RECEIVED
2019 JUL 31 AM 10:28
IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

DAVID J. MEYER
VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF COUNSEL FOR
REGULATORY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AVISTA CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 3727
1411 EAST MISSION AVENUE
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99220-3727
TELEPHONE: (509) 495-4316
FACSIMILE: (509) 495-8851
DAVID.MEYER@AVISTACORP.COM

**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF AVISTA CORPORATION FOR THE EXTENSION OF AVISTA'S ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS FIXED COST ADJUSTMENT MECHANISMS IN THE STATE OF IDAHO | ) ) ) ) ) ) ) | CASE NO. AVU-E-19-06<br>CASE NO. AVU-G-19-03<br><br>EXHIBIT NO. 1 |

FOR AVISTA CORPORATION

(ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS)

# AVISTA DECOUPLING EVALUATION

## Final Report

*Hugh Peach - H. Gil Peach & Associates LLC*
*Mark Thompson - Forefront Economics Inc.*
*John Joseph - Joseph Associates, Inc.*

H. Gil Peach & Associates LLC

10/01/2018

Exhibit No. 1
Case Nos. AVU-E-19-0_ and AVU-G-19-0_
P. Ehrbar, Avista
Page 1 of 224

## Vision Statement

To be a world leader in developing truthful measurement and useful results; to support development of efficient, ethical, and effective practices, sustained economically; to advance human development. To improve the quality of life during the era of climate change.

## Goals Statement

- To build inclusion, diversity and social justice in support of all technical goals.
- Inclusion, diversity and social justice is the top technical goal.
- Excellence in the integration of knowledge, method, and practice
- Improvement and learning at all levels
- Contextually sound measurement, analysis, and reporting
- Anticipate and meet the needs of our clients
- Awareness of human relevance and of the ethical core of research
- To go further, to find better ways

## Mission Statement

With extensive experience in North America we can provide the full range of evaluation, verification, policy, management, planning, regulatory and adaptation services – wherever and whenever there is a need.

## Environmental Policy Statement

Collectively, we are at a Darwin moment. Either we move to a better model for production; work intensely to mitigate climate change; anticipate and actualize inclusive climate adaptation - or we face being edited out of history.

# Table of Contents


**Table of Contents** ..... **i**
List of Tables ..... iv
Table of Figures ..... vii

**Introduction** ..... **1**

**Section 1. Fidelity Analysis** ..... **1-1**
Decoupling Mechanism – 2015 Electric (Schedule 75) and Gas (Schedule 175) ..... 1-2
*Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-3*
*Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-11*
2015 Earnings Test ..... 1-19
*Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test* ..... *1-19*
*Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test* ..... *1-20*
2015 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation ..... 1-20
*Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-20*
*Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-23*
Decoupling Mechanism - 2016 Electric (Schedule 75) and Natural Gas (Schedule 175) ..... 1-26
*Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-26*
*Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-34*
2016 Earnings Test ..... 1-43
*Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test* ..... *1-43*
*Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test* ..... *1-45*
2016 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation ..... 1-47
*Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-47*
*Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-48*
Decoupling Mechanism - 2017 Electric (Schedule 75) and Natural Gas (Schedule 175) ..... 1-49
*Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-49*
*Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)* ..... *1-57*
2017 Earnings Test ..... 1-66
*Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test* ..... *1-66*
*Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test* ..... *1-68*
2017 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation ..... 1-70
*Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-70*
*Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test* ..... *1-71*
Audit Statements: Is the Source Data Credible? ..... 1-72
Summary - Task 1 ..... 1-74

**Section 2. Billing Impacts and Recovery of Cost of Service Analysis** ..... **2-1**
Summary of Decoupling Mechanics and Results ..... 2-2
*Factors Influencing Use per Customer* ..... *2-4*
*Weather Compared to Normal* ..... *2-9*
Task 2 Part 1: Impact of Decoupling Tracker Adjustment by Customer Class ..... 2-11
*Electric* ..... *2-11*
*Natural Gas* ..... *2-16*
Task 2 Part 2: Are Allowed Revenues Recovering Cost of Service by Rate Group? ..... 2-22
*Electric* ..... *2-24*
*Natural Gas* ..... *2-24*
Summary - Task 2 ..... 2-28

**Section 3. Low-Income Analysis and Contrasts** ..... **3-1**
Low-Income Billing Impacts (includes Parts A and D) ..... 3-2
*Impact on Electric Low-Income Customers* ..... *3-3*
*Impact on Natural Gas Low-Income Customers* ..... *3-7*
*Summary – Task 3, Parts A and D* ..... *3-10*
Low-Income Savings, Expenditures and Customers Served ..... 3-10

*Conservation Program Savings* ..... *3-10*
*Low-Income Bill Assistance* ..... *3-11*
*Low-Income Rate Assistance Program (LIRAP)* ..... *3-12*
*Rate Discount Pilot Program for Seniors* ..... *3-16*
*Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)* ..... *3-16*
*Project Share* ..... *3-16*
*Miscellaneous Bill Assistance* ..... *3-17*
*Bill Assistance Funding Trends* ..... *3-18*
*Number of Bill Assistance Grants* ..... *3-19*
*Average Bill Assistance Grant* ..... *3-20*
*Low-Income Weatherization Services* ..... *3-21*
*Avista Low-Income Weatherization Funding* ..... *3-22*
*Number of Low-Income Weatherization Grants* ..... *3-25*
*Average Weatherization Job Costs* ..... *3-25*
*Inflation Adjusted Funding Levels* ..... *3-26*
*Summary – Task 3, Part B* ..... *3-27*
Modifications to Low-Income Programs ..... 3-28
Effect on Low-Income vs. Average Residential ..... 3-31
Other Factors ..... 3-31
*Overview of Approach* ..... *3-31*
*Energy Usage* ..... *3-33*
*Housing Characteristics* ..... *3-34*
*Housing Type and HVAC Equipment* ..... *3-35*
*Summary – Task 3e* ..... *3-36*

**Section 4. Analysis of Revenue Effects ..... 4-1**
Has Decoupling Stabilized Revenue ..... 4-1
Revenue Deviations from Planning Assumptions and Causes ..... 4-3
Review of Rate Cap and Earnings Test ..... 4-8
Review of Deferrals ..... 4-9
Summary – Task 4 ..... 4-12

**Section 5. Fixed Costs and Charges, Non-Decoupled Customers ..... 5-1**
Electric Customers ..... 5-1
Natural Gas Customers ..... 5-2
Summary – Task 5 ..... 5-3

**Section 6. Analysis of Conservation Achievement ..... 6-1**
What is the Impact of Fuel Conversion on Decoupling Revenue? ..... 6-2
Summary - Impact of Fuel Conversion on Decoupling Revenue ..... 6-6
Have the Mechanisms had an Impact on Natural Gas or Electric Conservation? ..... 6-7
*Decoupling and Conservation Achievement (Totals): Perspective* ..... *6-7*
*Residential Electric Group* ..... *6-10*
*Low-Income Electric Group* ..... *6-12*
*Nonresidential Electric Group* ..... *6-13*
*Residential Natural Gas Group* ..... *6-14*
*Low-Income Natural Gas Group* ..... *6-15*
*Nonresidential Natural Gas Group* ..... *6-16*
Summary - Impact on Conservation Achievement ..... 6-16

**Section 7. Analysis of Possible Adverse Impacts ..... 7-1**
Are there Adverse Effects? ..... 7-1
*Customer Service and Service Quality Indices (SQI)* ..... *7-2*
Price Signals and Conservation Participation ..... 7-8
*Cost Control and Operational Efficiency* ..... *7-12*
Summary – Task 7 (Adverse Impacts) ..... 7-17



Exhibit No. 1
Case Nos. AVU-E-19-0_ and AVU-G-19-0_
P. Ehrbar, Avista
Page 4 of 224

**Section 8. Low-Income Appendix ..... 8-1**
Attachment G - Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty ..... 8-1
Attachment H - The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014 ..... 8-2
Making Sense of Federal Poverty Level vs. Income Insufficiency ..... 8-5
Level of Rigor ..... 8-9
Understanding Low-Income within the Overall Allocation of Income ..... 8-11

**Section 9. Weather Appendix ..... 9-1**
Sequences of Warm and Cold Years ..... 9-3
Zero Heating Degree Days ..... 9-4

**Section 10. Recommendations ..... 10-1**

## List of Tables


Table 1-1. General Rate Case and Test Year Definitions by Deferral Year ..... 1-2
Table 1-2. 2015 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-5
Table 1-3. 2015 Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-6
Table 1-4. 2015 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-7
Table 1-5. 2015 Electric Deferral Calculations ..... 1-8
Table 1-6. 2015 Development of Electric Deferral ..... 1-10
Table 1-7. 2015 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-13
Table 1-8. 2015 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-14
Table 1-9. 2015 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-15
Table 1-10. 2015 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations ..... 1-16
Table 1-11. 2015 Development of Natural Gas Deferral ..... 1-18
Table 1-12. 2015 Electric and Natural Gas Earnings Tests ..... 1-19
Table 1-13. 2015 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment ..... 1-19
Table 1-14. 2015 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-21
Table 1-15. 2015 Residential Electric Carryover Deferred Revenue ..... 1-22
Table 1-16. 2015 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-23
Table 1-17. 2015 Residential Natural Gas Carryover Deferred Revenue ..... 1-24
Table 1-18. 2015 Non-Residential Natural Gas Carryover Deferred Revenue ..... 1-25
Table 1-19. 2016 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-28
Table 1-20. 2016 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-29
Table 1-21. 2016 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-30
Table 1-22. 2016 Electric Deferral Calculations ..... 1-32
Table 1-23. 2016 Development of Electric Deferral ..... 1-33
Table 1-24. 2016 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-36
Table 1-25. 2016 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-37
Table 1-26. 2016 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-38
Table 1-27. 2016 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations ..... 1-41
Table 1-28. 2016 Development of Natural Gas Deferral ..... 1-42
Table 1-29. 2016 Electric Earnings Test ..... 1-43
Table 1-30. 2016 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment ..... 1-44
Table 1-31. Derivation of 2016 Electric Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor ..... 1-44
Table 1-32. 2016 Natural Gas Earnings Test ..... 1-45
Table 1-33. Derivation of 2016 Natural Gas Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor ..... 1-46
Table 1-34. 2016 Natural Gas Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment ..... 1-46
Table 1-35. 2016 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-47
Table 1-36. 2016 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-48
Table 1-37. 2017 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-51
Table 1-38. 2017 Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-52
Table 1-39. 2017 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-53
Table 1-40. 2017 Electric Deferral Calculations ..... 1-55
Table 1-41. 2017 Development of Electric Deferral ..... 1-56
Table 1-42. 2017 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-59
Table 1-43. 2017 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-60
Table 1-44. 2017 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 1-61
Table 1-45. 2017 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations ..... 1-64
Table 1-46. 2017 Development of Natural Gas Deferral ..... 1-65
Table 1-47. 2017 Electric Earnings Test ..... 1-66
Table 1-48. 2017 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment ..... 1-67
Table 1-49. 2017 Derivation of Electric Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor ..... 1-68
Table 1-50. 2017 Natural Gas Earnings Test ..... 1-68
Table 1-51. 2017 Derivation of Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor (Natural Gas) ..... 1-69

Table 1-52. 2017 Natural Gas Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment ..... 1-69
Table 1-53. 2017 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-70
Table 1-54. 2017 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test ..... 1-71
Table 2-1. Electric and Natural Gas Rate Groups and Customer Classes (Rate Categories) ..... 2-1
Table 2-2. Summary of Deferral Balances and Decoupling Recovery Rates ..... 2-3
Table 2-3. Electric Use per Customer Variance from Test Year ..... 2-5
Table 2-4. Natural Gas Use per Customer Variance from Test Year ..... 2-7
Table 2-5. Comparison of Actual and Normal Annual Heating Degree Days ..... 2-10
Table 2-6. Annual Electric Customer Counts by Customer Class ..... 2-11
Table 2-7. Annual Electric Revenue by Customer Class ..... 2-12
Table 2-8. Annual Decoupling Tariff Revenue by Electric Customer Class ..... 2-12
Table 2-9. 2016 Electric Monthly Billing Data ..... 2-14
Table 2-10. 2017 Electric Monthly Billing Data ..... 2-15
Table 2-11. Annual Natural Gas Customer Counts by Customer Class ..... 2-17
Table 2-12. Annual Natural Gas Revenue by Customer Class ..... 2-17
Table 2-13. Annual Decoupling Tariff Revenue by Natural Gas Customer Class ..... 2-18
Table 2-14. 2016 Natural Gas Monthly Billing Data ..... 2-19
Table 2-15. 2017 Natural Gas Monthly Billing Data ..... 2-20
Table 2-16. Electric Revenues and Cost of Service by Rate Group (thousands of dollars) ..... 2-26
Table 2-17. Natural Gas Revenues and Cost of Service by Rate Group (thousands of dollars) ..... 2-27
Table 3-1. All Residential and Low-Income Electric and Natural Gas Customer Counts ..... 3-3
Table 3-2. Comparison of Average Annual Electric Revenue per Customer ..... 3-4
Table 3-3. Monthly Electric Usage, Meters and Revenue, Low-Income and All Residential ..... 3-6
Table 3-4. Comparison of Average Annual Natural Gas Revenue per Customer ..... 3-8
Table 3-5. Monthly Natural Gas, Meters and Revenue, Low-Income and All Residential ..... 3-9
Table 3-6. Total Electric Energy Savings - Conservation and Conversions (kWh) ..... 3-10
Table 3-7. I-937 Electric Conservation (kWh) ..... 3-11
Table 3-8. Electric Conversion to Natural Gas Savings (kWh) ..... 3-11
Table 3-9. Percentage Electric Savings Due to Conversions from Electric to Natural Gas ..... 3-11
Table 3-10. Total Natural Gas Conservation Savings (therms) ..... 3-11
Table 3-11. Electric Service LIRAP Tariff Rate ..... 3-13
Table 3-12. Natural Gas Service LIRAP Tariff Rate ..... 3-15
Table 3-13. LIHEAP Poverty Guidelines (2017) ..... 3-16
Table 3-14. Electric Service DSM Tariff ..... 3-22
Table 3-15. Natural Gas Service DSM Tariff ..... 3-23
Table 3-16. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2015) ..... 3-29
Table 3-17. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2015) ..... 3-29
Table 3-18. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2016) ..... 3-29
Table 3-19. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2016) ..... 3-30
Table 3-20. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2017) ..... 3-30
Table 3-21. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2017) ..... 3-30
Table 3-22. Avista Customer Counts by Residential Group and Service Type ..... 3-33
Table 3-23. Comparison of Housing Characteristics ..... 3-34
Table 3-24. Distribution of Housing Types ..... 3-35
Table 3-25. Distribution of Heating Equipment ..... 3-36
Table 3-26. Distribution of Cooling Equipment ..... 3-36
Table 4-1. Authorized and Actual Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 4-3
Table 4-2. Test Year and Actual Electric Usage, Customers and Use per Customer ..... 4-3
Table 4-3. Authorized and Actual Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer ..... 4-5
Table 4-4. Test Year and Actual Natural Gas Usage, Customers and Use per Customer ..... 4-6
Table 4-5. Earning Test Shared Revenue ..... 4-8
Table 4-6. History of Rate Cap Results - Was Rate Cap Reached? ..... 4-9
Table 4-7. Electric Revenue from Decoupled Rate Groups ..... 4-9

Table 4-8. Natural Gas Revenue from Decoupled Rate Groups ..... 4-10
Table 4-9. Summary of Deferral Balances and Decoupling Recovery Rates ..... 4-10
Table 4-10. Deferred Revenue at Normal Weather ..... 4-11
Table 5-1. Electric Revenue from Fixed Charges and Fixed Cost (thousands of dollars) ..... 5-1
Table 5-2. Fixed Cost and Fixed Charges, Non-Decoupled Natural Gas Customer Classes ..... 5-2
Table 6-1. Electric Residential Conversions as Percentage of Conservation Achievement (kWh) ..... 6-3
Table 6-2. Electric Non-Residential Conversion as Percentage of Conservation Achievement (kWh) ..... 6-3
Table 6-3. Residential Fuel Conversion Program Savings ..... 6-4
Table 6-4. Allocation of Nonresidential Revenue based on Gross Verified Savings (kWh) ..... 6-5
Table 6-5. Residential Gas Decoupling Revenue Based on Gross Verified Savings (therms) ..... 6-5
Table 6-6. Nonresidential Gas Decoupling Revenue (Gross Verified Savings - therms) ..... 6-6
Table 7-1. 2015 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52 ..... 7-3
Table 7-2. 2016 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52 ..... 7-4
Table 7-3. 2017 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52 ..... 7-4
Table 7-4. Customer Service Indicators for Before and After Decoupling – DR 52 ..... 7-5
Table 7-5. Indicators of Electric Service Reliability – DR 52 ..... 7-6
Table 7-6. 2016 Customer Service Guarantee - DR 52 ..... 7-7
Table 7-7. 2017 Customer Service Guarantee - DR 52 ..... 7-7
Table 7-8. Electric Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2016 ..... 7-9
Table 7-9. Natural Gas Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2016 ..... 7-9
Table 7-10. Electric Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2017 ..... 7-11
Table 7-11. Natural Gas Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2017 ..... 7-11
Table 7-12. Rate of Return vs. Cost of Capital – DR 066, Revised, Attachment A ..... 7-17
Table 8-1. 150% of Poverty or Less - Receiving Bill Assistance or Avista Weatherization ..... 8-2
Table 8-2. Self-Sufficiency Standard Expressed as a Percentage of Poverty ..... 8-3
Table 8-3. Results at 200% Poverty based on American Community Survey ..... 8-5
Table 8-4. Monthly Costs included in the Self-Sufficiency Standard - Spokane 2014 ..... 8-7
Table 8-5. 150% Poverty Guidelines (2001 vs. 2017) ..... 8-8
Table 8-6. Self-Sufficiency Standard Spokane County (2001 vs. 2017) ..... 8-8
Table 8-7. 150% of FPL vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard, Spokane County, 2001 ..... 8-8
Table 8-8. 150% of FPL vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard, Spokane County, 2017 ..... 8-8
Table 9-1. Model Summary and Parameter Estimates ..... 9-4

## Table of Figures


Figure 1-1. Timing of Deferral Balance Accumulation and Decoupling Rate ..... 1-1
Figure 1-2. 2016 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2015 ..... 1-72
Figure 1-3. 2017 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2016 ..... 1-73
Figure 1-4. 2018 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2017 ..... 1-73
Figure 2-1. Timing of Deferral Balance Accumulation and Decoupling Rate ..... 2-3
Figure 2-2. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Residential ..... 2-5
Figure 2-3. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Non-Residential ..... 2-6
Figure 2-4. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Residential ..... 2-7
Figure 2-5. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Non-Residential ..... 2-8
Figure 2-6. Monthly Heating Degree Days (difference from normal) ..... 2-9
Figure 2-7. Monthly Cooling Degree Days (difference from normal) ..... 2-10
Figure 2-8. Schedule 75 as a Percent of Monthly Customer Class Revenues ..... 2-16
Figure 2-9. Schedule 175 as a Percent of Monthly Customer Class Revenues ..... 2-21
Figure 3-1. The Parts of Task 3 ..... 3-1
Figure 3-2. Annual Electric Use per Customer, Low-Income and All Residential ..... 3-3
Figure 3-3. Comparison of Average Monthly Electric Schedule 75 Revenue per Customer ..... 3-5
Figure 3-4. Annual Natural Gas Use per Customer, Low-Income and Average Residential ..... 3-7
Figure 3-5. Comparison of Average Monthly Natural Gas Schedule 175 Revenue per Customer ..... 3-8
Figure 3-6. Electric Service LIRAP Tariff (Weighted Average) ..... 3-13
Figure 3-7. Natural Gas Service LIRAP Tariff (Weighted Average) ..... 3-15
Figure 3-8. Value of All Bill Assistance Grants ..... 3-18
Figure 3-9. Value of Bill Assistance by Funding Source ..... 3-18
Figure 3-10. Number of Bill Assistance Grants Provided ..... 3-19
Figure 3-11. Number of Bill Assistance Grants by Funding Source ..... 3-20
Figure 3-12. Average Bill Assistance Grant by Funding Source ..... 3-21
Figure 3-13. Electric Service DSM Tariff (Weighted Average) ..... 3-22
Figure 3-14. Natural Gas Service DSM Tariff (Weighted Average) ..... 3-23
Figure 3-15. Avista Low-Income Weatherization Funding Trends ..... 3-24
Figure 3-16. Number of Low-Income Weatherization Grants ..... 3-25
Figure 3-17. Average Cost of Weatherization Jobs ..... 3-25
Figure 3-18. Inflation Adjusted Bill Assistance (All Sources) ..... 3-26
Figure 3-19. Inflation Adjusted Avista Weatherization Funding ..... 3-26
Figure 3-20. Annual 2017 Unadjusted Billed Energy Usage per Premise ..... 3-33
Figure 3-21. Annual 2017 Unadjusted Billed Energy per Square Foot ..... 3-34
Figure 4-1. Electric Revenue Variability (2015-2017) ..... 4-2
Figure 4-2. Natural Gas Revenue Variability (2015-2017) ..... 4-2
Figure 4-3. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Residential ..... 4-4
Figure 4-4. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Non-Residential ..... 4-5
Figure 4-5. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Residential ..... 4-7
Figure 4-6. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Non-Residential ..... 4-7
Figure 6-1. Task 6 - Conservation Achievement ..... 6-1
Figure 6-2. Planning for Decoupling 5% ..... 6-8
Figure 6-3. Conservation Achievement - Residential Electric ..... 6-11
Figure 6-4. Conservation Achievement - Low-Income Electric ..... 6-12
Figure 6-5. Nonresidential Electric Conservation Achievement (MWh) ..... 6-13
Figure 6-6. Residential Natural Gas Conservation Achievement ..... 6-14
Figure 6-7. Low-Income Natural Gas Conservation Achievement ..... 6-15
Figure 6-8. Nonresidential Natural Gas Conservation Achievement ..... 6-16
Figure 6-9. Regulatory Assistance Project on Decoupling ..... 6-17
Figure 7-1. Identify Adverse Impacts ..... 7-1
Figure 7-2. Increasing Earnings in a Decoupled Utility (RAP) ..... 7-12

Figure 8-1. Variation of Self-Sufficiency Standard across Washington Counties....8-4
Figure 8-2. Historical Divergence of BLS CPI (Courtesy of ShadowStats.com)....8-9
Figure 8-3. Income Donut for Washington State (Census 1990)....8-11
Figure 8-4. Income Donut for Washington State (Census 2000)....8-12
Figure 9-1. Drought Conditions....9-1
Figure 9-2. Wildland Fire Potential Outlook....9-2
Figure 9-3. Pattern of Heating Degree Days (Spokane)....9-2
Figure 9-4. Pattern of Cooling Degree Days (Spokane)....9-3
Figure 9-5. Regression of HDD on Year....9-5
Figure 9-6. Year in which HDD = Zero is Reached, Using different Numbers of Analysis Years....9-5
Figure 9-7. Years from 2018 until Zero HDD, using different Numbers of Analysis Years....9-6
Figure 9-8. Thirty Year Average vs. Other Averages for HDD....9-7

# Introduction

This evaluation of Avista's Decoupling Mechanisms is partly a compliance evaluation and partly a policy evaluation of Avista's decoupling as a specific rate reform (alternative form of rate making) within a specific window of time.

The structure of the evaluation is in section. Each section from Section 1 through Section 7 corresponds to a specific task (Task 1 through Task 7).

- Section 1 is a compliance evaluation: Did Avista comply with the specifics of the decoupling order?
- Section 2 is concerned with billing impacts and recovery of cost of service.
- Section 3 is focused on low-income customers and contrast between low-income and residential customers generally.
- Section 4 analyzes overall revenue effect.
- Section 5 examines fixed costs and charges for non-decoupled customers.
- Section 6 is an analysis of conservation achievement.
- Section 7 examines possible adverse impacts of decoupling.
- Section 8 is an appendix on a more extensive analysis of low-income customers.
- Section 9 is an appendix on the effects of weather.
- Section 10 covers evaluation recommendations.

We find that Avista's decoupling is working well within the specific window of time examined.

*This page left intentionally blank*

## Section 1. Fidelity Analysis

For this analysis, the evaluation objective is to complete a review of whether the deferrals and rates were calculated in accordance with the Commission order approving the mechanisms. Or, in other words, were the mechanisms administered and calculated correctly, per the Amended Petition? This first task is an assessment of compliance. Operationally, we compare the Decoupling Mechanism Development of Deferrals as submitted by Avista in 2016 for the 2015 deferral year[1], as submitted in 2017 for the 2016 deferral year, and as submitted in 2018 for the 2017 deferral year to the specification of method in Schedule 75 (75, 75A, 75B, 75C, 75D, 75E) for electric service and in Schedule 175 (175, 175A, 175B, 175C, 175D, 175E) for natural gas service. This includes the Earnings Test and the 3% Annual Increase Test.

In order to facilitate and order discussion, it will be useful to define decoupling deferral years and rate years as shown in Figure 1-1.




*Figure 1-1. Timing of Deferral Balance Accumulation and Decoupling Rate*

The timing of deferral balance accumulation and decoupling rate adjustments is shown in Figure 1-1. Avista's decoupling mechanism allows for the recovery of the difference between actual revenue and allowed revenue.[2] This difference is referred to as the decoupling deferral balance and is tracked for the two electric and two natural gas customer groups subject to decoupling; residential and non-residential.

Beginning in 2015, monthly deferrals are accumulated over a calendar year and used with other determinants to calculate the decoupling rate required to collect or refund the under or over collected revenue. Decoupling rates become effective in Schedule 75 (electric) and Schedule 175 (natural gas) November 1 of the year following the year in which deferral balances were calculated.

[1] Pat Ehrbar, Sr. Manager, Rates and Tariffs to Mr. Steven King, Executive Director and Secretary, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, August 31, 2016, with attachments.
[2] The details of Avista's decoupling mechanism are included in Final Order ("Order 5") for Docket Numbers UE-140188 and UG-140189.

The first deferral year resulted in a deferral balance at the end of 2015 that was used, along with other determinants, to calculate the decoupling rate in effect during the first rate year (November 1, 2016 through October 31, 2017). The same process is followed in the second deferral year and rate year. Any deferral balance carried over from the first rate year due to the application of the 3% cap is included in the calculations of decoupling rates in effect during the second rate year (November 2017 through October 2018). Each year, electric and natural gas results are separately developed. Also, within each year and energy source, Residential and Non-Residential Rate Groups are separately analyzed.

It is also useful to understand the test year in effect during each deferral year. Table 1-1 shows test year definitions used in each general rate case (GRC).

*Table 1-1. General Rate Case and Test Year Definitions by Deferral Year*

| Item | Electric | | Natural Gas | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deferral Year | 2015 | 2016 & 2017 | 2015 | 2016 & 2017 |
| General Rate Case | UE-140188 | UE-150204 | UG-140189 | UG-150205 |
| Test Year | Proforma 2015 | Oct 2013–Sep 2014 | Proforma 2015 | Oct 2013–Sep 2014 |

In the first decoupling deferral year (2015) the decoupling mechanism used a forecast of 2015 customers, usage and revenue as the test year. During the 2016 and 2017 deferral years a new GRC was in effect for electric and for natural gas, both of which used a 12-month period ending with September 2014 as the test year. This means that GRC rates and cost of service changed between the GRCs in effect for the 2015 deferral year and the GRCs in effect for the 2016 and 2017 deferral years. This has implications for some of the calculations and relationships reported in this study. For example, the determination of decoupled revenue is the same for 2016 as it for 2017 since both years use the same GRC and test year. When in our opinion the change in test year or other GRC assumptions have a meaningful influence in observed patterns or relationships being considered we will point this out to the reader.

We next examine the working of the electric decoupling mechanism and of the natural gas decoupling mechanisms in detail for the 2015 deferral year. The same detailed review is repeated for the 2016 and 2017 deferral years.

## Decoupling Mechanism – 2015 Electric (Schedule 75) and Gas (Schedule 175)

Essentially, the decoupling mechanism is designed to capture all fixed cost that is to be collected from the volumetric portion of rates. With decoupling, the total amount remaining for recovery is allocated to customer bills according to a model, and recovered in a structure manner on an ongoing basis. The decoupling deferrals applied beginning in November 2016 are based on comparison of the value of actual sales in 2015 to the value of projected sales that would have met the revenue requirement from January through December 2015.

As specified in Schedule 75 and Schedule 175, calculations were carried out separately and in parallel, for Residential and Non-Residential accounts. For each of these groups of accounts, the sum of monthly deferral amounts over 2015 is the cumulative deferral (rebate or surcharge) for 2015. The cumulative deferral for 2015 is then applied over the twelve months beginning

November 2016. Amortization of the cumulative deferral balance developed over calendar 2015 was implemented over the twelve-month time window from November 1, 2016 to October 31, 2017.[3]

- For Schedule 75, Group 1 is Residential customers (Schedules 1 and 2).
- For Schedule 75, Group 2 is Non-Residential customers (Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 30, 31 and 32).
- For Schedule 75, two rate schedules were not decoupled (Schedule 25 – Extra Large General Service and Schedule 41-48 – Street and Area Lighting). The non-decoupled schedules are not included in this analysis.
- For Schedule 175, Group 1 is Residential customers (Schedules 101 and 102).
- For Schedule 175, Group 2 is Non-Residential customers (Schedules 111, 121 and 131.

## *Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

Schedule 75A is used to develop the *Decoupled Revenue per Customer.* Schedule 75B uses the results from Schedule 75A to develop the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral.*

### ***Schedule 75A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

For electric service, following steps in Schedule 75A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 75A. These steps are implemented in Table 1-2 and Table 1-3.[4]

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each Rate Schedule. Table 1-2, Line 1 shows initial Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows Settlement Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 1, 2015). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Power Supply Revenue. This value is shown on Line 6 and is the product of Normalized kWh (2015 Rate Year) from Line 4 and Retail Revenue Credit from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to enter Delivery and Power Plant Revenue. This is constructed by subtraction of Variable Power Supply Revenue (Line 6) from the Total Normalized Revenue (Line 3) and is entered on Line 7.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to Remove Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed.

[3] While calculation of deferral amounts begins in January 2015, customers first encountered the decoupling mechanism in customer bills November 1, 2016.

[4] Table 1-2, Table 1-3, Table 1-4, and Table 1-5 are attachments or parts of attachments to the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing of August 31, 2016.

Basic Charge Revenue is shown on Line 10. It is the product of the number of Customer Bills (2015 Rate Year) on Line 8 times the Proposed Basic Charge (Line 9).[5]

**Step 5:** In Step 5, the Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery and Power Plant Revenue (Step 7; Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Step 4; Line 10). Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, (see Table 1-3) Decoupled Revenue is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Rate Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group).

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by modeling monthly kWh use (by Rate Group) in relationship to the annual kWh use for the rate year. This modeling is shown in Table 1-4. Kilowatt hours (kWh) for Group 1 (Residential) for 2015 is shown in Line 3 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 6. Both monthly values and the annual kWh value are shown. Below the monthly values (Lines 4 and 7) monthly percentages are shown. Lines 11 and 14 shows the use of these percentages, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) to generate monthly values.

The monthly values developed following the steps in Schedule 75A are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 75B.

[5] Basic charge includes minimum charge revenue for non-residential

*Table 1-2. 2015 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Electric**

**Updated to reflect November 2014 Power Supply update.**

| | | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 1 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 11,12 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 21,22 | PUMPING SCH. 30, 31, 32 | EX LG GEN SVC SCHEDULE 25 | ST & AREA LTG SCH. 41-48 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Total Normalized 2015 Revenue (Appendix 2) | $ 490,833,000 | $ 214,476,000 | $ 69,493,000 | $ 127,831,000 | $ 10,525,000 | $ 61,637,000 | $ 6,871,000 |
| 2 | Settlement Revenue Increase (Appendix 2) | $ 12,295,000 | $ 5,372,000 | $ 1,738,000 | $ 3,205,000 | $ 264,000 | $ 1,544,000 | $ 172,000 |
| 3 | Total Rate Revenue (January 1, 2015) | $ 503,128,000 | $ 219,848,000 | $ 71,231,000 | $ 131,036,000 | $ 10,789,000 | $ 63,181,000 | $ 7,043,000 |
| 4 | Normalized kWhs (2015 Rate Year) | 5,689,806,234 | 2,437,508,068 | 586,109,432 | 1,436,806,481 | 127,927,573 | 1,076,126,636 | 25,328,044 |
| 5 | Retail Revenue Credit (line 14) | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.02108 |
| 6 | Variable Power Supply Revenue (L4 * L5) | $ 119,941,115 | $ 51,382,670 | $ 12,355,187 | $ 30,287,881 | $ 2,696,713 | $ 22,684,749 | $ 533,915 |
| 7 | Delivery & Power Plant Revenue (L3 - L6) | $ 336,181,549 | $ 168,465,330 | $ 58,875,813 | $ 100,748,119 | $ 8,092,287 | | |
| 8 | Customer Bills (2015 Rate Year) | 2,917,521 | 2,494,197 | 369,788 | 24,074 | 29,462 | Schedule 25 & Schedules 41-48 Excluded From Decoupling | |
| 9 | Proposed Basic Charges | | $ 8.50 | $ 18.00 | $ 500.00 | $ 18.00 | | |
| 10 | Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 40,424,175 | $ 21,200,675 | $ 6,656,184 | $ 12,037,000 | $ 530,316 | | |
| 11 | Decoupled Revenue | $ 295,757,375 | $ 147,264,655 | $ 52,219,629 | $ 88,711,119 | $ 7,561,971 | | |

*Table 1-3. 2015 Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Updated to reflect November 2014 Power Supply update.**

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Annual Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Appendix 4, Page 1 | $ 147,264,655 | $ 148,492,719 |
| 2 | Rate Year # of Customers 2015 | Revenue Data | 207,850 | 35,277 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 708.51 | $ 4,209.34 |

* Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Revenues | | | |
| From revenue per customer | $ 147,263,626 | $ 148,492,887 | |
| From basic charge | $ 21,200,675 | $ 19,223,500 | |
| From power supply | $ 51,382,670 | $ 45,339,781 | |
| Total | $ 219,846,971 | $ 213,056,168 | |

*Table 1-4. 2015 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

Updated to reflect November 2014 Power Supply update.

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | **Electric Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 271,130,047 | 240,621,765 | 221,370,825 | 175,525,307 | 161,914,993 | 154,545,588 | 176,072,045 | 186,627,300 | 157,769,890 | 180,730,371 | 225,437,958 | 285,761,978 | 2,437,508,067 |
| 4 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 11.12% | 9.87% | 9.08% | 7.20% | 6.64% | 6.34% | 7.22% | 7.66% | 6.47% | 7.41% | 9.25% | 11.72% | 100.00% |
| 5 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 181,922,081 | 170,861,843 | 173,030,139 | 157,004,730 | 167,947,307 | 175,614,812 | 195,632,184 | 207,327,409 | 177,370,453 | 177,453,044 | 174,351,964 | 192,327,521 | 2,150,843,487 |
| 7 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 8.46% | 7.94% | 8.04% | 7.30% | 7.81% | 8.16% | 9.10% | 9.64% | 8.25% | 8.25% | 8.11% | 8.94% | 100.00% |
| 8 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | - 2015 Decoupled RPC | Appendix 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 708.51 |
| 11 | - 2015 Monthly Decoupled RPC | (4) x (10) | $ 78.81 | $ 69.94 | $ 64.35 | $ 51.02 | $ 47.06 | $ 44.92 | $ 51.18 | $ 54.25 | $ 45.86 | $ 52.53 | $ 65.53 | $ 83.06 | $ 708.51 |
| 12 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | - 2015 Decoupled RPC | Appendix 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 4,209.34 |
| 14 | - 2015 Monthly Decoupled RPC | (7) x (13) | $ 356.03 | $ 334.39 | $ 338.63 | $ 307.27 | $ 328.68 | $ 343.69 | $ 382.86 | $ 405.75 | $ 347.13 | $ 347.29 | $ 341.22 | $ 376.40 | $ 4,209.34 |

* Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32.

