORRIS: E-c-o-v-a. It's the name of | 12 | other parties that wish to weigh in, in terms of their |
| 13 | a business. It used to be. Now its name has been since | 13 | testimony on this? Mr. Dahl. |
| 14 | changed since we sold it. | 14 | MR. DAHL: All right. I think this is on |
| 15 | ALJ MOSS: Okay. Thank you. | 15 | now. |
| 16 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Ms. Andrews, were you done | 16 | One thing that I will point to is Commitment 17, |
| 17 | with your statement? | 17 | which, to my recollection, I just saw on page 9 of my |
| 18 | So, Mr. Schmidt, do you have anything to add? | 18 | testimony which is Exhibit CJT1T. To my recollection, |
| 19 | MR. SCHMIDT: Sure. Thank you. As my | 19 | that commitment was negotiated into the settlement and |
| 20 | first words, thank you for the kind invitation back to | 20 | was not in the original application. |
| 21 | your beautiful state. It's a real pleasure to be here. | 21 | And the high-level view of that particular |
| 22 | I might just say structurally we are really -- in | 22 | commitment is that, depending on the timing of the next |
| 23 | both organizations in a very good position to measure | 23 | rate case filing, it provides for the test years that |
| 24 | not only costs but revenues. And we think about our | 24 | the company will provide. So it will allow for the |
| 25 | external auditors, which would be KPMG and Deloitte. | 25 | commission to compare the operations of Avista before |
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| 1 | and after the acquisition, depending on the timing of | 1 | depreciation schedule by $\$ 1.6$ million a year, when I add |
| 2 | the next rate case filing. | 2 | up all of those numbers I get to a net rate credit -- |
| 3 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So your understanding of | 3 | potential credit of about \$17 million over five years |
| 4 | that is to create a baseline before a next rate case | 4 | for ratepayers. |
| 5 | would be filed if the merger was approved, and then that | 5 | What's your response to that? |
| 6 | baseline would allow going forward for anybody auditing | 6 | ALJ MOSS: Mr. Ehrbar, it looked like you |
| 7 | the books to be able to compare how the calculations | 7 | were going to be able to avoid it for a moment. |
| 8 | were made and allocations were made? | 8 | (Mr. Ehrbar sworn.) |
| 9 | MR. DAHL: Yeah, that's my understanding. | 9 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you. Please have a seat |
| 10 | And, additionally, it's also to better understand if | 10 | up here. |
| 11 | there are any savings that result from the merger, from | 11 | MR. EHRBAR: Good morning. So can you |
| 12 | synergies or other things of that nature. It will allow | 12 | repeat the numbers that you just shared? |
| 13 | for easier baseline comparisons. | 13 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So starting with the |
| 14 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Thank you. Any other -- | 14 | 30.7 million in the settlement over five years, you have |
| 15 | Mr. McGuire? | 15 | a potential offsetable amount of the rate credit of just |
| 16 | MR. MCGUIRE: Chris McGuire, with | 16 | over a million dollars per year, so that's 5 million |
| 17 | commission staff. Beyond Commitment 17 that was just | 17 | over five years. And then you have the rate impact of |
| 18 | referenced which will, to some extent, allow us to see | 18 | accelerating the Colstrip depreciation schedule of |
| 19 | the pre- and post-merger conditions, there were other | 19 | approximately 1.6 million per year. So for five years, |
| 20 | commitments in the settlement that -- the goal of which | 20 | that adds up to just over \$8 million. So, effectively, |
| 21 | was to better preserve staff and other parties' ability | 21 | that brings the net rate credit down from just over |
| 22 | to pursue lines of inquiry in a general rate case, such | 22 | 30 million to just around $\$ 17$ million, in my math. And |
| 23 | that we could identify if there are costs that were | 23 | I want to know what your response to that is. |
| 24 | allocated to Avista that should not be paid by | 24 | MR. EHRBAR: Sure. I think I would focus |
| 25 | ratepayers. And I just wanted to point those out, those | 25 | back on, first, the rate credit of 30.7 million. When |
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| 1 | being Commitment No. 22, separate books and records; | 1 | we say a portion is offsetable up to a million a year in |
| 2 | Commitment 23, access to and maintenance to books and | 2 | the first five years, those savings will still be there. |
| 3 | records; and Commitment 24, related to cost allocations | 3 | So customers will still get the benefit of that credit, |
| 4 | related to corporate structure and affiliated interests. | 4 | it's just a matter of if it's in a separate tariff, as |
| 5 | And those -- those commitments gave staff some comfort | 5 | originally filed, or if it's incorporated in the base |
| 6 | that they would be able to pursue questions related to | 6 | rates, which we would justify in a general rate |
| 7 | cost allocations in future rate cases. | 7 | proceeding. So customers will get that portion, the |
| 8 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Thank you. I appreciate | 8 | 30.7 million, through the first five years no matter |
| 9 | it. | 9 | what. It's just a matter of where those dollars are, |
| 10 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So I would like to focus | 10 | base rates, or the adduct schedules or the deduct |
| 11 | on the rate credit, which in the settlement is proposed | 11 | schedules. |
| 12 | as 30.7 million over five years for Washington | 12 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So what about the |
| 13 | ratepayers, electric and gas. | 13 | Colstrip depreciation aspect, though? Because I |
| 14 | So the first question I would like to ask is: For a | 14 | understand that part about the offsetable portion of the |
| 15 | typical residential electric and gas customer, what does | 15 | rate credit, but -- and then that will lead to my next |
| 16 | that mean to them on their monthly bill? | 16 | series of questions on the Colstrip depreciation rate |
| 17 | MS. ANDREWS: I'm going to have to defer | 17 | impacts -- but that 1.6 million is actually not |
| 18 | this question to Mr. Ehrbar. | 18 | currently reflected in base rates, correct? |
| 19 | MR. MORRIS: So it's -- electric is 79 | 19 | MR. EHRBAR: That is correct. That would |
| 20 | cents per month and 49 cents per month for gas | 20 | be -- if this settlement is adopted, and we close by |
| 21 | customers. | 21 | October 1st, then base rates would go up 1.6 million. |
| 22 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. And so when you | 22 | It would be offset by the rate credit so that there is a |
| 23 | factor in the potential offset of the rate credit of | 23 | net savings to customers. |
| 24 | just over a million dollars per year, and then you | 24 | CHAIR BALASBAS: However, that would be |
| 25 | factor in the rate impact of accelerating the Colstrip | 25 | for the first five years, though, correct? |
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| 1 | MR. EHRBAR: That is correct. | 1 | we have the tax credit available to us around this |
| 2 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Because we are looking at | 2 | excess protected plant that was collected from customers |
| 3 | a potential -- I believe it's a 7- and 9-year | 3 | in the past that now was going to be returned to other |
| 4 | acceleration of the current Colstrip depreciation | 4 | customers in the future. |
| 5 | schedules and base rates? | 5 | So that -- for 36 years, that's going to be returned |
| 6 | MR. EHRBAR: That is correct. | 6 | to customers at approximately $\$ 5.7$ million over that |
| 7 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So then after year five | 7 | 36 -year period. So taking the 58.5 million of this |
| 8 | when the rate credit expires, that would be roughly | 8 | Colstrip asset, regulatory asset and amortizing it over |
| 9 | 1.6 million per year base rate increase to ratepayers? | 9 | the same time period would help reduce that impact to |
| 10 | MR. EHRBAR: Yes, that's correct. | 10 | our future customers. |
| 11 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. And now I would | 11 | So even though the rate impact went in effect May 1, |
| 12 | like to turn to the structure of the proposed financing | 12 | it still is going to be in place over the next 36 years. |
| 13 | of the Colstrip accelerated -- depreciation schedule | 13 | So although we recognize that reduction to customers has |
| 14 | acceleration. | 14 | already occurred, and this increase for depreciation |
| 15 | So there is the piece that is currently collected | 15 | expense or amortization of this regulatory asset won't |
| 16 | through base rates from ratepayers. And then there is | 16 | start until October, it's going to occur at the same |
| 17 | the proposal to use the $\$ 10.4$ million of the excess | 17 | time as the rate credit will occur. So customers will |
| 18 | deferred income tax that is not protected by the IRS | 18 | see a benefit in October with a net reduction of about |
| 19 | average -- ARAM requirements to pass back to ratepayers. | 19 | $\$ 3.3$ million, Ithink it is. And then after five years, |
| 20 | So that leaves a deficit of roughly 58 and a half | 20 | you are correct, that will fall off. But that excess |
| 21 | million dollars to cover the accelerated depreciation | 21 | plant will offset that amortization until the end. |
| 22 | costs. | 22 | CHAIR BALASBAS: However, when we amortize |
| 23 | So my first question is: That total, 58 and a half | 23 | that 36-year return to ratepayers, that effectively |
| 24 | million dollars, represents an increase to current rates | 24 | means a reduction to base rates for the customers over |
| 25 | to ratepayers; is that correct? | 25 | the next 36 years. So with the proposed settlement, |
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| 1 | MR. EHRBAR: That is correct. I would | 1 | we're effectively taking back a portion of that amount |
| 2 | defer -- not to play musical chairs -- I would defer | 2 | that we have already decided that should be returned to |
| 3 | back to Ms. Andrews who can get into more details | 3 | customers? |
| 4 | specifically on the tax component and the Colstrip | 4 | MS. ANDREWS: Right. And, you know, keep |
| 5 | depreciation. | 5 | in mind that the increase in this amortization is for |
| 6 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. So that's where my | 6 | costs that customers would be paying over time anyway, |
| 7 | next set of questions is going. So if you want to bring | 7 | it's just what period of time are they paying for it. |
| 8 | Ms. Andrews back, that's fine. | 8 | So we have rates in place today to cover a certain |
| 9 | All right. So, Ms. Andrews, in the settlement it's | 9 | level. We had filed a depreciation study to increase |
| 10 | proposed that the 58-and-a-half-million-dollar | 10 | related to the -- as the retirement obligation. So |
| 11 | regulatory asset created for the deficit in the Colstrip | 11 | there was something in front of the commission to ask to |
| 12 | depreciation, the settlement proposes to -- and I'm | 12 | start recovering those costs in the future. |
| 13 | using the word from the settlement -- is offset by the | 13 | So it's really just a timing. It's just |
| 14 | 36 -year protected excess deferred income tax portion. | 14 | advantageous for the company, and especially our |
| 15 | Now, how would you say that that is offsetting that | 15 | customers, to have this at the same time as the tax |
| 16 | rate impact when, in our recently concluded general rate | 16 | credit so that they are not seeing an increase in their |
| 17 | case, the commission's decision was to begin putting | 17 | bills at this time. |
| 18 | that money -- or returning that money to the ratepayers | 18 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So you actually didn't |
| 19 | over the next 36 years? | 19 | really answer my question. |
| 20 | MS. ANDREWS: Right. So, you know, this | 20 | MS. ANDREWS: Okay. |
| 21 | was an opportunity that actually was a suggestion from | 21 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So when you look at the |
| 22 | commission staff around -- with the intergenerational | 22 | approximately -- and I know that that number, the |
| 23 | inequity that we have with Colstrip of increasing or | 23 | 5.7 million for over 36 years, I think you mentioned in |
