

AVISTA CORP.
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

JURISDICTION:	WASHINGTON	DATE PREPARED:	04/26/2016
CASE NO.:	UE-160228 & UG-160229	WITNESS:	Heather Rosentrater
REQUESTER:	Public Counsel/Energy Project	RESPONDER:	Clay Storey/L. La Bolle
TYPE:	Data Request	DEPT:	State & Federal Regulation
REQUEST NO.:	PC/EP – 019	TELEPHONE:	(509) 495-4710
		EMAIL:	larry.labolle@avistacorp.com

REQUEST:**RE: Direct Testimony of Heather L. Rosentrater, Exhibit No. HLR-1T at 30:18-23.**

What is the cost of Avista’s “oversight committee” and “an advanced meter security working group” as identified on page 30, lines 18-23 and identify where and in what amount these costs are included in the business case.

RESPONSE:

As described in Exhibit No. HLR-3 on pages 28-31, Avista’s cyber security practices are designed to ensure that operational objectives are effectively achieved, while ensuring the integrity of our data and systems is protected at every level from possible unintentional incidents, and the full range of potential cyber security threats. Cyber security is a foundational part of every system used by the Company and is designed from the ground up to meet our security and confidentiality standards, various regulatory requirements, and interoperability standards, among others. Security is highly integrated into each phase of every project we implement, including planning, design, build, test, Go Live, and ongoing operations. In every application, the goal of Avista’s security processes is to ensure we have appropriate and cost-effective measures in place that provide comprehensive and seamless protection for our customers, employees, contractors, and work processes, across computer hardware and software systems, energy delivery and communications infrastructure, and myriad end-use devices.

Our success in accomplishing these objectives requires that we organize various standing committees composed of employee subject matter experts, such as provided in detail in Avista’s response to PC/EP DR-20. Because the “oversight committee” and “the advanced meter security working group” are standing committees (for the advanced meter group because Avista already has an operating AMI system), and because the security governance they provide is an integrated part of our enterprise-wide security effort, the cost associated with the portion of their time they spend in committee is not allocated to individual projects. The costs for the actual work of installing security systems to support the Washington AMI project are described in Avista’s response to PC/EP DR-17.