## ***Schedule 75B – Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 75B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for electric service. The calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2015 is shown in Table 1-5 for both decoupled groups.[6] In the full version of this table (Table 1-6), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2015 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2015. For the electric residential group, deferred revenue for 2015 is $7,167,748. Deferred revenue in 2015 for the electric non-residential group is negative $2,373,472.

*Table 1-5. 2015 Electric Deferral Calculations*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2015)**

| Line No. | | Source | | Revised Jan-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | | 207,224 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 4, Page 3 | | $78.81 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ | 16,331,182 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ | 25,101,845 |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ | 1,761,404 |
| 6 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | | 273,966,953 |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Appendix 4, Page 1 | $ | 0.021080 |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ | 5,775,223 |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ | 17,565,217 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | | $84.76 |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ | (1,234,035) |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ | 56,019 |
| | | FERC Rate | | 3.25% |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ | (1,595) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$** | **(1,179,611)** |
| 13 | Cumulative Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | $ | (1,179,611) |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | | 35,059 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 4, Page 3 | | $356.03 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ | 12,482,171 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ | 16,258,940 |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ | 1,590,724 |
| 19 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | | 162,655,588 |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Appendix 4, Page 1 | $ | 0.021080 |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ | 3,428,780 |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ | 11,239,437 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | | $320.59 |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ | 1,242,735 |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ | (56,414) |
| | | FERC Rate | | 3.25% |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ | 1,606 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$** | **1,187,927** |
| 26 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | $ | 1,187,927 |
| 25 | Total Cumulative Deferral | (13) + (26) | $ | 8,316 |

[6] Only one month is shown here to keep the table readable on the page.

The sequence of the line numbers in Table 1-5 implement Schedule 75B. Actual customers each month (Step1 of Schedule 75B) corresponds to Line 1 for the residential group and Line 14 for the non-residential group.

Decoupling Deferrals (Step 2 of Schedule 75B) corresponds to Line 3 in both tables. It is calculated by multiplying the number of Actual Customers (Line 1) by the Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2). Actual Revenue collected in a month (Step 3 of Schedule 75B) is shown on Line 4.

The Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Step 4) is shown on Line 5. The total revenue collected related to the variable power supply (Step 5) is shown on Line 8. This is the product of Actual kWh Sales (Line 6) and the Retail Revenue Credit (Line 7).

Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6) is calculated by subtracting the Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Line 4) and the variable power supply revenue (Line 8) from the Actual Base Rate Revenue and is shown on Line 9.

The Monthly Residential Deferral Total for each month (Step 7) is shown just below Line 12. This is the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6; Line 9) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue (Step 2; Line 3) plus any interest on the deferral.

Interest on the deferred balance accrues at the quarterly rate published by the FERC. The Monthly Residential Deferral Total for January 2015 is negative $1,179,611. In Table 1-6, these values are cumulatively incremented by month over 2015 on Line 13 and the electric deferred revenue for 2015 shown on Line 13 at the right is $7,167,748. This is the Residential value given by Avista on page 2 of 5 in the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing in compliance with Commission Order No. 05 in Docket No. UE-140188 on August 31, 2016.

Continuing with the electric analysis, identical procedural steps were applied for non-residential customers beginning in Line 14 and yielding a non-residential annual deferral amount of negative $2,373,472 in Line 26. The net deferral of $4,794,276, including electric residential and electric non-residential, is shown at the bottom of Table 1-6.

# *Table 1-6. 2015 Development of Electric Deferral*

**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2015)**

| Line No. | | Source | Revised Jan-15 | Revised Feb-15 | Mar-15 | Apr-15 | May-15 | Jun-15 | Jul-15 | Aug-15 | Sep-15 | Oct-15 | Nov-15 | Dec-15 | 2015 Annual Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 207,224 | 207,250 | 206,422 | 206,679 | 206,185 | 206,224 | 207,030 | 206,682 | 207,742 | 208,615 | 208,228 | 210,165 | 2,488,446 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 4, Page 3 | $78.81 | $69.94 | $64.35 | $51.02 | $47.06 | $44.92 | $51.18 | $54.25 | $45.86 | $52.53 | $65.53 | $83.06 | $59.08 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 16,331,182 | $ 14,495,372 | $ 13,282,392 | $ 10,544,743 | $ 9,703,850 | $ 9,263,940 | $ 10,595,553 | $ 11,211,862 | $ 9,526,829 | $ 10,959,143 | $ 13,644,766 | $ 17,456,805 | $ 147,016,437 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 25,101,845 | $ 17,879,887 | $ 17,559,760 | $ 15,694,519 | $ 13,097,133 | $ 14,889,107 | $ 19,331,801 | $ 17,006,511 | $ 13,586,943 | $ 13,096,810 | $ 18,959,164 | $ 23,830,695 | |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,761,404 | $ 1,761,625 | $ 1,754,587 | $ 1,756,772 | $ 1,752,573 | $ 1,752,904 | $ 1,821,150 | $ 1,819,598 | $ 1,819,260 | $ 1,819,349 | $ 1,806,884 | $ 1,823,573 | |
| 6 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 273,966,953 | 197,618,642 | 196,511,929 | 174,058,158 | 144,371,121 | 166,807,706 | 215,398,297 | 186,598,692 | 148,639,680 | 144,517,723 | 213,318,297 | 261,492,406 | |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Appendix 4, Page 1 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ 5,775,223 | $ 4,165,801 | $ 4,142,471 | $ 3,669,146 | $ 3,043,343 | $ 3,516,306 | $ 4,540,596 | $ 3,933,500 | $ 3,133,324 | $ 3,046,434 | $ 4,496,750 | $ 5,512,260 | |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ 17,565,217 | $ 11,952,461 | $ 11,662,701 | $ 10,268,602 | $ 8,301,217 | $ 9,619,896 | $ 12,970,055 | $ 11,253,413 | $ 8,634,359 | $ 8,231,028 | $ 12,655,530 | $ 16,494,862 | $ 139,609,342 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $84.76 | $57.67 | $56.50 | $49.68 | $40.26 | $46.65 | $62.65 | $54.45 | $41.56 | $39.46 | $60.78 | $78.49 | $56.10 |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ (1,234,035) | $ 2,542,911 | $ 1,619,691 | $ 276,142 | $ 1,402,633 | $ (355,956) | $ (2,374,502) | $ (41,551) | $ 892,470 | $ 2,728,115 | $ 989,236 | $ 961,943 | $ 7,407,095 |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 56,019 | $ (115,435) | $ (73,526) | $ (12,535) | $ (63,673) | $ 16,159 | $ 107,791 | $ 1,886 | $ (40,514) | $ (123,843) | $ (44,906) | $ (43,667) | $ (336,245) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (1,595) | $ 92 | $ 5,474 | $ 7,939 | $ 10,131 | $ 11,511 | $ 8,013 | $ 4,911 | $ 6,025 | $ 10,721 | $ 15,556 | $ 18,120 | $ 96,898 |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (1,179,611)** | **$ 2,427,568** | **$ 1,551,638** | **$ 271,546** | **$ 1,349,091** | **$ (328,286)** | **$ (2,258,699)** | **$ (34,753)** | **$ 857,981** | **$ 2,614,994** | **$ 959,885** | **$ 936,395** | **$ 7,167,748** |
| 13 | Cumulative Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | $ (1,179,611) | $ 1,247,957 | $ 2,799,595 | $ 3,071,141 | $ 4,420,232 | $ 4,091,945 | $ 1,833,247 | $ 1,798,493 | $ 2,656,474 | $ 5,271,468 | $ 6,231,353 | $ 7,167,748 | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 35,059 | 35,579 | 35,140 | 35,293 | 35,221 | 35,212 | 35,004 | 35,238 | 35,232 | 35,284 | 35,077 | 35,843 | 423,182 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 4, Page 3 | $356.03 | $334.39 | $338.63 | $307.27 | $328.68 | $343.69 | $382.86 | $405.75 | $347.13 | $347.29 | $341.22 | $376.40 | $350.78 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ 12,482,171 | $ 11,897,180 | $ 11,899,500 | $ 10,844,425 | $ 11,576,571 | $ 12,101,997 | $ 13,401,801 | $ 14,297,930 | $ 12,229,924 | $ 12,253,678 | $ 11,968,907 | $ 13,491,213 | $ 148,445,296 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 16,258,940 | $ 17,169,122 | $ 17,145,797 | $ 17,146,414 | $ 17,228,784 | $ 20,052,822 | $ 19,981,392 | $ 20,610,294 | $ 17,559,914 | $ 17,606,688 | $ 18,027,728 | $ 17,364,216 | |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,590,724 | $ 1,612,616 | $ 1,612,908 | $ 1,601,684 | $ 1,610,510 | $ 1,601,190 | $ 1,620,119 | $ 1,617,035 | $ 1,618,291 | $ 1,611,788 | $ 1,595,841 | $ 1,623,807 | |
| 19 | Acutal Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 162,655,588 | 168,483,376 | 171,828,336 | 170,229,514 | 173,532,298 | 208,221,126 | 205,625,075 | 213,909,780 | 176,781,649 | 176,161,200 | 180,918,565 | 171,400,749 | |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Appendix 4, Page 1 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | $ 0.021080 | |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ 3,428,780 | $ 3,551,630 | $ 3,622,141 | $ 3,588,438 | $ 3,658,061 | $ 4,389,301 | $ 4,334,577 | $ 4,509,218 | $ 3,726,557 | $ 3,713,478 | $ 3,813,763 | $ 3,613,128 | |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ 11,239,437 | $ 12,004,877 | $ 11,910,747 | $ 11,956,292 | $ 11,960,214 | $ 14,062,331 | $ 14,026,697 | $ 14,484,040 | $ 12,215,066 | $ 12,281,422 | $ 12,618,124 | $ 12,127,281 | $ 150,886,527 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $320.59 | $337.41 | $338.95 | $338.77 | $339.58 | $399.36 | $400.72 | $411.03 | $346.70 | $348.07 | $359.73 | $338.34 | $356.55 |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ 1,242,735 | $ (107,697) | $ (11,247) | $ (1,111,868) | $ (383,643) | $ (1,960,334) | $ (624,895) | $ (186,110) | $ 14,858 | $ (27,744) | $ (649,217) | $ 1,363,932 | $ (2,441,231) |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ (56,414) | $ 4,889 | $ 511 | $ 50,473 | $ 17,415 | $ 88,989 | $ 28,367 | $ 8,448 | $ (674) | $ 1,259 | $ 29,471 | $ (61,916) | $ 110,820 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ 1,606 | $ 3,078 | $ 2,933 | $ 1,489 | $ (440) | $ (3,472) | $ (6,823) | $ (7,890) | $ (8,133) | $ (8,171) | $ (9,069) | $ (8,169) | $ (43,061) |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ 1,187,927** | **$ (99,730)** | **$ (7,804)** | **$ (1,059,906)** | **$ (366,668)** | **$ (1,874,816)** | **$ (603,351)** | **$ (185,552)** | **$ 6,051** | **$ (34,656)** | **$ (628,814)** | **$ 1,293,847** | **$ (2,373,472)** |
| 26 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | $ 1,187,927 | $ 1,088,197 | $ 1,080,393 | $ 20,488 | $ (346,180) | $ (2,220,996) | $ (2,824,348) | $ (3,009,899) | $ (3,003,848) | $ (3,038,504) | $ (3,667,319) | $ (2,373,472) | |
| 25 | Total Cumulative Electric Deferral | (13) + (26) | $ 8,316 | $ 2,336,154 | $ 3,879,988 | $ 3,091,628 | $ 4,074,051 | $ 1,870,949 | $ (991,101) | $ (1,211,406) | $ (347,374) | $ 2,232,963 | $ 2,564,034 | $ 4,794,276 | |

## *Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

For natural gas, following steps in Schedule 175A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 175A. These steps are implemented in Table 1-7 and Table 1-8.[7] Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer for Group 1: Residential and Group 2: Non-Residential are then used to develop the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas, following the steps in Schedule 175B.

***Schedule 175A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each Rate Schedule. Table 1-7, Line 1 shows initial Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows Settlement Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 1, 2015). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Gas Supply Revenue. This Variable Gas Supply Revenue is shown on Line 6. It is the product of Normalized Therms by rate schedule from the last approved general rate case (2015 Rate Year) from Line 4 times the PGA Rates from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to determine Delivery Revenue, which is entered on Line 7. To determine the Delivery Revenue, the Variable Gas Supply Revenue is subtracted from the Total Normalized Revenue.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to calculate the Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed. Basic Charge Revenue is the product of the number of Customer Bills in the test period (2015 Rate Year) on Line 8 times the Settlement Basic Charges (Line 9). The result, Basic Charge Revenue, is shown on Line 10.[8]

**Step 5:** Determine the Allowed Decoupled Revenue. The Allowed Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery Revenue (from Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Line 10). The resulting Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, Decoupled Revenue from Line 11 is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Rate Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) as shown in Table 1-8.

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by modeling monthly therm use (by Rate Group) in relationship to the annual therm use for the rate year. This modeling is shown in Table 1-9.

[7] All tables in this section are attachments or parts of attachments to the Electric and Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment filings of August 31, 2016.

[8] For natural gas minimum charges are treated like fixed charges.

In Table 1-9, therm use for Group 1 (Residential) for 2015 is shown in Line 4 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 8. Both monthly therm values and the annual therm values are shown. Below the monthly values, percentages (Lines 5 and 9) are shown. Lines 14 and 18 show the use of these percentages, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) to generate monthly values.

These monthly values are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 175B.

*Table 1-7. 2015 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Natural Gas**

| | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 101 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 111 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 121 | INTERRUPTIBLE SCH 131 | SCHEDULES 112, 122, 132 | SCHEDULES 146 & 148 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Total Normalized 2015 Revenue (Appendix 2) | $ 153,075,000 | $ 110,008,000 | $ 34,391,000 | $ 3,645,000 | $ - | $ 1,055,000 | $ 3,976,000 |
| 2 Settlement Revenue Increase (Appendix 2) | $ 8,500,000 | $ 6,581,000 | $ 1,515,000 | $ 168,000 | $ - | $ 56,000 | $ 180,000 |
| 3 Total Rate Revenue (January 1, 2015) | $ 161,575,000 | $ 116,589,000 | $ 35,906,000 | $ 3,813,000 | $ - | $ 1,111,000 | $ 4,156,000 |
| 4 Normalized Therms (2015 Rate Year) | 247,662,972 | 117,011,207 | 46,256,893 | 5,507,204 | - | 1,721,574 | 77,166,094 |
| 5 PGA Rates | | $ 0.49803 | $ 0.49535 | $ 0.47449 | $ 0.44955 | | |
| 6 Variable Gas Supply Revenue | $ 83,801,557 | $ 58,275,091 | $ 22,913,352 | $ 2,613,113 | $ - | | |
| 7 Delivery Revenue (Ln 3 - Ln 6) | $ 72,506,443 | $ 58,313,909 | $ 12,992,648 | $ 1,199,887 | $ - | | |
| 8 Customer Bills (2015 Rate Year) | 1,833,425 | 1,802,235 | 30,276 | 305 | 0 | 48 | 561 |
| 9 Settlement Basic Charges | | $9.00 | $87.04 | $215.24 | $0.00 | | |
| 10 Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 18,920,986 | $ 16,220,115 | $ 2,635,223 | $ 65,648 | $ - | | |
| 11 Decoupled Revenue | $ 53,585,457 | $ 42,093,794 | $ 10,357,425 | $ 1,134,239 | $ - | Excluded From Decoupling | |

*Table 1-8. 2015 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Appendix 5, Page 1 | $ 42,093,794 | $ 11,491,664 |
| 2 | Rate Year # of Customers 2015 | Revenue Data | 150,186 | 2,548 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue Per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 280.28 | $ 4,509.33 |

*Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Revenues | | | |
| From Revenue Per Customer | $ 42,094,202 | $ 11,491,652 |
| From Basic Charges | $ 16,220,115 | $ 2,700,871 |
| From Gas Supply | $ 58,275,091 | $ 25,526,465 |
| Total | $ 116,589,409 | $ 39,718,988 |

## *Table 1-9. 2015 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**'Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | **Natural Gas Delivery Volume** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 20,096,515 | 16,729,826 | 14,285,474 | 9,202,394 | 5,127,082 | 3,376,941 | 2,456,171 | 2,227,453 | 2,907,962 | 6,931,034 | 13,836,643 | 19,833,713 | 117,011,207 |
| 5 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 17.17% | 14.30% | 12.21% | 7.86% | 4.38% | 2.89% | 2.10% | 1.90% | 2.49% | 5.92% | 11.83% | 16.95% | 100.00% |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 7,372,432 | 6,284,928 | 5,638,128 | 3,840,835 | 2,388,634 | 1,911,614 | 1,631,753 | 1,792,654 | 2,433,461 | 4,483,160 | 6,399,826 | 7,586,671 | 51,764,097 |
| 9 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 14.24% | 12.14% | 10.89% | 7.42% | 4.61% | 3.69% | 3.15% | 3.46% | 4.70% | 8.66% | 12.36% | 14.66% | 100.00% |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | - 2015 Decoupled RPC | Appendix 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 280.28 |
| 14 | - 2015 Monthly Decoupled RPC | (5) x (13) | $ 48.14 | $ 40.07 | $ 34.22 | $ 22.04 | $ 12.28 | $ 8.09 | $ 5.88 | $ 5.34 | $ 6.97 | $ 16.60 | $ 33.14 | $ 47.51 | $ 280.28 |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | - 2015 Decoupled RPC | Appendix 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 4,509.33 |
| 18 | - 2015 Monthly Decoupled RPC | (9) x (17) | $ 642.24 | $ 547.50 | $ 491.15 | $ 334.59 | $ 208.08 | $ 166.53 | $ 142.15 | $ 156.16 | $ 211.99 | $ 390.54 | $ 557.51 | $ 660.90 | $ 4,509.33 |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | *Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Schedule 175B - Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 175B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas service. The calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2015 is shown in Table 1-10.[9] In the full version of this table (Table 1-11), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2015 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2015. As shown in Table 1-11, the annual total decoupling deferral for Residential natural gas is $5,311,558. The annual total decoupling deferral for Non-Residential natural gas is $1,736,736.

*Table 1-10. 2015 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations*

| Line No. | Category | Source | Revised Jan-15 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 150,806 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 5, Page 3 | $48.14 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 7,259,455 |
| | Actual Usage | Revenue System | 20,316,016 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 9,163,509 |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,357,254 |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 7,806,255 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $51.76 |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (546,800) |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 24,495 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (707) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (523,012)** |
| | | | |
| 10 | Cumulative Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((7) ~ (9)) | $ (523,012) |
| | | | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 2,622 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 5, Page 3 | $642.24 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 1,683,941 |
| | Actual Usage | Revenue System | 6,976,301 |
| 14 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 1,739,453 |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 231,552 |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 1,507,901 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $575.10 |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ 176,039 |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ (7,886) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ 228 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ 168,381** |
| | | | |
| 20 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((17) ~ (19)) | $ 168,381 |
| | | | |
| 21 | Total Cumulative Natural Gas Deferral | (10) + (20) | $ (354,631) |

[9] Only one month is shown here to keep the table readable on the page. The full natural gas deferral table is shown in Table 1-11.

The individual steps in the Schedule 175B procedure are shown in both Table 1-10 and Table 1-11.

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to determine the actual number of customers each month. For Group 1: Residential, this is shown in Line 1 of Table 1-9 and Table 1-10. For Group 2: Non-Residential, this is shown in Line 11 of Table 1-11.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to multiply the actual number of customers (Line 1 for Residential; Line 11 for Non-Residential) by the applicable monthly Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2 for Residential; Line 12 for Non-Residential), which was developed in the Schedule 175A procedure. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Residential is shown on Line 3. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Non-Residential is shown on Line 13.

**Step 3:** Step 3 determines Actual Revenue collected. For Residential, this is shown on Line 4. For Non-Residential Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) is shown on Line 14.

**Step 4:** Step 4 shows the amount of Actual Fixed Charge Revenues included in Actual Revenues. This is shown on Line 5 for Residential and on Line 15 for Non-Residential.

**Step 5:** In Step 5, Actual Fixed Charge Revenue (Line 5 for Residential; Line 15 for Non-Residential) is subtracted from Actual Revenue (Line 4 for Residential; Line 14 for Non-Residential). The result is shown on Line 6 for Residential and on Line 16 for Non-Residential. At this point in the calculation all fixed charges have been removed, leaving only variable charges. In Table 1-10 this is shown as both Customer Decoupled Payments in total and as Revenue per Customer received.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue from Step 5 (Line 6 for Residential and Line 16 for Non-Residential) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue from Step 2 (Line 3 for Residential and Line 13 for Non-Residential) is calculated. The resulting balance (Lines 7, 8 and 9 for Residential and Lines 17, 18 and 19 for Non-Residential) is the Deferral Total.

Within Step 6, Line 7 for Residential and Line 17 for Non-Residential is the Direct Deferral (which is either a Surcharge or a Rebate).

Revenue Related Expenses are stated on Line 8 for Residential and Line 18 for Non-Residential. Below this, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission rate of interest (FERC Rate) is stated. Then, the result of the Average Balance Calculation is stated.

Line 9 (for Residential) and Line 19 (for Non-Residential) show the amount of Interest on Deferral. Below this, the result is the Deferral Totals.

For both Residential and Non-Residential, the Deferral Totals are positive, which would result in a surcharge.

# *Table 1-11. 2015 Development of Natural Gas Deferral*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Natural Gas Deferrals (Calendar Year 2015)**

| Line No. | | Source | Revised Jan-15 | Revised Feb-15 | Mar-15 | Apr-15 | May-15 | Jun-15 | Jul-15 | Aug-15 | Sep-15 | Oct-15 | Nov-15 | Dec-15 | 2015 Annual Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 150,806 | 150,842 | 150,516 | 150,480 | 150,641 | 150,509 | 150,813 | 150,779 | 151,278 | 152,195 | 152,484 | 153,235 | 1,814,578 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 5, Page 3 | $48.14 | $40.07 | $34.22 | $22.04 | $12.28 | $8.09 | $5.88 | $5.34 | $6.97 | $16.60 | $33.14 | $47.51 | $23.39 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 7,259,455 | $ 6,044,750 | $ 5,150,412 | $ 3,316,991 | $ 1,850,027 | $ 1,217,448 | $ 887,283 | $ 804,478 | $ 1,053,729 | $ 2,526,755 | $ 5,053,819 | $ 7,279,921 | $ 42,445,067 |
| | Actual Usage | Revenue System | 20,316,016 | 13,011,547 | 10,479,005 | 7,714,478 | 3,297,360 | 1,968,489 | 2,145,139 | 1,956,853 | 3,273,458 | 4,833,943 | 15,378,531 | 19,467,743 | |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 9,163,509 | $ 5,564,097 | $ 5,529,316 | $ 3,919,939 | $ 2,352,553 | $ 2,000,137 | $ 2,133,781 | $ 2,054,596 | $ 2,453,090 | $ 3,015,264 | $ 6,697,840 | $ 8,586,502 | |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,357,254 | $ 1,357,578 | $ 1,354,644 | $ 1,354,320 | $ 1,355,769 | $ 1,354,581 | $ 1,386,104 | $ 1,384,612 | $ 1,386,467 | $ 1,392,529 | $ 1,390,608 | $ 1,396,726 | |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 7,806,255 | $ 4,206,519 | $ 4,174,672 | $ 2,565,619 | $ 996,784 | $ 645,556 | $ 747,677 | $ 669,984 | $ 1,066,623 | $ 1,622,735 | $ 5,307,232 | $ 7,189,776 | $ 36,999,431 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $51.76 | $27.89 | $27.74 | $17.05 | $6.62 | $4.29 | $4.96 | $4.44 | $7.05 | $10.66 | $34.81 | $46.92 | $20.39 |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (546,800) | $ 1,838,231 | $ 975,740 | $ 751,372 | $ 853,243 | $ 571,893 | $ 139,606 | $ 134,493 | $ (12,893) | $ 904,020 | $ (253,413) | $ 90,145 | $ 5,445,637 |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 24,495 | $ (82,347) | $ (43,710) | $ (33,659) | $ (38,223) | $ (25,619) | $ (6,254) | $ (6,025) | $ 578 | $ (40,497) | $ 11,352 | $ (4,038) | $ (243,948) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (707) | $ 961 | $ 4,604 | $ 6,850 | $ 8,944 | $ 10,812 | $ 11,762 | $ 12,148 | $ 12,338 | $ 13,524 | $ 14,403 | $ 14,230 | $ 109,869 |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (523,012)** | **$ 1,756,845** | **$ 936,634** | **$ 724,563** | **$ 823,965** | **$ 557,086** | **$ 145,114** | **$ 140,617** | **$ 23** | **$ 877,047** | **$ (227,659)** | **$ 100,337** | **$ 5,311,558** |
| 10 | Cumulative Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((7) ~ (9)) | $ (523,012) | $ 1,233,833 | $ 2,170,467 | $ 2,895,030 | $ 3,718,994 | $ 4,276,080 | $ 4,421,193 | $ 4,561,810 | $ 4,561,833 | $ 5,438,880 | $ 5,211,221 | $ 5,311,558 | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 2,622 | 2,634 | 2,688 | 2,640 | 2,654 | 2,647 | 2,647 | 2,642 | 2,653 | 2,650 | 2,644 | 2,687 | 31,808 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Appendix 5, Page 3 | $642.24 | $547.50 | $491.15 | $334.59 | $208.08 | $166.53 | $142.15 | $156.16 | $211.99 | $390.54 | $557.51 | $660.90 | $375.97 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 1,683,941 | $ 1,442,114 | $ 1,320,224 | $ 883,310 | $ 552,248 | $ 440,796 | $ 376,263 | $ 412,584 | $ 562,400 | $ 1,034,936 | $ 1,474,053 | $ 1,775,834 | $ 11,958,701 |
| | Actual Usage | Revenue System | 6,976,301 | 6,062,129 | 4,366,524 | 3,881,256 | 2,151,394 | 1,884,766 | 1,570,309 | 1,559,112 | 2,190,921 | 2,990,095 | 6,044,897 | 6,497,733 | |
| 14 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 1,739,453 | $ 1,533,381 | $ 1,343,015 | $ 1,101,126 | $ 700,533 | $ 616,648 | $ 549,119 | $ 547,598 | $ 686,637 | $ 862,126 | $ 1,566,029 | $ 1,733,268 | |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 231,552 | $ 232,468 | $ 237,297 | $ 233,119 | $ 234,209 | $ 233,600 | $ 234,360 | $ 233,812 | $ 235,201 | $ 235,529 | $ 234,164 | $ 237,838 | |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 1,507,901 | $ 1,300,913 | $ 1,105,719 | $ 868,007 | $ 466,323 | $ 383,048 | $ 314,759 | $ 313,786 | $ 451,436 | $ 626,596 | $ 1,331,866 | $ 1,495,430 | $ 10,165,785 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $575.10 | $493.89 | $411.35 | $328.79 | $175.71 | $144.71 | $118.91 | $118.77 | $170.16 | $236.45 | $503.73 | $556.54 | $319.60 |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ 176,039 | $ 141,201 | $ 214,505 | $ 15,303 | $ 85,924 | $ 57,748 | $ 61,504 | $ 98,798 | $ 110,964 | $ 408,339 | $ 142,187 | $ 280,404 | $ 1,792,916 |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ (7,886) | $ (6,325) | $ (9,609) | $ (686) | $ (3,849) | $ (2,587) | $ (2,755) | $ (4,426) | $ (4,971) | $ (18,292) | $ (6,370) | $ (12,561) | $ (80,317) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ 228 | $ 639 | $ 1,101 | $ 1,401 | $ 1,535 | $ 1,725 | $ 1,884 | $ 2,097 | $ 2,374 | $ 3,052 | $ 3,772 | $ 4,329 | $ 24,137 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ 168,381** | **$ 135,514** | **$ 205,996** | **$ 16,018** | **$ 83,611** | **$ 56,886** | **$ 60,633** | **$ 96,469** | **$ 108,367** | **$ 393,099** | **$ 139,590** | **$ 272,172** | **$ 1,736,736** |
| 20 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge | Σ((17) ~ (19)) | $ 168,381 | $ 303,895 | $ 509,892 | $ 525,909 | $ 609,520 | $ 666,406 | $ 727,040 | $ 823,509 | $ 931,876 | $ 1,324,975 | $ 1,464,565 | $ 1,736,736 | |
| 21 | Total Cumulative Natural Gas Deferral | (10) + (20) | $ (354,631) | $ 1,537,728 | $ 2,680,358 | $ 3,420,939 | $ 4,328,514 | $ 4,942,486 | $ 5,148,233 | $ 5,385,319 | $ 5,493,708 | $ 6,763,854 | $ 6,675,786 | $ 7,048,294 | |

## 2015 Earnings Test

The decoupling mechanism, in Schedules 75D and 175D, provides for application of an earnings test, separately for electric and for natural gas.

### *Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 75D, the decoupling mechanism for electric is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-12, Line 3, the calculated rate of return on a normalized basis in 2015 is 7.40%. This exceeds the 7.32% allowed return established by Order 05 of Docket No. UE-140188 (Line 4). Excess Earnings (Line 6) is $1,113,401. A Conversion Factor is applied in Line 7. When the 50% Sharing is applied, the 2015 Total Earnings Test Sharing is $898,901 (Line 10).

*Table 1-12. 2015 Electric and Natural Gas Earnings Tests*

| Line Number | 2015 Commission Basis Earnings Test for Decoupling | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Category | Electric | Natural Gas |
| 1 | Rate Base | $ 1,338,806,000 | $ 272,971,000 |
| 2 | Net Income | $ 99,114,000 | $ 16,783,000 |
| 3 | Calculated ROR | 7.40% | 6.15% |
| 4 | Base ROR | 7.32% | 7.32% |
| 5 | Excess ROR | 0.08% | -1.17% |
| 6 | Excess Earnings | $ 1,113,401 | $ - |
| 7 | Conversion Factor | 0.619312 | 0.619450 |
| 8 | Excess Revenue (Excess Earnings/CF) | $ 1,797,803 | $ - |
| 9 | Sharing % | 50% | 50% |
| 10 | 2015 Total Earnings Test Sharing | **$ 898,901** | $ - |

For decoupled electric customers, the earnings test sharing amount is split between residential and non-residential customer groups in proportion to their contribution to total normalized revenue (see calculations in Table 1-13).

*Table 1-13. 2015 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment*

| | Revenue From 2015 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Residential Revenue | $ 216,224,542 | 49.58% |
| 12 | Non-Residential Revenue | $ 219,883,826 | 50.42% |
| 13 | Total Normalized Revenue | $ 436,108,368 | 100.00% |
| | **Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment** | Gross Revenue Adjustment | Net of Revenue Related Expenses |
| 14 | Residential | $ 445,679 | $ 424,638 |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ 453,222 | $ 431,824 |
| 16 | Total | $ 898,901 | |

### *Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 175D, the decoupling mechanism for natural gas is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-12, the rate of return on a normalized basis in 2015 is 6.15%. This is less than the 7.32% allowed return established by Order 05 of Docket No. UG-140189 which established the decoupled rates in effect in 2015.

Since the normalized return is less than the allowed return, the Earnings Test has no effect for Natural Gas customers for 2016.

## 2015 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation

Decoupling annual rate adjustment surcharges are subject to a 3% annual rate increase limitation (there is no reciprocal limit on rebate rate adjustments). The test is to divide the *incremental* annual revenue to be collected (proposed surcharge revenue minus present surcharge revenue) by the total "normalized" revenue for the two Rate Groups for the most recent January through December.

Normalized revenue is determined by multiplying the weather-corrected usage for the period by the present rates in effect. If the incremental amount of the proposed surcharge exceeds 3%, only a 3% incremental rate increase will apply. Any remaining deferred revenue will be carried over to the following years.

### *Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test*

The Electric Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-14. Specifications for the test limits the Residential Surcharge to 3% with the remainder deferred to the following year (Line 23). For Non-Residential customers, there is a Rebate of 1.4% (Line 24). The Residential Electric Carryover Deferred Revenue is $875,657 (Table 1-15, line 25). The Non-Residential Electric Carryover Deferred Revenue is $0.

*Table 1-14. 2015 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| Line No. | 3% Incremental Surcharge Test | Electric |
|---|---|---|
| | November 2016 - October 2017 Usage | |
| 1 | Residential | 2,465,787,464 |
| 2 | Non-Residential | 2,154,719,740 |
| | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 3 | Residential | $0.00300 |
| 4 | Non-Residential | -$0.00143 |
| | Present Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 5 | Residential | $0.00000 |
| 6 | Non-Residential | $0.00000 |
| | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 7 | Residential | $0.00300 |
| 8 | Non-Residential | -$0.00143 |
| 9 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 4,316,113 |
| 10 | Residential | $ 7,397,362 |
| 11 | Non-Residential | $ (3,081,249) |
| | Incremental Surcharge % | |
| 12 | Residential | **3.42%** |
| 13 | Non-Residential | **-1.40%** |
| | 3% Test Adjustment (1) | |
| 14 | Residential | $ (910,626) |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ - |
| | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | |
| 16 | Residential | -$0.00037 |
| 17 | Non-Residential | $0.00000 |
| | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 18 | Residential | $0.00263 |
| 19 | Non-Residential | -$0.00143 |
| 20 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | 3,403,772 |
| 21 | Residential | 6,485,021 |
| 22 | Non-Residential | (3,081,249) |
| | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | |
| 23 | Residential | **3.00%** |
| 24 | Non-Residential | **-1.40%** |

Notes

(1) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period.