| 24 | accelerating depreciation and putting that acceleration | 24 | your testimony that that is not a straight-line number, |
| 25 | of costs onto our future customers came at a time when | 25 | that fluctuates slightly from year to year over the |
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| 1 | 36-year period. | 1 | many different stakeholders in this group. |
| 2 | But effectively, as I said earlier, since we have, | 2 | So I would just say, Commissioner, that it was four |
| 3 | in the general rate case, started that clock on the | 3 | and a half million dollars directed to the City of |
| 4 | 36 years to return that money to ratepayers, we're | 4 | Colstrip and around a process. So from a local |
| 5 | effectively in the settlement proposal saying that we're | 5 | perspective, it was important to the mayor, the city |
| 6 | going to take back 1.6 million a year of that amount, | 6 | council, and others, that they felt like they had some |
| 7 | over 36 years, to cover the regulatory asset to | 7 | local control, some immediate benefit, and some |
| 8 | accelerate the Colstrip distribution? | 8 | opportunity to do some thinking around recognizing that |
| 9 | MS. ANDREWS: Yes. | 9 | Colstrip would close someday and how could they get in |
| 10 | MR. BALASBAS: Then related to that, using | 10 | front of it, and this would be a great way for them to |
| 11 | this 36-year period, starting in 2018 that 36 years | 11 | have some dollars to have that. |
| 12 | means 2054? | 12 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So is it four-and-a-half |
| 13 | MS. ANDREWS: Correct. | 13 | million total? |
| 14 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So by amortizing the | 14 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. |
| 15 | Colstrip depreciation deficit over 36 years, aren't we | 15 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. And then before I |
| 16 | now effectively asking ratepayers to pay for Colstrip | 16 | return the mike back to my colleagues, I have just a |
| 17 | through 2054 and not 2027? | 17 | follow-up question on an aspect of |
| 18 | MS. ANDREWS: Well, most of the dollars | 18 | Commissioner Rendahl's question earlier about cost |
| 19 | are associated with the asset retirement obligation, | 19 | allocation. And, I believe, Mr. Schmidt, you may be |
| 20 | which would actually occur over a longer period of time, | 20 | able to answer this question. |
| 21 | 2027, or whatever time the plant closure is. Whenever | 21 | So in Hydro One's current structure, with its other |
| 22 | that is in the future, there is still that -- most of | 22 | affiliated businesses, both regulated and unregulated, |
| 23 | these dollars are associated with that asset retirement | 23 | is there effectively what I would -- how I would |
| 24 | obligation, which would occur over a longer period of | 24 | describe maybe, like, central headquarters overhead |
| 25 | time. | 25 | allocations to all of those entities? |
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| 1 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So that's a yes, we are | 1 | MR. SCHMIDT: The allocation would be |
| 2 | effectively asking ratepayers to pay for Colstrip | 2 | separate and apart, regulated/deregulated. And we would |
| 3 | through 2054, at least a small portion of it? | 3 | have an allocation -- |
| 4 | MS. ANDREWS: Yes. And that balance will | 4 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Can you turn your mike |
| 5 | build up over time. That's the other thing about the | 5 | on, please? |
| 6 | asset retirement obligation, on our books today is about | 6 | MR. SCHMIDT: I think it's on. Can you |
| 7 | 15 million. So there is about 24 million of Washington | 7 | hear me clearly? |
| 8 | share of this additional ARO that's going to build up | 8 | ALJ MOSS: The red light should be |
| 9 | over that time period. So it's not that total today, | 9 | illuminated. |
| 10 | but -- but, yes, to answer your question. | 10 | MR. SCHMIDT: It is. |
| 11 | MR. BALASBAS: Okay. And then I would | 11 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Maybe if you pull the |
| 12 | like to just ask a clarifying question about the amount | 12 | mike a little closer, that might help. |
| 13 | of the commitment to the Colstrip community. I believe | 13 | MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir. There we go. Is |
| 14 | it was mentioned at the beginning of the hearing that | 14 | that better? I'm sorry, apologies. |
| 15 | that has been increased to four-and-a-half million | 15 | Yes, in fact, we have president of Telecom, and his |
| 16 | dollars. Is that a total amount of commitment across | 16 | compensation is separate and apart from the regulated |
| 17 | all jurisdictions, or was that just the commitment to | 17 | part of our business. Yes, sir. |
| 18 | Montana, four-and-a-half million, plus 3 million that is | 18 | CHAIR BALASBAS: And so under the |
| 19 | proposed in the settlement? | 19 | acquisition structure and the way that the structure is |
| 20 | MR. MORRIS: So the way it was negotiated | 20 | set up for Avista, there would be -- there effectively |
| 21 | was it's four-and-a-half million dollars, given to the | 21 | would be some kind of central cost allocation coming |
| 22 | community of Colstrip from shareholder dollars, | 22 | from Hydro One headquarters through Olympus and then to |
| 23 | recognizing, of course, that there is going to be | 23 | Avista? |
| 24 | continued dialogue among six owners and multiple | 24 | MR. SCHMIDT: No, there is not. There is |
| 25 | jurisdictions around how best to do the right thing for | 25 | not an allocation of my expense, it goes to shareholders |
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| 1 | at the Hydro One level. And the board of directors and | 1 | that we were on the record clarifying, and I believe |
| 2 | the Avista management is separate and apart from any | 2 | it's an agreed-to intent with all of the parties, but |
| 3 | Hydro One expenses. | 3 | that it would apply to other sections, such as Section H |
| 4 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. | 4 | and, you know, other areas. And the previous section, |
| 5 | CHAIR DANNER: So I just wanted to clarify | 5 | Section F, I think, has some items in it too. |
| 6 | Commissioner Balasbas' question earlier about the | 6 | CHAIR RENDAHL: You just want to make sure |
| 7 | \$3 million. You're committing here a $\$ 3$ million | 7 | that the commitment made in No. 74 does not apply to |
| 8 | contribution. That's the same \$3 million, right? So | 8 | just implementing the conditions in Section G? |
| 9 | it's \$3 million total to Colstrip? | 9 | MS. GERLITZ: Correct. |
| 10 | MR. MORRIS: Is it's four and a half | 10 | CHAIR RENDAHL: But also throughout all |
| 11 | million dollars. | 11 | the commitments made in the settlement. And I guess |
| 12 | CHAIR DANNER: That's the total across all | 12 | that's a question to ask -- |
| 13 | the states? | 13 | MR. MORRIS: Yes, and that was our intent |
| 14 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 14 | as well. So that's a really good clarification. |
| 15 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. I have | 15 | ALJ MOSS: All right. Of course, if the |
| 16 | one question I want to ask about the non-consolidation | 16 | parties think it appropriate and deem it necessary to do |
| 17 | opinion. Who or what firm is going to be hired to | 17 | so, they can file a short amendment to reflect that. |
| 18 | complete that opinion that's outlined in Commitment 44? | 18 | But we can also rely on the record here if the parties |
| 19 | Do you have any information on that? | 19 | don't believe something formal is necessary. I |
| 20 | MR. MORRIS: I'm told Bracewell. | 20 | personally do not think it's necessary, but we'll leave |
| 21 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Is that a firm in Spokane? | 21 | that to the parties' discretion. And, Ms. Gerlitz, you |
| 22 | CHAIR DANNER: It's a law firm in Texas. | 22 | may wish to speak to the applicants on that. |
| 23 | MR. LOPEZ: Formerly, Bracewell \& | 23 | MS. GERLITZ: Thank you. |
| 24 | Patterson headquartered in New York. | 24 | ALJ MOSS: And generally, Chairman Danner |
| 25 | ALJ MOSS: All right. This apparently is | 25 | reminded me what I should have said ta the outset, and |
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| 1 | a good time for us to take our morning break. So l'm | 1 | that is if any of you witnesses have follow-up on points |
| 2 | seeing some applause. We'll break for five minutes, | 2 | that are being raised by your fellow witnesses or from |
| 3 | which will be our typical ten, I'm sure. But please try | 3 | the bench, please let us know just by raising your hand |
| 4 | to be back ten to the hour and be taking your seats and | 4 | briefly or shouting out if we ignore you too much. But |
| 5 | so forth. | 5 | we don't want to miss any information that may be |
| 6 | (Recess.) | 6 | valuable to us. And with there being so many of you, my |
| 7 | ALJ MOSS: Back on the record. | 7 | spider sense may not be adequate to pick up the subtle |
| 8 | CHAIR DANNER: First, I would like to see | 8 | signs that someone wishes to speak. Thank you. Yes, |
| 9 | if there are any other parties who wanted to weigh in on | 9 | sir. Mr. Dahl. |
| 10 | the colloquy we just heard, if there was anything you | 10 | MR. DAHL: On that note... |
| 11 | were hoping to contribute to that you didn't get a | 11 | ALJ MOSS: First taker. |
| 12 | chance to. | 12 | MR. DAHL: I want to jump back to |
| 13 | MS. GERLITZ: Thank you. This is Wendy | 13 | Chairman Danner's first question about net benefit |
| 14 | Gerlitz with the Northwest Energy Coalition. I just | 14 | standard. Jumping on to what Mr. Woolridge had said in |
| 15 | wanted to clarify around there was a commitment in | 15 | terms of public counsel's view, you will see in my |
| 16 | section -- well, it's No. 74 regarding tribal | 16 | testimony that from public counsel's standpoint, it's |
| 17 | communities. And it came to our attention this week | 17 | sort of a two-step understanding of how you reach and |
| 18 | that the wording of that could be slightly confusing | 18 | determine that point where net benefits are accrued. |
| 19 | because it's implementing these conditions of the civil | 19 | And that is, first, you must reach a status where |
| 20 | reach-out to tribal communities. | 20 | there is no harm. So all of the transactional risks, |
| 21 | And so that these conditions, we were -- we had | 21 | whatever they may be depending on the circumstances of |
| 22 | intended that those would apply to all -- you know, all | 22 | the case, should be mitigated through any commitments. |
| 23 | of the applicable settlement conditions throughout the | 23 | And then at that point, in order for any benefits to |
| 24 | entire settlement, not just to the ones in that | 24 | accrue to the customers, you know, those risks must be |
| 25 | particular section. And so we just wanted to make sure | 25 | mitigated. |
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| 1 | So that, you know, goes back to your original | 1 | well-developed thoughts on that standard. So if you |
| 2 | question of how do we determine and what are net | 2 | would like to have that conversation and turn it over to |
| 3 | benefits. And because this is a case of first | 3 | the attorneys, they would be more than willing to have |
| 4 | impression and the statutory language is pretty sparing | 4 | that discussion. |
| 5 | and not very specific, we look to this case from a point | 5 | Secondly, I had want to circle back to |
| 6 | of trying to recognize certain benefits in various | 6 | Commissioner Balasbas' questions about Colstrip units 3 |
| 7 | categories or buckets based on transactions in other | 7 | and 4. And because staff was the party that initially |
| 8 | states and the market conditions here in Washington, the | 8 | proposed this approach, I think it's appropriate that we |
| 9 | various circumstances that Washington ratepayers face. | 9 | give you some sense of why we landed where we did. |
| 10 | So if you see on my testimony page 21, we proposed a | 10 | And we landed where we did because we envisioned if |
| 11 | sort of analytical framework of various categories of | 11 | we did nothing that would be even a bigger problem. And |
| 12 | commitments that we looked for when we were going into | 12 | what I mean by that is if we did nothing, when Colstrip |
| 13 | this process, and we believed that this settlement | 13 | units 3 and 4 closed, whenever they close, there would |
| 14 | addresses those issues. | 14 | be a substantial unrecovered plant balance remaining on |
