

WASHINGTON ELECTRIC COST OF SERVICE HISTORY

AVISTA

2015 GRC (UE-150204 & UG-150205)	<i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i>
2014 GRC (UE-140188 & UG-140189)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2014 Load study estimates rate class hourly load for demand allocation
2012 GRC (UE-120436 & UG-120437)	<i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i>
2011 GRC (UE-110876 & UG-110876)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company Proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● System load factor to determine demand related production costs instead of using a ratio based on Peaker units ● Apply system load factor to transmission costs
2010 GRC (UE-100467 & UG-100468)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company Proposals based on 2007 review but are not adopted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IRP based analysis of total dispatch value from a CCCT to determine demand/energy ratio ● Apply same methodology to transmission costs ● Load research study used to estimate hourly load by rate class for cost of service demand allocations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Company concludes that demand allocation from previous cost of service models substantially similar to cost of service study including demand study results ◆ Company states intent to annual augment study
2009 GRC (UE-090134/UG-090135)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company conducts four sensitivity analyses to test the effect of NCP and CP allocations on demand costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Company concludes that rate classes allocation would not substantially change as a result of large swings in NCP/CP allocators

2008 GRC (UE-080416 & UG-080417)	<i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i>
2007 GRC (UE-070804 & UG-070805)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company agrees to examine allocation of costs and characteristics of its electric system resources ○ Company agrees to conduct load study
2005 GRC (UE-050482 & UG-050483)	<i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i>
2004 Gas Only GRC (UG-041515)	N/A
2001 Electric Only GRC (UE-011595)	<p><i>Multiparty Settlement - No changes to cost of service</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company proposes modification of 1999 approach to A&G based on Commission Order. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A&G costs which cannot be directly assigned instead use a functional allocators equivalent to the 1992 PSE method (UE-920499)
1999 GRC (UE-991606 & UG-991607)	<p><i>Commission Order – Accepts all but the allocation of A&G expenses as proposed by the Company</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company proposes peak credit methodology similar to 1992 PSE Method. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Separately identified peak credit ratios for thermal and hydro plants using replacement cost per kW ● A&G directly assigned where possible, remaining costs. This allocated 40% on annual energy, 60% on number of customers. ● Transmission costs allocated 50% based on hydro peak credit ratio & 50% on thermal plant peak ratio ● Fuel and load dispatch expenses allocated 100% on energy ● Peak plant costs allocated 100% demand ● Purchased Power and Other Power Supply allocated in proportion to production plant ○ Company applied basic customer classification for distribution facilities