*Table 1-15. 2015 Residential Electric Carryover Deferred Revenue*

| Line No. | | Ending Balance | Interest | Amortization |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Residential Electric | | | |
| | Calculate Estimated Monthly Balances through October 2017 | | | |
| | | | 3.25% Q1 2016<br>3.46% Q2 2016<br>3.50% Q3 2016 | |
| 1 | Dec-15 | $7,167,748 | | |
| 2 | Earnings Sharing Adjustment | ($424,638) | | |
| 3 | Adjusted December Balance | $6,743,110 | | |
| 4 | Jan-16 | $6,761,373 | $18,263 | |
| 5 | Feb-16 | $6,779,685 | $18,312 | |
| 6 | Mar-16 | $6,798,046 | $18,362 | |
| 7 | Apr-16 | $6,817,647 | $19,601 | |
| 8 | May-16 | $6,837,305 | $19,658 | |
| 9 | Jun-16 | $6,857,019 | $19,714 | |
| 10 | Jul-16 | $6,877,019 | $20,000 | |
| 11 | Aug-16 | $6,897,077 | $20,058 | |
| 12 | Sep-16 | $6,917,193 | $20,116 | |
| 13 | **Oct-16** | **$6,937,368** | $20,175 | |
| 14 | Nov-16 | $6,391,343 | $19,409 | $565,435 |
| 15 | Dec-16 | $5,699,185 | $17,606 | $709,764 |
| 16 | Jan-17 | $5,015,346 | $15,603 | $699,442 |
| 17 | Feb-17 | $4,459,555 | $13,797 | $569,588 |
| 18 | Mar-17 | $3,902,195 | $12,176 | $569,537 |
| 19 | Apr-17 | $3,453,624 | $10,712 | $459,283 |
| 20 | May-17 | $3,044,869 | $9,463 | $418,217 |
| 21 | Jun-17 | $2,651,240 | $8,295 | $401,924 |
| 22 | Jul-17 | $2,179,058 | $7,034 | $479,216 |
| 23 | Aug-17 | $1,715,582 | $5,671 | $469,148 |
| 24 | Sep-17 | $1,330,525 | $4,436 | $389,493 |
| 25 | **Oct-17** | **$875,657** | $3,213 | $458,081 |
| 26 | Total | | $321,674 | $6,189,127 |
| | **Summary** | | | |
| 27 | 2015 Deferred Revenue | $7,167,748 | | |
| 28 | Less Earnings Sharing | ($424,638) | | |
| 29 | Add Interest through 10/31/2017 | $321,674 | | |
| 30 | Add Revenue Related Expense Ad | $295,894 | | |
| 31 | Total Requested Recovery | $7,360,678 | | |
| 32 | Customer Surcharge Revenue | $6,485,021 | | |
| 33 | Carryover Deferred Revenue | $875,657 | | |

## *Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test*

The Natural Gas Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-16. The test limits the Residential and the Non-Residential Surcharge each to 3%. For both the Residential and the Non-Residential Groups, there is an additional revenue amount that is deferred to the following year.

*Table 1-16. 2015 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| | **3% Incremental Surcharge Test** | |
|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Natural Gas |
| | November 2016 - October 2017 Usage | |
| 1 | Residential | 119,200,013 |
| 2 | Non-Residential | 52,601,464 |
| | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 3 | Residential | $0.04872 |
| 4 | Non-Residential | $0.03613 |
| | Present Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 5 | Residential | $0.00000 |
| 6 | Non-Residential | $0.00000 |
| | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 7 | Residential | $0.04872 |
| 8 | Non-Residential | $0.03613 |
| 9 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 7,707,916 |
| 10 | Residential | $ 5,807,425 |
| 11 | Non-Residential | $ 1,900,491 |
| | Incremental Surcharge % | |
| 12 | Residential | **4.99%** |
| 13 | Non-Residential | **5.14%** |
| | 3% Test Adjustment (1) | |
| 14 | Residential | $ (2,318,875) |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ (791,747) |
| | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | |
| 16 | Residential | -$0.01945 |
| 17 | Non-Residential | -$0.01505 |
| | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | |
| 18 | Residential | $0.02927 |
| 19 | Non-Residential | $0.02108 |
| 20 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | 4,597,823 |
| 21 | Residential | 3,488,984 |
| 22 | Non-Residential | 1,108,839 |
| | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | |
| 23 | Residential | **3.00%** |
| 24 | Non-Residential | **3.00%** |
| | Notes | |
| | (1) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period. | |

For Residential Natural Gas, the Carryover Deferred Revenue is $2,261,112 (Table 1-17, Line 33).

*Table 1-17. 2015 Residential Natural Gas Carryover Deferred Revenue*

| | Residential Natural Gas | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Calculate Estimated Monthly Balances through October 2017 | | | |
| Line No. | | Ending Balance | Interest | Amortization |
| | | | 3.25% Q1 2016<br>3.46% Q2 2016<br>3.50% Q3 2016 | |
| 1 | Dec-15 | $5,317,198 | | |
| 2 | Earnings Sharing Adjustment | $0 | | |
| 3 | Adjusted December Balance | $5,317,198 | | |
| 4 | Jan-16 | $5,331,599 | $14,401 | |
| 5 | Feb-16 | $5,346,038 | $14,440 | |
| 6 | Mar-16 | $5,360,517 | $14,479 | |
| 7 | Apr-16 | $5,375,974 | $15,456 | |
| 8 | May-16 | $5,391,474 | $15,501 | |
| 9 | Jun-16 | $5,407,020 | $15,545 | |
| 10 | Jul-16 | $5,422,790 | $15,770 | |
| 11 | Aug-16 | $5,438,607 | $15,816 | |
| 12 | Sep-16 | $5,454,469 | $15,863 | |
| 13 | **Oct-16** | **$5,470,378** | $15,909 | |
| 14 | Nov-16 | $5,086,191 | $15,373 | $399,559 |
| 15 | Dec-16 | $4,521,334 | $13,991 | $578,847 |
| 16 | Jan-17 | $3,934,687 | $12,314 | $598,961 |
| 17 | Feb-17 | $3,457,978 | $10,765 | $487,474 |
| 18 | Mar-17 | $3,054,220 | $9,483 | $413,241 |
| 19 | Apr-17 | $2,815,654 | $8,548 | $247,114 |
| 20 | May-17 | $2,686,572 | $8,012 | $137,094 |
| 21 | Jun-17 | $2,615,315 | $7,721 | $78,978 |
| 22 | Jul-17 | $2,561,284 | $7,538 | $61,570 |
| 23 | Aug-17 | $2,513,130 | $7,389 | $55,543 |
| 24 | Sep-17 | $2,450,245 | $7,228 | $70,112 |
| 25 | **Oct-17** | **$2,261,112** | $6,861 | $195,994 |
| | | | | |
| 26 | Total | | $268,402 | $3,324,488 |
| | | | | |
| | **Summary** | | | |
| 27 | 2015 Deferred Revenue | $5,317,198 | | |
| 28 | Less Earnings Sharing | $0 | | |
| 29 | Add Interest through 10/31/2017 | $268,402 | | |
| 30 | Add Revenue Related Expense Adj. | $164,496 | | |
| 31 | Total Requested Recovery | $5,750,096 | | |
| 32 | Customer Surcharge Revenue | $3,488,984 | | |
| 33 | Carryover Deferred Revenue | $2,261,112 | | |

For Non-Residential Natural Gas, the Carryover Deferred Revenue is $770,314 (Table 1-18, Line 33).[10]

*Table 1-18. 2015 Non-Residential Natural Gas Carryover Deferred Revenue*

| | Non-Residential Natural Gas | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Calculate Estimated Monthly Balance through October 2017 | | | |
| Line No. | | Ending Balance | Interest | Amortization |
| | | | 3.25% Q1 2016<br>3.46% Q2 2016<br>3.50% Q3 2016 | |
| 1 | Dec-15 | $1,736,736 | | |
| 2 | Earnings Sharing Adjustment | $0 | | |
| 3 | Adjusted December Balance | $1,736,736 | | |
| 4 | Jan-16 | $1,741,440 | $4,704 | |
| 5 | Feb-16 | $1,746,156 | $4,716 | |
| 6 | Mar-16 | $1,750,885 | $4,729 | |
| 7 | Apr-16 | $1,755,934 | $5,048 | |
| 8 | May-16 | $1,760,997 | $5,063 | |
| 9 | Jun-16 | $1,766,074 | $5,078 | |
| 10 | Jul-16 | $1,771,225 | $5,151 | |
| 11 | Aug-16 | $1,776,391 | $5,166 | |
| 12 | Sep-16 | $1,781,572 | $5,181 | |
| 13 | **Oct-16** | **$1,786,769** | $5,196 | |
| 14 | Nov-16 | $1,662,289 | $5,023 | $129,502 |
| 15 | Dec-16 | $1,508,055 | $4,617 | $158,850 |
| 16 | Jan-17 | $1,353,347 | $4,167 | $158,875 |
| 17 | Feb-17 | $1,223,770 | $3,753 | $133,330 |
| 18 | Mar-17 | $1,113,406 | $3,403 | $113,768 |
| 19 | Apr-17 | $1,042,272 | $3,139 | $74,273 |
| 20 | May-17 | $998,010 | $2,971 | $47,233 |
| 21 | Jun-17 | $965,754 | $2,860 | $35,116 |
| 22 | Jul-17 | $934,225 | $2,767 | $34,295 |
| 23 | Aug-17 | $900,960 | $2,672 | $35,938 |
| 24 | Sep-17 | $859,553 | $2,564 | $43,970 |
| 25 | **Oct-17** | **$770,314** | $2,373 | $91,613 |
| | | | | |
| 26 | Total | | $90,341 | $1,056,763 |
| | | | | |
| | **Summary** | | | |
| 27 | 2015 Deferred Revenue | $1,736,736 | | |
| 28 | Less Earnings Sharing | $0 | | |
| 29 | Add Interest through 10/31/2017 | $90,341 | | |
| 30 | Add Revenue Related Expense Adj | $52,075 | | |
| 31 | Total Requested Recovery | $1,879,152 | | |
| 32 | Customer Surcharge Revenue | $1,108,839 | | |
| 33 | Carryover Deferred Revenue | $770,314 | | |

[10] The difference of $5,640 between the deferred revenue of $5,317,198 in Table 1-17 and the deferred revenue of $5,311,558 in Line 9 of Table 1-11 is the balance from a prior account associated with a previous decoupling mechanism.

## Decoupling Mechanism - 2016 Electric (Schedule 75) and Natural Gas (Schedule 175)

In this section, we review analysis of data from the test year from October 2013 through September 2014 (a historical test year), which was used to develop amounts for revenue recovery for calendar 2016. Recovery occurred from November 2017 through the end of October 2018 (the second rate year). The decoupling mechanism is designed to capture all fixed cost assigned for recovery through volumetric rates that is not actually recovered due to lower sales than expected during calendar 2016. This cost is recovered by allocation to customer bills according to a model. The decoupling deferrals total is based on comparison of the value of actual sales in calendar 2016 to the value of normalized sales (from October 2013 through September 2014) on a per customer basis.

As specified in Schedule 75 and Schedule 175, calculations were carried out separately and in parallel, for Residential and Non-Residential accounts. For each of these groups of accounts, the sum of monthly deferral amounts over calendar year 2016 is the cumulative deferral (rebate or surcharge). The cumulative deferral (with adjustments for prior year carryover balance, interest, and revenue related expense adjustment) is collected through the decoupling tariff on a volumetric basis from November 1, 2017 to October 31, 2018.

### *Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

First the electric service analysis is reviewed, then the analysis for natural gas service.

***Schedule 75A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

For electric service, following steps in Schedule 75A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 75A. These steps are implemented in Table 1-19 and Table 1-20.[11]

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each Rate Schedule. Table 1-19, Line 1 shows initial Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows the Allowed Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Power Supply Revenue. This value is shown on Line 6 and is the product of Normalized kWh (12 ME September 2014 Test Year) from Line 4 and Retail Revenue Adjustment from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to enter Delivery and Power Plant Revenue. This is constructed by subtraction of Variable Power Supply Revenue (Line 6) from the Total Normalized Revenue (Line 3) and is entered on Line 7.

[11] All tables in this section are attachments or parts of attachments to the Electric and Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment filings of August 31, 2017 for the 2016 deferral year.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to Remove Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed. Basic Charge Revenue is shown on Line 10. Basic Charge Revenue is the product of the number of Customer Bills in the GRC test year on Line 8 times the Allowed Basic Charge (Line 9).

**Step 5:** In Step 5, the Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery and Power Plant Revenue (Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Line 10). Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, (see Table 1-20) Decoupled Revenue is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Test Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group).

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by modeling monthly kWh use (by Rate Group) in relationship to the annual kWh use for the rate year. This modeling is shown in Table 1-21. Kilowatt hours for Group 1 (Residential) for the test year is shown in Line 3 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 6. Both monthly values and the annual kWh values are shown. Below the monthly values (Lines 4 and 7) monthly percentages are shown. Lines 11 and 14 use this percentage model, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group), to generate monthly values.

The monthly values developed following the steps in Schedule 75A are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 75B.

*Table 1-19. 2016 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Electric**

| | | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 1 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 11,12 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 21,22 | PUMPING SCH. 30, 31, 32 | EX LG GEN SVC SCHEDULE 25 | ST & AREA LTG SCH. 41-48 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Total Normalized 12 ME Sept 2014 Revenue | $ 499,982,000 | $ 214,841,000 | $ 71,304,000 | $ 130,152,000 | $ 11,471,000 | $ 65,194,000 | $ 7,020,000 |
| 2 | Allowed Revenue Increase (Attachment 1) | $ (8,110,000) | $ (3,478,000) | $ (1,159,000) | $ (2,118,000) | $ (187,000) | $ (1,056,000) | $ (112,000) |
| 3 | Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016) | $ 491,872,000 | $ 211,363,000 | $ 70,145,000 | $ 128,034,000 | $ 11,284,000 | $ 64,138,000 | $ 6,908,000 |
| 4 | Normalized kWhs (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 5,653,834,483 | 2,378,478,031 | 588,401,236 | 1,419,228,271 | 137,227,044 | 1,105,372,136 | 25,127,765 |
| 5 | Retail Revenue Adjustment (line 14) | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 |
| 6 | Variable Power Supply Revenue (L4 * L5) | $ 92,779,424 | $ 39,030,824 | $ 9,655,664 | $ 23,289,536 | $ 2,251,896 | $ 18,139,157 | $ 412,347 |
| 7 | Delivery & Power Plant Revenue (L3 - L6) | $ 346,598,080 | $ 172,332,176 | $ 60,489,336 | $ 104,744,464 | $ 9,032,104 | | |
| 8 | Customer Bills (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 2,879,945 | 2,462,067 | 364,552 | 24,110 | 29,216 | | |
| 9 | Allowed Basic Charges | | $ 8.50 | $ 18.00 | $ 500.00 | $ 18.00 | | |
| 10 | Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 40,070,394 | $ 20,927,570 | $ 6,561,936 | $ 12,055,000 | $ 525,888 | | |
| 11 | Decoupled Revenue | $ 306,527,686 | $ 151,404,606 | $ 53,927,400 | $ 92,689,464 | $ 8,506,216 | Excluded From Decoupling | |
| 12 | Retail Revenue Adjustment - (Attachment 3) | $0.01566 | | | | | | |
| 13 | Gross Up Factor for Revenue Related Exp | 104.81% | | | | | | |
| 14 | Grossed Up Retail Revenue Adjustment | $0.01641 | | | | | | |

| | | Residential | Non-Residential Group |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Average Number of Customers (Line 8 / 12) | 205,172 | 34,823 |
| 16 | Annual kWh | 2,378,478,031 | 2,144,856,551 |
| 17 | Basic Charge Revenues | 20,927,570 | 19,142,824 |
| 18 | Customer Bills | 2,462,067 | 417,878 |
| 19 | Average Basic Charge | $8.50 | $45.81 |

*Table 1-20. 2016 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Annual Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 151,404,606 | $ 155,123,080 |
| 2 | Test Year # of Customers 12 ME 09.2014 | Revenue Data | 205,172 | 34,823 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 737.94 | $ 4,454.59 |
| | * Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32. | | | |
| | Revenues | | | |
| | From revenue per customer | | $ 151,404,810 | $ 155,122,930 |
| | From basic charge | | $ 20,927,570 | $ 19,142,824 |
| | From power supply | | $ 39,030,824 | $ 35,197,096 |
| | Total | | $ 211,363,204 | $ 209,462,850 |

*Table 1-21. 2016 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | **Electric Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 284,675,925 | 232,597,855 | 228,752,581 | 172,322,869 | 166,632,549 | 148,170,954 | 153,360,033 | 181,322,317 | 146,560,541 | 174,054,557 | 212,665,464 | 277,362,386 | 2,378,478,031 |
| 4 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 11.97% | 9.78% | 9.62% | 7.25% | 7.01% | 6.23% | 6.45% | 7.62% | 6.16% | 7.32% | 8.94% | 11.66% | 100.00% |
| 5 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 174,546,983 | 177,500,854 | 166,289,029 | 165,417,455 | 178,108,889 | 185,503,197 | 200,737,081 | 187,588,012 | 179,420,897 | 183,203,251 | 168,530,619 | 178,010,284 | 2,144,856,551 |
| 7 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 8.14% | 8.28% | 7.75% | 7.71% | 8.30% | 8.65% | 9.36% | 8.75% | 8.37% | 8.54% | 7.86% | 8.30% | 100.00% |
| 8 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | -UE-150204 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 737.94 |
| 11 | - Monthly Decoupled RPC | (4) x (10) | $ 88.32 | $ 72.17 | $ 70.97 | $ 53.46 | $ 51.70 | $ 45.97 | $ 47.58 | $ 56.26 | $ 45.47 | $ 54.00 | $ 65.98 | $ 86.05 | $ 737.94 |
| 12 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | -UE-150204 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 4,454.59 |
| 14 | - Monthly Decoupled RPC | (7) x (13) | $ 362.51 | $ 368.65 | $ 345.36 | $ 343.55 | $ 369.91 | $ 385.27 | $ 416.90 | $ 389.60 | $ 372.63 | $ 380.49 | $ 350.02 | $ 369.70 | $ 4,454.59 |

* Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32.

***Schedule 75B - Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 75B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for electric service. For Group 1 (Residential), the calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2016 is shown in the top part of Table 1-22.[12] For Group 2 (Non-Residential) the calculation method is shown in the bottom part of Table 1-22. In the full version of this table (Table 1-23), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2016 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2016. For the Electric Residential, deferred revenue for 2016 is $10,288,205. For Electric Non-Residential, deferred revenue for 2016 is $1,967,777

Residential Decoupling Deferrals (Step 2 of Schedule 75B) corresponds to Line 3 in the top part of Table 1-22 and the top part of Table 1-23. It is calculated by multiplying the number of Actual Customers (Line 1) by the Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2).

Residential Actual Revenue collected in a month (Step 3 of Schedule 75B) is shown on Line 4.

The Residential Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Step 4) is shown on Line 5. The total revenue collected related to the variable power supply (Step 5) is shown on Line 8. This is the product of Actual kWh Sales (Line 6) and the Retail Revenue Credit (Line 7).

Residential Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6) is calculated by subtracting the Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Line 4) and the variable power supply revenue (Line 8) from the Actual Base Rate Revenue and is shown on Line 9.

The Monthly Residential Deferral Total for each month (Step 7) is shown just below Line 12. This is the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6; Line 9) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue (Step 2; Line 3) plus any interest on the deferral.

Interest on the deferred balance accrues at the quarterly rate published by the FERC. In Table 1-23, these values are cumulatively incremented by month over 2016 on Line 13 and the electric deferred revenue for 2016 shown on Line 13 at the right is $10,288,205. This is the Residential value given by Avista on page 2 of 6 in the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing in compliance with Commission Order No. 05 in Docket No. UE-140188 on August 31, 2017.

For Electric Non-Residential, Schedule 75B specifies the method for developing the Monthly Decoupling Deferral for electric service. In the full version of this table (bottom section of Table 1-23), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2016 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2016 (for Electric Non-Residential) of $1,967,777. This is the Electric Non-Residential value given on Page 3 of 6 in the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing in compliance with Commission Order No. 05 in Docket No. UE-140188 on August 31, 2017. Since deferred revenue is positive, Electric Non-Residential receives a surcharge.

The calculations and the Excel programming are identical for Electric Residential and Electric Non-Residential.[13]

[12] Only the first few columns of the table are shown here, to keep the table readable on the page.

[13] New rates became effective January 11, 2016. Deferred revenue calculations for the first 10 days of January 2016 were calculated at the rates prior to the change. January 11th through the 31st was calculated using the new rates.

*Table 1-22. 2016 Electric Deferral Calculations*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UE-150204 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2016)**

| Line No. | | Source | 32% Old Base | 68% New Base | Pro Rated Jan-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | | | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 67,166.77 | 141,050.23 | 208,217 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $78.81 | $88.32 | $85.25 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 5,293,368 | $ 12,457,946 | $ 17,751,313 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 8,069,977 | $ 16,946,951 | $ 25,016,927 |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 582,373 | $ 1,222,984 | $ 1,805,358 |
| 6 | Acutal Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 88,782,350 | 186,442,936 | 275,225,286 |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01792 |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ 1,871,532 | $ 3,059,529 | $ 4,931,061 |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ 5,616,071 | $ 12,664,438 | $ 18,280,509 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $83.61 | $89.79 | $87.80 |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ (322,704) | $ (206,492) | $ (529,196) |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 14,649 | $ 9,474 | $ 24,123 |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (684) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ (505,757)** |
| 13 | Cumulative Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | | | $ (505,757) |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 11,397.10 | 23,933.90 | 35,331 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $356.03 | $362.51 | $360.42 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ 4,057,746 | $ 8,676,316 | $ 12,734,062 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 5,689,116 | $ 11,947,143 | $ 17,636,258 |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 512,506 | $ 1,076,263 | $ 1,588,769 |
| 19 | Acutal Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 57,402,939 | 120,546,172 | 177,949,111 |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01792 |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ 1,210,054 | $ 1,978,163 | $ 3,188,217 |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ 3,966,555 | $ 8,892,717 | $ 12,859,272 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $348.03 | $371.55 | $363.97 |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ 91,191 | $ (216,401) | $ (125,210) |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ (4,140) | $ 9,928 | $ 5,789 |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (162) |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ (119,583)** |
| 26 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | | | $ (119,583) |
| 27 | **Total Cumulative Electric Deferral** | **(13) + (26)** | | | $ (625,340) |

# *Table 1-23. 2016 Development of Electric Deferral*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UE-150204 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2016)**

| Line No. | | Source | 32% Old Base | 68% New Base | Pro Rated Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | | | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 67,166.77 | 141,050.23 | 208,217 | 210,418 | 209,750 | 209,405 | 209,004 | 208,965 | 209,204 | 209,512 | 210,314 | 210,674 | 211,346 | 211,562 | 2,518,371 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $78.81 | $88.32 | $85.25 | $72.17 | $70.97 | $53.46 | $51.70 | $45.97 | $47.58 | $56.26 | $45.47 | $54.00 | $65.98 | $86.05 | $734.87 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 5,293,368 | $ 12,457,946 | $ 17,751,313 | $ 15,184,850 | $ 14,886,407 | $ 11,195,716 | $ 10,805,288 | $ 9,606,353 | $ 9,954,148 | $ 11,786,424 | $ 9,563,286 | $ 11,376,751 | $ 13,944,820 | $ 18,205,690 | $ 154,261,045 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 8,069,977 | $ 16,946,951 | $ 25,016,927 | $ 18,682,934 | $ 17,505,111 | $ 13,895,473 | $ 12,707,668 | $ 13,822,017 | $ 15,745,170 | $ 16,208,773 | $ 13,825,250 | $ 13,859,174 | $ 17,109,790 | $ 25,244,722 | $ 203,623,009 |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 582,373 | $ 1,222,984 | $ 1,805,358 | $ 1,824,049 | $ 1,818,745 | $ 1,824,228 | $ 1,831,181 | $ 1,838,974 | $ 1,833,280 | $ 1,848,334 | $ 1,838,516 | $ 1,835,029 | $ 1,834,655 | $ 1,836,304 | $ 21,968,649 |
| 6 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System Attachment 4, | 88,782,350 | 186,442,936 | 275,225,286 | 209,519,142 | 198,506,123 | 156,664,757 | 142,430,315 | 156,502,975 | 178,634,451 | 181,567,778 | 154,183,097 | 157,178,161 | 193,299,820 | 284,514,826 | 2,288,226,731 |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Page 1 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01792 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ 1,871,532 | $ 3,059,529 | $ 4,931,061 | $ 3,438,209 | $ 3,257,485 | $ 2,570,869 | $ 2,337,281 | $ 2,568,214 | $ 2,931,391 | $ 2,979,527 | $ 2,530,145 | $ 2,579,294 | $ 3,172,050 | $ 4,668,888 | $ 37,964,414 |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ 5,616,071 | $ 12,664,438 | $ 18,280,509 | $ 13,420,676 | $ 12,428,881 | $ 9,500,377 | $ 8,539,206 | $ 9,414,829 | $ 10,980,499 | $ 11,380,912 | $ 9,456,589 | $ 9,444,852 | $ 12,103,086 | $ 18,739,530 | $ 143,689,946 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $83.61 | $89.79 | $87.80 | $63.78 | $59.26 | $45.37 | $40.86 | $45.05 | $52.49 | $54.32 | $44.96 | $44.83 | $57.27 | $88.58 | |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ (322,704) | $ (206,492) | $ (529,196) | $ 1,764,174 | $ 2,457,526 | $ 1,695,339 | $ 2,266,082 | $ 191,524 | $ (1,026,351) | $ 405,512 | $ 106,697 | $ 1,931,899 | $ 1,841,734 | $ (533,841) | $ 10,571,099 |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 14,649 | $ 9,474 | $ 24,123 | $ (80,940) | $ (112,751) | $ (77,782) | $ (103,968) | $ (8,787) | $ 47,089 | $ (18,605) | $ (4,895) | $ (88,636) | $ (84,499) | $ 24,493 | $ (485,159) |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (684) | $ 910 | $ 6,367 | $ 12,509 | $ 17,994 | $ 21,426 | $ 20,575 | $ 19,771 | $ 20,541 | $ 23,438 | $ 28,757 | $ 30,661 | $ 202,264 |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ (505,757)** | **$ 1,684,144** | **$ 2,351,141** | **$ 1,630,066** | **$ 2,180,108** | **$ 204,163** | **$ (958,687)** | **$ 406,678** | **$ 122,343** | **$ 1,866,701** | **$ 1,785,992** | **$ (478,687)** | **$ 10,288,205** |
| 13 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | | | $ (505,757) | $ 1,178,387 | $ 3,529,528 | $ 5,159,594 | $ 7,339,701 | $ 7,543,864 | $ 6,585,177 | $ 6,991,856 | $ 7,114,199 | $ 8,980,900 | $ 10,766,892 | **$ 10,288,205** | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 11,397.10 | 23,933.90 | 35,331 | 35,572 | 35,571 | 35,497 | 35,658 | 35,516 | 35,519 | 35,694 | 35,669 | 35,828 | 35,762 | 35,782 | 427,399 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $356.03 | $362.51 | $360.42 | $368.65 | $345.36 | $343.55 | $369.91 | $385.27 | $416.90 | $389.60 | $372.63 | $380.49 | $350.02 | $369.70 | $4,452.50 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ 4,057,746 | $ 8,676,316 | $ 12,734,062 | $ 13,113,488 | $ 12,284,830 | $ 12,195,019 | $ 13,190,221 | $ 13,683,114 | $ 14,808,048 | $ 13,906,242 | $ 13,291,483 | $ 13,632,177 | $ 12,517,284 | $ 13,228,762 | $ 158,584,729 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 5,689,116 | $ 11,947,143 | $ 17,636,258 | $ 16,471,105 | $ 16,873,160 | $ 16,097,542 | $ 17,385,509 | $ 18,365,177 | $ 19,234,390 | $ 18,762,263 | $ 17,379,615 | $ 17,841,080 | $ 16,178,487 | $ 18,917,894 | $ 211,142,481 |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 512,506 | $ 1,076,263 | $ 1,588,769 | $ 1,582,404 | $ 1,565,686 | $ 1,575,041 | $ 1,566,939 | $ 1,572,602 | $ 1,567,372 | $ 1,565,138 | $ 1,570,581 | $ 1,567,535 | $ 1,580,197 | $ 1,573,244 | $ 18,875,508 |
| 19 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System Attachment 4, | 57,402,939 | 120,546,172 | 177,949,111 | 164,762,769 | 170,862,451 | 162,142,313 | 179,654,733 | 189,325,960 | 201,220,320 | 194,881,850 | 178,530,679 | 182,657,424 | 160,599,007 | 196,411,492 | 2,158,998,109 |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Page 1 | $ 0.02108 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01792 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ 1,210,054 | $ 1,978,163 | $ 3,188,217 | $ 2,703,757 | $ 2,803,853 | $ 2,660,755 | $ 2,948,134 | $ 3,106,839 | $ 3,302,025 | $ 3,198,011 | $ 2,929,688 | $ 2,997,408 | $ 2,635,430 | $ 3,223,113 | $ 35,697,231 |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ 3,966,555 | $ 8,892,717 | $ 12,859,272 | $ 12,184,944 | $ 12,503,621 | $ 11,861,746 | $ 12,870,436 | $ 13,685,737 | $ 14,364,993 | $ 13,999,113 | $ 12,879,346 | $ 13,276,136 | $ 11,962,861 | $ 14,121,538 | $ 156,569,743 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $348.03 | $371.55 | $363.97 | $342.54 | $351.51 | $334.16 | $360.94 | $385.34 | $404.43 | $392.20 | $361.08 | $370.55 | $334.51 | $394.65 | |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ 91,191 | $ (216,401) | $ (125,210) | $ 928,544 | $ (218,791) | $ 333,273 | $ 319,784 | $ (2,623) | $ 443,056 | $ (92,871) | $ 412,137 | $ 356,041 | $ 554,423 | $ (892,776) | $ 2,014,986 |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ (4,140) | $ 9,928 | $ 5,789 | $ (42,602) | $ 10,038 | $ (15,291) | $ (14,672) | $ 120 | $ (20,327) | $ 4,261 | $ (18,909) | $ (16,335) | $ (25,437) | $ 40,961 | $ (92,403) |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (162) | $ 876 | $ 1,795 | $ 2,074 | $ 2,978 | $ 3,423 | $ 4,085 | $ 4,585 | $ 5,042 | $ 6,126 | $ 7,410 | $ 6,961 | $ 45,194 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ (119,583)** | **$ 886,818** | **$ (206,958)** | **$ 320,056** | **$ 308,091** | **$ 920** | **$ 426,814** | **$ (84,026)** | **$ 398,270** | **$ 345,832** | **$ 536,397** | **$ (844,854)** | **$ 1,967,777** |
| 26 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | | | $ (119,583) | $ 767,235 | $ 560,277 | $ 880,333 | $ 1,188,424 | $ 1,189,344 | $ 1,616,158 | $ 1,532,132 | $ 1,930,403 | $ 2,276,234 | $ 2,812,631 | **$ 1,967,777** | |
| 25 | **Total Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance** | **(13) + (26)** | | | $ (625,340) | $ 1,945,621 | $ 4,089,805 | $ 6,039,927 | $ 8,528,126 | $ 8,733,209 | $ 8,201,335 | $ 8,523,988 | $ 9,044,601 | $ 11,257,134 | $ 13,579,523 | **$ 12,255,982** | |

## *Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

For natural gas, following steps in Schedule 175A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 175A. These steps are implemented in Table 1-24 and Table 1-25.[14] Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer for Group 1: Residential and Group 2: Non-Residential are then used to develop the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas, following the steps in Schedule 175B.

***Schedule 175A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each rate class. Table 1-24, Line 1 shows initial Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows Allowed Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Gas Supply Revenue. This Variable Gas Supply Revenue is shown on Line 6. It the product of Normalized Therms by rate schedule from the last approved general rate case from Line 4 times the PGA Rates from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to determine Delivery Revenue, which is entered on Line 7. To determine the Delivery Revenue, the Variable Gas Supply Revenue is subtracted from the Total Normalized Revenue.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to calculate the Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed. It is the product of the number of Customer Bills in the test period on Line 8 times the Allowed Basic Charges (Line 9). The result, Basic Charge Revenue, is shown on Line 10.

**Step 5:** Determine the Allowed Decoupled Revenue. The Allowed Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery (from Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Line 10). The resulting Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, Decoupled Revenue from Line 11 is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Test Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) as shown in Table 1-25.

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by first calculating the distribution of monthly therm use in the test year. This calculation is shown in Table 1-26.

[14] All tables in this section are attachments or parts of attachments to the Electric and Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment filings of August 31, 2017 for the 2016 deferral year.

In Table 1-26, therm use for Group 1 (Residential) for test year is shown in Line 4 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 8. Both monthly therm values and the annual therm values are shown. Below the monthly values, percentages (Lines 5 and 9) are shown. Lines 14 and 18 show the use of these percentages, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) to generate monthly values.

These monthly values are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 175B.

*Table 1-24. 2016 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Natural Gas**

| | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 101 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 111 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 121 | INTERRUPTIBLE SCH 131 | SCHEDULES 112, 122, 132 | SCHEDULES 146 & 148 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Total Normalized 12 ME Sept 2014 Revenue | $ 146,557,000 | $ 106,954,000 | $ 31,478,000 | $ 2,973,000 | $ - | $ 968,000 | $ 4,184,000 |
| 2 Allowed Revenue Increase (Attachment 2) | $ 10,824,000 | $ 8,398,000 | $ 1,867,000 | $ 161,000 | $ - | $ 40,000 | $ 358,000 |
| 3 Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016) | $ 157,381,000 | $ 115,352,000 | $ 33,345,000 | $ 3,134,000 | $ - | $ 1,008,000 | $ 4,542,000 |
| 4 Normalized Therms (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 255,186,931 | 120,721,607 | 47,537,282 | 5,069,530 | - | 1,781,211 | 80,077,301 |
| 5 11/1/2015 Schedule 150 PGA Rates | | $ 0.38907 | $ 0.38166 | $ 0.37077 | $ 0.33645 | | |
| 6 Variable Gas Supply Revenue | $ 66,991,864 | $ 46,969,156 | $ 18,143,079 | $ 1,879,630 | $ - | | |
| 7 Delivery Revenue (Ln 3 - Ln 6) | $ 84,839,136 | $ 68,382,844 | $ 15,201,921 | $ 1,254,370 | $ - | | |
| 8 Customer Bills (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 1,819,516 | 1,787,943 | 30,697 | 312 | 0 | 48 | 516 |
| 9 Allowed Basic Charges | | $9.00 | $101.44 | $252.28 | $0.00 | | |
| 10 Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 19,284,102 | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,113,904 | $ 78,711 | $ - | | |
| 11 Decoupled Revenue | $ 65,555,034 | $ 52,291,357 | $ 12,088,017 | $ 1,175,659 | $ - | Excluded From Decoupling | |

| | Residential | Non-Residential Group |
|---|---|---|
| 12 Average Number of Customers (Line 8 / 12) | 148,995 | 2,584 |
| 13 Annual Therms | 120,721,607 | 52,606,812 |
| 14 Basic Charge Revenues | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,192,615 |
| 15 Customer Bills | 1,787,943 | 31,009 |
| 16 Average Basic Charge | $9.00 | $102.96 |

*Table 1-25. 2016 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**

**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Attachment 5, Page 1 | $ 52,291,357 | $ 13,263,676 |
| 2 | Test Year # of Customers 12 ME 09.2014 | Revenue Data | 148,995 | 2,584 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue Per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 350.96 | $ 5,132.84 |
| | *Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131. | | | |
| | | Revenues | | |
| | | From Revenue Per Customer | $ 52,291,373 | $ 13,263,686 |
| | | From Basic Charges | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,192,615 |
| | | From Gas Supply | $ 46,969,156 | $ 20,022,709 |
| | | Total | $ 115,352,016 | $ 36,479,010 |

*Table 1-26. 2016 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**'Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | **Natural Gas Delivery Volume** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 21,149,989 | 17,496,849 | 14,113,448 | 7,866,788 | 4,895,089 | 2,998,022 | 2,095,088 | 2,047,777 | 2,727,612 | 8,666,827 | 14,928,966 | 21,735,152 | 120,721,607 |
| 5 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 17.52% | 14.49% | 11.69% | 6.52% | 4.05% | 2.48% | 1.74% | 1.70% | 2.26% | 7.18% | 12.37% | 18.00% | 100.00% |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 7,724,199 | 6,497,617 | 5,741,989 | 3,833,669 | 3,002,355 | 2,283,253 | 1,727,751 | 1,696,708 | 2,070,681 | 4,248,069 | 5,991,318 | 7,789,203 | 52,606,812 |
| 9 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 14.68% | 12.35% | 10.91% | 7.29% | 5.71% | 4.34% | 3.28% | 3.23% | 3.94% | 8.08% | 11.39% | 14.81% | 100.00% |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | -UG-150205 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 350.96 |
| 14 | -Monthly Decoupled RPC | (5) x (13) | $ 61.49 | $ 50.87 | $ 41.03 | $ 22.87 | $ 14.23 | $ 8.72 | $ 6.09 | $ 5.95 | $ 7.93 | $ 25.20 | $ 43.40 | $ 63.19 | $ 350.96 |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | -UG-150205 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 5,132.84 |
| 18 | -Monthly Decoupled RPC | (9) x (17) | $ 753.65 | $ 633.97 | $ 560.25 | $ 374.05 | $ 292.94 | $ 222.78 | $ 168.58 | $ 165.55 | $ 202.04 | $ 414.48 | $ 584.57 | $ 759.99 | $ 5,132.84 |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | *Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Schedule 175B – Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 175B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas service. For Group 1 (Residential), the calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2016 is shown in Table 1-27.[15] In the full version of this table (Table 1-28), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2016 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2016. As shown in Table 1-28, the annual total decoupling deferral for Residential natural gas is $7,152,977. The annual total decoupling deferral for Non-Residential natural gas is $2,002,654.