| 15 | And, of course, the facts and circumstances of any | 15 | the books that somebody would have to cover. And some |
| 16 | particular acquisition change, based on not only when | 16 | may argue that's the company's responsibility and others |
| 17 | the merger occurs, based on current market conditions, | 17 | may argue that that is the ratepayers' responsibility |
| 18 | but also the specific parties or applicants involved. | 18 | because the company did nothing wrong. |
| 19 | So this isn't to say that this particular settlement | 19 | We thought that there was substantial risk to the |
| 20 | is, you know, a word-for-word blueprint of how any | 20 | ratepayers being on the hook for those stranded costs, |
| 21 | future mergers must go down or, you know, the conditions | 21 | so we decided to try to do something in this venue. And |
| 22 | are meant to reach the net benefit standard. But it's | 22 | the way we determined how to handle this was to first |
| 23 | sort of a way to look at this and understanding what the | 23 | set the depreciation expense such that it didn't change |
| 24 | statute is intending and what parties are looking for. | 24 | as a result of this acquisition. |
| 25 | And really it's a benefit, in our view, to everyone, as | 25 | And what that entailed was creating a regulatory |
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| 1 | applicants are going to this that they understand what | 1 | asset, and then we had to decide over what time frame |
| 2 | kind of commitments that they should address through any | 2 | should we amortize that regulatory asset. And we came |
| 3 | sort of proposal. | 3 | to the conclusion that in order to best mitigate |
| 4 | CHAIR DANNER: So I read your testimony | 4 | intergenerational inequity, we could -- well, let me |
| 5 | and I thank you for your comments. I still keep coming | 5 | take a step back and just talk quickly about the |
| 6 | back to, I guess I'll know it when I see it. You know, | 6 | intergenerational inequity that is created by changing a |
| 7 | there is still not anything that says -- we know that | 7 | depreciation schedule. |
| 8 | it's a higher standard, we just don't know how high the | 8 | Interchanging a depreciation schedule and |
| 9 | parties have to jump to meet that standard or whether | 9 | accelerating a depreciation schedule, you're essentially |
| 10 | it's just simply something that's above no harm but | 10 | asking for future generations of ratepayers to pay less |
| 11 | barely above no harm. | 11 | than -- I'm sorry, pay more than their fair share of the |
| 12 | So, you know, I think that the analytical approach | 12 | facility, while previous generations of ratepayers would |
| 13 | you took is, in the end, I mean, if there is going to be | 13 | pay less than their fair share of depreciation expense. |
| 14 | a fact-specific analysis that's probably what we're | 14 | And at this point in time we, in a sense, are |
| 15 | going to do. But l'm increasingly hearing there is no | 15 | allowed to go back in time and collect dollars of past |
| 16 | bright-line test and we're going to have to figure it | 16 | generations of ratepayers through their |
| 17 | out. | 17 | over-contribution to taxes. Excess deferred income |
| 18 | Mr. McGuire? | 18 | taxes essentially amount to previous generations of |
| 19 | MR. MCGUIRE: I have a couple of points I | 19 | ratepayers overpaying taxes. |
| 20 | would like to make. The first is in regard to your last | 20 | So in amortizing the Colstrip regulatory asset, we |
| 21 | comment, Chairman Danner. The net benefit standard is a | 21 | attempted to tie the amortization period to the ARAM |
| 22 | legal standard that may be better addressed by legal | 22 | amortization period for the excess deferred income tax, |
| 23 | counsel in this room. And my understanding is that they | 23 | which was 36 years. In our minds, that is previous |
| 24 | have come to this hearing room prepared to speak to the | 24 | generations of ratepayers picking up the difference and |
| 25 | legal net benefit standard. And they have been all very | 25 | an accelerated -- or increased depreciation expense due |
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| 1 | to accelerated depreciation. | 1 | ALJ MOSS: I'm assuming you wish to add to |
| 2 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So I appreciate all of | 2 | that, Ms. Andrews? |
| 3 | that context, but I guess my question back to you would | 3 | MS. ANDREWS: Yes. The company fully |
| 4 | be, is this an issue that you could have addressed in | 4 | plans to supplement once we receive -- we were going to |
| 5 | the context of Avista's next general rate case? | 5 | discuss with staff the appropriate timing. It may be |
| 6 | MR. MCGUIRE: The answer to that is yes, | 6 | appropriate to wait for an order from the commission |
| 7 | to some extent. The depreciation of Colstrip's side of | 7 | approving the sale and the use and the acceleration of |
| 8 | the equation we could have, yes. It's not certain when | 8 | Colstrip within this docket before we supplement that |
| 9 | Avista will be in next. And the longer we wait to | 9 | response. But we'll discuss with staff the best |
| 10 | address Colstrip-related issues, the more risk there is | 10 | appropriate way to do that, to take into effect. And we |
| 11 | to future ratepayers of an earlier retirement of those | 11 | recognize that is outside of the general rate case. |
| 12 | units. | 12 | I can tell you that for -- if you were to remove the |
| 13 | So I think time is of the essence. So we should | 13 | Colstrip portion because it's being handled in this |
| 14 | attempt to address this, sooner rather than later. And | 14 | docket, then both electric and gas would result, as it's |
| 15 | in this circumstance it made sense because we perceived | 15 | filed today or as its filed, would result in reductions |
| 16 | the excess deferred income tax as being sort of an | 16 | for customers. So we would obviously want to try to |
| 17 | appropriate offset to mitigate intergenerational | 17 | incorporate that as soon as we could so customers |
| 18 | inequity, and we would not have that ability in a future | 18 | benefit from that. But I believe our application |
| 19 | rate case. | 19 | requested that we defer whatever those costs or savings |
| 20 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So following on that, and | 20 | were and so that it can go back to customers as soon as |
| 21 | we maybe you can start this -- start answering this | 21 | possible. |
| 22 | question, there may be others who want to. | 22 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So are you saying you |
| 23 | So, in this case, the parties, the settling parties | 23 | believe there would be additional reductions to electric |
| 24 | have set the schedule, the depreciation schedule for | 24 | and gas customers in the depreciation study as a |
| 25 | Colstrip units 3 and 4 outside of a rate case. And | 25 | result -- if this docket -- the merger request is |
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| 1 | depending on the outcome of this proceeding, it's also | 1 | approved, the settlement is approved, there would be |
| 2 | being determined outside of the depreciation study that | 2 | additional beyond the Colstrip changes in the |
| 3 | Avista has already filed with the commission in a | 3 | depreciation study? |
| 4 | separate docket. | 4 | MS. ANDREWS: Yes, because if we strip out |
| 5 | So how do the parties anticipate resolving this | 5 | this Colstrip -- the asset retirement obligation is the |
| 6 | piecemeal approach to setting the depreciation rates for | 6 | largest piece that was causing an increase to the |
| 7 | the company, and how is this all going to be tied up? | 7 | electric side. If you strip that out, we'll end up, |
| 8 | What's the plan? | 8 | ultimately, I believe, ending up with electric |
| 9 | MR. MCGUIRE: My opinion on this is | 9 | reduction. |
| 10 | that -- well, first, my understanding is that if this | 10 | CHAIR RENDAHL: You said there might also |
| 11 | were to be approved, if the settlement were to be | 11 | be impacts on the gas side? |
| 12 | approved by the commission, the company would file an | 12 | MS. ANDREWS: Yes. The filing that's in |
| 13 | updated depreciation study that would reflect the | 13 | front of the commission already shows a reduction to gas |
| 14 | agreement in the settlement. | 14 | depreciation expense. |
| 15 | But my opinion is that a depreciation study itself | 15 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Thank you. |
| 16 | filed alone doesn't mean anything for rates. A | 16 | CHAIR DANNER: Mr. McGuire, you mentioned |
| 17 | depreciation study is useful in a general rate case for | 17 | the risks of early retirement, and yet what happens if |
| 18 | establishing depreciation rates. But just because the | 18 | we're in a situation where we have changed the |
| 19 | company has filed a depreciation study with the | 19 | depreciation schedule and we don't have early |
| 20 | commission, doesn't mean the commission is obligated to | 20 | retirement? There has been some testimony in other |
| 21 | change rates consistent with that depreciation study | 21 | states about continuing to run these two plants for the |
| 22 | outside of a general rate case. So this will be tied up | 22 | rest of their useful lives, whatever those might be. |
| 23 | through an update of the depreciation study and, B, | 23 | So is there -- what are the protections if this |
| 24 | incorporating those depreciation rates into rates in the | 24 | plant runs for quite a while longer and we have changed |
| 25 | next general rate case. | 25 | the depreciation schedules? Is there a need to revisit? |
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| 1 | MR. MCGUIRE: So we never get depreciation | 1 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you very much. Sorry for |
| 2 | expense right. We're constantly updating depreciation | 2 | that. |
| 3 | expense because depreciable balance and depreciable life | 3 | MR. LOPEZ: That's okay. |
| 4 | is always evolving. So I fully expect us to be wrong in | 4 | ALJ MOSS: Mr. Dahl? |
| 5 | whatever we do. I'm comfortable with that. | 5 | MR. DAHL: I just wanted to chime in here |
| 6 | But what we're doing in changing the depreciation | 6 | on the Colstrip issue, to go on the record that public |
| 7 | schedule now is addressing the risk of early closure. | 7 | counsel does recognize the risk that the change in the |
| 8 | If it does not close early, then we will readjust the | 8 | depreciation schedule doesn't necessarily equate to |
| 9 | depreciation schedule such that future ratepayers end up | 9 | closure. The offset provided by this settlement is a |
| 10 | paying less than current ratepayers as a result of this | 10 | reason public counsel was comfortable accepting it, and |
| 11 | settlement. And that is acceptable -- that's an | 11 | it is also in line with the depreciation schedules set |
| 12 | acceptable tradeoff to us because the risk of early | 12 | in the Puget Sound Energy general rate case. You know, |
| 13 | retirement, the risk of saddling future ratepayers with | 13 | and so we understand that that situation exists. And |
| 14 | unrecovered plant balance, is substantially high enough | 14 | given the circumstances of this settlement, we feel |
| 15 | for us to do something now. | 15 | comfortable with our position here. |
| 16 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. | 16 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Dahl. Okay. |
| 17 | ALJ MOSS: Mr. Howell. | 17 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Are we done |
| 18 | MR. HOWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. I | 18 | with -- any more questions on Colstrip? |
| 19 | appreciate the melding of art and science and the | 19 | So I had a couple of specific questions I wanted to |
| 20 | attempt to get it right. And so -- | 20 | ask. We had a number of public hearings around the |
| 21 | CHAIR DANNER: He said we don't have to | 21 | state and we heard testimony in both Colville and |
| 22 | get it right. | 22 | Spokane Valley from Mr. Mike Brown of IBEW Local 77. |
| 23 | ALJ MOSS: Even more comfort in that. | 23 | And he raised concerns regarding the apprenticeship |
| 24 | MR. HOWELL: And to the extent that there | 24 | programs and the agreement that you had reached with |
| 25 | is something that can inform this balance, I just would | 25 | WNIDCL. And I was wondering if you could speak to the |
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| 1 | like to remind the bench of the -- the trend that | 1 | status of apprenticeship training and the agreements |
| 2 | reported on actually in a public hearing before you, I | 2 | that you had with IBEW Local 77 and how those are going |
| 3 | believe it was on a Puget Sound Energy public hearing, | 3 | to be accommodated, if at all, with the proposed merger? |
| 4 | there was some really good testimony from someone from | 4 | MR. MORRIS: So, as you know, we're very |
| 5 | the Western Clean Energy Coalition, I believe is the | 5 | proud of our workforce at Avista and our craft |
| 6 | name of it, talking about the trends of all the plants | 6 | positions. They are true professionals and it's -- |
| 7 | in the West. And, categorically, what they found with | 7 | frankly, as far as I'm concerned, it has been one of our |
| 8 | the -- I think it was the six largest plants that have | 8 | advantages that we have because we have such a |
| 9 | now moved to retirement, within a year before they | 9 | well-trained workforce and have been committed to |
| 10 | retired, and sometimes even months, what you were | 10 | apprenticeships for my entire 37 years at the company |
| 11 | hearing is that the plant was going to go on forever and | 11 | and longer. |
| 12 | ever or much longer than what was being anticipated in | 12 | So we have multiple apprenticeships through the IBEW |
| 13 | the short-term. | 13 | that have been developed and have been -- that continue |
| 14 | And, categorically, across all these big closures | 14 | to even improve to this day. And we don't see any |
| 15 | across the West, in every circumstance that closure was | 15 | change in any of that. So from our perspective, we're |
| 16 | happening much, much faster than even what was being | 16 | going to continue to work developing our own, our own |
| 17 | stated by the owners, within a year and sometimes just | 17 | multiple craft positions that work in both and all of |
| 18 | within months. | 18 | our generation facilities, our linemen, our meter |
| 19 | So what we know, to the extent that it can | 19 | people, our gas folks. |
| 20 | contribute to the science, is that there is a very clear | 20 | So, you know, I can understand Mike's passion around |
| 21 | trend across the West in the past few years and that all | 21 | the apprenticeships, and we share that same passion |
| 22 | closures are happening much sooner than anticipated. | 22 | around the apprenticeships, Mr. Chairman. So I don't |
| 23 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Howell. | 23 | see any change about how we go about doing our |
| 24 | Mr. Lopez, did you have something to add? | 24 | apprenticeships with IBEW. |
| 25 | MR. LOPEZ: No. | 25 | CHAIR DANNER: Well, as I'm looking at the |
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| 1 | commitments in -- or Commitment 80, it's not clear to me | 1 | ALJ MOSS: Other questions? |
| 2 | if you are basically agreeing to exclusives with WNIDCL | 2 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So following on that theme |
| 3 | with regard to flagging and natural gas work or if there | 3 | of the public hearings, which I know many of you from |
| 4 | is a role for IBEW. | 4 | Avista and Hydro One were there, in Colville and Spokane |
| 5 | Is it your position that IBEW, Local 77, which I | 5 | there were some significant concerns raised about the |
| 6 | guess is 650 members that work for you, that they will | 6 | issue of potential foreign ownership of a |
| 7 | continue to do the work that they are currently doing -- | 7 | Washington-based/Spokane-based utility. |
| 8 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 8 | We understand and acknowledge that a number of the |
| 9 | CHAIR DANNER: -- and that whatever | 9 | commitments in the joint settlement provide for |
| 10 | apprenticeship programs they have will continue? | 10 | protections for maintaining local control over Avista's |
| 11 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 11 | operations and management, as well as our jurisdiction, |
| 12 | CHAIR DANNER: So you're not seeing any | 12 | the commission's jurisdiction, over those operations. |
| 13 | change there? | 13 | So, Mr. Schmidt, I would like you to address this |
| 14 | MR. MORRIS: No. | 14 | issue of concern about foreign ownership. And the role |
| 15 | CHAIR DANNER: So this doesn't -- this | 15 | of the Province, which was addressed in the public |
| 16 | settlement agreement does not favor WNIDCL over IBEW -- | 16 | hearings as well, in terms of having significant |
| 17 | MR. MORRIS: We carved out those -- not | 17 | ownership of the company and how that could play out, |
| 18 | carved out -- we identified those, we do not see any | 18 | especially with the potential change in the political |
| 19 | change to any of our current apprenticeships. For | 19 | landscape. |
| 20 | example, we don't do apprenticeships around flagging, | 20 | So if you could address that. And maybe, as you're |
| 21 | for example. So none of that changes. | 21 | speaking, consider that you're addressing those folks |
| 22 | It says, "Work covered by these commitments does not | 22 | that expressed that concern in the public hearings, |
| 23 | include work that is customarily performed by Avista | 23 | which I'm sure was relayed back to you. |
| 24 | employees represented by IBEW Local 77, but that is | 24 | MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. I would be happy to. |
| 25 | contracted out pursuant to IBEW Local 77's collective | 25 | In fact, I have a unique vantage point of being both an |
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| 1 | bargaining agreement with Avista. It also does not | 1 | American and more recently a Canadian citizen. |
| 2 | include any work that is performed by Avista employees | 2 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Can you check and see if |
| 3 | regardless of the type of work involved." That's -- | 3 | your microphone is on? |
| 4 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So when Mr. Brown | 4 | MR. SCHMIDT: It is. I'll speak more |
| 5 | spoke in Spokane Valley, what he said, "What I want to | 5 | closely. |
| 6 | speak on today is the opposition to the agreement | 6 | CHAIR RENDAHL: That helps. Thank you. |
| 7 | between Avista and the Washington and Northern Idaho | 7 | MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, again. I'll do |
| 8 | District Council of Laborers. We've been representing | 8 | that. |
| 9 | gas workers in Avista since the late 1950s, and we've | 9 | Yes. I was saying I think I have a bit of a unique |
| 10 | got a joint apprenticeship training committee, so | 10 | vantage point, being both an American and having spent a |
| 11 | apprenticeships have been with us." | 11 | good portion of my professional career working in the |
| 12 | ALJ MOSS: Can you slow down for the court | 12 | Pacific Northwest, and the more recent years being in |
| 13 | reporter? | 13 | Canada. |
| 14 | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, sure. In his | 14 | So it really begins with -- and l'll start with |
| 15 | testimony, it's not clear what his specific objections | 15 | maybe with the governance agreement. So Ontario made an |
| 16 | are, but overall he comes out in opposition to the | 16 | appropriate and unique decision to monetize the assets |
| 17 | agreement. So clearly there is something that is giving | 17 | of Hydro One for purposes of other infrastructure needs |
| 18 | him concerns, and I'm trying to get at what that might | 18 | that the Province had to grow, and thereby allowing the |
| 19 | be. | 19 | organization to the benefits -- and the Province and the |
| 20 | MR. MORRIS: And I think we need to | 20 | citizens and the customers -- of the benefits of having |
| 21 | continue to talk to Mike to find out what they might be. | 21 | a commercial organization, which has gone on to increase |
| 22 | Because, again, in this agreement, it doesn't change any | 22 | every customer-satisfaction statistic, as well as |
| 23 | of their current work or current apprenticeships. | 23 | taking -- through productivity and efficiencies taking |
| 24 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you for | 24 | cost out of the system while increasing employment in |
| 25 | that. | 25 | the Province, so in a very constructive and positive |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | way. | 1 | Canada is myself and one other business leader to be |
| 2 | The governance agreement structurally is that the | 2 | determined from Hydro One. The rest are a combination |
| 3 | Province and the company have a contract. And that | 3 | of Scott as chairman, the CEO, also one other candidate |
| 4 | contract is that the shareholder -- which, of course, in | 4 | from Avista, and three independent directors as |
| 5 | this case is a Province -- is a shareholder and is not a | 5 | identified as independent by the New York Stock |
| 6 | manager of the business. | 6 | Exchange. |
| 7 | And one of the ways that we uniquely discuss it is | 7 | So, structurally, between the ring fencing and the |
| 8 | as a shareholder, much like securities law, the Ontario | 8 | governance, and the independent operations that we |
| 9 | Securities Commission sits between us. So as long as | 9 | felt -- and the fact that Avista had the pin, and when |
| 10 | the Province doesn't find themselves offsides with the | 10 | they did the design, in fact, we did not change any of |
| 11 | Ontario Security Commission and how they act as any | 11 | the design. We, in fact, accepted it in its entirety |
| 12 | other shareholder is that the company and all | 12 | because it was, quite frankly, very well and eloquently |
| 13 | shareholders would be just fine. And, in fact, I | 13 | written and served everyone's needs. So that would be |
| 14 | can certainly comment that the Province has been | 14 | how I would address that concern. |
| 15 | exemplary in their behavior in not involving themselves | 15 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So, Mr. Schmidt, just |
| 16 | in the business of the organization and, quite frankly, | 16 | following up on that a little bit. You mentioned that |
| 17 | has found the work of the organization to be, simply | 17 | the Province as a shareholder of -- I think your word |
| 18 | put, outstanding. | 18 | was off-sides of the Ontario Security Commission. Is |
| 19 | Now, when I think about -- and having worked and | 19 | the Ontario Securities Commission an entity created by |
| 20 | lived in the Pacific Northwest and, quite frankly, the | 20 | the Province of Ontario? |
| 21 | relationship that began to grow between our two | 21 | MR. SCHMIDT: It would be under the law of |
| 22 | companies, particularly when Scott and I met, is when | 22 | the Ontario -- of the Province of Ontario, yes. |
| 23 | Hydro One and myself had in our strategy had identified | 23 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. Could you speak to |
| 24 | the Northwest because it is the type of community that's | 24 | what is -- a little bit about what is happening? I |
| 25 | very similar to Canada and a very kind and gentle | 25 | understand the Ontario Province has provincial elections |
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| 1 | society, and certainly an outdoor society, respect for | 1 | coming up in a few weeks. |
| 2 | the environment. And so we begin to think, as | 2 | Could you describe what the -- I believe the three |
| 3 | importantly as the financial metrics, could we meld | 3 | major political parties are proposing should they win a |
| 4 | culturally, and Scott and his team clearly confirmed | 4 | majority government in the provincial elections of what |
| 5 | that we could. | 5 | they plan to do with Hydro One? |
| 6 | So when I think about the foreign ownership aspect | 6 | MR. SCHMIDT: Sure. I would be happy to. |
| 7 | and, of course, having had the benefit of working on | 7 | And I think your question is should they form a |
| 8 | both sides of the border my entire career, I would say a | 8 | majorities is a key, is a point. First of all, the |
| 9 | combination of structure, which is ring fencing, the | 9 | government today is the Liberals, in fact, were the |
| 10 | agreement that Scott and I arrived to with the | 10 | privatizer of Hydro One and notionally have -- I should |
| 11 | governance agreement -- and I spoke to this in Juneau, | 11 | not say notionally -- I should say structurally have |
| 12 | in Idaho, and also here more formally at the governor's | 12 | committed to maintaining a 40 percent ownership. Should |
| 13 | office -- is that it really was a conversation that | 13 | they go below 45, they put themselves in a position |