The individual steps in the Schedule 175B procedure are shown in both Table 1-27 and Table 1-28.[16]

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to Determine the actual number of customers each month. For Group 1 (Residential), this is shown in Line 1 of Table 1-27 and Table 1-28. For Group 2 (Non-Residential), this is shown in Line 11.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to multiply the actual number of customers (Line 1 for Residential; Line 11 for Non-Residential) by the applicable monthly Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2 for Residential; Line 12 for Non-Residential), which was developed in the Schedule 175A procedure. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Residential is shown on Line 3. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Non-Residential is shown on Line 13.

**Step 3:** Step 3 determines Actual Revenue collected. For Residential, this is shown on Line 4. For Non-Residential Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) is shown on Line 14.

**Step 4:** Step 4 calculates the amount of Actual Fixed Charge Revenues included in Actual Revenues. This is shown on Line 5 for Residential and on Line 15 for Non-Residential.

**Step 5:** In Step 5, Actual Fixed Charge Revenue (Line 5 for Residential; Line 15 for Non-Residential) is subtracted from Actual Revenue (Line 4 for Residential; Line 14 for Non-Residential). The result is shown on Line 6 for Residential and on Line 16 for Non-Residential. At this point in the calculation all fixed charges have been removed, leaving only variable charges. In Table 1-28 this is shown as both Customer Decoupled Payments in total and as Revenue per Customer received.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue from Step 5 (Line 6 for Residential and Line 16 for Non-Residential) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue from Step 2 (Line 3 for Residential and Line 13 for Non-Residential) is calculated. The resulting balance (Lines 7, 8 and 9 for Residential and Lines 17, 18 and 19 for Non-Residential) is the Deferral Total.

Within Step 6, Line 7 for Residential and Line 17 for Non-Residential is the Direct Deferral (which is either a Surcharge or a Rebate).

---

[15] Only one month is shown here to keep the table readable on the page. The full natural gas deferral table is shown in Table 1-28.

[16] New rates became effective January 11, 2016. Deferred revenue calculations for the first 10 days of January 2016 were calculated at the rates prior to the change. January 11th through the 31st was calculated using the new rates.

Revenue Related Expense are stated on Line 8 for Residential and Line 18 for Non-Residential. Below this, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission rate of interest (FERC Rate) is stated. Then, the result of the Average Balance Calculation is stated.

Line 9 (for Residential) and Line 19 (for Non-Residential) show the amount of Interest on Deferral. Below this, the result is the Deferral Totals.

For Residential, the Deferral Total is $7,152,977. This result is reported by Avista on Page 2 of 5 in the letter of transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission dated August 31, 2017. For Non-Residential, the Deferral Total is $2,002,654. Since both are positive, both result in a surcharge. This result is reported by Avista on Page 3 of 5 in the letter of transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission dated August 31, 2017.

*Table 1-27. 2016 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UG-150205 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Natural Gas Deferrals (Calendar Year 2016)**

| Line No. | | Source | 32% Old Base | 68% New Base | Pro Rated Jan-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | | | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 49,326.45 | 103,585.55 | 152,912 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $48.14 | $61.49 | $57.18 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 2,374,462 | $ 6,369,157 | $ 8,743,619 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | Revenue System | 6,502,859 | 13,656,003 | 20,158,862 |
| | Actual Base Rate Revenue | | | | |
| 4 | (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 3,329,859 | $ 6,992,704 | $ 10,322,563 |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 449,251 | $ 943,427 | $ 1,392,678 |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 2,880,608 | $ 6,049,277 | $ 8,929,885 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $58.40 | $58.40 | $58.40 |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (506,146) | $ 319,880 | $ (186,266) |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 22,674 | $ (14,608) | $ 8,066 |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (241) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ (178,442)** |
| 10 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate) Balance | Σ((7) + (9)) | | | $ (178,442) |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 859.35 | 1,804.65 | 2,664 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $642.24 | $753.65 | $717.71 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 551,908 | $ 1,360,069 | $ 1,911,977 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | | | | 6,913,974 |
| | Actual Base Rate Revenue | | | | |
| 14 | (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 642,749 | $ 1,349,772 | $ 1,992,521 |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 78,920 | $ 165,731 | $ 244,651 |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 563,829 | $ 1,184,041 | $ 1,747,870 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $656.11 | $656.11 | $656.11 |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ (11,921) | $ 176,028 | $ 164,107 |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 534 | $ (8,039) | $ (7,505) |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ 212 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | | | **$ 156,815** |
| 20 | Cumulative Deferral Surcharge(Rebate) Balance | Σ((17) + (19)) | | | $ 156,815 |
| **21** | **Total Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)** | **(10) + (20)** | | | $ (21,627) |

*Table 1-28. 2016 Development of Natural Gas Deferral*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UG-150205 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Natural Gas Deferrals (Calendar Year 2016)**

| Line No. | | Source | 32% Old Rate | 68% New Rate | Pro Rated Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | | | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 49,326.45 | 103,585.55 | 152,912 | 153,882 | 153,511 | 153,360 | 153,389 | 153,224 | 153,459 | 153,740 | 154,156 | 154,684 | 155,353 | 155,792 | 1,847,462 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $48.14 | $61.49 | $57.18 | $50.87 | $41.03 | $22.87 | $14.23 | $8.72 | $6.09 | $5.95 | $7.93 | $25.20 | $43.40 | $63.19 | $346.65 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 2,374,462 | $ 6,369,157 | $ 8,743,619 | $ 7,827,450 | $ 6,298,618 | $ 3,507,375 | $ 2,182,868 | $ 1,335,470 | $ 934,689 | $ 915,255 | $ 1,222,406 | $ 3,897,428 | $ 6,742,516 | $ 9,844,200 | $ 53,451,894 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | Revenue System | 6,502,859 | 13,656,003 | 20,158,862 | 14,313,636 | 12,256,797 | 5,360,973 | 3,390,462 | 2,769,530 | 2,296,193 | 2,357,534 | 3,002,763 | 7,275,160 | 11,371,978 | 24,244,299 | 108,796,187 |
| | Actual Base Rate Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 3,329,859 | $ 6,992,704 | $ 10,322,563 | $ 7,563,312 | $ 6,495,025 | $ 3,429,418 | $ 2,661,586 | $ 2,472,638 | $ 2,330,790 | $ 2,442,106 | $ 2,614,492 | $ 4,372,648 | $ 6,355,325 | $ 11,925,970 | $ 63,005,911 |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 449,251 | $ 943,427 | $ 1,392,678 | $ 1,402,065 | $ 1,398,500 | $ 1,402,369 | $ 1,406,025 | $ 1,409,895 | $ 1,407,339 | $ 1,411,326 | $ 1,411,704 | $ 1,414,453 | $ 1,417,998 | $ 1,420,221 | $ 16,896,382 |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 2,880,608 | $ 6,049,277 | $ 8,929,885 | $ 6,161,247 | $ 5,096,525 | $ 2,027,049 | $ 1,255,561 | $ 1,062,743 | $ 923,451 | $ 1,028,900 | $ 1,222,788 | $ 2,958,235 | $ 4,937,318 | $ 10,505,750 | $ 46,109,530 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $58.40 | $58.40 | $58.40 | $40.04 | $33.20 | $13.22 | $8.19 | $6.94 | $6.02 | $6.69 | $7.93 | $19.12 | $31.78 | $67.43 | |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (506,146) | $ 319,880 | $ (186,266) | $ 1,666,203 | $ 1,202,093 | $ 1,480,346 | $ 927,307 | $ 272,727 | $ 11,238 | $ (113,725) | $ (38) | $ 939,193 | $ 1,805,178 | $ (661,549) | $ 7,342,364 |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 22,674 | $ (14,608) | $ 8,066 | $ (76,092) | $ (54,897) | $ (67,604) | $ (42,348) | $ (12,455) | $ (511) | $ 5,194 | $ 17 | $ (42,891) | $ (82,439) | $ 30,212 | $ (335,752) |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ (241) | $ 1,670 | $ 5,381 | $ 9,435 | $ 12,775 | $ 14,463 | $ 15,067 | $ 14,969 | $ 14,853 | $ 16,203 | $ 20,070 | $ 21,720 | $ 146,365 |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals:** | | | | **$ (178,442)** | **$ 1,591,781** | **$ 1,152,577** | **$ 1,422,177** | **$ 897,734** | **$ 274,735** | **$ 25,792** | **$ (93,563)** | **$ 14,489** | **$ 912,505** | **$ 1,742,809** | **$ (639,617)** | **$ 7,152,977** |
| 10 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate) Balance | 2nd(7) + (9)) | | | $ (178,442) | $ 1,413,339 | $ 2,565,916 | $ 3,988,093 | $ 4,885,826 | $ 5,160,561 | $ 5,186,354 | $ 5,092,791 | $ 5,107,280 | $ 6,019,785 | $ 7,762,595 | $ 7,152,977 | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 859.35 | 1,804.65 | 2,664 | 2,705 | 2,708 | 2,797 | 2,769 | 2,793 | 2,794 | 2,775 | 2,794 | 2,798 | 2,812 | 2,833 | 33,242 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $642.24 | $753.65 | $717.71 | $633.97 | $560.25 | $374.05 | $292.94 | $222.78 | $168.58 | $165.55 | $202.04 | $414.48 | $584.57 | $759.99 | $5,096.90 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 551,908 | $ 1,360,069 | $ 1,911,977 | $ 1,714,893 | $ 1,517,144 | $ 1,046,220 | $ 811,149 | $ 622,215 | $ 471,003 | $ 459,395 | $ 564,489 | $ 1,159,725 | $ 1,643,817 | $ 2,153,056 | $ 14,075,082 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | | | | 6,913,974 | 5,609,302 | 5,156,824 | 2,896,859 | 2,532,832 | 1,900,306 | 1,776,830 | 1,842,874 | 2,260,370 | 4,076,896 | 4,431,065 | 8,810,762 | 48,209,894 |
| | Actual Base Rate Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 642,749 | $ 1,349,772 | $ 1,992,521 | $ 1,706,491 | $ 1,603,845 | $ 1,020,533 | $ 884,603 | $ 726,949 | $ 690,821 | $ 709,441 | $ 818,005 | $ 1,285,548 | $ 1,504,422 | $ 2,468,231 | $ 15,411,390 |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 78,920 | $ 165,731 | $ 244,651 | $ 275,956 | $ 279,705 | $ 288,136 | $ 285,292 | $ 287,768 | $ 287,473 | $ 286,537 | $ 287,792 | $ 287,908 | $ 324,417 | $ 258,141 | $ 3,394,177 |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 563,829 | $ 1,184,041 | $ 1,747,870 | $ 1,430,535 | $ 1,324,140 | $ 732,397 | $ 599,311 | $ 439,181 | $ 403,348 | $ 422,904 | $ 530,213 | $ 997,640 | $ 1,179,605 | $ 2,210,090 | $ 12,017,213 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $656.11 | $656.11 | $656.11 | $528.85 | $488.97 | $261.83 | $216.44 | $157.24 | $144.36 | $152.49 | $189.77 | $356.55 | $419.49 | $780.12 | |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ (11,921) | $ 176,028 | $ 164,107 | $ 284,359 | $ 193,004 | $ 313,823 | $ 211,838 | $ 183,034 | $ 67,655 | $ 36,491 | $ 34,276 | $ 162,085 | $ 464,212 | $ (57,014) | $ 2,057,869 |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 534 | $ (8,099) | $ (7,565) | $ (12,986) | $ (8,814) | $ (14,332) | $ (9,674) | $ (8,359) | $ (3,090) | $ (3,666) | $ (3,565) | $ (7,402) | $ (21,209) | $ 2,604 | $ (93,989) |
| | | FERC Rate | | | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.25% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.46% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | | | $ 212 | $ 792 | $ 1,431 | $ 2,204 | $ 2,933 | $ 3,485 | $ 3,884 | $ 4,041 | $ 4,151 | $ 4,436 | $ 5,321 | $ 5,903 | $ 38,775 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals:** | | | | **$ 156,815** | **$ 272,165** | **$ 185,601** | **$ 301,695** | **$ 205,097** | **$ 178,160** | **$ 68,449** | **$ 35,565** | **$ 36,861** | **$ 159,119** | **$ 448,333** | **$ (48,507)** | **$ 2,002,654** |
| 20 | Cumulative Deferral Surcharge(Rebate) Balance | 2nd(17) + (19)) | | | $ 156,815 | $ 428,979 | $ 614,580 | $ 916,275 | $ 1,121,373 | $ 1,299,533 | $ 1,367,982 | $ 1,403,548 | $ 1,440,409 | $ 1,602,528 | $ 2,051,162 | $ 2,002,654 | |
| 21 | **Total Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)** | **(10) + (20)** | | | $ (21,627) | $ 1,842,318 | $ 3,180,496 | $ 4,904,368 | $ 6,007,199 | $ 6,460,094 | $ 6,554,336 | $ 6,496,339 | $ 6,550,989 | $ 7,622,614 | $ 9,813,756 | **$ 9,155,632** | |

## 2016 Earnings Test

The decoupling mechanism, in Schedules 75D and 175D provides for application of an earnings test, separately for electric and for natural gas.

### *Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 75D, the decoupling mechanism for decoupled electric customers is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-29, Line 3, the rate of return on a normalized basis in 2016 is 7.51%. This exceeds the 7.29% allowed return established by Order 05 of Docket No. UE-150204[17] (Line 4). The Excess ROR is 0.22%, corresponding to Excess Earnings of $3,218,417 (Line 6). A Conversion Factor is entered on Line 7, which is divided into the Excess Earnings to produce Excess Revenue (Line 8) of $5,193,843. When the 50% Sharing (Line 9) is applied, the Total Earnings Sharing for electric is $2,596,921 (Line 10).

*Table 1-29. 2016 Electric Earnings Test*

| Line No. | | Electric |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rate Base | $ 1,442,726,000 |
| 2 | Net Income | $ 108,405,000 |
| 3 | Calculated ROR | 7.51% |
| 4 | Base ROR | 7.29% |
| 5 | Excess ROR | 0.22% |
| 6 | Excess Earnings | $ 3,218,417 |
| 7 | Conversion Factor | 0.619660 |
| 8 | Excess Revenue (Excess Earnings/CF) | $ 5,193,843 |
| 9 | Sharing % | 50% |
| 10 | 2016 Total Earnings Test Sharing | **$ 2,596,921** |

The Electric Total Earnings Test Sharing amount is then split between residential and non-residential customer groups in proportion to their contribution to Total Normalized Revenue (Table 1-30). The split is 50.62% Electric Residential and 49.38% Electric Non-Residential.

The dollar values for the split are $1,314,495 Electric Residential (Line 14) and $1,282,427 Electric Non-Residential (Line 15). These values are adjusted to remove various revenue related expenses by dividing them by the Gross Up Factor derived in Table 1-31 (1.048963). The final

[17] Page 6, Paragraph 5 (Commission Determinations) in Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Avista Corporation dba Avista Utilities, Dockets UE-150204 and UG-150205 (Consolidated), Order 05, Final Order Rejecting Tariff Finding, Accepting Partial Settlement Stipulation, Authorizing Tariff Findings. Service Date January 26, 2016.

values for the Electric Earnings Test are $1,253,138 for Residential Electric and $1,222,566 for Non-Residential Electric. These values are shown on Line 14 and Line 15, respectively, in Table 1-30. These are also reported on Page 2 of 6 (Residential) and Page 3 of 6 (Non-Residential) of the Letter of Transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission for the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment, Tariff WN U-28, Electric Service, dated August 31, 2017.

*Table 1-30. 2016 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment*

| | Revenue From 2016 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Residential Revenue | $ 223,399,000 | 50.62% |
| 12 | Non-Residential Revenue | $ 217,949,000 | 49.38% |
| 13 | Total Normalized Revenue | $ 441,348,000 | 100.00% |
| | **Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment** | Gross Revenue Adjustment | Net of Revenue Related Expenses |
| 14 | Residential | $ 1,314,495 | $ 1,253,138 |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ 1,282,427 | $ 1,222,566 |
| 16 | Total | $ 2,596,921 | $ 2,475,704 |

*Table 1-31. Derivation of 2016 Electric Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor*

**AVISTA UTILITIES**
**Revenue Conversion Factor**
**Washington - Electric System**
**TWELVE MONTHS ENDED December 31, 2016**

| Line No. | Description | *Factor* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Revenues** | *1.000000* |
| | **Expense:** | |
| 2 | Uncollectibles | *0.006183* |
| 3 | Commission Fees | *0.002000* |
| 4 | Washington Excise Tax | *0.038495* |
| 5 | Total Expense | *0.046677* |
| 6 | Net Operating Income Before FIT | *0.953323* |
| 7 | Federal Income Tax @ 35% | *0.333663* |
| 8 | **REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR** | *0.619660* |
| 9 | Gross Up Factor | 1.048963 |

2016 Commission Basis Conversion Factor with Uncollectible Service Correction

## *Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 175D, the decoupling mechanism for natural gas is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-32, the rate of return on a normalized basis in 2016 is 8.56%. This is more than the 7.29% allowed return[18] (Line 4). The Excess ROR is 1.27% (Line 5). The dollar value of Excess Earnings is $3,628,723. This is adjusted for various revenue expenses by dividing by the Conversion Factor (0.619798) given in Line 7 for Excess Revenue of $5,854,687 as shown in Line 8.

*Table 1-32. 2016 Natural Gas Earnings Test*

| | **2016 Commission Basis Earnings Test for Decoupling** | |
|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Natural Gas |
| 1 | Rate Base | $ 286,597,000 |
| 2 | Net Income | $ 24,524,000 |
| 3 | Calculated ROR | 8.56% |
| 4 | Base ROR | 7.29% |
| 5 | Excess ROR | 1.27% |
| 6 | Excess Earnings | $ 3,628,723 |
| 7 | Conversion Factor | 0.619798 |
| 8 | Excess Revenue (Excess Earnings/CF) | $ 5,854,687 |
| 9 | Sharing % | 50% |
| 10 | 2016 Total Earnings Test Sharing | **$ 2,927,343** |

With the Sharing percentage set at 50%, the 2016 Total Earnings Test Sharing is $2,927,343 (Line 10). The Conversion Factor on Line 7 of Table 1-32 is developed in Table 1-33.

[18] Page 6, Paragraph 5 (Commission Determinations) in Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Avista Corporation dba Avista Utilities, Dockets UE-150204 and UG-150205 (Consolidated), Order 05, Final Order Rejecting Tariff Finding, Accepting Partial Settlement Stipulation, Authorizing Tariff Findings. Service Date January 26, 2016.

*Table 1-33. Derivation of 2016 Natural Gas Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor*

**AVISTA UTILITIES**
**Revenue Conversion Factor**
**Washington - Gas System**
**TWELVE MONTHS ENDED December 31, 2016**

| Line No. | Description | Factor |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Revenues** | 1.000000 |
| | **Expense:** | |
| 2 | Uncollectibles | 0.006183 |
| 3 | Commission Fees | 0.002000 |
| 4 | Washington Excise Tax | 0.038282 |
| 5 | Total Expense | 0.046465 |
| 6 | Net Operating Income Before FIT | 0.953535 |
| 7 | Federal Income Tax @ 35% | 0.333737 |
| 8 | REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR | 0.619798 |
| 9 | Gross Up Factor | 1.048729 |

2016 Commission Basis Conversion Factor with Uncollectible Service Correction

The split between Natural Gas Residential and Natural Gas Non-Residential is developed in Table 1-34. The split is modeled on contribution to revenue. Stated in percentage terms, the split is 76.15% Residential and 23.85% Non-Residential (Lines 11 and 12). At the Gross level, the dollar values are $2,229,293 Residential and $698,050 Non-Residential. When expressed net of various revenue expenses (by dividing by the Gross Up Factor from Table 1-33, Line 9, the values are $2,125,710 Natural Gas Residential and $665,616 Natural Gas Non-Residential. These values are also reported Page 2 of 5 for Residential and Page 3 of 5 for Non-Residential in Letter of Transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission for the Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment, Tariff WN U-28, Electric Service, dated August 31, 2017.

*Table 1-34. 2016 Natural Gas Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment*

| | **Revenue From 2016 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Residential Revenue | $ 110,176,000 | 76.15% |
| 12 | Non-Residential Revenue | $ 34,499,000 | 23.85% |
| 13 | Total Normalized Revenue | $ 144,675,000 | 100.00% |
| | **Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment** | Gross Revenue Adjustment | Net of Revenue Related |
| 14 | Residential | $ 2,229,293 | $ 2,125,710 |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ 698,050 | $ 665,616 |
| 16 | Total | $ 2,927,343 | $ 2,791,326 |

## 2016 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation

Decoupling annual rate adjustment surcharges are subject to a 3% annual rate increase limitation (there is no reciprocal limit on rebate rate adjustments). The test is to divide the *incremental* annual revenue to be collected (proposed surcharge revenue minus present surcharge revenue) by the total "normalized" revenue for the two Rate Groups for the most recent January through December.

Normalized revenue is determined by multiplying the weather-corrected usage for the period by the present rates in effect. If the incremental amount of the proposed surcharge exceeds 3%, only a 3% incremental rate increase will apply. Any remaining deferred revenue will be carried over to the following years.

### *Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test*

The electric Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-35. Following the specifications for the test limits the Residential Surcharge to 3% with the remainder deferred to the following year.

However, division of the Revenue from 2016 Normalized Loads with Customers at Present Billing Rates (Line 1) by the Incremental Decoupling Recovery (Line 6) results in a value of 2.0% for Electric Residential and a value of 0.4% for Electric Non-Residential (Line 7). Since these values are both less than 3%, no adjustment is necessary for either Electric Residential or for Electric Non-Residential. For both Electric Rate Groups, the Carryover Deferred Revenue is equal to zero.

*Table 1-35. 2016 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| | 3% Incremental Surcharge Test | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Residential | Non-Residential |
| 1 | Revenue From 2016 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates (Note 1) | $ 223,399,000 | $ 217,949,000 |
| 2 | November 2017 - October 2018 Usage (kWhs) | 2,452,572,967 | 2,160,028,828 |
| 3 | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.00445 | $0.00040 |
| 4 | Present Decoupling Surcharge Recovery Rates | $0.00263 | $0.00000 |
| 5 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.00182 | $0.00040 |
| 6 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 4,463,683 | $ 864,012 |
| 7 | Incremental Surcharge % | **2.00%** | **0.40%** |
| 8 | 3% Test Adjustment (Note 2) | $ - | $ - |
| 9 | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | $0.00000 | $0.00000 |
| 10 | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.00445 | $0.00040 |
| 11 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 4,463,683 | $ 864,012 |
| 12 | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | **2.00%** | **0.40%** |
| | Notes | | |
| | (1) 2016 Normalized Revenue derived from UE-170485 Revenue Model with billed rates adjusted to reflect August 1, 2017 present rates. | | |
| | (2) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period. | | |

## *Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test*

The natural gas Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-36. The test limits the residential and the non-residential surcharge each to 3%.

For the natural gas residential group, there is an additional revenue amount of $718,577 that is deferred to the following year because of the test (Line 8). For the natural gas non-residential group, the surcharge is less than 3% so the deferred revenue carried forward to the following year is equal to zero.

*Table 1-36. 2016 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| Line No. | 3% Incremental Surcharge Test | Residential | Non-Residential |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Revenue From 2016 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates (Note 1) | $ 110,176,000 | $ 34,499,000 |
| 2 | November 2017 - October 2018 Usage | 124,577,619 | 56,682,411 |
| 3 | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.06157 | $0.03904 |
| 4 | Present Decoupling Surcharge Recovery Rates | $0.02927 | $0.02108 |
| 5 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.03230 | $0.01796 |
| 6 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 4,023,857 | $ 1,018,016 |
| 7 | Incremental Surcharge % | **3.65%** | **2.95%** |
| 8 | 3% Test Adjustment (1) | $ (718,577) | $ - |
| 9 | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | -$0.00577 | $0.00000 |
| 10 | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | $0.05580 | $0.03904 |
| 11 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ 3,305,044 | $ 1,018,016 |
| 12 | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | **3.00%** | **2.95%** |
| | Notes | | |
| | (1) 2016 Normalized Revenue derived from UG-170486 Revenue Model with billed rates adjusted to reflect August 1, 2017 present rates. | | |
| | (2) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period. | | |

## Decoupling Mechanism - 2017 Electric (Schedule 75) and Natural Gas (Schedule 175)

In this section, we review analysis of data from the test year from October 2013 through September 2014 (a historical test year), which was used to develop amounts for revenue recovery for calendar 2017. Recovery will occur from November 2018 through the end of October 2019 (the third rate year). The decoupling mechanism is designed to capture all fixed cost assigned for recovery through volumetric rates that is not actually recovered due to lower sales than expected during calendar 2017. This cost is recovered by allocation to customer bills according to a model. The decoupling deferrals total is based on comparison of the value of actual sales in calendar 2017 to the value of normalized sales (from October 2013 through September 2014) on a per customer basis. Note that the 2017 deferral year uses the same test year and decoupled revenue per customer as 2016.

As specified in Schedule 75 and Schedule 175, calculations were carried out separately and in parallel, for Residential and Non-Residential accounts. For each of these groups of accounts, the sum of monthly deferral amounts over calendar year 2017 is the cumulative deferral (rebate or surcharge). The cumulative deferral (with adjustments for prior year carryover balance, interest, and revenue related expense adjustment) is collected through the decoupling tariff on a volumetric basis from November 1, 2018 through October 31, 2019.

### *Electric Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

First the electric service analysis is reviewed, then the analysis for natural gas service.

***Schedule 75A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

For electric service, following steps in Schedule 75A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 75A. Electric tables for 2017 are attachments or parts of attachments to the Tariff WN U-28, Electric Service, Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filed August 17, 2018.

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized 12 ME September, 2014 Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each Rate Schedule. Table 1-37, Line 1 shows initial Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows the Allowed Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Power Supply Revenue. This value is shown on Line 6 and is the product of Normalized kWh for the test year from Line 4 and Retail Revenue Adjustment from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to enter Delivery and Power Plant Revenue. This is constructed by subtraction of Variable Power Supply Revenue (Line 6) from the Total Normalized Revenue (Line 3) and is entered on Line 7.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to Remove Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed. Basic Charge Revenue is shown on Line 10. It is the product of the number of Customer Bills in the GRC test year on Line 8 times the Allowed Basic Charge (Line 9).

**Step 5:** In Step 5, the Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery and Power Plant Revenue (Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Line 10). Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, (see Table 1-38) Decoupled Revenue is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Test Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group).

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by modeling monthly kWh use (by Rate Group) in relationship to the annual kWh use for the test year. This modeling is shown in Table 1-39. Kilowatt hours for Group 1 (Residential) for the test year is shown in Line 3 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 6. Both monthly values and the annual kWh values are shown. Below the monthly values (Lines 4 and 7) monthly percentages are shown. Lines 11 and 14 use this percentage model, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group), to generate monthly values.

The monthly values developed following the steps in Schedule 75A are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 75B.

*Table 1-37. 2017 Development of Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Electric**

| | | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 1 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 11,12 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 21,22 | PUMPING SCH. 30, 31, 32 | EX LG GEN SVC SCHEDULE 25 | ST & AREA LTG SCH. 41-48 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Total Normalized 12 ME Sept 2014 Revenue | $ 499,982,000 | $ 214,841,000 | $ 71,304,000 | $ 130,152,000 | $ 11,471,000 | $ 65,194,000 | $ 7,020,000 |
| 2 | Allowed Revenue Increase (Attachment 1) | $ (8,110,000) | $ (3,478,000) | $ (1,159,000) | $ (2,118,000) | $ (187,000) | $ (1,056,000) | $ (112,000) |
| 3 | Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016) | $ 491,872,000 | $ 211,363,000 | $ 70,145,000 | $ 128,034,000 | $ 11,284,000 | $ 64,138,000 | $ 6,908,000 |
| 4 | Normalized kWhs (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 5,653,834,483 | 2,378,478,031 | 588,401,236 | 1,419,228,271 | 137,227,044 | 1,105,372,136 | 25,127,765 |
| 5 | Retail Revenue Adjustment (line 14) | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 |
| 6 | Variable Power Supply Revenue (L4 * L5) | $ 92,779,424 | $ 39,030,824 | $ 9,655,664 | $ 23,289,536 | $ 2,251,896 | $ 18,139,157 | $ 412,347 |
| 7 | Delivery & Power Plant Revenue (L3 - L6) | $ 346,598,080 | $ 172,332,176 | $ 60,489,336 | $ 104,744,464 | $ 9,032,104 | | |
| 8 | Customer Bills (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 2,879,945 | 2,462,067 | 364,552 | 24,110 | 29,216 | | |
| 9 | Allowed Basic Charges | | $ 8.50 | $ 18.00 | $ 500.00 | $ 18.00 | | |
| 10 | Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 40,070,394 | $ 20,927,570 | $ 6,561,936 | $ 12,055,000 | $ 525,888 | | |
| 11 | Decoupled Revenue | $ 306,527,686 | $ 151,404,606 | $ 53,927,400 | $ 92,689,464 | $ 8,506,216 | Excluded From Decoupling | |
| 12 | Retail Revenue Adjustment - (Attachment 3) | $0.01566 | | | | | | |
| 13 | Gross Up Factor for Revenue Related Exp | 104.81% | | | | | | |
| 14 | Grossed Up Retail Revenue Adjustment | $0.01641 | | | | | | |

| | | Residential | Non-Residential Group |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Average Number of Customers (Line 8 / 12) | 205,172 | 34,823 |
| 16 | Annual kWh | 2,378,478,031 | 2,144,856,551 |
| 17 | Basic Charge Revenues | 20,927,570 | 19,142,824 |
| 18 | Customer Bills | 2,462,067 | 417,878 |
| 19 | Average Basic Charge | $8.50 | $45.81 |

*Table 1-38. 2017 Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Annual Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 151,404,606 | $ 155,123,080 |
| 2 | Test Year # of Customers 12 ME 09.2014 | Revenue Data | 205,172 | 34,823 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 737.94 | $ 4,454.59 |
| | * Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32. | | | |
| | Revenues | | | |
| | From revenue per customer | | $ 151,404,810 | $ 155,122,930 |
| | From basic charge | | $ 20,927,570 | $ 19,142,824 |
| | From power supply | | $ 39,030,824 | $ 35,197,096 |
| | Total | | $ 211,363,204 | $ 209,462,850 |

*Table 1-39. 2017 Development of Monthly Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Electric Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Electric**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | **Electric Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 284,675,925 | 232,597,855 | 228,752,581 | 172,322,869 | 166,632,549 | 148,170,954 | 153,360,033 | 181,322,317 | 146,560,541 | 174,054,557 | 212,665,464 | 277,362,386 | 2,378,478,031 |
| 4 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 11.97% | 9.78% | 9.62% | 7.25% | 7.01% | 6.23% | 6.45% | 7.62% | 6.16% | 7.32% | 8.94% | 11.66% | 100.00% |
| 5 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | - Weather-Normalized kWh Sales | Monthly Rate Year | 174,546,983 | 177,500,854 | 166,289,029 | 165,417,455 | 178,108,889 | 185,503,197 | 200,737,081 | 187,588,012 | 179,420,897 | 183,203,251 | 168,530,619 | 178,010,284 | 2,144,856,551 |
| 7 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 8.14% | 8.28% | 7.75% | 7.71% | 8.30% | 8.65% | 9.36% | 8.75% | 8.37% | 8.54% | 7.86% | 8.30% | 100.00% |
| 8 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | -UE-150204 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 737.94 |
| 11 | - Monthly Decoupled RPC | (4) x (10) | $ 88.32 | $ 72.17 | $ 70.97 | $ 53.46 | $ 51.70 | $ 45.97 | $ 47.58 | $ 56.26 | $ 45.47 | $ 54.00 | $ 65.98 | $ 86.05 | $ 737.94 |
| 12 | *Non-Residential** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | -UE-150204 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 4, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 4,454.59 |
| 14 | - Monthly Decoupled RPC | (7) x (13) | $ 362.51 | $ 368.65 | $ 345.36 | $ 343.55 | $ 369.91 | $ 385.27 | $ 416.90 | $ 389.60 | $ 372.63 | $ 380.49 | $ 350.02 | $ 369.70 | $ 4,454.59 |

*Schedules 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32.

***Schedule 75B - Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 75B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for electric service. For Group 1 (Residential), the calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2017 is shown in the top part of Table 1-40.[19] For Group 2 (Non-Residential) the calculation method is shown in the bottom part of Table 1-40. In the full version of this table (Table 1-41), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2017 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2017. For the Electric Residential, deferred revenue for 2017 is negative with a value of ($2,092,790). For Electric Non-Residential, deferred revenue for 2017 is $1,735,911.

Residential Decoupling Deferrals (Step 2 of Schedule 75B) corresponds to Line 3 in the top part of Table 1-40 and the top part of Table 1-41. It is calculated by multiplying the number of Actual Customers (Line 1) by the Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2).

Residential Actual Revenue collected in a month (Step 3 of Schedule 75B) is shown on Line 4.

The Residential Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Step 4) is shown on Line 5. The total revenue collected related to the variable power supply (Step 5) is shown on Line 8. This is the product of Actual kWh Sales (Line 6) and the Retail Revenue Credit (Line 7).

Residential Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6) is calculated by subtracting the Actual Basic Charge Revenue (Line 4) and the variable power supply revenue (Line 8) from the Actual Base Rate Revenue and is shown on Line 9.

The Monthly Residential Deferral Total for each month (Step 7) is shown just below Line 12. This is the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue (Step 6; Line 9) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue (Step 2; Line 3) plus any interest on the deferral. Interest on the deferred balance accrues at the quarterly rate published by the FERC. In Table 1-41, these values are cumulatively incremented by month over 2017 on Line 13 and the electric deferred revenue for 2017 shown on Line 13 with the value of minus $2,092,790. This is the Residential value given by Avista on page 2 of 5 in Tariff WN U-28, Electric Service, Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing in compliance with Commission Order No. 05 in Docket No. UE-140188 on August 17, 2018. Since the value is negative, Electric Residential does not receive a surcharge.

For Electric Non-Residential, Schedule 75B specifies the method for developing the Monthly Decoupling Deferral for electric service. In the full version of this table (bottom section of Table 1-41), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2017 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2017 (for Electric Non-Residential) of $1,735,911. This is the Electric Non-Residential value given on Page 3 of 5 in the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment filing in compliance with Commission Order No. 05 in Docket No. UE-140188 on August 17, 2018. Since deferred revenue is positive, Electric Non-Residential receives a surcharge. The surcharge is adjusted by the Earnings Sharing Deduction, the Prior Year Residual Balance, and by Revenue Related Expense Adjustment for a final Customer Surcharge Revenue Amount of $1,170,966.

[19] Only the first few columns of the table are shown here to keep the table readable on the page.

The calculations and the Excel programming are identical for Electric Residential and Electric Non-Residential.

*Table 1-40. 2017 Electric Deferral Calculations*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UE-150204 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2017)**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan-17 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 212,134 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $88.32 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 18,736,261 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 29,977,440 |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,836,153 |
| 6 | Acutal Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 330,420,975 |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.01641 |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ 5,422,208 |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ 22,719,078 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $107.10 |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ (3,982,817) |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 182,732 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (5,542) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (3,805,628)** |
| 13 | Cumulative Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | $ (3,805,628) |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 35,883 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $362.51 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ 13,008,001 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 18,192,580 |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,566,351 |
| 19 | Acutal Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 185,988,820 |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.01641 |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ 3,052,077 |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ 13,574,152 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $378.29 |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ (566,151) |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 25,975 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (788) |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (540,964)** |
| 26 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | $ (540,964) |
| 27 | **Total Cumulative Electric Deferral** | **(13) + (26)** | $ (4,346,591) |

# *Table 1-41. 2017 Development of Electric Deferral*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UE-150204 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Electric Deferrals (Calendar Year 2017)**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 212,134 | 212,059 | 212,618 | 212,018 | 211,258 | 211,830 | 211,439 | 212,411 | 212,339 | 213,798 | 213,856 | 214,177 | 2,549,937 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $88.32 | $72.17 | $70.97 | $53.46 | $51.70 | $45.97 | $47.58 | $56.26 | $45.47 | $54.00 | $65.98 | $86.05 | $737.94 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 18,736,261 | $ 15,303,273 | $ 15,089,955 | $ 11,335,418 | $ 10,921,817 | $ 9,738,060 | $ 10,060,491 | $ 11,949,512 | $ 9,655,366 | $ 11,545,452 | $ 14,110,432 | $ 18,430,720 | $ 156,876,758 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 29,977,440 | $ 21,701,036 | $ 19,217,979 | $ 15,485,303 | $ 14,335,482 | $ 13,375,308 | $ 17,431,399 | $ 18,289,235 | $ 14,321,080 | $ 14,347,883 | $ 18,951,062 | $ 24,646,420 | $ 222,079,628 |
| 5 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,836,153 | $ 1,834,377 | $ 1,843,863 | $ 1,840,658 | $ 1,850,433 | $ 1,866,107 | $ 1,855,734 | $ 1,869,014 | $ 1,855,882 | $ 1,860,480 | $ 1,856,154 | $ 1,857,488 | $ 22,226,341 |
| 6 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 330,420,975 | 242,845,820 | 216,778,430 | 174,126,974 | 161,673,824 | 149,145,253 | 195,746,292 | 206,172,696 | 161,177,614 | 163,829,516 | 214,624,109 | 275,751,737 | 2,492,293,240 |
| 7 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | |
| 8 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (6) x (7) | $ 5,422,208 | $ 3,985,100 | $ 3,557,334 | $ 2,857,424 | $ 2,653,067 | $ 2,447,474 | $ 3,212,197 | $ 3,383,294 | $ 2,644,925 | $ 2,688,442 | $ 3,521,982 | $ 4,525,086 | $ 40,898,532 |
| 9 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) -(8) | $ 22,719,078 | $ 15,881,560 | $ 13,816,783 | $ 10,787,221 | $ 9,831,982 | $ 9,061,727 | $ 12,363,469 | $ 13,036,927 | $ 9,820,274 | $ 9,798,961 | $ 13,572,927 | $ 18,263,846 | $ 158,954,755 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $107.10 | $74.89 | $64.98 | $50.88 | $46.54 | $42.78 | $58.47 | $61.38 | $46.25 | $45.83 | $63.47 | $85.27 | |
| 10 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (9) | $ (3,982,817) | $ (578,287) | $ 1,273,172 | $ 548,197 | $ 1,089,836 | $ 676,333 | $ (2,302,978) | $ (1,087,415) | $ (164,908) | $ 1,746,491 | $ 537,505 | $ 166,874 | $ (2,077,997) |
| 11 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 182,732 | $ 26,532 | $ (58,413) | $ (25,151) | $ (50,002) | $ (31,030) | $ 105,661 | $ 49,891 | $ 7,566 | $ (80,129) | $ (24,661) | $ (7,656) | $ 95,338 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 4.21% | 4.21% | 4.21% | |
| 12 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (5,542) | $ (11,904) | $ (10,972) | $ (8,978) | $ (6,590) | $ (4,005) | $ (6,849) | $ (12,209) | $ (14,221) | $ (12,522) | $ (8,743) | $ (7,595) | $ (110,132) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (3,805,628)** | **$ (563,660)** | **$ 1,203,787** | **$ 514,068** | **$ 1,033,244** | **$ 641,298** | **$ (2,204,166)** | **$ (1,049,734)** | **$ (171,563)** | **$ 1,653,840** | **$ 504,101** | **$ 151,623** | **$ (2,092,790)** |
| 13 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance | Σ((10) ~ (12)) | $ (3,805,628) | $ (4,369,287) | $ (3,165,501) | $ (2,651,433) | $ (1,618,188) | $ (976,891) | $ (3,181,057) | $ (4,230,791) | $ (4,402,355) | $ (2,748,514) | $ (2,244,413) | **$ (2,092,790)** | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 35,883 | 35,789 | 36,027 | 35,857 | 35,704 | 36,104 | 35,886 | 36,188 | 36,104 | 36,212 | 35,948 | 36,223 | 431,925 |
| 15 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 4, Page 3 | $362.51 | $368.65 | $345.36 | $343.55 | $369.91 | $385.27 | $416.90 | $389.60 | $372.63 | $380.49 | $350.02 | $369.70 | $4,454.59 |
| 16 | Decoupled Revenue | (14) x (15) | $ 13,008,001 | $ 13,193,484 | $ 12,442,315 | $ 12,318,697 | $ 13,207,236 | $ 13,909,650 | $ 14,961,052 | $ 14,098,703 | $ 13,453,579 | $ 13,778,285 | $ 12,582,387 | $ 13,391,801 | $ 160,345,191 |
| 17 | Actual Base Rate Revenue | Revenue System | $ 18,192,580 | $ 17,500,279 | $ 17,252,313 | $ 16,052,469 | $ 16,625,114 | $ 17,868,330 | $ 19,688,932 | $ 20,070,393 | $ 17,360,373 | $ 17,081,518 | $ 17,352,968 | $ 18,278,019 | $ 213,323,288 |
| 18 | Actual Basic Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,566,351 | $ 1,568,279 | $ 1,574,252 | $ 1,569,821 | $ 1,564,851 | $ 1,581,612 | $ 1,566,310 | $ 1,584,153 | $ 1,577,422 | $ 1,573,389 | $ 1,578,531 | $ 1,581,325 | $ 18,886,297 |
| 19 | Actual Usage (kWhs) | Revenue System | 185,988,820 | 176,601,249 | 174,880,403 | 161,375,406 | 169,307,988 | 184,519,265 | 206,968,295 | 209,585,575 | 179,036,918 | 172,986,219 | 173,841,003 | 191,504,968 | 2,186,596,108 |
| 20 | Retail Revenue Credit ($/kWh) | Attachment 4, Page 1 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | $ 0.01641 | |
| 21 | Variable Power Supply Payments | (19) x (20) | $ 3,052,077 | $ 2,898,026 | $ 2,869,787 | $ 2,648,170 | $ 2,778,344 | $ 3,027,961 | $ 3,396,350 | $ 3,439,299 | $ 2,937,996 | $ 2,838,704 | $ 2,852,731 | $ 3,142,597 | $ 35,882,042 |
| 22 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (17) - (18) -(21) | $ 13,574,152 | $ 13,033,973 | $ 12,808,273 | $ 11,834,477 | $ 12,281,918 | $ 13,258,757 | $ 14,726,273 | $ 15,046,941 | $ 12,844,955 | $ 12,669,425 | $ 12,921,706 | $ 13,554,097 | $ 158,554,949 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $378.29 | $364.19 | $355.52 | $330.05 | $343.99 | $367.24 | $410.36 | $415.80 | $355.78 | $349.87 | $359.46 | $374.18 | |
| 23 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (16) - (22) | $ (566,151) | $ 159,511 | $ (365,958) | $ 484,220 | $ 925,318 | $ 650,893 | $ 234,780 | $ (948,238) | $ 608,624 | $ 1,108,860 | $ (339,319) | $ (162,296) | $ 1,790,242 |
| 24 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 25,975 | $ (7,318) | $ 16,790 | $ (22,216) | $ (42,454) | $ (29,863) | $ (10,772) | $ 43,505 | $ (27,924) | $ (50,874) | $ 15,568 | $ 7,446 | $ (82,136) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 4.21% | 4.21% | 4.21% | |
| 25 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (788) | $ (1,356) | $ (1,647) | $ (1,577) | $ 498 | $ 2,824 | $ 4,418 | $ 3,309 | $ 2,785 | $ 5,846 | $ 7,154 | $ 6,340 | $ 27,805 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (540,964)** | **$ 150,837** | **$ (350,815)** | **$ 460,427** | **$ 883,362** | **$ 623,854** | **$ 228,426** | **$ (901,424)** | **$ 583,485** | **$ 1,063,831** | **$ (316,598)** | **$ (148,510)** | **$ 1,735,911** |
| 26 | Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance | Σ((23) ~ (25)) | $ (540,964) | $ (390,127) | $ (740,942) | $ (280,515) | $ 602,847 | $ 1,226,701 | $ 1,455,126 | $ 553,702 | $ 1,137,188 | $ 2,201,019 | $ 1,884,421 | **$ 1,735,911** | |
| 25 | **Total Cumulative Deferral (Rebate)/Surcharge Balance** | **(13) + (26)** | $ (4,346,591) | $ (4,759,414) | $ (3,906,443) | $ (2,931,948) | $ (1,015,341) | $ 249,810 | $ (1,725,931) | $ (3,677,089) | $ (3,265,167) | $ (547,495) | $ (359,992) | **$ (356,879)** | |

## *Natural Gas Group 1 (Residential) and Group 2 (Non-Residential)*

For natural gas, following steps in Schedule 175A, *Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group)* is developed. Calculation of Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) is specified in seven steps in Schedule 175A. These steps are implemented in Table 1-42 and Table 1-43. Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer for Group 1: Residential and Group 2: Non-Residential are then used to develop the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas, following the steps in Schedule 175B.

***Schedule 175A – Decoupled Revenue per Customer***

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to enter the Total Normalized Revenue, which is equal to the final approved base rate revenue approved in the Company's last general rate case, individually for each rate class. Table 1-42, Line 1 shows initial 12 ME September 2014 Total Normalized Net Revenue. In addition, Line 2 shows Allowed Revenue Increase. The sum of Line 1 and Line 2 is shown on Line 3 as the Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016). This corresponds to the full value specified in Step 1.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to determine the Variable Gas Supply Revenue. This Variable Gas Supply Revenue is shown on Line 6. It the product of Normalized Therms by rate schedule from the last approved general rate case from Line 4 times the PGA Rates from Line 5.

**Step 3:** Step 3 is to determine Delivery Revenue, which is entered on Line 7. To determine the Delivery Revenue, the Variable Gas Supply Revenue is subtracted from the Total Normalized Revenue.

**Step 4:** Step 4 is to calculate the Basic Charge Revenue. Because the decoupling mechanism only tracks revenue that varies with customer energy usage, revenue from Fixed Charges is removed. It is the product of the number of Customer Bills in the test period on Line 8 times the Allowed Basic Charges (Line 9). The result, Basic Charge Revenue, is shown on Line 10.

**Step 5:** Determine the Allowed Decoupled Revenue. The Allowed Decoupled Revenue is equal to the Delivery (from Line 7) minus the Basic Charge Revenue (Line 10). The resulting Decoupled Revenue is shown on Line 11.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, Decoupled Revenue from Line 11 is put on a per customer basis. The Decoupled Revenue (by Rate Group) is divided by the approved Test Year number of customers (by Rate Group). This determines the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) as shown in Table 1-43.

**Step 7:** Step 7 is different from the other steps because it converts the annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) into monthly values. The assignment of monthly values is carried out by first calculating the distribution of monthly therm use in the test year. This calculation is shown in Table 1-44.

In Table 1-44, therm use for Group 1 (Residential) for test year is shown in Line 4 and for Group 2 (Non-Residential) in Line 8. Both monthly therm values and the annual therm values are shown. Below the monthly values, percentages (Lines 5 and 9) are shown. Lines 14 and 18

show the use of these percentages, applied to annual Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (by Rate Group) to generate monthly values.

These monthly values are then taken forward to be used in the implementation of Schedule 175B.

*Table 1-42. 2017 Development of Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue by Rate Schedule - Natural Gas**

| | TOTAL | RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE 101 | GENERAL SVC. SCH. 111 | LG. GEN. SVC. SCH. 121 | INTERRUPTIBLE SCH 131 | SCHEDULES 112, 122, 132 | SCHEDULES 146 & 148 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Total Normalized 12 ME Sept 2014 Revenue | $ 146,557,000 | $ 106,954,000 | $ 31,478,000 | $ 2,973,000 | $ - | $ 968,000 | $ 4,184,000 |
| 2 Allowed Revenue Increase (Attachment 2) | $ 10,824,000 | $ 8,398,000 | $ 1,867,000 | $ 161,000 | $ - | $ 40,000 | $ 358,000 |
| 3 Total Rate Revenue (January 11, 2016) | $ 157,381,000 | $ 115,352,000 | $ 33,345,000 | $ 3,134,000 | $ - | $ 1,008,000 | $ 4,542,000 |
| 4 Normalized Therms (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 255,186,931 | 120,721,607 | 47,537,282 | 5,069,530 | - | 1,781,211 | 80,077,301 |
| 5 11/1/2015 Schedule 150 PGA Rates | | $ 0.38907 | $ 0.38166 | $ 0.37077 | $ 0.33645 | | |
| 6 Variable Gas Supply Revenue | $ 66,991,864 | $ 46,969,156 | $ 18,143,079 | $ 1,879,630 | $ - | | |
| 7 Delivery Revenue (Ln 3 - Ln 6) | $ 84,839,136 | $ 68,382,844 | $ 15,201,921 | $ 1,254,370 | $ - | | |
| 8 Customer Bills (12ME Sept 2014 Test Year) | 1,819,516 | 1,787,943 | 30,697 | 312 | 0 | 48 | 516 |
| 9 Allowed Basic Charges | | $9.00 | $101.44 | $252.28 | $0.00 | | |
| 10 Basic Charge Revenue (Ln 8 * Ln 9) | $ 19,284,102 | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,113,904 | $ 78,711 | $ - | | |
| 11 Decoupled Revenue | $ 65,555,034 | $ 52,291,357 | $ 12,088,017 | $ 1,175,659 | $ - | Excluded From Decoupling | |

| | Residential | Non-Residential Group |
|---|---|---|
| 12 Average Number of Customers (Line 8 / 12) | 148,995 | 2,584 |
| 13 Annual Therms | 120,721,607 | 52,606,812 |
| 14 Basic Charge Revenues | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,192,615 |
| 15 Customer Bills | 1,787,943 | 31,009 |
| 16 Average Basic Charge | $9.00 | $102.96 |

*Table 1-43. 2017 Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**Development of Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Residential | Non-Residential Schedules* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) |
| 1 | Decoupled Revenues | Attachment 5, Page 1 | $ 52,291,357 | $ 13,263,676 |
| 2 | Test Year # of Customers 12 ME 09.2014 | Revenue Data | 148,995 | 2,584 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue Per Customer | (1) / (2) | $ 350.96 | $ 5,132.84 |

*Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131.

| | Revenues | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| From Revenue Per Customer | $ 52,291,373 | $ 13,263,686 |
| From Basic Charges | $ 16,091,487 | $ 3,192,615 |
| From Gas Supply | $ 46,969,156 | $ 20,022,709 |
| Total | $ 115,352,016 | $ 36,479,010 |

*Table 1-44. 2017 Development of Monthly Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

**Avista Utilities**
**Natural Gas Decoupling Mechanism**
**'Development of Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer - Natural Gas**

| Line No. | | Source | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | **Natural Gas Delivery Volume** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 21,149,989 | 17,496,849 | 14,113,448 | 7,866,788 | 4,895,089 | 2,998,022 | 2,095,088 | 2,047,777 | 2,727,612 | 8,666,827 | 14,928,966 | 21,735,152 | 120,721,607 |
| 5 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 17.52% | 14.49% | 11.69% | 6.52% | 4.05% | 2.48% | 1.74% | 1.70% | 2.26% | 7.18% | 12.37% | 18.00% | 100.00% |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | - Weather-Normalized Therm Delivery Volume | Monthly Rate Year | 7,724,199 | 6,497,617 | 5,741,989 | 3,833,669 | 3,002,355 | 2,283,253 | 1,727,751 | 1,696,708 | 2,070,681 | 4,248,069 | 5,991,318 | 7,789,203 | 52,606,812 |
| 9 | - % of Annual Total | % of Total | 14.68% | 12.35% | 10.91% | 7.29% | 5.71% | 4.34% | 3.28% | 3.23% | 3.94% | 8.08% | 11.39% | 14.81% | 100.00% |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | **Monthly Decoupled Revenue Per Customer ("RPC")** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | *Residential* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | -UG-150205 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 350.96 |
| 14 | -Monthly Decoupled RPC | (5) x (13) | $ 61.49 | $ 50.87 | $ 41.03 | $ 22.87 | $ 14.23 | $ 8.72 | $ 6.09 | $ 5.95 | $ 7.93 | $ 25.20 | $ 43.40 | $ 63.19 | $ 350.96 |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | *Non-Residential Sales** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | -UG-150205 Decoupled RPC | Attachment 5, P. 2 L. 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | $ 5,132.84 |
| 18 | -Monthly Decoupled RPC | (9) x (17) | $ 753.65 | $ 633.97 | $ 560.25 | $ 374.05 | $ 292.94 | $ 222.78 | $ 168.58 | $ 165.55 | $ 202.04 | $ 414.48 | $ 584.57 | $ 759.99 | $ 5,132.84 |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | *Sales Schedules 111, 121, 131 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Schedule 175B – Monthly Decoupling Deferral***

Schedule 175B specifies the method for developing the *Monthly Decoupling Deferral* for natural gas service. For Group 1 (Residential), the calculation of the monthly decoupling deferral for January 2017 is shown in Table 1-45.[20] In the full version of this table (Table 1-46), the monthly decoupling deferral amounts across 2017 sum to the annual total decoupling deferral for 2017. As shown in Table 1-46, the annual total decoupling deferral for Residential natural gas is negative $1,972,082. The annual total decoupling deferral for Non-Residential natural gas is $840,286.

The individual steps in the Schedule 175B procedure are shown in both Table 1-45 and Table 1-46.

**Step 1:** Step 1 is to determine the actual number of customers each month. For Group 1 (Residential), this is shown in Line 1 of Table 1-45 and Table 1-46. For Group 2 (Non-Residential), this is shown in Line 11.

**Step 2:** Step 2 is to multiply the actual number of customers (Line 1 for Residential; Line 11 for Non-Residential) by the applicable monthly Allowed Decoupled Revenue per Customer (Line 2 for Residential; Line 12 for Non-Residential), which was developed in the Schedule 175A procedure. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Residential is shown on Line 3. Allowed Decoupled Revenue for Non-Residential is shown on Line 13.

**Step 3:** Step 3 determines Actual Revenue collected. For Residential, this is shown on Line 4. For Non-Residential Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excluding Gas Costs) is shown on Line 14.

**Step 4:** Step 4 calculates the amount of Actual Fixed Charge Revenues included in Actual Revenues. This is shown on Line 5 for Residential and on Line 15 for Non-Residential.

**Step 5:** In Step 5, Actual Fixed Charge Revenue (Line 5 for Residential; Line 15 for Non-Residential) is subtracted from Actual Revenue (Line 4 for Residential; Line 14 for Non-Residential). The result is shown on Line 6 for Residential and on Line 16 for Non-Residential. At this point in the calculation all fixed charges have been removed, leaving only variable charges. In Table 1-46 this is shown as both Customer Decoupled Payments in total and as Revenue per Customer received.

**Step 6:** In Step 6, the difference between the Actual Decoupled Revenue from Step 5 (Line 6 for Residential and Line 16 for Non-Residential) and the Allowed Decoupled Revenue from Step 2 (Line 3 for Residential and Line 13 for Non-Residential) is calculated. The resulting balance (Lines 7, 8 and 9 for Residential and Lines 17, 18 and 19 for Non-Residential) is the Deferral Total.

Within Step 6, Line 7 for Residential and Line 17 for Non-Residential is the Direct Deferral (which is either a Surcharge or a Rebate).

[20] Only one month is shown here to keep the table readable on the page.

Revenue Related Expense are stated on Line 8 for Residential and Line 18 for Non-Residential. Below this, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission rate of interest (FERC Rate) is stated. Then, the result of the Average Balance Calculation is stated.

Line 9 (for Residential) and Line 19 (for Non-Residential) show the amount of Interest on Deferral. Below this, the result is the Deferral Totals.

For Residential, the Deferral Total has is a negative $1,972,082. This result is reported by Avista on Page 2 of 5 in the Natural Gas letter of transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission dated August 17, 2018. For Non-Residential, the Deferral Total is $840,286. This result is reported by Avista on Page 3 of 5 in the Natural Gas letter of transmittal regarding Tariff WN U-29, Natural Gas Service, Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment in Docket Number UG-140189 from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission dated August 17, 2018.

*Table 1-45. 2017 Natural Gas Deferral Calculations*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UG-150205 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Natural Gas Deferrals (Calendar Year 2017)**

| Line No. | | Source | Pro Rated Jan-17 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| | **Residential Group** | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 156,425 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $61.49 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 9,618,092 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | Revenue System | 27,300,256 |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 14,178,143 |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,422,936 |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 12,755,207 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $81.54 |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (3,137,115) |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 143,266 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (4,366) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (2,998,215)** |
| 10 | Cumulative Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((7) ~ (9)) | $ (2,998,215) |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 2,866 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $753.65 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 2,159,958 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | | 9,022,828 |
| 14 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 2,687,109 |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 319,691 |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 2,367,417 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $826.04 |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ (207,459) |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 9,474 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (289) |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (198,274)** |
| 20 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral Surcharge/(Rebate) Balance | Σ((17) ~ (19)) | $ (198,274) |
| 21 | **Total Cumulative Natural Gas Deferral** | **(10) + (20)** | $ (3,196,489) |

*Table 1-46. 2017 Development of Natural Gas Deferral*

**Avista Utilities**
**Decoupling Mechanism - UG-150205 Base effective 1/11/2016**
**Development of WA Natural Gas Deferrals (Calendar Year 2017)**

| Line No. | | Source | Pro Rated Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | 2017 YTD Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) | (j) | (k) | (l) | (m) | (n) | (o) |
| | **Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 156,425 | 156,620 | 156,919 | 156,785 | 156,510 | 157,170 | 157,080 | 157,589 | 157,973 | 158,696 | 159,255 | 159,738 | 1,890,760 |
| 2 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $61.49 | $50.87 | $41.03 | $22.87 | $14.23 | $8.72 | $6.09 | $5.95 | $7.93 | $25.20 | $43.40 | $63.19 | $29.28 |
| 3 | Decoupled Revenue | (1) x (2) | $ 9,618,092 | $ 7,966,722 | $ 6,438,449 | $ 3,585,705 | $ 2,227,282 | $ 1,369,863 | $ 956,744 | $ 938,169 | $ 1,252,674 | $ 3,998,515 | $ 6,911,868 | $ 10,093,541 | $ 55,357,624 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | Revenue System | 27,300,256 | 19,186,624 | 14,338,876 | 9,656,822 | 4,949,757 | 2,545,688 | 2,072,779 | 2,083,100 | 3,151,156 | 8,849,788 | 14,859,437 | 22,788,639 | |
| 4 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 14,178,143 | $ 9,916,592 | $ 7,596,509 | $ 5,392,471 | $ 3,376,968 | $ 2,365,888 | $ 2,319,586 | $ 2,360,614 | $ 2,703,609 | $ 4,991,030 | $ 7,735,067 | $ 11,662,425 | |
| 5 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 1,422,936 | $ 1,424,844 | $ 1,431,234 | $ 1,430,091 | $ 1,435,815 | $ 1,447,083 | $ 1,441,215 | $ 1,447,191 | $ 1,446,363 | $ 1,450,971 | $ 1,453,338 | $ 1,455,831 | |
| 6 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (4) - (5) | $ 12,755,207 | $ 8,491,748 | $ 6,165,275 | $ 3,962,380 | $ 1,941,153 | $ 918,805 | $ 878,371 | $ 913,423 | $ 1,257,246 | $ 3,540,059 | $ 6,281,729 | $ 10,206,594 | $ 57,311,991 |
| | Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $81.54 | $54.22 | $39.29 | $25.27 | $12.40 | $5.85 | $5.59 | $5.80 | $7.96 | $22.31 | $39.44 | $63.90 | $30.31 |
| 7 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (3) - (6) | $ (3,137,115) | $ (525,026) | $ 273,174 | $ (376,675) | $ 286,130 | $ 451,058 | $ 78,373 | $ 24,746 | $ (4,572) | $ 458,456 | $ 630,139 | $ (113,054) | $ (1,954,367) |
| 8 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 143,266 | $ 23,977 | $ (12,475) | $ 17,202 | $ (13,067) | $ (20,599) | $ (3,579) | $ (1,130) | $ 209 | $ (20,937) | $ (28,777) | $ 5,163 | $ 89,252 |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 4.21% | 4.21% | 4.21% | |
| 9 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (4,366) | $ (9,475) | $ (9,854) | $ (10,628) | $ (10,794) | $ (9,740) | $ (9,595) | $ (9,464) | $ (9,464) | $ (9,335) | $ (7,545) | $ (6,706) | $ (106,967) |
| | **Monthly Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (2,998,215)** | **$ (510,524)** | **$ 250,845** | **$ (370,101)** | **$ 262,268** | **$ 420,718** | **$ 65,199** | **$ 14,151** | **$ (13,827)** | **$ 428,184** | **$ 593,816** | **$ (114,597)** | **$ (1,972,082)** |
| 10 | Cumulative Residential Deferral Surcharge (Rebate) Balance | Σ((7) ~ (9)) | $ (2,998,215) | $ (3,508,740) | $ (3,257,895) | $ (3,627,996) | $ (3,365,728) | $ (2,945,009) | $ (2,879,810) | $ (2,865,659) | $ (2,879,486) | $ (2,451,302) | $ (1,857,485) | **$ (1,972,082)** | |
| | **Non-Residential Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Actual Customers | Revenue System | 2,866 | 2,902 | 2,916 | 2,906 | 2,896 | 2,946 | 2,913 | 2,937 | 2,920 | 2,927 | 2,936 | 2,948 | 35,013 |
| 12 | Monthly Decoupled Revenue per Customer | Attachment 5, Page 3 | $753.65 | $633.97 | $560.25 | $374.05 | $292.94 | $222.78 | $168.58 | $165.55 | $202.04 | $414.48 | $584.57 | $759.99 | $427.33 |
| 13 | Decoupled Revenue | (11) x (12) | $ 2,159,958 | $ 1,839,786 | $ 1,633,675 | $ 1,086,991 | $ 848,352 | $ 656,300 | $ 491,063 | $ 486,213 | $ 589,945 | $ 1,213,193 | $ 1,716,304 | $ 2,240,455 | $ 14,962,237 |
| | Actual Usage (informational only) | | 9,022,828 | 7,657,412 | 5,938,084 | 4,309,520 | 2,727,620 | 2,167,431 | 1,721,383 | 1,755,660 | 2,513,871 | 3,878,272 | 5,784,096 | 8,208,132 | |
| 14 | Actual Base Rate Revenue (Excludes Gas Costs) | Revenue System | $ 2,687,109 | $ 2,288,757 | $ 1,839,236 | $ 1,400,402 | $ 968,527 | $ 804,792 | $ 687,977 | $ 700,180 | $ 887,558 | $ 1,254,376 | $ 1,801,576 | $ 2,405,752 | |
| 15 | Actual Fixed Charge Revenue | Revenue System | $ 319,691 | $ 298,237 | $ 299,449 | $ 298,624 | $ 298,968 | $ 304,063 | $ 299,901 | $ 302,515 | $ 300,448 | $ 300,605 | $ 332,404 | $ 284,936 | |
| 16 | Customer Decoupled Payments | (14) - (15) | $ 2,367,417 | $ 1,990,520 | $ 1,539,787 | $ 1,101,779 | $ 669,559 | $ 500,729 | $ 388,076 | $ 397,664 | $ 587,110 | $ 953,771 | $ 1,469,172 | $ 2,120,816 | $ 14,086,400 |
| | Non-Residential Revenue Per Customer Received | | $826.04 | $685.91 | $528.05 | $379.14 | $231.20 | $169.97 | $133.22 | $135.40 | $201.07 | $325.85 | $500.40 | $719.41 | $402.32 |
| 17 | Deferral - Surcharge (Rebate) | (13) - (16) | $ (207,459) | $ (150,734) | $ 93,888 | $ (14,788) | $ 178,794 | $ 155,571 | $ 102,987 | $ 88,549 | $ 2,835 | $ 259,422 | $ 247,132 | $ 119,639 | $ 875,837 |
| 18 | Deferral - Revenue Related Expenses | Rev Conv Factor | $ 9,474 | $ 6,884 | $ (4,288) | $ 675 | $ (8,165) | $ (7,105) | $ (4,703) | $ (4,044) | $ (129) | $ (11,847) | $ (11,286) | $ (5,464) | $ (39,998) |
| | | FERC Rate | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.71% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 3.96% | 4.21% | 4.21% | 4.21% | |
| 19 | Interest on Deferral | Avg Balance Calc | $ (289) | $ (788) | $ (869) | $ (808) | $ (568) | $ (77) | $ 325 | $ 628 | $ 774 | $ 1,264 | $ 2,117 | $ 2,738 | $ 4,447 |
| | **Monthly Non-Residential Deferral Totals** | | **$ (198,274)** | **$ (144,639)** | **$ 88,731** | **$ (14,920)** | **$ 170,061** | **$ 148,390** | **$ 98,609** | **$ 85,133** | **$ 3,479** | **$ 248,839** | **$ 237,963** | **$ 116,914** | **$ 840,286** |
| 20 | Cumulative Non-Residential Deferral Surcharge (Rebate) Balance | Σ((17) ~ (19)) | $ (198,274) | $ (342,912) | $ (254,181) | $ (269,101) | $ (99,041) | $ 49,349 | $ 147,958 | $ 233,091 | $ 236,570 | $ 485,410 | $ 723,372 | **$ 840,286** | |
| 21 | **Total Cumulative Natural Gas Deferral** | **(10) + (20)** | $ (3,196,489) | $ (3,851,652) | $ (3,512,076) | $ (3,897,097) | $ (3,464,769) | $ (2,895,660) | $ (2,731,852) | $ (2,632,568) | $ (2,642,916) | $ (1,965,892) | $ (1,134,113) | **$ (1,131,796)** | |

## 2017 Earnings Test

The decoupling mechanism, in Schedules 75D and 175D provides for application of an earnings test,[21] separately for electric and for natural gas.[22]

### *Schedule 75D – Electric Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 75D, the decoupling mechanism for decoupled electric customers is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-47, Line 3, the rate of return on a normalized basis in 2017is 7.41%. This exceeds the 7.29% allowed return established by Docket No. UE-150204 (Line 4).[23] The Excess ROR is 0.12%, corresponding to Excess Earnings of $1,852,833 (Line 6). A Conversion Factor is entered on Line 7, which is divided into the Excess Earnings to produce Excess Revenue (Line 8) of $2,986,551. When the 50% Sharing (Line 9) is applied, the Total Earnings Test Sharing for electric is $1,493,276 (Line 10).

*Table 1-47. 2017 Electric Earnings Test*

| 2017 Commission Basis Earnings Test for Decoupling | | |
|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Electric |
| 1 | Rate Base | $ 1,513,706,000 |
| 2 | Net Income | $ 112,202,000 |
| 3 | Calculated ROR | 7.41% |
| 4 | Base ROR | 7.29% |
| 5 | Excess ROR | 0.12% |
| 6 | Excess Earnings | $ 1,852,833 |
| 7 | Conversion Factor | 0.620392 |
| 8 | Excess Revenue (Excess Earnings/CF) | $ 2,986,551 |
| 9 | Sharing % | 50% |
| 10 | 2017 Total Earnings Test Sharing | **$ 1,493,276** |

[21] Information on the background of the Earnings Test is limited to information provided in the Tariff. In response to Data Request 092, Avista states that "[t]he calculation of excess earnings was agreed upon as part of the Settlement process in Docket Nos. 140188 and 140189. All information regarding the excess earnings test is included in the Tariff Schedule 75D."

[22] Rate of Return is not related to the operation of the 3% cap. In response to DR 091, Avista states that "Rate of Return (ROR) is net income divided by rate base for a given annual period. The combination of three elements, namely revenues, expenses, and rate base, determine the resulting ROR. Changes to the relationship among all of these elements will impact the actual or normalized actual ROR achieved each year. The 3% cap impacts the timing of amortization of prior year deferred revenue and as such does not impact earnings or rate base during the amortization period because surcharge revenues from customers are offset by deferred revenue amortization for a net income impact of $0 and the deferred revenue on the balance sheet is not included in rate base."

[23] Page 6, Paragraph 5 (Commission Determinations) in Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Avista Corporation dba Avista Utilities, Dockets UE-150204 and UG-150205 (Consolidated), Order 05, Final Order Rejecting Tariff Finding, Accepting Partial Settlement Stipulation, Authorizing Tariff Findings. Service Date January 26, 2016.

The Electric Total Earnings Test Sharing amount is then split between residential and non-residential customer groups in proportion to their contribution to Total Normalized Revenue (Table 1-48). The split is 51.09% Electric Residential and 48.91% Electric Non-Residential.

The dollar values for the split are $762,867 Electric Residential (Line 14) and $730,409 Electric Non-Residential (Line 15). These values are adjusted to remove various revenue related expenses by dividing them by the Gross Up Factor derived in Table 1-49 (1.047725). The final values for the Electric Earnings Test are $728,117 for Residential Electric and $697,138 for Non-Residential Electric. These values are shown on Line 14 and Line 15, respectively, in Table 1-48. These are also reported on Page 2 of 5 (Residential) through Page 3 of 5 (Non-Residential) of the Letter of Transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission for the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment, Tariff WN U-28, Electric Service, dated August 17, 2018, in Docket Number UE-140188.