| 14 | said, How do we set up a board of directors, and how do | 14 | where they would not be in a position to buy backup to |
| 15 | we, in fact, govern the organization. "We" being the | 15 | have a position greater than 45. |
| 16 | board, which I and one other executive from Hydro One | 16 | The NDP has run on a platform for a long time of -- |
| 17 | would join of the nine, but in fact I offered to Scott | 17 | it was their view that Hydro One should not have been |
| 18 | to both take the pin in the structure and also identify | 18 | privatized. And, in fact, they would like to see it |
| 19 | for Hydro One's choice three Pacific Northwest business | 19 | back in control of the Province. |
| 20 | leaders that would have unique insights and experience | 20 | Having said that, there is certainly recognition |
| 21 | in the Pacific Northwest. We would identify those -- | 21 | that the Ontario Energy Board sets all policies and |
| 22 | primarily Scott, because of his experience -- and those | 22 | practices around pricing for customers. |
| 23 | would in fact be independent and be the choices for | 23 | Thirdly, is we have a Progressive Conservative |
| 24 | Hydro One's three. | 24 | party, the third party. That party would take the view |
| 25 | So out of the nine, all that really comes from | 25 | that the compensation of executives at the organization |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | are outside of what are normal public corporation -- | 1 | I noticed, for example, that there is a provision |
| 2 | companies, so owned by the Province structurally. And | 2 | that Province's right to replace directors, |
| 3 | so they would take the view that they would replace the | 3 | notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement, |
| 4 | board of directors in an effort to change the | 4 | the Province may at any time provide Hydro One with a |
| 5 | compensatory practices, commercial versus provincially | 5 | notice, a removal notice, setting out its intention to |
| 6 | owned. | 6 | request Hydro One to hold a shareholder's meeting for |
| 7 | So those have been the three stated objectives early | 7 | the purpose of removing all directors they had in |
| 8 | in the policy, among what I think now is a growing focus | 8 | office, including provincial nominees, with the |
| 9 | on more of the issues around the Province, debt, and | 9 | exception of the CEO, and at the Province's solo |
| 10 | hospitals and children and such. But that's, on the | 10 | discretion, the chair. |
| 11 | onset, been the conversation. | 11 | That sounds to me like the Province still has |
| 12 | CHAIR BALASBAS: And in the governance | 12 | potential to have large sway over the policies and |
| 13 | agreement between Hydro One and the Province, I believe | 13 | direction of the company. Is that your read? |
| 14 | it has a provision that says the agreement can only be | 14 | MR. SCHMIDT: So understanding what you've |
| 15 | terminated by both parties. | 15 | read, the board of directors -- |
| 16 | So if the -- however, if the Province acting as the | 16 | CHAIR DANNER: Yeah, this is Section 4.7 |
| 17 | government of the Province decides to terminate the | 17 | of the governance agreement. |
| 18 | agreement, how could they not terminate that agreement? | 18 | MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you for that. I'm |
| 19 | MR. SCHMIDT: Good question. Thank you. | 19 | very familiar with that. |
| 20 | So the Province, should they choose to, could ask to | 20 | The board of directors currently today, of course, |
| 21 | excuse the board of directors, and then they would act | 21 | is fully independent of the Province and they act |
| 22 | with the chairman of the board to end five of the | 22 | commercially. And as I mentioned, the Province has not |
| 23 | largest shareholders to identify another independent | 23 | weighed in on any matters associated with the commercial |
| 24 | board of directors. They are not in a position to | 24 | operations of the organization. |
| 25 | terminate the CEO. That would only be through a board. | 25 | Secondly, to your reading, is that should the |
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| 1 | So an independent board of directors, in conjunction | 1 | Province determine that they want to change the board of |
| 2 | with the five largest shareholders, and not the | 2 | directors -- and in fact the early design was to not be |
| 3 | Province, would in fact identify and vote for a new | 3 | in a position for a Province to change a few or certain |
| 4 | slate of fully independent board of directors that have | 4 | members of the board because they might be more |
| 5 | no -- have no structural relationship with the Province. | 5 | commercially or independent from the Province, is that |
| 6 | CHAIR DANNER: So I want to follow up on | 6 | it would have a higher bar to change the entire board |
| 7 | that, I mean, because CBC has said that the | 7 | and yet an even higher bar to bring back another yet |
| 8 | privatization of Hydro One is "a major issue in this | 8 | fully independent board of directors who has no |
| 9 | election." The one that's coming up on June 7th. | 9 | connectivity with the provincial government. So |
| 10 | And so we've got -- there's four parties. The NDP | 10 | therefore it's a net zero-sum gain of not gaining any |
| 11 | has said it will seek to buy back the shares and bring | 11 | particular influence over the commercial operations of |
| 12 | Hydro One back into public hands. That's their | 12 | the organization, and all through that being that we |
| 13 | electoral position. The Progressive Conservatives have | 13 | have a contract with the Province that they in fact will |
| 14 | said they are going to fire the CEO and all the board | 14 | operate as a shareholder but not a manager of the |
| 15 | members. And the Greens have said they want to buy back | 15 | business. |
| 16 | just enough shares to get a controlling stake. | 16 | So structurally, they can remove the full board of |
| 17 | I'm just trying to get a handle on what kind of | 17 | directors, not the CEO. Then they would be compelled to |
| 18 | volatility, if any, we're stepping into. Motley Fool | 18 | vote for another fully independent board of directors |
| 19 | warned investors to pay attention because "policy shifts | 19 | and, again, not having the ability to terminate the CEO, |
| 20 | and promises of retribution could impact the stock of | 20 | who would be running the commercial operations of the |
| 21 | the company." | 21 | business. If that's helpful. |
| 22 | So this agreement between the Province and Hydro One | 22 | CHAIR DANNER: Well, it is. How much, if |
| 23 | is very important. And even though it says that Ontario | 23 | I may -- I'm sorry, it looks like your counsel wants to |
| 24 | can't take part in the management, I wanted to just dig | 24 | confer with you. |
| 25 | down a little bit into the agreement and see. | 25 | MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you for that, Jamie. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | If I may, Commissioner, Jamie asked me to, I guess, | 1 | participate in that equity raise, which is a debt |
| 2 | emphasize that should the -- should they, in fact, | 2 | position that, on closing, converts into equity for the |
| 3 | decide to eliminate the full board in its entirety, then | 3 | organization, which is about $\$ 1.2$ billion. So that |
| 4 | the chairman of the board would form an ad hoc | 4 | would have been their choice. |
| 5 | committee, which I spoke to. But to be more specific, | 5 | Now, as far as ownership, no one party or parties |
| 6 | of the five largest shareholders, such as companies like | 6 | acting in concert, including the Province, once the |
| 7 | Fidelity who would represent their interest in fact, | 7 | Province sells down, but no other party other than the |
| 8 | seeing that they -- in fact they've invested in a | 8 | Province acting in concert can be more than 9.9 percent. |
| 9 | commercial organization, not a crown agency. And those | 9 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So what I'm getting |
| 10 | fully independent ad hoc committees of our largest | 10 | at is the Province couldn't just basically decide to |
| 11 | shareholders, public capital markets, would in fact be | 11 | align itself with a minority shareholder and suddenly |
| 12 | the selectors of the new board of directors that would | 12 | have over 51 percent and then have a say in the |
| 13 | be fully independent. So that really is the protection, | 13 | direction of the company in terms of its board of |
| 14 | in addition to other ring fencing structural distance | 14 | directors, it's policies, et cetera? |
| 15 | that Avista has from the Province of Ontario. So they | 15 | MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Commissioner, that is |
| 16 | will all have their own board of directors, their own | 16 | correct. Once they go below 45 they are no longer. |
| 17 | leadership team, so that the Province is not in a | 17 | CHAIR DANNER: But they are not at 45 yet? |
| 18 | position to effectively effect the board or the CEO of | 18 | MR. SCHMIDT: They will be only after the |
| 19 | the Avista organization. | 19 | dilution effect of our combination. And I might just |
| 20 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So do you mean the five | 20 | add, because of the good question on the three parties |
| 21 | largest private shareholders, not including the | 21 | and their perspectives, the Progressive Conservatives, |
| 22 | Province? | 22 | in fact, were the first party ten years ago that moved |
| 23 | MR. SCHMIDT: That is correct. Private | 23 | to privatize or create a public commercial company of |
| 24 | being commercial organizations, such as Fidelity, for | 24 | Hydro One. At that time they got very close, but some |
| 25 | example. Yes, that's correct. | 25 | impediments got in the way and they didn't complete |
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| 1 | CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry, can you tell us | 1 | that. So that was also their historical platform as a |
| 2 | who the five largest shareholders are? | 2 | political party. |
| 3 | MR. LOPEZ: Fidelity is one, 1824. There | 3 | ALJ MOSS: Ms. Thomas, did you have |
| 4 | is an Australian -- I'm trying to remember the name -- | 4 | something to add? |
| 5 | there is a large Australian pension fund. It is very | 5 | MS. THOMAS: Thank you, Judge Moss. |
| 6 | diverse, but we'll get you the top five and we'll bring | 6 | ALJ MOSS: You'll need to approach the |
| 7 | it forward at that point. | 7 | microphone, please. |
| 8 | CHAIR DANNER: That would be useful. | 8 | MS. THOMAS: On behalf of Hydro One, if |
| 9 | Thank you. | 9 | there are more questions along these lines, general |
| 10 | And can you tell me how -- I mean, this is a | 10 | counsel Jamie Scarlett is very familiar with the |
| 11 | publicly-traded company, how much ownership can any one | 11 | securities laws in Canada and the provisions of the |
| 12 | party take before they need to disclose that or get the | 12 | general grievant and those sorts of things, and we |
| 13 | Ontario utility board to approve the merger or that | 13 | offered to swear him in if there are additional |
| 14 | acquisition? | 14 | questions along those lines. |
| 15 | MR. SCHMIDT: So the only approval that -- | 15 | ALJ MOSS: Thank you very much. Let me -- |
| 16 | and I'll go to a couple levels -- the only approval that | 16 | while we're interrupted here, we will treat as bench |
| 17 | the Province of Ontario had over the combination with | 17 | request No. 2 the request of the identity of the five |
| 18 | Avista was the opportunity, which was 48 hours prior to, | 18 | largest shareholders, aside from the Province, and that |
| 19 | to participate in the equity portion, which would have | 19 | will be reflected in the exhibit list and the record. |
| 20 | meant they would have stayed pro rata in their | 20 | Thank you. |
| 21 | ownership. So they were at 49 percent, they reduced 2 | 21 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So if I may, the |
| 22 | percent in a contribution to the First Nations | 22 | real high-level question I'm looking at is: Is there a |
| 23 | community. This combination from 487 would take them | 23 | scenario under which the Province could undo the |
| 24 | down to approximately 42 percent, and the Province | 24 | privatization of Hydro One, or is there a scenario by |
| 25 | chose, because they were selling down, not to | 25 | which the Province could gain control of the company |