*Table 1-48. 2017 Electric Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment*

| | **Revenue From 2017 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Residential Revenue | $ 231,219,047 | 51.09% |
| 12 | Non-Residential Revenue | $ 221,381,435 | 48.91% |
| 13 | Total Normalized Revenue | $ 452,600,482 | 100.00% |
| | **Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment** | Gross Revenue Adjustment | Net of Revenue Related Expenses |
| 14 | Residential | $ 762,867 | $ 728,117 |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ 730,409 | $ 697,138 |
| 16 | Total | $ 1,493,276 | $ 1,425,255 |

*Table 1-49. 2017 Derivation of Electric Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor*

| Line No. | Description | Factor |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Revenues** | *1.000000* |
| | **Expense:** | |
| 2 | Uncollectibles | *0.005011* |
| 3 | Commission Fees | *0.002000* |
| 4 | Washington Excise Tax | *0.038540* |
| 5 | Total Expense | *0.045551* |
| 6 | Net Operating Income Before FIT | *0.954449* |
| 7 | Federal Income Tax @ 35% | *0.334057* |
| 8 | **REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR** | *0.620392* |
| 9 | Gross Up Factor | 1.047725 |
| 2017 Commission Basis Conversion Factor | | |

## *Schedule 175D – Natural Gas Earnings Test*

According to Schedule 175D, the decoupling mechanism for natural gas is subject to an annual earnings test based on the Company's year-end Commission Basis Reports that reflect actual decoupling-related revenues and various normalizing adjustments. As shown in Table 1-50. the rate of return on a normalized basis in 2017 is 8.32%. This is more than the 7.29% allowed return (Line 4). The Excess ROR is 1.03% (Line 5). The dollar value of Excess Earnings is $3,226,615. This is adjusted for various revenue expenses by dividing by the Conversion Factor (0.620530) given in Line 7 for Excess Revenue of $5,199,773 as shown in Line 8.

*Table 1-50. 2017 Natural Gas Earnings Test*

| 2017 Commission Basis Earnings Test for Decoupling | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | | Natural Gas |
| 1 | Rate Base | $ | 313,174,000 |
| 2 | Net Income | $ | 26,057,000 |
| 3 | Calculated ROR | | 8.32% |
| 4 | Base ROR | | 7.29% |
| 5 | Excess ROR | | 1.03% |
| 6 | Excess Earnings | $ | 3,226,615 |
| 7 | Conversion Factor | | 0.620530 |
| 8 | Excess Revenue (Excess Earnings/CF) | $ | 5,199,773 |
| 9 | Sharing % | | 50% |
| 10 | 2017 Total Earnings Test Sharing | $ | **2,599,887** |

With the Sharing percentage set at 50%, the 2017 Total Earnings Test Sharing is $2,599,887 (Line 10). The Conversion Factor on Line 7 is developed in Table 1-51.

*Table 1-51. 2017 Derivation of Gross Up Factor and Revenue Conversion Factor (Natural Gas)*

**AVISTA UTILITIES**
**Revenue Conversion Factor**
**Washington - Gas System**
**TWELVE MONTHS ENDED December 31, 2017**

| Line No. | Description | Factor |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Revenues** | 1.000000 |
| | **Expense:** | |
| 2 | Uncollectibles | 0.005012 |
| 3 | Commission Fees | 0.002000 |
| 4 | Washington Excise Tax | 0.038327 |
| 5 | Total Expense | 0.045339 |
| 6 | Net Operating Income Before FIT | 0.954661 |
| 7 | Federal Income Tax @ 35% | 0.334131 |
| 8 | REVENUE CONVERSION FACTOR | 0.620530 |
| 9 | Gross Up Factor | 1.047492 |
| 2017 Commission Basis Conversion Factor | | |

The split between Natural Gas Residential and Natural Gas Non-Residential is developed in Table 1-52. The split is modeled on contribution to revenue. Stated in percentage terms, the split is 77.11% Residential and 22.89% Non-Residential (Lines 11 and 12). At the Gross level, the dollar values are $2,004,793 Residential and $595,094 Non-Residential. When expressed net of various revenue expenses (by dividing by the Gross Up Factor from Table 1-52, Line 9, the values are $1,913,898 Natural Gas Residential and $568,113 Natural Gas Non-Residential. These values are also reported Page 2 of 5 for Residential and Page 3 of 5 for Non-Residential in Letter of Transmittal from Patrick Ehrbar to the Commission for Tariff WN U-29, Natural Gas Service, Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment, dated August 17, 2018 in Docket Number UG-140189.

*Table 1-52. 2017 Natural Gas Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment*

| | **Revenue From 2017 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Residential Revenue | $ 104,202,001 | 77.11% |
| 12 | Non-Residential Revenue | $ 30,930,843 | 22.89% |
| 13 | Total Normalized Revenue | $ 135,132,844 | 100.00% |
| | **Earnings Test Sharing Adjustment** | Gross Revenue Adjustment | Net of Revenue Related Expenses |
| 14 | Residential | $ 2,004,793 | $ 1,913,898 |
| 15 | Non-Residential | $ 595,094 | $ 568,113 |
| 16 | Total | $ 2,599,887 | $ 2,482,011 |

## 2017 Three-Percent Annual Rate Increase Limitation

Decoupling annual rate adjustment surcharges are subject to a 3% annual rate increase limitation (there is no reciprocal limit on rebate rate adjustments). The test is to divide the *incremental* annual revenue to be collected (proposed surcharge revenue minus present surcharge revenue)[24] by the total "normalized" revenue for the two Rate Groups for the most recent January through December.

Normalized revenue is determined by multiplying the weather-corrected usage for the period by the present rates in effect. If the incremental amount of the proposed surcharge exceeds 3%, only a 3% incremental rate increase will apply. Any remaining deferred revenue will be carried over to the following years.

### *Schedule 75E – Electric 3% Rate Increase Test*

The electric Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-53. Following the specifications for the test limits the Residential Surcharge to 3% with the remainder deferred to the following year.

However, division of the Revenue from 2017 Normalized Loads with Customers at Present Billing Rates (Line 1) by the Incremental Decoupling Recovery (Line 6) results in a value of negative 5.78% for Electric Residential and a value of positive 0.14% for Electric Non-Residential (Line 7). Since these values are both less than three percent (3%), no adjustment is necessary for either Electric Residential or for Electric Non-Residential.

*Table 1-53. 2017 Electric 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| | **3% Incremental Surcharge Test** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Residential | Non-Residential |
| 1 | Revenue From 2017 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates (Note 1) | $ 231,219,047 | $ 221,381,435 |
| 2 | November 2018 - October 2019 Usage (kWhs) | 2,384,168,302 | 2,168,455,465 |
| 3 | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.00116 | $0.00054 |
| 4 | Present Decoupling Surcharge Recovery Rates | $0.00445 | $0.00040 |
| 5 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.00561 | $0.00014 |
| 6 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ (13,375,184) | $ 303,584 |
| 7 | Incremental Surcharge % | **-5.78%** | **0.14%** |
| 8 | 3% Test Adjustment (Note 2) | $ - | $ - |
| 9 | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | $0.00000 | $0.00000 |
| 10 | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.00116 | $0.00054 |
| 11 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ (13,375,184) | $ 303,584 |
| 12 | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | **-5.78%** | **0.14%** |
| | Notes | | |
| | (1) Revenue from 2017 normalized loads and customers at present billing rates effective since July 1, 2018. | | |
| | (2) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period. | | |

[24] To emphasize, this is a test of an incremental surcharge and this test is a key element in the flexibility of Avista's decoupling mechanisms.

## *Schedule 175E – Natural Gas 3% Rate Increase Test*

The natural gas Incremental Surcharge Test is shown in Table 1-54. The test limits the incremental residential and the incremental non-residential surcharge each to 3%.

For both the natural gas residential group and the natural gas non-residential group, the numeric value of the result is negative. Since these values are under 3%, no adjustment is applied. For both groups, there is no deferred revenue carried forward to the following year.

*Table 1-54. 2017 Natural Gas 3% Incremental Surcharge Test*

| | **3% Incremental Surcharge Test** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Line No. | | Residential | Non-Residential |
| 1 | Revenue From 2017 Normalized Loads and Customers at Present Billing Rates (Note 1) | $ 104,202,001 | $ 30,930,843 |
| 2 | November 2018 - October 2019 Usage | 126,528,897 | 59,004,176 |
| 3 | Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.02720 | $0.00691 |
| 4 | Present Decoupling Surcharge Recovery Rates | $0.05580 | $0.03904 |
| 5 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.08300 | -$0.03213 |
| 6 | Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ (10,501,898) | $ (1,895,804) |
| 7 | Incremental Surcharge % | **-10.08%** | **-6.13%** |
| 8 | 3% Test Adjustment (2) | $ - | $ - |
| 9 | 3% Test Rate Adjustment | $0.00000 | $0.00000 |
| 10 | Adjusted Proposed Decoupling Recovery Rates | -$0.02720 | $0.00691 |
| 11 | Adjusted Incremental Decoupling Recovery | $ (10,501,898) | $ (1,895,804) |
| 12 | Adjusted Incremental Surcharge % | **-10.08%** | **-6.13%** |
| | Notes | | |
| | (1) Revenue from 2017 normalized loads and customers at present billing rates effective since June 1, 2018. | | |
| | (2) The carryover balances will differ from the 3% adjustment amounts due to the revenue related expense gross up partially offset by additional interest on the outstanding balance during the amortization period. | | |

## Audit Statements: Is the Source Data Credible?

Having reviewed calculations for conformance to Schedule 75 and Schedule 175, the second step in the Task 1 analysis is to validate the general credibility of the test period costs and revenues, balance sheets, load projections, and other company financial data. Since this data was audited by a professional audit team (Deloitte & Touche LLP) that provides an opinion regarding the accuracy of the data, we are relying on their professional opinion to validate the financial integrity of the data.

Attachment A to Avista's Response to H. Gil Peach & Associates Data Request No. 015 provides copies of the Report of the Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm for the Avista Corporation and subsidiaries for calendar years 2015, 2016 and 2017. These opinions are based on certified audits of the company's accounting practices. Each Independent Registered Public Accounting Report expresses an unqualified opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting. These opinions validate the data used to implement the Avista electric and natural gas decoupling mechanisms.

The Deloitte & Touche LLP "Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm" for the twelve-month period ending December 31, 2015 is shown as Figure 1-2. Deloitte & Touche LLP also provided their financial audit opinions of Avista's reported financial statements for calendar year 2016 and 2017, as shown in Figure 1-2 and Figure 1-3.



REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Board of Directors and Shareholders of
Avista Corporation
Spokane, Washington

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Avista Corporation and subsidiaries (the "Company") as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, and the related consolidated statements of income, comprehensive income, equity and redeemable noncontrolling interests, and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2015. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, such consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Avista Corporation and subsidiaries at December 31, 2015 and 2014, and the results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2015, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

We have also audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2015, based on the criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (2013) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, and our report, dated February 23, 2016 expressed an unqualified opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

/s/ Deloitte & Touche LLP

Seattle, Washington

February 23, 2016

*Figure 1-2. 2016 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2015*

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM (2016)

To the Board of Directors and
Shareholders of Avista
Corporation
Spokane, Washington

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Avista Corporation and subsidiaries (the "Company") as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, and the related consolidated statements of income, comprehensive income, equity and redeemable noncontrolling interests, and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2016. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, such consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Avista Corporation and subsidiaries at December 31, 2016 and 2015, and the results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2016, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

We have also audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2016, based on the criteria established in *Internal Control—Integrated Framework (2013)* issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, and our report, dated February 21, 2017 expressed an unqualified opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

/s/ Deloitte & Touche LLP

Seattle,
Washington
February 21,
2017

*Figure 1-3. 2017 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2016*

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the shareholders and the Board of Directors of Avista Corporation

**Opinion on the Financial Statements**

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Avista Corporation and subsidiaries (the "Company") as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, the related consolidated statements of income, comprehensive income, equity, and cash flows, for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017, and the related notes (collectively referred to as the "financial statements"). In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Company as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

We have also audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States) (PCAOB), the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2017, based on criteria established in *Internal Control - Integrated Framework (2013)* issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission and our report dated February 20, 2018, expressed an unqualified opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

**Basis for Opinion**

These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Company's financial statements based on our audits. We are a public accounting firm registered with the PCAOB and are required to be independent with respect to the Company in accordance with the U.S. federal securities laws and the applicable rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the PCAOB.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether due to error or fraud. Our audits included performing procedures to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to error or fraud, and performing procedures that respond to those risks. Such procedures included examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. Our audits also included evaluating the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

/s/ Deloitte & Touche LLP

Seattle, Washington
February 20, 2018

We have served as the Company's auditor since 1933.

*Figure 1-4. 2018 Financial Audit Opinion for Calendar 2017*

## Summary - Task 1

Based on our analysis of three years of data, we conclude that Avista has calculated rates and deferrals in accordance with the Commission Order approving the decoupling mechanisms for the first through the third Decoupling Years.

The purpose of the Decoupling Mechanism is to decouple the Company's Commission-authorized revenues from sales, such that the *portion of the Company's fixed costs planned for recovery through volumetric sales and not otherwise recovered from actual energy sales* will be recovered through the mechanism. In decoupling, the revenue requirement for a given year is first set. The portion of fixed costs collected through the fixed portion of customer bills is not included in the analysis. Since volumetric sales fluctuate and may not fully cover the fixed cost component included within the volumetric portions of customer rates, the difference between actual decoupling-related revenue received from customers through volumetric rates, and the decoupling-related revenue approved for recovery through volumetric rates is accumulated in deferred revenue accounts.

Operationally, this compliance verification was carried out in two steps:

- First, we traced calculations to insure conformance with Schedule 75(A, B, C, D, E) and Schedule 175(A, B, C, D, E). In carrying out this analysis, we checked to see that the reported calculations matched the methodological specifications in each Schedule. Also, we checked for 2015, 2016 and 2017 the component Excel spreadsheets introduced as Avista Exhibits for the annual filings for Tariff WN U-28 Electric Service for Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment; and for Tariff WN U-29 Natural Gas Service for Natural Gas Decoupling Rate Adjustment as filed on August 31, 2016, August 31, 2017 and on August 17, 2018.
- Second, we have included the opinions of the independent auditor for 2015, 2016 and 2017 to indicate the validity of the financial data upon which the calculations depend.

The overall result in this section of the analysis is that we find the deferrals and rates to have been calculated by the Company in accordance with the Commission order and the Amended Petition, as determined by methodological specification in Schedule 75 and Schedule 175.

## Section 2. Billing Impacts and Recovery of Cost of Service Analysis

There are two primary evaluation objectives associated with Task 2:

- Determine if there were any differences in decoupling tracker adjustments between rate classes.
- Determine if allowed revenues are recovering the cost of service for group one (residential) and group two (non-residential subject to decoupling)[25] and customers not subject to decoupling.

Each objective is addressed in a separate section. Both sections use the customer classes (rate categories) customarily used by Avista for cost of service analysis and for decoupling filings. These customer classes are listed in the table below for electric and natural gas customers.

*Table 2-1. Electric and Natural Gas Rate Groups and Customer Classes (Rate Categories)*

| Electric Service | | | | | Natural Gas Service | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Rate Group** | **Customer Class Code** | **Customer Class** | **Rate Schedules** | **De-coupled** | **Rate Group** | **Customer Class Code** | **Customer Class** | **Rate Schedules** | **De-coupled** |
| Residential | E1 | Residential | 1, 2 | Yes | Residential | G1 | Residential | 101, 102 | Yes |
| Non-Residential | E2A | General Services | 11, 12 | Yes | Non-Residential | G2A | General Services | 111 | Yes |
| Non-Residential | E2B | Large General Services | 21, 22 | Yes | Non-Residential | G2B | Large General Services | 121 | Yes |
| Non-Residential | E2C | Pumping | 30, 31, 32 | Yes | Non-Residential | G2C | Interruptible | 131 | Yes (a) |
| Non-Decoupled | E3A | Extra Large General Services | 25 | No | Non-Decoupled | G3A | Excluded Schedules1 | 112, 122, 132 | No |
| Non- Decoupled | E3B | Street & Area Lighting | 41 - 48 | No | Non-Decoupled | G3B | Excluded Schedules 2 | 146, 148 | No |
| (a) No customer history for natural gas Rate Schedule 131 (Interruptible) over the years requested (2012-2017) | | | | | | | | | |

[25] For customers subject to decoupling, the mechanism captures all fixed costs allocated to the volumetric portion of customer bills. Avista states in response to Data Request 090 that "…on a customer basis there are no costs which are not captured in the mechanism."

For reporting and referencing purposes, we have defined a Customer Class Code for each rate category. The Customer Class Code identifies the fuel in the first character, electric (E) or natural gas (G), decoupling rate group in the second and a subset of the rate group defined by one or more rate schedules in the third. Separately for electric and natural gas, and as explained in the section of the evaluation covering Task 1, the decoupling mechanism defines two groups of customers subject to the decoupling tracker adjustment, residential (Rate Group 1) and non-residential (Rate Group 2). We also define Rate Group 3, non-residential customers not subject to the decoupling tariff. The aggregation level hierarchy listed from highest level of aggregation to the lowest is as follows:

1. Rate Group
2. Customer Class (Rate Category)
3. Rate Schedule

For example, Customer Class Code E1 is electric decoupling Rate Group 1, residential, and includes rate schedules 1 and 2. A third character is not necessary since Rate Group 1 only includes residential rate schedules. Rate Group 2 is non-residential customers subject to the decoupling adjustment tariff. There are three customer classes (collection of rate schedules) included in Rate Group 2 for both electric and natural gas service. Rate Group 3 is used to identify customers not subject to the decoupling tariff adjustment. Electric and natural gas each have two customer classes that belong to Rate Group 3.

## Summary of Decoupling Mechanics and Results

Before examining the impact of decoupling by rate class it is useful to take a high-level look at the mechanics of the decoupling mechanism, actual deferrals, requested recovery amounts and decoupling rates. Avista's decoupling mechanism allows for the recovery of the difference between actual revenue and allowed revenue.[26] This difference is referred to as the decoupling deferral balance and is tracked for the two electric and two natural gas customer groups subject to decoupling; residential and non-residential.

Beginning in 2015, monthly deferrals are accumulated over a calendar year and used with other determinants to calculate the decoupling rate required to collect or refund the under or over collected revenue. Decoupling rates become effective in Schedule 75 (electric) and Schedule 175 (natural gas) November 1 of the year following the year in which deferral balances were calculated. The timing of deferral balance accumulation and decoupling rate adjustments is shown in Figure 2-1.

[26] The details of Avista's decoupling mechanism are included in Final Order ("Order 5") for Docket Numbers UE-140188 and UG-140189.




*Figure 2-1. Timing of Deferral Balance Accumulation and Decoupling Rate*

The first deferral year resulted in a deferral balance at the end of 2015 that was used, along with other determinants, to calculate the decoupling rate in effect during the first rate year (November 1, 2016 through October 31, 2017). The same process is followed in the second deferral year and rate year. Any deferral balance carried over from the first rate year due to the application of the 3% cap is included in the calculations of decoupling rates in effect during the second rate year (November 2017 through October 2018). Details of these calculations are shown in Table 2-2 for the first three years of operation of the decoupling mechanism.

*Table 2-2. Summary of Deferral Balances and Decoupling Recovery Rates*

| ---------- Electric ---------- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Residential Group | | | Non-Residential Group | | |
| | Notes | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Deferred Revenue ($) | | 7,167,748 | 10,288,205 | -2,092,790 | -2,373,472 | 1,967,777 | 1,735,911 |
| Requested Recovery ($) | A | 7,360,678 | 10,913,950 | -2,765,635 | -3,081,249 | 864,012 | 1,170,966 |
| Customer Surcharge (Rebate) Revenue ($) | | 6,485,021 | 10,913,950 | -2,765,635 | -3,081,249 | 864,012 | 1,170,966 |
| Carryover Deferred Revenue ($) | | 875,657 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Decoupling Rate (Schedule 75) ($/kWh) | B | 0.00263 | 0.00445 | -0.00116 | -0.00143 | 0.00040 | 0.00054 |
| Incremental Revenue (Percent) | | 3.00% | 2.00% | -5.78% | -1.40% | 0.40% | 0.14% |
| Limited by 3% Cap? | | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| ---------- Natural Gas ---------- | | | | | | | |
| | | Residential Group | | | Non-Residential Group | | |
| | Notes | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Deferred Revenue ($) | | 5,317,198 | 7,152,977 | -1,972,082 | 1,736,736 | 2,002,654 | 840,286 |
| Requested Recovery ($) | A | 5,750,096 | 7,652,369 | -3,441,586 | 1,879,152 | 2,212,881 | 407,719 |
| Customer Surcharge (Rebate) Revenue ($) | | 3,488,984 | 6,951,431 | -3,441,586 | 1,108,839 | 2,212,881 | 407,719 |
| Carryover Deferred Revenue ($) | | 2,261,112 | 700,938 | 0 | 770,313 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Decoupling Rate (Schedule 175) ($/therm) | B | 0.02927 | 0.05580 | -0.02720 | 0.02108 | 0.03904 | 0.00691 |
| Incremental Revenue (Percent) | | 3.00% | 3.00% | -10.08% | 3.00% | 2.95% | -6.13% |
| Limited by 3% Cap? | | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| A: Requested recovery is equal to deferred revenue after adjusting for shared excess earnings (if applicable), deferral balance carryover from prior year (if any), interest, and revenue related expenses. | | | | | | | |
| B: Decoupling rates Schedule 75 (electric) and Schedule 175 (natural gas) take effect on November 1st of the following year. For example, rates shown in the 2016 column have an effective date of November 1, 2017 | | | | | | | |

Years shown in Table 2-2 correspond to the deferral years and rate years shown in Figure 2-1. For example, the 2015 column refers to calculations made from data for deferral year one (2015) and the resulting deferral rates in effect for rate year one (November 1, 2016 through October 31, 2017). As a specific example, consider the workings of the decoupling mechanism as shown for the natural gas residential rate group in 2016. Cumulative deferral balances during the year amounted to $7.153 million. This amount along with adjustments, including the carryover of $2.261 million from 2015 requested recovery not amortized into rate year one due to the 3% cap, resulted in a requested recovery of $7.652 million. For the second consecutive year the 3% cap took effect, limiting the customer surcharge revenue expected from the new decoupling rate (effective November 1, 2017) to $6.951 million and resulting in carryover deferred revenue of $0.701 million.

An important characteristic of the Avista decoupling mechanism that applies to all rate groups and fuels is evident in the residential natural gas example. Because the 3% test is applied using current rates, including the current decoupling rate, the new decoupling rate will adjust higher and be capable of amortizing higher levels of requested recovery.[27] At some point, even if weather or other conditions that caused initially high deferral carryovers persist, the decoupling rate will eventually adjust to a level that recovers 100 percent of requested recovery and carryover deferral balances will fall to zero. This greatly reduces the possibility of snow-balling deferral balances even in the face of persistently warm winters over consecutive heating seasons. This point is well illustrated for residential natural gas customers. Carryover deferred revenue fell from $2.261 million for the 2015 deferral year to $0.701 million in 2016 even though deferred revenue and the requested recovery was nearly two million dollars higher for the 2016 deferral year. Heating degree days were 15% less than normal (warmer winter weather) in 2015 and 14% less than normal in 2016.

### *Factors Influencing Use per Customer*

Avista relies on volumetric charges to recover a portion of fixed costs for all rate groups and fuels. This causes use per customer to be an important factor in determining deferral balances and decoupling rates through the decoupling mechanism. More specifically, changes in use per customer from levels used in the test year to set decoupled revenue will lead to positive or negative deferral balances depending on the direction of change, all other things equal. Higher use per customer will cause negative deferrals and lower use per customer will result in higher deferrals, again all other things equal.

Two important factors causing use per customer to vary from test year are actual weather deviations from normal weather and acquired energy efficiency savings through Avista programs. There are other factors of course but these two are either known in the case of energy efficiency or readily measurable in the case of weather.

[27] This is a special feature of the Avista decoupling mechanism that makes the mechanism flexible.

## Electric

The table below shows calculations for estimating these impacts on electric use per customer.

*Table 2-3. Electric Use per Customer Variance from Test Year*

| | 2015 | | | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) |
| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 2,437,508 | 207,850 | 11,727 | 2,378,478 | 205,172 | 11,593 | 2,378,478 | 205,172 | 11,593 |
| Actual | 2,323,300 | 207,371 | 11,204 | 2,288,227 | 209,864 | 10,903 | 2,492,293 | 212,495 | 11,729 |
| Change from Test Year | (114,208) | (479) | (524) | (90,251) | 4,692 | (689) | 113,815 | 7,323 | 136 |
| Percent Change | -4.7% | -0.2% | -4.5% | -3.8% | 2.3% | -5.9% | 4.8% | 3.6% | 1.2% |
| Change from Test Year Due to: | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | (33,120) | | (160) | (73,659) | | (351) | 113,472 | | 534 |
| Cumulative Energy Efficiency | 0 | | 0 | (33,272) | | (159) | (61,500) | | (289) |
| | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 2,150,843 | 35,277 | 60,970 | 2,144,857 | 34,823 | 61,593 | 2,144,857 | 34,823 | 61,593 |
| Actual | 2,179,747 | 35,265 | 61,810 | 2,158,998 | 35,617 | 60,618 | 2,184,830 | 35,994 | 60,700 |
| Change from Test Year | 28,904 | (12) | 840 | 14,142 | 794 | (975) | 39,974 | 1,171 | (893) |
| Percent Change | 1.3% | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.7% | 2.3% | -1.6% | 1.9% | 3.4% | -1.5% |
| Change from Test Year Due to: | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | 10,361 | | 294 | (7,200) | | (202) | 28,851 | | 802 |
| Cumulative Energy Efficiency | - | | 0 | (41,935) | | (1,177) | (81,076) | | (2,252) |

The test year used for 2015 deferral calculations was a projection of 2015. The test years for 2016 and 2017 both used a 12-month period ending September 2014. Actual usage, customers and use per customer compared to the test year are straightforward calculations. Changes due to weather are also straightforward calculations, the results of which are also shown in Table 2-3 in terms of total and use per customer impacts. Avista provided the weather impacts and supporting monthly details by rate schedule showing the deviation in heating and cooling degree days from normal and the corresponding model coefficient on each weather term. Energy efficiency impacts are calculated as cumulative savings from Avista programs since the test year.

One way to quickly visualize the results of the calculations shown in Table 2-3 is a plot of each factor's influence on the percent change in use per customer from the test year. Figure 2-8 presents this information for the electric residential rate group.




*Figure 2-2. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Residential*

Considering 2017 results, use per customer was 1.2% higher than test year assumptions. Weather impacts alone are estimated to have pushed electric residential use per customer 4.6% higher. The 2017 weather impact was largely offset by a 2.5% drop in use per customer due to Avista's energy efficiency achievements. The "Other" category is simply the difference between the total and the readily quantifiable factors of weather and energy efficiency. Other unidentified factors have pushed use per customer lower and have been lessening in influence over time.

For electric residential customers weather impacts on use per customer can be large and work in either direction. It is also true that energy efficiency impacts always push use per customer lower and that downward influence becomes more pronounced the further in time an evaluation year is from the test year. Cumulative energy efficiency savings will reset with a new rate case and test year.

Figure 2-3 shows a plot of total and each factor's influence on the percent change in use per customer from the test year for the electric non-residential rate group.




*Figure 2-3. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Non-Residential*

Avista's energy efficiency achievements have been the primary factor influencing changing use per customer in the electric non-residential group. From having no influence in 2015 because they were implicitly included in test year assumptions, energy efficiency impacts more than offset weather and other factors in 2017 causing an overall drop in use per customer of 1.5%. Weather appears to be far less influential in electric non-residential customer usage than it is for the electric residential group. Other unidentified factors have pushed use per customer higher at a small but consistent percentage over time.

## Natural Gas

The same analysis of the factors impacting changes in electric use per customer were also completed for the natural gas rate groups. Results of the analysis are shown in Table 2-4.

*Table 2-4. Natural Gas Use per Customer Variance from Test Year*

| | 2015 | | | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) |
| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 117,011,207 | 150,186 | 779 | 120,721,607 | 148,995 | 810 | 120,721,607 | 148,995 | 810 |
| Actual | 103,436,220 | 151,254 | 684 | 108,796,187 | 153,995 | 706 | 131,782,922 | 157,563 | 836 |
| Change from Test Year | (13,574,987) | 1,068 | (95) | (11,925,420) | 5,000 | (104) | 11,061,315 | 8,568 | 26 |
| Percent Change | -11.6% | 0.7% | -12.2% | -9.9% | 3.4% | -12.8% | 9.2% | 5.8% | 3.2% |
| Change from Test Year Due to: | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | (15,318,639) | | (101) | (10,650,431) | | (69) | 4,404,967 | | 28 |
| Cumulative Energy Efficiency | 0 | | 0 | (360,660) | | (2) | (931,120) | | (6) |
| | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 51,764,097 | 2,548 | 20,316 | 52,606,812 | 2,584 | 20,358 | 52,606,812 | 2,584 | 20,358 |
| Actual | 45,886,568 | 2,651 | 17,309 | 48,208,894 | 2,770 | 17,404 | 55,684,308 | 2,918 | 19,083 |
| Change from Test Year | (5,877,529) | 103 | (3,006) | (4,397,918) | 186 | (2,954) | 3,077,496 | 334 | (1,275) |
| Percent Change | -11.4% | 4.0% | -14.8% | -8.4% | 7.2% | -14.5% | 5.8% | 12.9% | -6.3% |
| Change from Test Year Due to: | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | (5,357,641) | | (2,021) | (3,631,036) | | (1,311) | 1,407,324 | | 482 |
| Cumulative Energy Efficiency | - | | 0 | (687,328) | | (248) | (903,662) | | (310) |

As with electric, the natural gas decoupling mechanism used a projection of 2015 as the 2015 test year. The natural gas test year for 2016 and 2017 both used a 12-month period ending September 2014. Again, these definitions of test periods are consistent with the electric decoupling mechanism. The calculations shown in Table 2-6 are also consistent with the approach described for electric and presented in Table 2-3.

Results of the analysis of changes in natural gas use per customer are visually represented in Figure 2-4 for the natural gas residential group.




*Figure 2-4. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Residential*

Weather is clearly the dominant factor in understanding changes in residential therm use per customer from the test year. The total change in use per customer tracks the warmer than normal heating seasons in calendar years 2015 and 2016 and slightly colder than normal heating season in calendar year 2017. Energy efficiency impacts on use per customer are a small factor in understanding overall change from the test year. Natural gas prices have been persistently low, squeezing the cost effectiveness of natural gas efficiency programs. Other unidentified factors were small in 2015 and 2017 but relatively high in 2016. One possible explanation is that the 2016 weather adjustment was understated by the weather normalization model.

Figure 2-5 shows a plot of total and each factor's influence on the percent change in use per customer from test year assumptions for the natural gas non-residential rate group.




*Figure 2-5. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Non-Residential*

Except for weather in 2017, all factors in each year have contributed toward lower use per customer than test year assumptions. Unlike any of the other electric or natural gas rate groups, other factors are an important influence on use per customer for the natural gas non-residential group in each of the years examined. Other factors are by definition unquantified but could include increased efficiency outside of Avista's energy efficiency programs, lower use of natural gas due to fuel substitution (e.g. increased use of biomass in cogeneration) and cutbacks in customer facility operations. Weather is also influential although less so than for natural gas residential customers. Energy efficiency impacts on use per customer are a small factor in understanding overall change from the test year. Again, this could be due in part to persistently low natural gas prices putting pressure on the cost effectiveness of natural gas efficiency programs.

Avista's electric and natural gas energy efficiency programs are discussed in detail in Section 3 and Section 6 of this report. An examination of actual weather experienced over the three evaluation years is presented next.

## *Weather Compared to Normal*

The impact of weather depends on the level of weather sensitive energy usage and the difference between actual and normal weather.[28] Weather that causes greater usage results in over collection of allowed revenue (negative deferral balances) and vice versa. Residential is the most weather sensitive customer group and natural gas customers are typically more weather sensitive than electric customers because space conditioning makes up a greater percentage of natural gas usage than electric. Given these relationships we would expect the residential natural gas customer group to have the largest weather-related impacts on decoupling deferral balances and rates.

Heating degree days are useful for describing atmospheric temperatures in units related to the need for space heating. Figure 2-6 shows the difference between actual and normal heating degree days (HDD) from January 2015 through December 2017. A negative value means warmer than normal weather (i.e., less than normal need for space heating).




*Figure 2-6. Monthly Heating Degree Days (difference from normal)*

Actual weather was predominately warmer than normal in 2015 and 2016. In 2017 actual HDDs were much closer to but higher than normal, indicating a return to slightly greater but near normal space heating loads. As shown earlier in this section, this weather pattern has the expected impact on use per customer for natural gas residential and non-residential groups. Space heating is the predominant end-use for the natural gas residential group and a major end-use in the natural gas non-residential group.

For both of Avista's electric customer rate groups, the need for space cooling is also an important determination of use per customer. Cooling degree days are useful for describing atmospheric temperatures in units related to the need for space cooling. Figure 2-7 shows the difference between actual and normal cooling degree days (CDD) from January 2015 through

[28] For this analysis, normal weather is defined as a thirty-year moving average.

December 2017. A negative value means cooler than normal weather (i.e., less than normal need for space cooling).




*Figure 2-7. Monthly Cooling Degree Days (difference from normal)*

As shown by the monthly bars, significant warmer than normal weather was experienced in the summer months of 2015 and 2017 and somewhat warmer than normal in the summer of 2016. This would have led to greater than normal levels of electric loads for space cooling in both residential and non-residential rate groups in all deferral years, especially 2015 and 2017. The increased usage for space cooling would put downward pressure on deferral balances, all else held constant. This is especially true for the non-residential group where space cooling is likely to be a larger percentage of total usage than the residential rate group.

Monthly heating and cooling degree data are summarized for each of the three calendar years in Table 2-5.

*Table 2-5. Comparison of Actual and Normal Annual Heating Degree Days*

| | Heating Degree Days | | | Cooling Degree Days | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Actual | 5,611 | 5,610 | 6,725 | 828 | 494 | 794 |
| Normal | 6,629 | 6,547 | 6,513 | 477 | 478 | 490 |
| Percent Difference | -15.4% | -14.3% | 3.3% | 73.6% | 3.3% | 62.0% |
| Source: DR 40 and DR 76 | | | | | | |

Weather can be an important factor, along with energy efficiency achievements, contributing to actual use per customer variances from projected levels. It stands to reason that decoupling deferral balances are related to weather patterns. Holding everything else constant and considering just the variances from normal degree days shown in Table 2-5 it would be reasonable to expect deferral balances for both natural gas rate groups to be positive in 2015 and 2016 and near zero or slightly negative in 2017. This is in fact the pattern of deferral balances observed in both groups. For electric rate groups the presence of cooling loads makes it more


Exhibit No. 1
Case Nos. AVU-E-19-0_ and AVU-G-19-0_
P. Ehrbar, Avista
Page 96 of 224

difficult to explain deferral balances solely on the weather when heating and cooling differences from normal cause use per customer to move in opposite directions. This is the case in 2015 and 2016 when less than normal HDDs put downward pressure on use per customer and greater than normal CDDs put upward pressure on use per customer.

Earlier in this section the balance of these offsetting weather impacts was quantified and described along with energy efficiency and other factors impacting use per customer. Especially for electric rate groups weather is only a part of the story for understanding usage and energy efficiency achievements are an important factor in determining changes in use per customer. Avista's energy efficiency achievements are described in detail in Section 3 and Section 6 of this evaluation.

## Task 2 Part 1: Impact of Decoupling Tracker Adjustment by Customer Class

The objective for the first part of this task, as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"An assessment of the impacts of the Decoupling tariff tracker adjustments, calculated in relation to energy sales (kWh/therms), as a percent of monthly bills, and in total dollars for each rate category customarily used for purposes of Avista's cost of service analyses."*

Relating to this objective is the following evaluation question, also taken from the RFP:

> *"Were there any differences in Decoupling tracker adjustments between the rate classes?"*

We begin our analysis and reporting for this task with electric customer classes followed by natural gas customer classes.

### *Electric*

Six years of historical customer counts by customer class are shown in Table 2-6. Although, Rate Group 3 is not subject to decoupling, Customer Classes E3A and E3B are included for completeness and perspective.

*Table 2-6. Annual Electric Customer Counts by Customer Class*

| Year | E1: Residential | E2A: General Services | E2B: Large General Services | E2C: Pumping | E3A: Excluded Extra Large General Services | E3B: Excluded Street & Area Lighting | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 | 202,541 | 28,868 | 2,440 | 2,416 | 22 | 357 | 236,644 |
| 2013 | 203,883 | 29,622 | 2,050 | 2,427 | 21 | 375 | 238,378 |
| 2014 | 205,621 | 30,570 | 2,011 | 2,435 | 21 | 381 | 241,039 |
| 2015 | 209,419 | 31,089 | 2,027 | 2,445 | 23 | 400 | 245,403 |
| 2016 | 209,864 | 31,286 | 1,903 | 2,433 | 21 | 409 | 245,916 |
| 2017 | 212,495 | 31,666 | 1,896 | 2,432 | 22 | 413 | 248,924 |

Avista serves approximately one quarter of a million electric customers in the state of Washington. All but about 400 of these customers are subject to the decoupling tracker adjustment. Customer growth has varied year to year consistent with economic conditions and

construction activity, averaging about one percent annually for residential and slightly higher for non-residential customers. As discussed in the previous section, although the decoupling mechanism was effective January 1, 2015, the decoupling tracker adjustment did not show up on customer bills until late in 2016. Customer growth in 2017 was near the average of the 2012-2017 period, 1.3% for residential (slightly above the average of 1.0%) and 1.0% for non-residential (slightly below the average of 1.3%).

Annual revenues by electric customer class over the 2012 through 2017 period are shown in Table 2-7. For perspective and completeness Rate Group 3 customer classes are shown in the table even though they are not subject to the decoupling mechanism.

*Table 2-7. Annual Electric Revenue by Customer Class*

| Year | E1: Residential | E2A: General Services | E2B: Large General Services | E2C: Pumping | E3A: Excluded Extra Large General Services | E3B: Excluded Street & Area Lighting | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *(thousands of dollars)* | | | | | | |
| 2012 | 193,907 | 59,984 | 129,863 | 10,068 | 58,697 | 6,772 | 459,290 |
| 2013 | 205,149 | 67,922 | 126,981 | 10,431 | 61,511 | 6,694 | 478,687 |
| 2014 | 208,603 | 70,884 | 128,958 | 11,576 | 64,355 | 6,932 | 491,308 |
| 2015 | 208,022 | 73,727 | 133,362 | 12,516 | 70,931 | 7,201 | 505,758 |
| 2016 | 207,405 | 74,978 | 129,316 | 11,265 | 66,571 | 7,089 | 496,624 |
| 2017 | 237,119 | 78,186 | 130,454 | 11,396 | 68,445 | 6,776 | 532,376 |

Avista billed Washington electric customers $532 million in 2017, up over 7% from 2016 due primarily to the effect on residential customers of a return to colder than normal weather. Like most electric and natural gas utilities, Avista's billed revenue varies significantly with the weather. Eighty six percent (86%) of revenue in 2017 was collected from Rate Groups 1 and 2, and subject to the decoupling tariff tracker. Total revenue and Schedule 75 revenue are shown in Table 2-8 for these four customer classes. Schedule 75 revenue is the revenue collected through the decoupling adjustment mechanism.

*Table 2-8. Annual Decoupling Tariff Revenue by Electric Customer Class*

| | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Electric Customer Class | Revenue | Schedule 75 Revenue | Percent of Bill | Revenue | Schedule 75 Revenue | Percent of Bill |
| E1: Residential | 207,405,033 | 821,187 | 0.4% | 237,118,808 | 7,168,350 | 3.0% |
| E2A: General Services | 74,978,073 | -106,490 | -0.1% | 78,185,893 | -777,980 | -1.0% |
| E2B: Lg Gen Services | 129,315,832 | -236,728 | -0.2% | 130,454,356 | -1,723,065 | -1.3% |
| E2C: Pumping | 11,265,056 | -6,223 | -0.1% | 11,396,073 | -188,410 | -1.7% |

In 2016 Schedule 75 revenue amounted to a small percent of the overall billed revenue for a customer class. Schedule 75 adjustment to rates first took effect on November 1, 2016, muting the annual 2016 impact. The decoupling adjustment amounted to 0.4% of 2016 residential bills. The customer classes in the non-residential rate group (Group 2) had slightly lower bills in 2016 due to Schedule 75. The difference in the direction of Schedule 75 impact on billed revenue between rate groups is due to deferral balance differences shown in the previous section.

Schedule 75 revenue is significantly higher in 2017, the first full calendar year with Schedule 75 in rates. Although still small in percentage of revenue terms, Schedule 75 accounted for 3% of billed residential revenue in 2017. The billed revenue impact was negative for Group 2 customers, ranging from -1.0% of revenue for General Services customers and -1.7% for Pumping customers.

The pattern of monthly impacts, discussed next, provides insight on what to expect for 2018. Summarizing impacts annually is useful at a high level but a monthly view is necessary to examine the pattern of usage and impact on bills from the decoupling mechanism. Monthly details are shown by electric customer class for 2016 and 2017 in Table 2-9 and Table 2-10, respectively. These tables show total usage, revenue, meters (customers), average usage, average revenue, and Schedule 75 revenue (total, average, and as a percent of revenue) for customer classes subject to the decoupling mechanism.

Monthly revenue impacts follow the pattern of volumetric sales. As a result, customer classes with high seasonality also show high seasonality in the average customer's monthly Schedule 75 charge. Due to weather induced seasonality in monthly usage, the surcharge paid per customer varies significantly by month for the Residential Rate Group, ranging from a low of $0.86 per customer in November 2016 as Schedule 75 began to be phased into customer bills, to a high of $5.10 per customer in December 2017.

A review of the monthly data in Table 2-9 and Table 2-10 shows that the percentage impact of Schedule 75 on total revenue tends to be relatively constant from month-to month. The months of November and December can be exceptions and show significant differences in Schedule 75 revenue percentage from preceding months. This is due to the November 1 effective date of new Schedule 75 rate adjustments. For example, the Schedule 75 percent for the General Services class went from -1.1% in October 2017 to 0.3% in December 2017 as the new Schedule 75 rate effective November 1, 2017 became fully reflected in customer bills.[29]

[29] Although the effective date of revised Schedule 75 rates was November 1, customer bills in November reflect usage that is partially billed at the old Schedule 75 rate and part billed at the new Schedule 75 rate. The portion billed under the old and new rates is determined by a simple prorating of usage based on the number of calendar days in the billing period before November 1 and the number of days on or after November 1.

*Table 2-9. 2016 Electric Monthly Billing Data*

| | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E1: RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 281,027,480 | 230,506,821 | 198,363,507 | 175,201,661 | 148,495,652 | 154,090,137 | 163,425,633 | 176,921,758 | 176,555,296 | 148,062,106 | 171,637,794 | 244,773,659 | 2,269,061,504 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 25,630,827 | 20,881,166 | 17,916,278 | 15,817,614 | 13,485,159 | 13,978,673 | 14,848,991 | 16,154,290 | 16,160,405 | 13,635,478 | 15,857,718 | 23,038,434 | 207,405,033 |
| Number of Meters | 208,217 | 210,418 | 209,750 | 209,405 | 209,004 | 208,965 | 209,204 | 209,512 | 210,314 | 210,674 | 211,346 | 211,562 | 209,864 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,350 | 1,095 | 946 | 837 | 710 | 737 | 781 | 844 | 839 | 703 | 812 | 1,157 | 10,812 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 123 | 99 | 85 | 76 | 65 | 67 | 71 | 77 | 77 | 65 | 75 | 109 | 988 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 181,297 | 639,882 | 821,187 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 3.02 | 3.91 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 2.8% | 0.4% |
| **E2A: GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 62,103,053 | 55,492,050 | 51,335,713 | 47,127,306 | 45,475,268 | 46,917,495 | 48,733,807 | 51,765,642 | 52,690,785 | 45,883,770 | 46,983,800 | 57,305,285 | 611,813,974 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 7,354,645 | 6,706,943 | 6,270,124 | 5,841,911 | 5,654,397 | 5,797,372 | 5,990,673 | 6,343,772 | 6,470,890 | 5,783,943 | 5,864,035 | 6,899,367 | 74,978,073 |
| Number of Meters | 30,942 | 31,232 | 31,227 | 31,188 | 31,303 | 31,240 | 31,256 | 31,343 | 31,305 | 31,485 | 31,460 | 31,455 | 31,286 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 2,007 | 1,777 | 1,644 | 1,511 | 1,453 | 1,502 | 1,559 | 1,652 | 1,683 | 1,457 | 1,493 | 1,822 | 19,555 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 238 | 215 | 201 | 187 | 181 | 186 | 192 | 202 | 207 | 184 | 186 | 219 | 2,397 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (1) | (26,204) | (80,285) | (106,490) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | (0.00) | (0.83) | (2.55) | (3.40) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -0.4% | -1.2% | -0.1% |
| **E2B: LARGE GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 125,186,862 | 112,643,414 | 107,231,528 | 112,981,690 | 112,626,772 | 118,295,108 | 119,288,439 | 119,517,243 | 125,067,964 | 111,371,375 | 108,423,915 | 125,109,526 | 1,397,743,836 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 11,313,044 | 10,409,116 | 9,923,650 | 10,486,872 | 10,446,316 | 10,950,783 | 11,065,076 | 11,155,549 | 11,567,678 | 10,540,070 | 10,148,931 | 11,308,745 | 129,315,832 |
| Number of Meters | 1,951 | 1,928 | 1,895 | 1,910 | 1,897 | 1,901 | 1,895 | 1,887 | 1,899 | 1,889 | 1,889 | 1,895 | 1,903 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 64,165 | 58,425 | 56,587 | 59,153 | 59,371 | 62,228 | 62,949 | 63,337 | 65,860 | 58,958 | 57,398 | 66,021 | 734,495 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 5,799 | 5,399 | 5,237 | 5,491 | 5,507 | 5,761 | 5,839 | 5,912 | 6,091 | 5,580 | 5,373 | 5,968 | 67,954 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (63,440) | (173,288) | (236,728) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | (33.58) | (91.45) | (124.40) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -0.6% | -1.5% | -0.2% |
| **E2C: PUMPING** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 3,962,569 | 3,835,415 | 3,817,404 | 5,668,911 | 11,827,237 | 17,473,357 | 21,240,193 | 24,373,405 | 21,721,978 | 12,100,052 | 3,753,578 | 3,803,632 | 133,577,730 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 377,549 | 367,333 | 365,519 | 511,177 | 996,213 | 1,422,553 | 1,713,307 | 1,955,460 | 1,768,189 | 1,032,957 | 384,968 | 369,832 | 11,265,056 |
| Number of Meters | 2,438 | 2,412 | 2,449 | 2,399 | 2,458 | 2,441 | 2,368 | 2,464 | 2,465 | 2,454 | 2,413 | 2,432 | 2,433 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,625 | 1,590 | 1,559 | 2,363 | 4,812 | 7,158 | 8,970 | 9,892 | 8,812 | 4,931 | 1,556 | 1,564 | 54,908 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 155 | 152 | 149 | 213 | 405 | 583 | 724 | 794 | 717 | 421 | 160 | 152 | 4,631 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (1,410) | (4,813) | (6,223) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | (0.58) | (1.98) | (2.56) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -0.4% | -1.3% | -0.1% |

*Table 2-10. 2017 Electric Monthly Billing Data*

| | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E1: RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 328,204,493 | 275,264,984 | 227,842,125 | 191,579,775 | 164,336,749 | 154,995,685 | 174,494,045 | 202,126,296 | 185,654,057 | 158,083,535 | 193,502,303 | 246,386,721 | 2,502,470,768 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 31,350,022 | 26,114,270 | 21,484,843 | 17,986,535 | 15,471,354 | 14,643,313 | 16,410,432 | 19,007,693 | 17,533,688 | 14,994,830 | 18,396,962 | 23,724,868 | 237,118,808 |
| Number of Meters | 212,134 | 212,059 | 212,618 | 212,018 | 211,258 | 211,830 | 211,439 | 212,411 | 212,339 | 213,798 | 213,856 | 214,177 | 212,495 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,547 | 1,298 | 1,072 | 904 | 778 | 732 | 825 | 952 | 874 | 739 | 905 | 1,150 | 11,777 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 148 | 123 | 101 | 85 | 73 | 69 | 78 | 89 | 83 | 70 | 86 | 111 | 1,116 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 863,088 | 723,914 | 599,203 | 503,828 | 432,218 | 407,643 | 458,821 | 531,604 | 488,277 | 415,771 | 650,764 | 1,093,219 | 7,168,350 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 4.07 | 3.41 | 2.82 | 2.38 | 2.05 | 1.92 | 2.17 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 1.94 | 3.04 | 5.10 | 33.73 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 3.5% | 4.6% | 3.0% |
| **E2A: GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 69,639,379 | 62,715,188 | 55,420,473 | 49,931,059 | 45,551,600 | 46,970,717 | 49,125,818 | 55,050,314 | 52,837,851 | 46,342,805 | 49,944,410 | 57,177,776 | 640,707,390 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 8,132,069 | 7,444,497 | 6,719,641 | 6,136,001 | 5,684,455 | 5,829,780 | 6,027,863 | 6,651,048 | 6,468,476 | 5,821,251 | 6,229,478 | 7,041,334 | 78,185,893 |
| Number of Meters | 31,582 | 31,490 | 31,659 | 31,538 | 31,392 | 31,756 | 31,572 | 31,796 | 31,755 | 31,890 | 31,616 | 31,947 | 31,666 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 2,205 | 1,992 | 1,751 | 1,583 | 1,451 | 1,479 | 1,556 | 1,731 | 1,664 | 1,453 | 1,580 | 1,790 | 20,233 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 257 | 236 | 212 | 195 | 181 | 184 | 191 | 209 | 204 | 183 | 197 | 220 | 2,469 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (99,582) | (89,733) | (79,252) | (71,396) | (65,129) | (67,163) | (70,245) | (78,717) | (75,553) | (66,261) | (35,541) | 20,593 | (777,980) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (3.15) | (2.85) | (2.50) | (2.26) | (2.07) | (2.11) | (2.22) | (2.48) | (2.38) | (2.08) | (1.12) | 0.64 | (24.57) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.1% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.1% | -0.6% | 0.3% | -1.0% |
| **E2B: LARGE GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 131,962,124 | 121,904,042 | 113,711,113 | 110,407,518 | 108,649,337 | 115,767,544 | 118,417,390 | 124,991,961 | 123,316,003 | 108,948,024 | 115,016,232 | 123,409,034 | 1,416,500,321 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 11,777,863 | 11,064,040 | 10,434,852 | 10,172,816 | 10,085,530 | 10,721,135 | 10,969,641 | 11,451,523 | 11,364,341 | 10,253,727 | 10,700,620 | 11,458,269 | 130,454,356 |
| Number of Meters | 1,884 | 1,898 | 1,893 | 1,897 | 1,889 | 1,904 | 1,893 | 1,904 | 1,899 | 1,893 | 1,896 | 1,901 | 1,896 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 70,044 | 64,228 | 60,069 | 58,201 | 57,517 | 60,802 | 62,555 | 65,647 | 64,937 | 57,553 | 60,663 | 64,918 | 747,132 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 6,252 | 5,829 | 5,512 | 5,363 | 5,339 | 5,631 | 5,795 | 6,014 | 5,984 | 5,417 | 5,644 | 6,027 | 68,808 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (188,706) | (174,237) | (162,607) | (157,883) | (155,369) | (165,548) | (169,337) | (178,739) | (176,342) | (155,796) | (79,348) | 40,845 | (1,723,065) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (100.16) | (91.80) | (85.90) | (83.23) | (82.25) | (86.95) | (89.45) | (93.88) | (92.86) | (82.30) | (41.85) | 21.49 | (908.83) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.5% | -0.7% | 0.4% | -1.3% |
| **E2C: PUMPING** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 4,114,424 | 4,433,880 | 4,576,516 | 4,451,164 | 7,314,108 | 14,910,662 | 23,854,142 | 30,594,405 | 23,144,049 | 11,688,998 | 4,880,546 | 3,366,624 | 137,329,517 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 389,284 | 417,478 | 426,104 | 416,359 | 637,403 | 1,223,511 | 1,882,387 | 2,382,676 | 1,841,934 | 978,615 | 466,727 | 333,597 | 11,396,073 |
| Number of Meters | 2,417 | 2,401 | 2,475 | 2,422 | 2,423 | 2,444 | 2,421 | 2,488 | 2,450 | 2,429 | 2,435 | 2,374 | 2,432 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,702 | 1,847 | 1,849 | 1,838 | 3,019 | 6,101 | 9,853 | 12,297 | 9,447 | 4,812 | 2,004 | 1,418 | 56,477 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 161 | 174 | 172 | 172 | 263 | 501 | 778 | 958 | 752 | 403 | 192 | 141 | 4,687 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (5,881) | (6,340) | (6,544) | (6,382) | (10,459) | (21,322) | (34,111) | (43,750) | (33,096) | (16,715) | (4,609) | 799 | (188,410) |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | (2.43) | (2.64) | (2.64) | (2.64) | (4.32) | (8.72) | (14.09) | (17.58) | (13.51) | (6.88) | (1.89) | 0.34 | (77.48) |
| Percent of Avg Bill | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.6% | -1.7% | -1.8% | -1.8% | -1.8% | -1.7% | -1.0% | 0.2% | -1.7% |

To visualize and contrast the impacts on customer electric revenues between customer classes, the percentage of monthly electric revenues attributed to Schedule 75 from the time rates were first impacted by the decoupling mechanism through December 2017 is shown in Figure 2-8.




*Figure 2-8. Schedule 75 as a Percent of Monthly Customer Class Revenues*

Figure 2-8 shows monthly Schedule 75 revenue as a percentage of total revenue for each customer class subject to decoupling. The impact on revenue of the first decoupling tariff adjustment effective November 1, 2016 can be seen beginning with November 2016 billed revenue. Residential customers saw the partial impact of Schedule 75 in November 2016 and the full impact in December 2016 with Schedule 75 revenue accounting for 2.8% of revenue. Schedule 75 revenue as a percent of class revenue increased again with new rates effective November 1, 2017. In incremental percentage terms, the 2017 increase was smaller than the 2016 increase in Schedule 75 revenue. In December 2017 when the full impact of the second year decoupling adjustment is reflected in rates, Residential Schedule 75 revenues were 4.6% of total revenue, 1.8 percentage points higher than the first rate adjustment revenue impact. As indicated by the long straight line near 3% for the Residential group in Figure 2-8, Schedule 75 was limited by the 3% annual cap in the first rate year but not in the second year, resulting in the smaller incremental increase of about 2% in rate year two (from around 3% to 5%).

For Group 2 (non-residential) customer classes, Schedule 75 had the impact of lowering customer bills with the first rate year adjustment (effective November 1, 2016). On a monthly basis, the full impact of Schedule 75 as percentage of total revenue ranged from -1.1% to -1.8%, depending on the month and customer class. This effective rebate from decoupling was reversed with the second rate year (effective November 1, 2017), resulting in Schedule 75 as a percentage of revenues ranging from 0.2% to 0.4% in December 2017. The 3% rate cap did not impact electric Group 2 customer classes in either 2016 or 2017.

## *Natural Gas*

Six years of historical customer counts by customer class are shown in Table 2-11. Although Rate Group 3 is not subject to decoupling, Customer Classes G3A and G3B are included for completeness and perspective.

*Table 2-11. Annual Natural Gas Customer Counts by Customer Class*

| Year | G1: Residential | G2A: General Services | G2B: Large General Services | G3A: Excluded Schedules 1 | G3B: Excluded Schedules 2 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 | 146,776 | 2,476 | 25 | 5 | 46 | 149,328 |
| 2013 | 147,880 | 2,498 | 26 | 4 | 49 | 150,457 |
| 2014 | 149,453 | 2,575 | 26 | 4 | 48 | 152,106 |
| 2015 | 152,182 | 2,648 | 26 | 4 | 43 | 154,903 |
| 2016 | 153,955 | 2,749 | 22 | 4 | 44 | 156,774 |
| 2017 | 157,563 | 2,896 | 22 | 4 | 45 | 160,530 |

Avista serves approximately 160,000 natural gas customers in the state of Washington. All but about 50 of these customers are subject to the decoupling tracker adjustment. Customer growth has varied year to year consistent with economic conditions and construction activity, averaging 1.4% annually for residential and 3.1% for non-residential customers. As discussed in the previous section, although the decoupling mechanism was effective January 1, 2015, the decoupling tracker adjustment did not show up on customer bills until late in 2016. Customer growth in 2017 was higher than experienced over the 2012-2017 period, 2.3% for residential and 5.3% for non-residential.

Annual revenues by customer class over the 2012 through 2017 period are shown in Table 2-12. For perspective and completeness Rate Group 3 customer classes are shown in the table even though they are not subject to the decoupling mechanism.

*Table 2-12. Annual Natural Gas Revenue by Customer Class*

| Year | G1: Residential | G2A: General Services | G2B: Large General Services | G3A: Excluded Schedules 1 | G3B: Excluded Schedules 2 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *(thousands of dollars)* | | | | | |
| 2012 | 103,264 | 32,161 | 3,176 | 1,546 | 3,297 | 143,444 |
| 2013 | 108,136 | 32,719 | 3,255 | 1,184 | 3,506 | 148,801 |
| 2014 | 114,968 | 36,439 | 3,520 | 1,060 | 3,597 | 159,584 |
| 2015 | 107,638 | 33,807 | 3,335 | 1,027 | 3,686 | 149,493 |
| 2016 | 102,989 | 31,098 | 2,441 | 928 | 4,121 | 141,577 |
| 2017 | 123,005 | 35,230 | 2,467 | 879 | 4,673 | 166,254 |

Avista billed Washington natural gas customers $166 million in 2017, up 17% from 2016 due primarily to a return to colder than normal weather and to a lesser extent rate changes between the two periods. Like most electric and natural gas utilities, Avista's billed revenue varies significantly with the weather. Ninety seven percent (97%) of revenue in 2017 was collected from Rate Groups 1 and 2, and subject to the decoupling tariff tracker (Schedule 175). Total revenue and Schedule 175 revenue are shown in Table 2-13 for these three customer classes. Schedule 175 revenue is the revenue collected through the decoupling adjustment mechanism.

*Table 2-13. Annual Decoupling Tariff Revenue by Natural Gas Customer Class*

| Natural Gas Customer Class | 2016 Revenue | 2016 Schedule 175 Revenue | 2016 Percent of Bill | 2017 Revenue | 2017 Schedule 175 Revenue | 2017 Percent of Bill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G1: Residential | 102,988,637 | 614,363 | 0.6% | 123,005,058 | 4,499,375 | 3.7% |
| G2A: General Services | 31,098,227 | 162,110 | 0.5% | 35,230,221 | 1,253,729 | 3.6% |
| G2B: Large General Services | 2,441,368 | 13,015 | 0.5% | 2,467,144 | 94,787 | 3.8% |

In 2016 Schedule 175 revenue amounted to a small percent of the overall billed revenue in each customer class. Schedule 175 adjustment to rates first took effect on November 1, 2016, muting the annual 2016 impact. The decoupling adjustment amounted to 0.6% of 2016 residential bills. The customer classes in the non-residential rate group (Group 2) experienced a similar Schedule 175 impact, 0.5% of billed revenue. The 3% cap on Schedule 175 impact on rates was hit in both the Residential and Non-residential groups in 2016 (effective November 2016).

Schedule 175 revenue is significantly higher in 2017, the first full calendar year with Schedule 175 in rates. Although still small in percentage of revenue terms, Schedule 175 accounted for 3.7% of billed residential revenue in 2017. The percentage of billed revenue for Group 2 customers was 3.6% for General Services and 3.8% for Large General Services. The 3% cap on Schedule 175 impact on rates was hit in the Residential group but not in the Non-residential groups in 2017 (effective November 2017).

Summarizing impacts annually is useful at a high level but a monthly view is necessary to examine the pattern of usage and impact on bills from the decoupling mechanism. Monthly details are shown by natural gas customer class for 2016 and 2017 in Table 2-14 and Table 2-15, respectively. These tables show total usage, revenue, meters (customers), average usage, average revenue, and Schedule 175 revenue (total, average, and as a percent of revenue) for customer classes subject to the decoupling mechanism.

Monthly revenue impacts follow the pattern of volumetric sales. As a result, customer classes with high seasonality also show high seasonality in the average customer's monthly Schedule 175 charge. Due to weather induced seasonality in monthly usage, the surcharge paid per customer varies significantly by month for the Residential Rate Group, ranging from a low of $0.36 per customer in August 2017 to a high of $6.35 per customer in December 2017.

A review of the monthly data in Table 2-14 and Table 2-15 shows that the percentage impact of Schedule 175 on total revenue also varies with seasonal usage. Because space heating in natural gas homes tends to be a much larger percentage of total annual usage than electrically space heated homes, volumetric charges dominate billed revenue during space heating months and fall off significantly during the summer. In summer months fixed charges make up a larger percentage of billed revenue causing Schedule 175 revenue as a percentage of total revenue to be lower in swing and summer months. In 2017, Schedule 175 revenue in the residential customer class fell from 3.3% of revenue during the winter months of January through March to 2.0% in August 2017.

*Table 2-14. 2016 Natural Gas Monthly Billing Data*

| | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **G1: RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 21,914,729 | 16,787,450 | 12,859,745 | 9,114,929 | 4,269,068 | 3,281,704 | 2,537,766 | 2,130,642 | 2,604,714 | 4,453,518 | 8,310,385 | 17,650,621 | 105,915,271 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 18,879,152 | 15,475,562 | 12,055,204 | 8,827,648 | 4,825,298 | 4,036,778 | 3,447,475 | 3,133,744 | 3,526,926 | 5,021,986 | 8,073,365 | 15,685,499 | 102,988,637 |
| Number of Meters | 152,912 | 153,882 | 153,511 | 153,360 | 153,389 | 153,224 | 153,459 | 153,740 | 154,156 | 154,684 | 155,353 | 155,792 | 153,955 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 143 | 109 | 84 | 59 | 28 | 21 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 29 | 53 | 113 | 688 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 123 | 101 | 79 | 58 | 31 | 26 | 22 | 20 | 23 | 32 | 52 | 101 | 669 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 99,281 | 515,080 | 614,363 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 3.31 | 3.99 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 3.3% | 0.6% |
| **G2A: GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 7,250,293 | 5,863,761 | 4,834,415 | 3,903,602 | 2,358,421 | 1,911,146 | 1,587,532 | 1,414,488 | 1,748,018 | 2,406,577 | 3,438,048 | 6,539,758 | 43,256,059 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 4,865,298 | 4,134,970 | 3,468,259 | 2,841,794 | 1,789,019 | 1,491,843 | 1,279,473 | 1,169,555 | 1,395,279 | 1,833,608 | 2,475,049 | 4,354,080 | 31,098,227 |
| Number of Meters | 2,642 | 2,680 | 2,684 | 2,773 | 2,745 | 2,769 | 2,770 | 2,751 | 2,770 | 2,775 | 2,789 | 2,835 | 2,749 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 2,744 | 2,188 | 1,801 | 1,408 | 859 | 690 | 573 | 514 | 631 | 867 | 1,233 | 2,307 | 15,738 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 1,842 | 1,543 | 1,292 | 1,025 | 652 | 539 | 462 | 425 | 504 | 661 | 887 | 1,536 | 11,314 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31,000 | 131,109 | 162,110 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.12 | 46.25 | 58.98 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 3.0% | 0.5% |
| **G2B: LARGE GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 446,020 | 429,267 | 364,759 | 321,617 | 284,309 | 246,649 | 258,436 | 228,650 | 254,582 | 284,516 | 310,486 | 281,871 | 3,711,161 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 278,087 | 280,673 | 242,268 | 215,329 | 192,525 | 169,507 | 174,805 | 156,875 | 173,252 | 190,246 | 236,385 | 131,418 | 2,441,368 |
| Number of Meters | 22 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 23 | (2) | 22 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 20,274 | 17,171 | 15,198 | 13,401 | 11,846 | 10,277 | 10,768 | 9,527 | 10,608 | 12,370 | 13,499 | (140,936) | 171,946 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 12,640 | 11,227 | 10,094 | 8,972 | 8,022 | 7,063 | 7,284 | 6,536 | 7,219 | 8,272 | 10,278 | (65,709) | 113,114 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,365 | 9,651 | 13,015 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 146.28 | (4,825.30) | 603.02 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.4% | 7.3% | 0.5% |

*Table 2-15. 2017 Natural Gas Monthly Billing Data*

| | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **G1: RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 28,097,989 | 22,824,741 | 17,107,156 | 11,663,543 | 7,585,209 | 3,624,139 | 2,244,626 | 1,945,490 | 2,351,286 | 5,277,069 | 11,805,965 | 18,233,568 | 132,760,781 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 24,698,422 | 20,121,375 | 15,196,675 | 10,587,506 | 7,285,546 | 4,192,134 | 3,126,045 | 2,905,889 | 3,213,633 | 5,429,458 | 10,536,640 | 15,711,736 | 123,005,058 |
| Number of Meters | 156,425 | 156,620 | 156,919 | 156,785 | 156,510 | 157,170 | 157,080 | 157,589 | 157,973 | 158,697 | 159,255 | 159,738 | 157,563 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 180 | 146 | 109 | 74 | 48 | 23 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 33 | 74 | 114 | 843 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 158 | 128 | 97 | 68 | 47 | 27 | 20 | 18 | 20 | 34 | 66 | 98 | 781 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 822,420 | 668,118 | 500,719 | 341,394 | 222,020 | 106,091 | 65,735 | 56,956 | 68,826 | 154,480 | 478,139 | 1,014,478 | 4,499,375 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 5.26 | 4.27 | 3.19 | 2.18 | 1.42 | 0.68 | 0.42 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.97 | 3.00 | 6.35 | 28.56 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.5% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.8% | 4.5% | 6.5% | 3.7% |
| **G2A: GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 9,444,237 | 8,207,928 | 6,445,497 | 4,650,963 | 3,329,865 | 2,145,598 | 1,481,188 | 1,342,384 | 1,685,701 | 2,461,586 | 4,581,047 | 6,497,022 | 52,273,015 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 6,154,477 | 5,390,009 | 4,289,898 | 3,159,748 | 2,317,512 | 1,562,645 | 1,145,389 | 1,064,828 | 1,269,990 | 1,743,517 | 3,023,266 | 4,108,942 | 35,230,221 |
| Number of Meters | 2,844 | 2,880 | 2,894 | 2,884 | 2,871 | 2,921 | 2,888 | 2,912 | 2,896 | 2,903 | 2,911 | 2,950 | 2,896 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 3,321 | 2,850 | 2,227 | 1,613 | 1,160 | 735 | 513 | 461 | 582 | 848 | 1,574 | 2,202 | 18,049 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 2,164 | 1,872 | 1,482 | 1,096 | 807 | 535 | 397 | 366 | 439 | 601 | 1,039 | 1,393 | 12,164 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 200,162 | 172,991 | 135,871 | 98,042 | 70,191 | 45,229 | 31,224 | 28,297 | 35,534 | 52,389 | 133,916 | 249,883 | 1,253,729 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 70.38 | 60.07 | 46.95 | 34.00 | 24.45 | 15.48 | 10.81 | 9.72 | 12.27 | 18.05 | 46.00 | 84.71 | 432.89 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.8% | 3.0% | 4.4% | 6.1% | 3.6% |
| **G2B: LARGE GENERAL SERVICES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 356,929 | 400,577 | 360,847 | 311,334 | 338,174 | 296,350 | 244,988 | 257,190 | 278,472 | 237,472 | 410,283 | 395,787 | 3,888,404 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 225,855 | 250,051 | 227,237 | 198,771 | 217,471 | 189,073 | 158,936 | 166,123 | 178,610 | 157,864 | 282,153 | 214,999 | 2,467,144 |
| Number of Meters | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | (2) | 22 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 16,224 | 18,208 | 16,402 | 14,152 | 13,527 | 11,854 | 9,800 | 10,288 | 11,603 | 9,895 | 16,411 | (197,893) | 180,158 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 10,266 | 11,366 | 10,329 | 9,035 | 8,699 | 7,563 | 6,357 | 6,645 | 7,442 | 6,578 | 11,286 | (107,500) | 114,308 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 8,374 | 8,444 | 7,607 | 6,563 | 7,129 | 6,247 | 5,164 | 5,422 | 5,870 | 5,006 | 12,708 | 16,253 | 94,787 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 380.64 | 383.83 | 345.76 | 298.32 | 285.15 | 249.88 | 206.57 | 216.86 | 244.59 | 208.58 | 508.34 | (8,126.30) | 4,391.66 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 3.7% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 7.6% | 3.8% |

The months of November and December can also show significant differences in Schedule 175 revenue percentage from preceding months. This is due to the November 1 effective date of new Schedule 175 rate adjustments. For example, the Schedule 175 percent for the General Services class went from 3.0% in October 2017 to 6.1% in December 2017 as the new Schedule 175 rate effective November 1, 2017 became fully reflected in customer bills.[30] In order to visualize and contrast the impacts on customer natural gas revenues between customer classes, the percentage of monthly natural gas revenues attributed to Schedule 175 from the time rates were first impacted by the decoupling mechanism through December 2017 is shown in Figure 2-9.




*Figure 2-9. Schedule 175 as a Percent of Monthly Customer Class Revenues*

Figure 2-9 shows monthly Schedule 175 revenue as a percentage of total revenue for each customer class subject to decoupling. The impact on revenue of the first decoupling tariff adjustment effective November 1, 2016 can be seen beginning with November 2016 billed revenue. Residential customers saw the partial impact of Schedule 175 in November 2016 and the full impact in December 2016 with Schedule 175 revenue accounting for 3.3% of revenue. Schedule 175 revenue as a percent of class revenue increased again with new rates effective November 1, 2017. In incremental percentage terms, the 2017 increase was nearly the same as the 2016 increase in Schedule 175 revenue. In December 2017 when the full impact of the second year decoupling adjustment is reflected in rates, Residential Schedule 175 revenues were 6.5% of total revenue, 3.2 percentage points higher than the first rate adjustment revenue impact in December 2016. Schedule 175 was limited by the 3% annual cap in both the first rate year and the second, resulting in the similar incremental increase in Schedule 175 revenue percentage in both years.

For Group 2 (non-residential) customer classes, Schedule 175 was also about 3% of total revenue with the first rate year adjustment (effective November 1, 2016). On a monthly basis in 2017, the impact of Schedule 175 as percentage of total revenue averaged 3.6% for General Services with lower amounts in the summer months and a similar incremental increase in the second rate

[30] Although the effective date of revised Schedule 175 rates was November 1, customer bills in November reflect usage that is partially billed at the old Schedule 175 rate and part billed at the new Schedule 175 rate. The portion billed under the old and new rates is determined by a simple prorating of usage based on the number of calendar days in the billing period before November 1 and the number of days on or after November 1.

year. The 3% rate cap limited the Non-Residential Schedule 175 rate the first rate year (effective November 1, 2016) but was not a factor in the second rate year (effective November 1, 2017). The spike shown in Figure 2-9 for Large General Service customers in December 2016 and December 2017 is due to retroactive bill adjustments that lowered the total revenue for these customers, resulting in a jump in Schedule 175 revenue as a percent of total revenue. The small number (around two dozen) of large customers in this group can lead to large changes overtime when compared to other customer classes.