going forward?
MR. SCHMIDT: My view would be -- and we have the benefit, if you would like -- Jamie Scarlett, of course, was with the securities commission also, over 30 years of M\&A practice in the Province of Ontario -but l'll just answer briefly and, if you would like more detail.

We would view it clearly as they have a contract and that that contract between the two parties, as earlier mentioned, would need the participation of both parties. Short of the province with a majority simply saying for whatever purpose we are going to go through the effort of changing the law and in fact affecting that contract, which, you know, of course, goes to any other commercial organization doing business in the Province thinking can the contract be set aside. And it would be our view that that would not be the outcome. And I could let our counsel speak to it in greater depth if you would like, Commissioner.

CHAIR DANNER: Well, Your Honor, perhaps I would just give the same question then to the counsel, if you want to swear him in.

ALJ MOSS: All right. We can do that. (Mr. Scarlett sworn.)
ALJ MOSS: Please be seated. And,

Province of Ontario respects its contracts, and if they tried to breach the contract we can go to court. But I don't expect any of that to happen.
The contract is very intentionally and carefully crafted to control the power of a major shareholder. So right now they have 47-odd percent. It will be diluted to 42 -odd percent if our deal goes through. But remember, this contract was in place when they owned 85 percent at the time of the IPO. And it constrains their ability. It constrains their ability. In a public-traded company, you don't have to have over 50 percent of the shares to vote the entire board. You can do it quite effectually at a much lower number.

What this agreement does is constrains the Province of Ontario to 40 percent of the board. Period, full stop. It has other language that prevents it from what we would say in Canada as acting jointly and in concert with another party.

So one of your questions was could they team up with somebody else to combine to get over 50 , and I would say, no, that's prevented in the contract. And, B, they really wouldn't have to anyway if they wanted -- if it wasn't for the other provisions in the governance agreement.
I think Mr. Schmidt took you through how the change
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Ms. Thomas, l'll steal your thunder here and ask the witness to please state his full name and spell his last name for the record.

MR. SCARLETT: My full name is James Dameron Scarlett, S-c-a-r-l-e-t-t, commonly go by Jamie, J-a-m-i-e.

ALJ MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Scarlett. CHAIR DANNER: So the questions that you heard me ask Mr. Schmidt are the same ones. Is there any scenario under which the Province of Ontario could undo the privatization of Hydro One or take over basically its -- either its direction, its board of directors, or its management?

MR. SCARLETT: As with many questions, there is a simple answer and a more complicated one.

CHAIR DANNER: I saw it as a five-part question.

MR. SCARLETT: The simple answer is: Absent a government passing new legislation to undo a lot of what's being done, the short answer is no. We have a contract with the government, the governance agreement, and that should be remembered as different from the governance arrangements we have with Avista. I'm only going to talk about the governance agreement with the Province of Ontario. It's a binding contract.
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of the board works. Again, it's a complicated procedure that's meant to make it difficult for the Province to weigh in at the board. It would have to be something dramatic, and even then the new board itself would have to be at the same standard of independence as the board that currently sits.

CHAIR DANNER: So even by filing a removal notice it's so arduous --

MR. SCARLETT: Well, it's probably a 90 -day process because they file a removal notice. That triggers the need for a shareholders meeting, which you can do under our corporate law. And that then triggers the need to set up an ad hoc nominating committee, which would then go out under the direction of our chair. Whether he or she is replaced or not, they are in charge of the ad hoc nominating committee. They line up representatives from our five biggest shareholders. We'll get you those names. And they create a new slate.

And then there is a shareholders meeting and they vote on the slate. Now, of course, then they would be having the votes, and even then, they only get their 40 percent. They don't get to vote the whole kit and caboodle. Just the 40 percent.

So it's in a very kind of carefully thought through and structured arrangement done intentionally because
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | the Province was selling the deal to the public. And if | 1 | election. The latest poll has the two top parties at |
| 2 | they went out to public investors and the investors | 2 | the same level, so who knows what the outcome is going |
| 3 | thought that the Province was going to be able to meddle | 3 | to be. |
| 4 | or fiddle around in the business of Hydro One, the view | 4 | In terms of -- l'm probably going beyond by strict |
| 5 | was the deal would not have been successful, nor would | 5 | legal mandate here, but in terms all utility, I would |
| 6 | they be able to assemble the management team led by | 6 | just note this: It is a cash deal. So if there is |
| 7 | Mayo Schmidt, because no one wanted to work for | 7 | volatility in the stock price of Hydro One, it won't be |
| 8 | Crown Corporation, to be blunt. | 8 | visited on Avista shareholders. |
| 9 | MR. BALASBAS: Mr. Scarlett, you prefaced | 9 | And I think, as Mr. Schmidt pointed out, putting |
| 10 | all of that explanation with, absent the Province | 10 | aside the governance agreement that we talked about, |
| 11 | passing a law on doing the privatization. So, in | 11 | there is all these protections between Hydro One and |
| 12 | essence, that is one potential scenario that could | 12 | Avista itself that keep the Avista ship of state sailing |
| 13 | happen is the Province could pass a law to just undo the | 13 | smoothly, regardless of what happens up in Ontario. We |
| 14 | privatization and return the Hydro One to provincial | 14 | have all the ring fencing on the financial side. We |
| 15 | control? | 15 | have all the governance arrangements that really -- and |
| 16 | MR. SCARLETT: The short answer again is | 16 | it was designed to do this, put Avista in a place where |
| 17 | yes. But there is a more complicated answer, which | 17 | it operates its business. And the noise -- if there is |
| 18 | is -- I mean, when I say undo the privatization, it's | 18 | noise in Ontario, it shouldn't have a big impact down |
| 19 | not a magic wand that makes all the shares just kind of | 19 | here. |
| 20 | gravitate back to the Province. You know, the Province | 20 | CHAIR RENDAHL: So I guess my question |
| 21 | would -- if it wanted to, say it's the NDP, and say they | 21 | would be, if the worst case happens and all of these |
| 22 | wanted to try and buy the company back, so they would | 22 | potential things occur, are the commitments in the |
| 23 | have to change the law to make it legally possible. | 23 | current settlement sufficient to protect Avista |
| 24 | Then they have to go to shareholders who own the shares | 24 | customers from any interference from the Province of |
| 25 | and they have to say, Would you sell them to me? And we | 25 | Ontario, which I think was the concern by many of those |
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| 1 | have securities law that dictates how that kind of a | 1 | folks who testified with concern about control from a |
| 2 | process happens. | 2 | foreign entity. |
| 3 | And, again, it isn't that it can't be done, but you | 3 | MR. SCARLETT: I'll answer it as a legal |
| 4 | have to make a good enough offer that people will | 4 | matter, because there is a broader judgment question |
| 5 | tender. And if you get enough people tendering, you can | 5 | there. But as a legal matter, I don't see how anything |
| 6 | then take a second-stage transaction to squeeze out | 6 | that happens in Ontario could upset the legal |
| 7 | minorities and all that stuff that those of us who know | 7 | requirements and undertakings that bind Hydro One |
| 8 | securities law would go yeah. Yeah. Yeah. But it's | 8 | through this process. |
| 9 | not -- it's not like snap the fingers. | 9 | Does that answer your question? |
| 10 | But you're asking could a new government do it? | 10 | CHAIR RENDAHL: Uh-huh. |
| 11 | Well, new governments can pass legislation. They can do | 11 | ALJ MOSS: All right. The reason I'm |
| 12 | lots of things. Just like state of Washington could | 12 | inquiring of the commissioners here about the remaining |
| 13 | pass laws that would have serious impacts on the | 13 | questions, and they tell me there is not much more, but |
| 14 | business of Avista. | 14 | earlier I was told that Mr. Schmidt had to leave at |
| 15 | CHAIR DANNER: Right. And what I'm trying | 15 | noon. Is that still the case? |
| 16 | to get to is really I just want to get sort of the | 16 | MR. SCHMIDT: If possible, that would -- |
| 17 | status of potential volatility here. I mean, in our | 17 | ALJ MOSS: Mr. Lopez would be able to pick |
| 18 | state, yes, we have public utility districts that can | 18 | up the baton to the extent necessary for Hydro One? |
| 19 | form and basically push Avista out of a service | 19 | MR. SCHMIDT: That's correct and |
| 20 | territory, but we don't see that as -- presently, | 20 | Mr. Scarlett as well. |
| 21 | volatility. And so that's what I'm really trying to get | 21 | ALJ MOSS: Well, I wanted to point that |
| 22 | a sense of, because this is -- seems to be a major | 22 | out since the noon hour is approaching rapidly. And if |
| 23 | election issue. Is this just real or is it just the | 23 | you have an important commitment elsewhere, and I had |
| 24 | heat of the election? | 24 | indicated that I thought we would be finished close to |
| 25 | MR. SCARLETT: I'm not going to call an | 25 | noon. It looks like it will be, but it may be on the |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | north side rather than the south side. So, please, if | 1 | foundation out of our budgets out of shareholder profit. |
| 2 | you need to excuse yourself, do so. And you also, | 2 | But it's not a consistent thing. |
| 3 | Mr. Scarlett, go ahead and take a seat in the back and | 3 | So our view is that we want to try to continue to |
| 4 | we'll rely on Mr. Lopez if you have to leave. | 4 | raise the corpus of the foundation so that it is |
| 5 | MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Is there any more | 5 | truly -- you know, continues to grow and be substantial. |
| 6 | questions right now or would you like me to stay a | 6 | But we don't have a consistent donation policy into the |
| 7 | couple of minutes? I'm happy -- | 7 | foundation. We pay -- our corporate donations, |
| 8 | CHAIR DANNER: Just a very quick one. | 8 | currently some come out of the foundation, some come out |
| 9 | Again, this is more curiosity than anything else. When | 9 | of shareholder dollars out of our budgets. So it's a |
| 10 | you mentioned 40 percent of the board of directors that | 10 | combination of both. |
| 11 | is filled by the Province, are those independent | 11 | CHAIR BALASBAS: And do you know what the |
| 12 | directors or are those basically representatives of | 12 | most recent annual budget of the foundation is or maybe |
| 13 | government or designees of government? | 13 | the last couple of years? |
| 14 | MR. SCHMIDT: Independent directors. And | 14 | MR. MORRIS: Well, our total contributions |
| 15 | in fact, after -- as this board was constituted, after | 15 | have been in excess of \$2 million. And the breakdown |
| 16 | it was in place, the Province then selected individuals | 16 | between that, I would say roughly the foundation is |
| 17 | who were in those roles that were independent and they | 17 | paying not quite a million dollars of that, I would say |
| 18 | were asked if they were prepared to at least be | 18 | probably closer to $\$ 800,000$, and the remaining comes out |
| 19 | designates. But they don't act for the Province, and | 19 | of our corporate budgets. |
| 20 | therefore independent, and that is the expectation of | 20 | CHAIR BALASBAS: Okay. |
| 21 | all directors moving forward. | 21 | MR. MORRIS: Again, we try to take about 4 |
| 22 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you. | 22 | or 5 percent of what the basis is of the foundation, and |
| 23 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So this is just a | 23 | that's what we use so we don't get into the corpus of |
| 24 | clarifying question on the charitable contribution | 24 | the foundation, and we just take the earnings. |
| 25 | aspect of the settlement agreement. I believe, if I | 25 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So switching topics to |
|  | Page 331 |  | Page 333 |
| 1 | remember correctly, the settlement proposes a one-time | 1 | the -- I believe it's Commitment 53 related to renewable |
| 2 | \$7 million contribution to the Avista foundation. And | 2 | energy resources. So my question on that is: Is this |
| 3 | is that -- that is in the similar vein to the commitment | 3 | commitment structured in such a way that if Avista does |
| 4 | to Colstrip, that is, a system-wide commitment, the | 4 | not have a need for those renewable resources that it |
| 5 | foundation operates as a separate entity? | 5 | would not be required to go out for an RFP for those |
| 6 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 6 | resources? And I would ask any party who wishes to |
| 7 | CHAIR BALASBAS: And the additional | 7 | answer that question to do so. |
| 8 | 2 million per year to the foundation is in the same | 8 | MS. GERLITZ: Yes. I believe that the |
| 9 | context where it is an additional 2 million on top of | 9 | wording is in Commitment No. 53. It says that it would |
| 10 | the contribution to the foundation today? | 10 | need to be necessary to meet load and also consistent |
| 11 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 11 | with the lowest reasonable cost resource portfolio, |
| 12 | CHAIR BALASBAS: So the current company | 12 | pursuant to the most recent IRP. So, yes, that's the |
| 13 | contribution to the foundation is \$2 million per year? | 13 | intent. |
| 14 | MR. MORRIS: No. At this point, the way | 14 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. So l just had a |
| 15 | we've done the foundation is that I started the | 15 | few questions that I would like to get on the record. |
| 16 | foundation back -- we sold the last of our Itron stock | 16 | Mr. Lopez, Ontario passed legislation in 2015 and |
| 17 | back in the early part of the 2000s and that's how we | 17 | permanently banned coal-fired power plants. How does |
| 18 | established the foundation. | 18 | that law affect Province's potential ownership? They |
| 19 | And since then we've tried to take opportunities to | 19 | are 49 percent owners of Hydro One, 42 or 45; their |
| 20 | add to that foundation when they have arisen. So when | 20 | potential ownership of 15 percent of Colstrip, 3 and 4. |
| 21 | we had the settlement with the State of California and | 21 | Is there any clout there whatsoever in the Hydro One or |
| 22 | we were able to get some money from Avista Energy, we | 22 | the Province of Ontario having banned coal plants but |
| 23 | took a portion of those proceeds and donated it to the | 23 | then taking ownership of them? |
| 24 | foundation. We have made some -- in years that we've | 24 | MR. LOPEZ: No, I believe the statute |
| 25 | had, we felt appropriate, we've donated to the | 25 | you're referring to talked about physical generation |


|  | Page 334 |  | Page 336 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | located in Ontario. So there can be no more coal | 1 | here a lifetime, you'll figure that out? |
| 2 | generation within the Province of Ontario. It's against | 2 | MR. MORRIS: Sure. I think the idea is |
| 3 | the law, as we sit today. | 3 | that they would be residents of Washington, Idaho, or |
| 4 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay, but across the border | 4 | Washington. |
| 5 | or -- | 5 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. Thank you. |
| 6 | MR. LOPEZ: Sorry, Jamie is just | 6 | MR. MORRIS: That's our definition of |
| 7 | conferring, that the Province does not own directly any | 7 | Pacific Northwest. |
| 8 | interest in the coal plant transaction. It's owned by | 8 | CHAIR DANNER: And mine too. Although |
| 9 | the shareholders, so Hydro One and then any direct | 9 | there are parts of those states that I sometimes |
| 10 | ownership. But the statute you're referring, to the | 10 | exclude. All right. |
| 11 | physical plants within the borders of Ontario. | 11 | ALJ MOSS: I have one question that might |
| 12 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. So whether it's | 12 | be more the nature of clarification than anything else. |
| 13 | direct or indirect ownership, there is no prohibition on | 13 | With respect to condition 37, which requires a report to |
| 14 | their taking ownership of Colstrip 3 and 4? | 14 | the commission in the event of the ratings agency |
| 15 | MR. LOPEZ: No. That's correct. | 15 | downgrade of Avista. As I recall, the transaction with |
| 16 | CHAIR DANNER: Last, I had a question on | 16 | PSE a few years back had a similar provision with |
| 17 | the independent board of directors coming from the | 17 | respect to PSE, and also the reporting requirement |
| 18 | Pacific Northwest. | 18 | applied to the newly created corporate subsidiary that |
| 19 | MR. MORRIS: Yes. | 19 | owned PSE. |
| 20 | CHAIR DANNER: And the Pacific Northwest | 20 | There does not appear to be any requirement that the |
| 21 | is identified as the four states, and there is a | 21 | newly formed corporate subsidiary of Hydro One that will |
| 22 | requirement for independent. I just -- I noticed that | 22 | own Avista will report if it is indeed downgraded. |
| 23 | Mr. Schmidt has some ties to the state of Montana, and | 23 | Is that something we should include, or was it a |
| 24 | is it anticipated that he would be one of those | 24 | conscious decision not to include that or... |
| 25 | northwest directors or is that -- | 25 | MR. LOPEZ: So the entity that will own |
|  | Page 335 |  | Page 337 |
| 1 | MR. MORRIS: No. The way that we've | 1 | Avista will be a special-purpose entity with no debt. |
| 2 | described it is that there is four Avista board members | 2 | So it will not have a rating. It does not need a |
| 3 | and five Hydro One board members. The five Hydro One | 3 | rating. It has no liability to the entity. |
| 4 | board members, two are from the Hydro One organization, | 4 | ALJ MOSS: That answers the question. |
| 5 | Mayo being one and another person. The three other | 5 | Thank you very much. |
| 6 | Hydro One board members would be independent, selected | 6 | All right. Anything else from the bench? |
| 7 | from the Pacific Northwest. So Mayo doesn't count -- | 7 | All right. Do parties -- and Mr. Meyer, I guess |
| 8 | CHAIR DANNER: As defined in the -- | 8 | I'll turn to you. Do you wish to have any closing |
| 9 | MR. MORRIS: Securities and Exchange. | 9 | statement before we finish up for the day? |
| 10 | CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. Okay. And then | 10 | MR. MEYER: The short answer is no. But |
| 11 | for the Northwest, those are selected by Hydro One as | 11 | we appreciate your patience, and if there are any |
| 12 | well? | 12 | follow-on questions or bench requests, we are always |
| 13 | MR. MORRIS: The independent board of | 13 | available to answer those. |
| 14 | directors ultimately would be selected, yes, by | 14 | ALJ MOSS: Anybody else? Anything else we |
| 15 | Hydro One. They would not be independent in the Pacific | 15 | need to take up today, counsel? |
| 16 | Northwest. The way we've done it initially is that Mayo | 16 | All right. Well, I would like to thank you all for |
| 17 | and I will confer, and he is again relying upon my | 17 | your appearance today. And I apologize for the tight |
| 18 | judgment as well as his own, about who those people | 18 | quarters there at the witness table, but it seemed to |
| 19 | might be. So we're in the process -- in a discovery | 19 | work out all right. |
| 20 | process who they might be. But to the future, they have | 20 | And I think we had a good hearing and got the |
| 21 | to be independent and they have to be picked from the | 21 | information that we need. We will, of course, follow on |
| 22 | Pacific Northwest. | 22 | if we need to. Otherwise, I will, again, say thank you |
| 23 | CHAIR DANNER: Okay. And it's -- what is | 23 | very much, and we'll close the record. |
| 24 | a resident of the Pacific Northwest, if it's somebody | 24 | (Proceeding concluded at 12:05 p.m.) |
| 25 | who has been here a year or two or somebody who has been | 25 |  |
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| verifiable 269:3 | 254:15 278:25 | 270:7 272:24 | wishes 247:11 | working 249:2 |
| versus 270:7 | 290:5 291:9,15,25 | 273:12 274:19 | 267:2 268:16 | 309:11 311:7 |
| 276:13 277:5 | 304:5,19 315:24 | 276:10 285:1 | 269:7 293:8 333:6 | works 253:15 325:1 |
| 314:5 | 324:22 326:7,21 | 286:4,5 295:14,16 | witness 243:20 | worry 273:10 |
| VI 230:9 | 326:22 329:21 | 301:18 302:2,6 | 244:9 245:24 | worrying 272:17 |
| viable 269:3 | wants 241:4 259:22 | 305:4,15 315:18 | 247:13 268:15 | worst 328:21 |
| Vice 234:8,20 | 266:11 317:23 | 321:16 335:19 | 323:2 337:18 | worthwhile $250: 8$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 235: 6,22 \\ \text { view } 277: 21 \quad 293: 15 \end{gathered}$ | warned 315:19 <br> Washington 230:1 | we've $250: 21$ | 338:20 | wouldn't $258: 7$ |
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| 272:5 324:22 | 005 238:5 | 2/16/2018 $238: 5$ | 30.7 279:12 280:14 | 507 232:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| written 251:9,10 |  | 2/2017 238:22 | 280:25 281:8 | $51320: 12$ |
| 312:13 | 1 | 2000 231:9 | 31 237:21 | 53 333:1,9 |
| wrong 252:18 | $1233: 15$ 238:4,16 | 2000s 331:17 | 321 232:4 | 55 235:2 |
| 275:11 296:18 | 238:18 284:11 | 2009 260:4,8 | 33 234:20 | 58 282:20,23 |
| 302:4 | 1.02 268:18 | 2011 238:16,18 | 34235:14 | 58-and-a-half-mi... |
| WUTC 241:6 | $1.2320: 3$ | 2012 238:11 | 36 283:19 284:5,12 | 283:10 |
|  | 1.6277:3 280:1,19 | 2013 237:21 | 284:25 285:23 | $58.5284: 7$ |
| X | 281:17,21 282:9 | 2014 238:21 | 286:4,7,11,15 | 5th 338:21 |
| X 233:1,1 234:1,1 | 286:6 | 2015 333:16 | 297:23 |  |
| 235:1,1 236:1,1 | 10-K 234:21 | 2016 234:10 235:10 | 36-year 283:14 | 6 |
| 237:1,1 238:1,1 | 10-month 256:2 | 2017 236:7 238:4 | 284:7,23 286:1,11 | 6/30/2017 234:23 |
| 239:1,1 | 10-Q 234:23 | 239:5 | $37305: 10$ 336:13 | $606232: 12$ |
| Y | 10.4 282:17 | 2018 230:10 236:20 | 3727 231:14 | 650 306:6 |
| $\overline{\text { yeah 259:9,2 }}$ | 11 262:20 | 240:1 286:11 |  | 6th 252:7 |
| 278:9 307:14 | 11-month 256:2 | 338:21 | 4262.25 | 7 |
| 316:16 327:8,8,8 | 12/31/2016 234:14 | 2054286 | 298:25 332:21 | $7263: 7$ 331:2 |
| year 234:21 263:6 | 234:22 | 287:3 | 333:20 334:14 | 7-282:3 |
| 279:24 280:1,16 | 12:05 230:10 | 2057 230:24 338:25 | 4-and-a-half 252:1 | 7-month 256:2 |
| 280:19 281:1 | 337:24 | 20th 251:11 | $4.7316: 16$ | 7/19/2017 234:25 |
| 282:7,9 285:25,25 | $13243: 17$ | 21 294:10 | 4/26/2018 237:12 | 73 234:18 |
| 286:6 303:9,17 | 13-M-0449 239:2 | 212 232:12 | $40313: 12$ 324:15 | 74 291:16 292:7 |
| 331:8,13 335:25 | 1300 230:11 232:7 | 21st 251:20 | 325:22,23 330:10 | 77 304:22 305:2 |
| years 266:16 | 13th 251:8 | 22 230:10 240:1 | 400 232:19 | 306:5,24 |
| 268:20 274:15 | 1400 231:24 | 279:1 | 42 319:24 333:19 | 77's 306:25 |
| 277:23 279:12 | 14th 256:8 | $2201232: 7$ | 42-odd 324:7 | 79 279:19 |
| 280:3,14,17,19 | 15 238:16,18,21 | 23 279:2 | 43 233:15 | 7th 315:9 |
| 281:2,8,25 283:19 | 239:5 287:7 | 24 279:3 287:7 | 44 290:18 |  |
| 284:5,12,19,25 | 333:20 | 25th 251:18 | $45313: 13,15$ | $\frac{8}{8236: 910238.11}$ |
| 285:23 286:4,7,11 | 16 234:12 | 26235:7 | 320:16,17 333:19 | 8236:9,10 238:11 |
| 286:15 297:23 | 16th 252:8 | 27 231:15 233:23 | 47-odd 324:6 | 280:20 |
| 303:21 305:10 | 17 277:16 278:17 | 236:20 | 48 319:18 | 80 306:1 |
| 309:12 320:22 | 280:3,22 | 2900 231:20 | 487 319:23 | $800231: 9$ |
| 322:5 331:24 | 173 234:18 |  | 49 279:20 319:21 | 800,000 332:18 |
| 332:13 336:16 | 18 232:19 236:11 | 3 | 333:19 | $85324: 9$ |
| yesterday 252:11 | $1824319: 3$ | 3 262:25 287:18 | 4th 251:1,6 252:9 | 8th 251:15 |
| York 238:19 239:2 | 1950s 307:9 | 290:7,7,8,9 296:6 | 255:21 | 9 |
| 239:4 290:24 | 1990-2018 238:15 | 296:13 298:25 |  | 9233:20 235:23 |
| 312:5 | 1st 250:17,19 251:2 | 333:20 334:14 | 5 | 277:17 |
| Z | 281:21 | 3-251:25 | 5 280:16 332:22 | 9-year 282:3 |
| zero-sum 317:10 | 2 | 3.3 284:19 | 5.7 284:6 285:23 | $9.9320: 8$ |
| Zillah 232:16 | 2319:21 321:17 | 30 236:5,6,23 | 5/7/2018 233:9,12 | 9/14/17 $235: 7$ |
| 0 | 331:8,9,13 332:15 | 262:18 280:22 | 233:14,18 236:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9/7/2017 234:16 } \\ & \text { 9:32 230:10 } 240: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
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