## Task 2 Part 2: Are Allowed Revenues Recovering Cost of Service by Rate Group?

The objective for the second part of Task 2 as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"This assessment must include an analysis detailing if allowed revenues from the residential, non-residential, and customers not subject to decoupling rate classes are recovering their respective costs of service."*

Relating to this objective is the following evaluation question, also taken from the RFP:

> *"Are the allowed revenues from the residential class, non-residential class, and customers not subject to decoupling recovering their cost of service?"*

For this analysis it is necessary to show annual calendar revenues and cost of service for each of the three rate groups; residential, non-residential and non-decoupled. Revenue details are fairly straightforward and are determined by base rate revenue and revenues deferred through the decoupling mechanism. Avista provided detailed electric and natural gas cost of service workbooks showing revenue and cost calculations for the three rate groups.[31] Actual cost allocations are based on allocation factors in cost of service studies provided in the general rate case (GRC) proceedings adjusted for actual usage and customer counts in each calendar year. GRC values for rates and cost of service changed between the first decoupled year (2015) and the last two years (2016 and 2017).[32] This shift in assumptions may result in strange relationships in the analysis of actual revenue and cost of service.

Results of this analysis are shown in Table 2-16 for electric and Table 2-17 for natural gas. Both tables are structured the same and begin with lines showing base rate revenue (line 1) and revenue from decoupling deferrals (line 2) over the calendar year. Total revenue is the sum of each of these revenue types. Cost of service is broken down by production and transmission (electric)/underground-storage (natural gas), distribution and customer services, and administrative and general expenses. Production and transmission/underground-storage expenses are further broken out between fixed and variable costs. Variable production and transmission costs for electric (Table 2-16, line 4) are defined as volumetric sales to each rate group multiplied by the retail revenue credit (cost per kWh). Variable production and

[31] See Avista response to Data Request number 89.
[32] See Table 1-1 for the electric and natural gas GRC in effect for a given year.

underground-storage costs for natural gas (Table 2-17, line 4) are defined by the applicable Weighted Average Cost of Gas (WACOG) rates from Schedule 150 multiplied by therm sales.

Net operating income is shown on line 11 and is derived by subtracting operating expenses (line 8) and income taxes (line 10) from total revenue (line 3). The earnings test rate of return (line 13) is calculated by dividing net operating income (line 11) by the rate base (line 12). The return ratio (line 14) shows the rate of return for the rate group relative to the overall rate of return for the calendar year. For comparison purposes, line 15 shows the return ratio from the applicable GRC settlement.

The allowed return on rate base is shown as an expense on line 16 and is calculated at unity (i.e. the allowed rate of return is achieved for each customer class). Other expenses related to allowed return on rate base, taxes and revenue related expenses, are also included in line 16. Total allowed cost at unity (line 17) is the sum of all expenses (lines 8, 10 and 16). The revenue over (excess) or under (shortfall) allowed costs is shown on line 18 and is calculated by subtracting total costs (line 17) from total revenue (line 3).

Various revenue-to-cost ratios are shown at the bottom of Table 2-16 and Table 2-17. Line 19 shows the actual revenue-to-cost ratio for each rate group and calendar year and is calculated by dividing total revenue (line 3) by total cost (line 17). The corresponding relative revenue-to-cost parity ratio (line 20) shows the revenue-to-cost ratio for the rate group relative to the overall revenue-to-cost ratio for the calendar year. For comparison purposes, line 15 shows the allowed revenue-to-cost ratio from the applicable GRC.

Readers can more easily understand the findings of this section by focusing attention on two areas of results in Table 2-16 and Table 2-17. First, determine if revenues exceeded all costs and, next, determine if the result was as planned given the structure of rates and costs in the applicable GRC. First, we are able to quickly determine if revenues for the system and each rate group were sufficient to cover all costs by looking at excess revenue (line 18). If excess revenue is positive then revenue exceeded all costs, including the allowed ROR on rate base. If excess revenues are negative then costs exceeded revenue. The revenue to cost ratio (line 19) shows the same relationship and can also be used to determine if revenues exceeded costs (line 19 is greater than 1.00) or fell short of costs (line 19 is less than 1.00).

The other area of results we draw the reader's attention to provides understanding of whether or not the observed excess or shortfall in revenue was expected (i.e. planned) given the rates and costs in the applicable GRC. This can quickly be determined by comparing actual results of the revenue to cost ratio (line 19) to the GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio (line 21). If line 19 is equal to line 21 then actual results were as planned by the GRC. When line 19 exceeds line 21 results were better than planned and, conversely, when line 19 is less than line 21 actual results were worse than planned.

We begin our analysis and reporting for this task with electric rate groups followed by natural gas rate groups. Within the electric and natural gas sub-sections below, we organize our discussion by rate group across the three years rather than by year across rate groups to highlight any trends within rate groups.

## *Electric*

An examination of the electric revenues and cost of service analysis summarized in Table 2-16 reveals that Avista's Washington electric system revenue exceeded total costs in all three years. As reported elsewhere in this report, these excess earnings are shared with decoupled customer groups. Overall the non-residential rate group subsidizes the residential rate group and, to a much lesser extent, the non-decoupled rate group. These cross-subsidization results are consistent with GRC expectations.

Electric residential customers have a revenue shortfall in each year and that shortfall (subsidy) has increased since 2015. The subsidy to residential is an artifact of the GRC as is the increasing level of subsidy. The GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio for electric residential was 0.89 in 2015 and 0.87 in 2016 and 2017. Although the actual revenue to cost ratio slightly exceeded these values, the subsidy to residential customers was mostly as planned.

The electric non-residential rate group experienced increasingly higher levels of excess revenue over the 2015 to 2017 period. Comparing the actual revenue to cost ratio with the GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio shows that the excess revenue was expected at nearly the same levels as experienced. The non-residential rate group has slightly exceeded GRC expectations in 2016 and 2017.

The electric non-decoupled rate group has received a slight subsidy (revenue shortfall). The subsidy has decreased between 2015 and 2017. The subsidy and decline in subsidy were as planned by the GRC with GRC allowed revenue to cost ratios moving from 0.96 in 2015 to 0.99 in 2016 and 2017.

## *Natural Gas*

An examination of natural gas revenues and cost of service analysis summarized in Table 2-17 reveals that Avista's Washington natural gas system had a revenue shortfall in 2015 and a surplus in 2016 and 2017. Unlike the electric system, excess revenue surpluses and shortfalls have not been consistent across the three years or within rate groups. The change in GRC assumptions between 2015 and 2016/2017 appears to have materially shifted actual and planned earnings results for all rate groups. The difference between actual and planned performance across each year and rate group has also been material. However, on a relative basis as measured by the relative revenue to cost parity ratio (line 20) the performance between rate groups has been as planned (comparing lines 20 and 21) except for the non-decoupled rate group.

After receiving a larger than planned subsidy (revenue shortfall) in 2015, the natural gas residential rate group experienced a small level of excess revenue in 2016 and an even smaller (in absolute value terms) level of revenue shortfall in 2017. Combined excess revenue for 2016 and 2017 is only slightly greater than zero meaning that revenue from residential customers are just covering all costs. This is slightly better than the expected subsidy to residential customers based on the GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio of 0.97.

The non-residential natural gas rate group essentially broke even in 2015 with a small level of excess revenue (revenue to cost ratio equal to 1.00). Excess revenue increased in 2016 and 2017

to over 5 million dollars that when considered with allowed costs results in a revenue to cost ratio of 1.17 for 2016 and 1.16 2017. The sharp increase in revenue to cost ratio from 1.00 in 2015 was largely although not totally planned. The GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio went from 1.04 in 2015 to 1.12 for 2016 and 2017. Actual performance of 1.17 and 1.16 in 2016 and 2017, respectively, outpaced planned performance of 1.12 for these years.

Excess revenue in the non-decoupled natural gas rate group experienced a shortfall in 2015 and 2016 but was slightly positive in 2017. The 2015 shortfall corresponded to a revenue to cost ratio of 0.89 and was largely unplanned. The GRC allowed revenue to cost ratio for 2015 of 0.99 was much higher than the actual value of 0.89. Actual performance, as measured by the revenue to cost ratio, in 2016 and 2017 steadily improved from 2015 levels. This improvement was largely unplanned considering the GRC approved revenue to cost ratio in effect for 2016 and 2017 was 0.91 and actual results were 0.94 in 2016 and 1.02 in 2017.

*Table 2-16. Electric Revenues and Cost of Service by Rate Group (thousands of dollars)*

| Row | Item | 2015 | | | | 2016 | | | | 2017 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled |
| 1 | Base Rate Revenue | 497,677 | 210,034 | 216,152 | 71,491 | 485,974 | 203,623 | 211,142 | 71,209 | 506,932 | 222,080 | 213,180 | 71,672 |
| 2 | Decoupling Deferred Revenue | 4,795 | 7,168 | (2,373) | 0 | 12,256 | 10,288 | 1,968 | 0 | (357) | (2,093) | 1,736 | 0 |
| 3 | **Total Revenue** | **502,472** | **217,202** | **213,779** | **71,491** | **498,230** | **213,911** | **213,110** | **71,209** | **506,575** | **219,987** | **214,916** | **71,672** |
| | Production and Transmission Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Variable | 113,158 | 46,745 | 43,856 | 22,557 | 88,146 | 36,157 | 34,115 | 17,873 | 91,100 | 39,029 | 34,215 | 17,856 |
| 5 | Fixed | 96,016 | 44,317 | 35,404 | 16,295 | 102,148 | 46,485 | 38,391 | 17,271 | 102,863 | 48,774 | 37,371 | 16,718 |
| 6 | Distribution & Customer Services Expenses | 87,863 | 46,658 | 32,894 | 8,311 | 87,628 | 47,878 | 31,365 | 8,384 | 89,071 | 49,177 | 31,442 | 8,453 |
| 7 | Administrative and General Expenses | 71,444 | 37,099 | 24,711 | 9,634 | 72,851 | 38,529 | 24,682 | 9,640 | 72,184 | 38,252 | 24,254 | 9,678 |
| 8 | **Sub-Total Expenses** | **368,481** | **174,819** | **136,865** | **56,797** | **350,773** | **169,051** | **128,554** | **53,168** | **355,218** | **175,233** | **127,281** | **52,704** |
| 9 | Income Before Income Tax | 133,991 | 42,383 | 76,914 | 14,694 | 147,457 | 44,861 | 84,556 | 18,040 | 151,357 | 44,754 | 87,635 | 18,968 |
| 10 | Income Tax Expenses | 34,877 | 8,792 | 22,567 | 3,518 | 39,052 | 9,156 | 25,294 | 4,602 | 39,155 | 8,371 | 25,976 | 4,808 |
| 11 | **Net Operating Income** | **99,114** | **33,592** | **54,347** | **11,175** | **108,405** | **35,704** | **59,262** | **13,438** | **112,202** | **36,383** | **61,659** | **14,160** |
| 12 | Rate Base | 1,338,806 | 657,459 | 502,553 | 178,794 | 1,442,726 | 714,182 | 534,277 | 194,266 | 1,513,706 | 764,429 | 549,839 | 199,438 |
| 13 | Earnings Test Rate of Return | 7.40% | 5.11% | 10.81% | 6.25% | 7.51% | 5.00% | 11.09% | 6.92% | 7.41% | 4.76% | 11.21% | 7.10% |
| 14 | Return Ratio | 1.00 | 0.69 | 1.46 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 1.48 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.64 | 1.51 | 0.96 |
| 15 | GRC Return Ratio | 1.00 | 0.67 | 1.48 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 1.50 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 1.50 | 0.98 |
| 16 | Allowed Return on Rate Base plus Related Expenses | 97,316 | 57,060 | 25,993 | 14,263 | 103,211 | 62,115 | 26,488 | 14,609 | 109,215 | 67,563 | 26,881 | 14,771 |
| 17 | Total Allowed Cost at Unity | 500,674 | 240,671 | 185,424 | 74,579 | 493,036 | 240,321 | 180,336 | 72,379 | 503,589 | 251,167 | 180,138 | 72,284 |
| 18 | **Excess (Shortfall) Revenue** | **1,798** | **(23,469)** | **28,355** | **(3,088)** | **5,194** | **(26,410)** | **32,775** | **(1,171)** | **2,987** | **(31,180)** | **34,778** | **(611)** |
| 19 | Revenue to Cost Ratio | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.15 | 0.96 | 1.01 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 0.88 | 1.19 | 0.99 |
| 20 | Relative Revenue to Cost Parity Ratio | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.15 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 1.17 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.19 | 0.99 |
| 21 | GRC Allowed Revenue to Cost Ratio | 1.00 | 0.89 | 1.16 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.17 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.17 | 0.99 |

*Table 2-17. Natural Gas Revenues and Cost of Service by Rate Group (thousands of dollars)*

| Row | Item | 2015 | | | | 2016 | | | | 2017 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Non-Decoupled |
| 1 | Base Rate Revenue | 141,717 | 103,106 | 35,543 | 3,069 | 142,618 | 105,157 | 34,044 | 3,417 | 165,706 | 123,511 | 38,296 | 3,900 |
| 2 | Decoupling Deferred Revenue | 7,048 | 5,311 | 1,737 | 0 | 9,156 | 7,153 | 2,003 | 0 | (1,132) | (1,972) | 840 | 0 |
| 3 | **Total Revenue** | **148,765** | **108,417** | **37,280** | **3,069** | **151,774** | **112,310** | **36,047** | **3,417** | **164,575** | **121,539** | **39,136** | **3,900** |
| | Production and Transmission Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Variable | 69,498 | 47,565 | 21,513 | 420 | 58,186 | 40,208 | 17,650 | 328 | 66,528 | 46,691 | 19,517 | 321 |
| 5 | Fixed | 2,234 | 1,511 | 679 | 44 | 2,577 | 1,750 | 777 | 49 | 2,519 | 1,738 | 735 | 46 |
| 6 | Distribution & Customer Services Expenses | 35,625 | 29,159 | 5,601 | 866 | 36,470 | 29,627 | 5,513 | 1,330 | 38,631 | 31,287 | 5,942 | 1,402 |
| 7 | Administrative and General Expenses | 17,288 | 12,448 | 3,687 | 1,153 | 20,388 | 17,606 | 2,224 | 558 | 20,883 | 17,947 | 2,357 | 578 |
| 8 | **Sub-Total Expenses** | **124,645** | **90,682** | **31,480** | **2,483** | **117,620** | **89,191** | **26,164** | **2,265** | **128,561** | **97,662** | **28,551** | **2,347** |
| 9 | Income Before Income Tax | 24,120 | 17,734 | 5,800 | 586 | 34,154 | 23,119 | 9,883 | 1,152 | 36,014 | 23,876 | 10,585 | 1,553 |
| 10 | Income Tax Expenses | 7,336 | 5,274 | 1,913 | 150 | 9,630 | 6,216 | 3,131 | 283 | 9,957 | 6,218 | 3,325 | 414 |
| 11 | **Net Operating Income** | **16,783** | **12,461** | **3,887** | **436** | **24,524** | **16,903** | **6,751** | **869** | **26,057** | **17,659** | **7,260** | **1,138** |
| 12 | Rate Base | 272,971 | 210,944 | 52,992 | 9,035 | 286,597 | 224,256 | 48,517 | 13,824 | 313,174 | 244,878 | 53,335 | 14,961 |
| 13 | Earnings Test Rate of Return | 6.15% | 5.91% | 7.33% | 4.82% | 8.56% | 7.54% | 13.92% | 6.29% | 8.32% | 7.21% | 13.61% | 7.61% |
| 14 | Return Ratio | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.19 | 0.78 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 1.63 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.64 | 0.91 |
| 15 | GRC Return Ratio | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.25 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.65 | 0.82 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.65 | 0.82 |
| 16 | Allowed Return on Rate Base plus Related Expenses | 21,946 | 17,272 | 3,874 | 800 | 18,669 | 16,011 | 1,566 | 1,093 | 20,857 | 17,970 | 1,826 | 1,061 |
| 17 | Total Allowed Cost at Unity | 153,928 | 113,228 | 37,267 | 3,433 | 145,919 | 111,417 | 30,861 | 3,641 | 159,375 | 121,850 | 33,702 | 3,823 |
| 18 | **Excess (Shortfall) Revenue** | **(5,163)** | **(4,811)** | **13** | **(364)** | **5,855** | **893** | **5,186** | **(224)** | **5,200** | **(311)** | **5,434** | **77** |
| 19 | Revenue to Cost Ratio | 0.97 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 1.17 | 0.94 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.02 |
| 20 | Relative Revenue to Cost Parity Ratio | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.04 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 0.99 |
| 21 | GRC Allowed Revenue to Cost Ratio | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.04 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 0.91 |

## Summary - Task 2

Impacts of decoupling on customer bills have been small over the first three calendar years of operation, partly due to the timing of billing impacts. The last year of the period, 2017, was the only year with the decoupling rate in effect for all 12 months. The impact of the decoupling rate on electric bills ranged from a reduction of 1.7 % for the pumping customer class to an increase of 3.0% for the residential customer class. Monthly impacts in November and December of 2017 reflect the latest change to decoupling rates and show increases in the residential rate group to 4.6% of customer bills and around 0.3% for the non-residential rate group.

The annual impact on natural gas customer bills followed a slightly higher path than electric due to greater exposure to the impacts of heating degree days on natural gas usage and deferral balances. Still, the impact on annual natural gas bills was small and nearly the same for all customer classes, around one half of one percent in 2016 and around 3.7% in 2017. The pattern of monthly impacts shows that the greatest impact on customer bills occurred at the end of 2017 when new decoupling rates took effect November 1, 2017. With the new decoupling rates, we expect calendar year 2018 natural gas bill impacts to be around 6% for both natural gas rate groups, residential and non-residential.

An important characteristic of the Avista decoupling mechanism is that the possibility of ever-increasing levels of carryover deferrals (snow-balling deferral balances) is greatly reduced by allowing the decoupling rate to adjust incrementally higher each rate year, subject to the annual 3% cap. This feature limits rate shock while also allowing the decoupling rate to amortize higher levels of requested recovery. At some point, even if weather or other conditions that caused initially high deferral carryovers persist, the decoupling rate will eventually adjust to a level that recovers 100 percent of requested recovery and carryover deferral balances will fall to zero.

An assessment to determine if allowed revenues from the residential, non-residential, and customers not subject to decoupling rate classes are recovering their respective costs of service shows significantly different results for electric and natural gas. Avista's Washington electric system revenue exceeded total costs in all three years. Overall the non-residential rate group subsidizes the residential rate group and, to a much lesser extent, the non-decoupled rate group. These cross-subsidization results are consistent with GRC expectations. Avista's Washington natural gas system had a revenue shortfall in 2015 and a surplus in 2016 and 2017. Unlike the electric system, revenue surpluses and shortfalls have not been consistent across the three years or within rate groups. The change in natural gas GRC assumptions between 2015 and 2016/2017 appears to have materially shifted actual and planned earnings results for all rate groups.

## Section 3. Low-Income Analysis and Contrasts

This section provides an evaluation of trends in Low-Income Bill Assistance and the Low-Income Weatherization services during the study period (2012-2014 and 2015-2017). The billing analysis compares data for the three-year period immediately preceding decoupling to the three-year period following decoupling implementation to identify any changes. Other analysis covers time since the inception of the decoupling mechanism.

Task 3: An assessment of the impact of the Mechanisms specifically on Avista's low-income customers. The known low-income population to Avista are those customers who have received bill payment assistance through Avista's Low-Income Rate Assistance Program ("LIRAP"), energy efficiency services funded by Avista's electric and/or natural gas energy efficiency programs, or the Federal LIHEAP program. Cognizant that a larger portion of the low-income population do not participate in the three programs referenced above, the Consultant is encouraged to use other available information, such as the information provided in Attachments G and H to this RFP, to better determine the impact on all Avista's low-income customers. The assessment should include: (3a-3e)

(3a) A summary of the annual deferrals and rate impacts of the Decoupling tariff tracker adjustments (cents per kWh, cents per therm, total dollars, and percent of monthly bills) on the group of customers receiving bill payment assistance through the above-referenced low-income programs.

(3b) A summary of annual low-income conservation program savings, expenditures and customers served compared with the rest of the residential class, where low-income conservation programs are defined as the programs currently being run under Electric Schedule 90 and Natural Gas Schedule 190.

(3c) A description of any modifications to conservation programs targeted to low-income customers since the inception of the Mechanisms including changes to funding levels as well as changes to specific measures.

(3d) A comparison of the effect of the Decoupling tariff tracker adjustment on the average customer receiving bill payment assistance through the above-referenced low-income programs relative to the impact on Avista's average residential customer.

(3e) To the extent data is available, Consultant should evaluate other factors such as household size, housing stock (e.g. mobile home, multifamily) and heat source (e.g., electric space heat) and the effect of seasonality when comparing the impact of decoupling on low-income customers versus other customer groups (such as average residential customers).

*Figure 3-1. The Parts of Task 3*

## Low-Income Billing Impacts (includes Parts A and D)

In this section we examine the billing impacts of the decoupling tracker adjustment for low-income customers. We also contrast those impacts with the residential customer class. To facilitate communication, we report here on both Part A and Part D of Task 3.

The objective of Task 3 Part A, as stated in the Request for Proposal (RFP), is shown below:

> *"A summary of the annual deferrals and rate impacts of the Decoupling tariff tracker adjustments (cents per kWh, cents per therm, total dollars, and percent of monthly bills) on the group of customers receiving bill payment assistance through the above-referenced low-income programs"*

The "above-referenced programs" are addressed at the outset of this section. The objective of Task 3 Part D, as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"A comparison of the effect of the Decoupling tariff tracker adjustment on the average customer receiving bill payment assistance through the above-referenced low-income programs relative to the impact on Avista's average residential customer."*

Relating to these objectives is the following evaluation question, also taken from the RFP:

> *"On average, were there any differences in the annual Decoupling deferrals and tariff tracker adjustment impacts between low-income customers and residential customers?"*

A good place to start the discussion is with the question of how to define Avista's low-income customers. Because this section relies on customer billing records, it is important to have a definition of low-income that can be applied to the customer information system. Avista refers to this group in the RFP for this evaluation as the "known low-income population and includes customers who have received bill payment assistance through Avista's Low-Income Rate Assistance Program ("LIRAP"), energy efficiency services funded by Avista's electric and/or natural gas energy efficiency programs, or the Federal LIHEAP program"[33]. These are the programs referred to in the "above-referenced programs" quote from the RFP above.

For the purposes of this section, we use the known low-income population for analysis and comparison to the residential customer class. Avista pulled account-specific billing records for low-income customers. Customer usage and revenue information was included for billing periods for which the customer participated in one or more low-income programs. Annual average low-income customer counts summarized from the account level data provided are shown in Table 3-1 below. Total residential customer counts as reported in Section 2 are also shown in the table.

[33] It is understood that the low-income population is much larger than the participants in the referenced programs. See Section 8, the low-income appendix for discussion and analysis of broader definitions of low-income.

*Table 3-1. All Residential and Low-Income Electric and Natural Gas Customer Counts*

| | Electric | | | Natural Gas | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | Residential | Low-Income | Percent | Residential | Low-Income | Percent |
| 2012 | 202,541 | 31,539 | 16% | 146,776 | 14,441 | 10% |
| 2013 | 203,883 | 31,343 | 15% | 147,880 | 14,341 | 10% |
| 2014 | 205,621 | 31,525 | 15% | 149,453 | 14,104 | 9% |
| 2015 | 209,419 | 32,793 | 16% | 152,182 | 14,208 | 9% |
| 2016 | 209,864 | 33,088 | 16% | 153,955 | 14,449 | 9% |
| 2017 | 212,495 | 31,782 | 15% | 157,563 | 14,189 | 9% |

The number of low-income customers on the electric system has varied narrowly between 31 and 33 thousand customers.[34] This amounts to 15 percent to 16 percent of the total residential customer class. Avista's natural gas system has served over 14 thousand customers annually since 2012, about 9 percent of the residential customer class.

Our reporting and analysis of deferral balances and decoupling tariff tracker adjustments (decoupling rates) for low-income customers, including a comparison to the residential customer class on average, is organized by electric and natural gas service.

### *Impact on Electric Low-Income Customers*

Customer usage is an important driver in most utility operations and financial results, including decoupling deferral balances and decoupling rates. Figure 3-2 shows electric use per customer for all residential and low-income customers.




*Figure 3-2. Annual Electric Use per Customer, Low-Income and All Residential*

Electric usage per low-income customer is distinctly higher than for the average residential customer. This difference appears to have narrowed over time, most likely due to conservation programs for low-income customers, including conversions to natural gas heat. Low-income use per customer averaged about 10 percent higher than average residential usage between 2015 and 2017. This means that low-income customers will have a 10 percent greater exposure (higher rebates and surcharges) to the decoupling rate (Schedule 75) than the average residential

[34] References to the Avista system refer to operations in the state of Washington, the scope of this evaluation.

customer. Possible explanations for higher use per customer in low-income residences are explored in Section 3 Part E, below.

Energy conservation programs are most likely the driver behind the narrowing gap between use per low-income customers and all residential customers shown in Figure 3-2. A relatively greater level of conservation savings in the low-income customer group relative to all residential would lead to the declining difference observed in the historical data. Considering just 2017, first year conservation savings for low-income customers amounted to 1.7 percent of usage while first year conservation savings for all residential was 1.3 percent.[35] The low-income conservation effort is also using conversions from electric space and water heating to natural gas at higher levels than all residential. In 2017 low-income conversions accounted for 73 percent of first year savings compared to 31 percent for all residential.

Average customer revenue and decoupling revenue (Schedule 75) is shown in Table 3-2 below.

*Table 3-2. Comparison of Average Annual Electric Revenue per Customer*

| Residential Group | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Revenue | Schedule 75 Revenue | Percent of Bill | Revenue | Schedule 75 Revenue | Percent of Bill |
| Low-Income | $ 1,116 | $ 4.33 | 0.4% | $ 1,268 | $ 37.02 | 2.9% |
| All Residential | $ 988 | $ 3.91 | 0.4% | $ 1,116 | $ 33.73 | 3.0% |
| Difference | $ 127 | $ 0.41 | 0.0% | $ 152 | $ 3.28 | -0.1% |

As explained in Section 2, deferral rates first became effective November 1, 2016. Decoupling impacts on revenues in 2016 are small because the first decoupling tariff tracker adjustment did not become effective in rates until November 1, 2016. In 2017 Schedule 75 accounted for about 3 percent of the revenue from each residential group. On a percentage of bill basis, there is no meaningful difference between low-income and all residential.[36] However, low-income customers paid just over $37 in Schedule 75 charges in 2017, $3.28 more after rounding than all residential. This is consistent with higher use per customer of low-income customers. Electric low-income customers will also receive a larger rebate than all residential when Schedule 75 is negative.

Monthly usage and revenue details for the two residential groups are shown in Table 3-3 for 2016 and 2017. The data for all residential is the same as reported in Section 2, repeated here for ease of comparison to low-income customers.

Schedule 75 revenue varies with the prevailing rate and the pattern of monthly usage. Average monthly payments are shown in Figure 3-3 for both residential groups.

In 2017 the average low-income customer paid a low of $2.01 in June to a high of $5.76 in December with higher winter usage and the new higher Schedule 75 rate effective November 1,

[35] Conservation program information referenced here is taken from Section 6 of this report where the impact of conservation programs is discussed in greater detail.
[36] Electric low-income customers show Schedule 75 revenue to be a slightly smaller percentage of the total bill.

2017. The impact of higher use per customer on Schedule 75 revenue is also evident in the chart with payments from low-income customers averaging $0.27 a month higher than all residential.




*Figure 3-3. Comparison of Average Monthly Electric Schedule 75 Revenue per Customer*

*Table 3-3. Monthly Electric Usage, Meters and Revenue, Low-Income and All Residential*

| | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 281,027,480 | 230,506,821 | 198,363,507 | 175,201,661 | 148,495,652 | 154,090,137 | 163,425,633 | 176,921,758 | 176,555,296 | 148,062,106 | 171,637,794 | 244,773,659 | 2,269,061,504 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 25,630,827 | 20,881,166 | 17,916,278 | 15,817,614 | 13,485,159 | 13,978,673 | 14,848,991 | 16,154,290 | 16,160,405 | 13,635,478 | 15,857,718 | 23,038,434 | 207,405,033 |
| Number of Meters | 208,217 | 210,418 | 209,750 | 209,405 | 209,004 | 208,965 | 209,204 | 209,512 | 210,314 | 210,674 | 211,346 | 211,562 | 209,864 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,350 | 1,095 | 946 | 837 | 710 | 737 | 781 | 844 | 839 | 703 | 812 | 1,157 | 10,812 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 123 | 99 | 85 | 76 | 65 | 67 | 71 | 77 | 77 | 65 | 75 | 109 | 988 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 181,297 | 639,882 | 821,187 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 3.02 | 3.91 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 2.8% | 0.4% |
| **LOW-INCOME RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 51,792,825 | 42,246,732 | 36,334,392 | 31,460,899 | 25,482,967 | 25,433,162 | 26,106,262 | 27,736,360 | 27,849,606 | 24,587,805 | 29,744,142 | 43,039,640 | 391,814,792 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 4,908,225 | 3,959,794 | 3,382,484 | 2,919,017 | 2,372,729 | 2,367,074 | 2,438,539 | 2,605,931 | 2,624,172 | 2,321,419 | 2,822,765 | 4,187,153 | 36,909,302 |
| Number of Meters | 33,094 | 33,250 | 33,390 | 33,373 | 33,323 | 33,262 | 33,051 | 32,953 | 32,822 | 32,807 | 32,843 | 32,882 | 33,088 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,565 | 1,271 | 1,088 | 943 | 765 | 765 | 790 | 842 | 849 | 749 | 906 | 1,309 | 11,842 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 148 | 119 | 101 | 87 | 71 | 71 | 74 | 79 | 80 | 71 | 86 | 127 | 1,116 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30,784 | 112,384 | 143,170 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.94 | 3.42 | 4.33 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 2.7% | 0.4% |

| | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 328,204,493 | 275,264,984 | 227,842,125 | 191,579,775 | 164,336,749 | 154,995,685 | 174,494,045 | 202,126,296 | 185,654,057 | 158,083,535 | 193,502,303 | 246,386,721 | 2,502,470,768 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 31,350,022 | 26,114,270 | 21,484,843 | 17,986,535 | 15,471,354 | 14,643,313 | 16,410,432 | 19,007,693 | 17,533,688 | 14,994,830 | 18,396,962 | 23,724,868 | 237,118,808 |
| Number of Meters | 212,134 | 212,059 | 212,618 | 212,018 | 211,258 | 211,830 | 211,439 | 212,411 | 212,339 | 213,798 | 213,856 | 214,177 | 212,495 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,547 | 1,298 | 1,072 | 904 | 778 | 732 | 825 | 952 | 874 | 739 | 905 | 1,150 | 11,777 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 148 | 123 | 101 | 85 | 73 | 69 | 78 | 89 | 83 | 70 | 86 | 111 | 1,116 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 863,088 | 723,914 | 599,203 | 503,828 | 432,218 | 407,643 | 458,821 | 531,604 | 488,277 | 415,771 | 650,764 | 1,093,219 | 7,168,350 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 4.07 | 3.41 | 2.82 | 2.38 | 2.05 | 1.92 | 2.17 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 1.94 | 3.04 | 5.10 | 33.73 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 3.5% | 4.6% | 3.0% |
| **LOW-INCOME RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (kWh) | 58,734,312 | 49,295,700 | 40,591,195 | 33,534,017 | 28,021,392 | 24,588,795 | 25,980,235 | 29,336,020 | 27,138,379 | 24,397,403 | 31,080,870 | 39,248,667 | 411,946,985 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 5,822,267 | 4,844,930 | 3,951,217 | 3,241,125 | 2,708,450 | 2,386,460 | 2,515,190 | 2,842,472 | 2,644,188 | 2,377,756 | 3,043,320 | 3,910,652 | 40,288,025 |
| Number of Meters | 32,813 | 32,738 | 32,759 | 32,621 | 32,431 | 32,181 | 31,801 | 31,528 | 31,034 | 30,757 | 30,501 | 30,214 | 31,782 |
| Avg Usage (kWh) | 1,790 | 1,506 | 1,239 | 1,028 | 864 | 764 | 817 | 930 | 874 | 793 | 1,019 | 1,299 | 12,962 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 177 | 148 | 121 | 99 | 84 | 74 | 79 | 90 | 85 | 77 | 100 | 129 | 1,268 |
| Total Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 154,388 | 129,610 | 106,721 | 88,193 | 73,695 | 64,646 | 68,329 | 77,155 | 71,374 | 64,164 | 103,987 | 174,161 | 1,176,423 |
| Avg Schedule 75 Revenue ($) | 4.71 | 3.96 | 3.26 | 2.70 | 2.27 | 2.01 | 2.15 | 2.45 | 2.30 | 2.09 | 3.41 | 5.76 | 37.02 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 3.4% | 4.5% | 2.9% |

### *Impact on Natural Gas Low-Income Customers*

As with electric, due to the influence of use per customer on decoupling deferrals, we begin our discussion of natural gas with a comparison between low-income and all residential use per customer. Figure 3-4 shows natural gas use per customer for all residential and low-income customers.




*Figure 3-4. Annual Natural Gas Use per Customer, Low-Income and Average Residential*

Natural gas use per low-income customer is clearly lower than the average residential customer. This is the opposite of the electric system where low-income use per customer is higher than the residential class. Natural gas low-income use per customer averaged about 10 percent lower than average residential usage between 2015 and 2017. This means that low-income natural gas customers will have a 10 percent lower exposure (lower rebates and surcharges) to the decoupling rate (Schedule 175) than the average residential customer. Possible explanations for lower use per customer in low-income residences are explored in Section 3 Part E.

Average customer revenue and decoupling revenue (Schedule 175) is shown in Table 3-4, below. As explained in Section 2, deferral rates first became effective November 1, 2016. Decoupling impacts on revenues in 2016 are small because the first decoupling tariff tracker adjustment did not become effective in rates until November 1, 2016. In 2017 Schedule 175 accounted for 3.4 percent of low-income revenue and 3.7 percent of all residential revenue. On a percentage of bill basis, there is only a minor difference between low-income and all residential.[37] However, low-income customers paid just over $25 in Schedule 175 charges in 2017, $3.55 less than all residential. This is consistent with lower use per customer of low-income customers. Natural gas low-income customers will also receive a lower rebate than all residential when Schedule 175 is negative.

[37] Natural gas low-income customers show Schedule 175 revenue to be a slightly smaller percentage of the total bill.

*Table 3-4. Comparison of Average Annual Natural Gas Revenue per Customer*

| Customer Group | 2016 Revenue | 2016 Schedule 175 Revenue | 2016 Percent of Bill | 2017 Revenue | 2017 Schedule 175 Revenue | 2017 Percent of Bill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low-Income | $ 629 | $ 3.39 | 0.5% | $ 731 | $ 25.01 | 3.4% |
| All Residential | $ 669 | $ 3.99 | 0.6% | $ 781 | $ 28.56 | 3.7% |
| Difference | $ (40) | $ (0.60) | -0.1% | $ (50) | $ (3.55) | -0.2% |

Monthly natural gas usage and revenue details for the two residential groups are shown in Table 3-5 for 2016 and 2017. The data for all residential is the same as reported in Section 2, repeated here for ease of comparison to low-income customers.

Schedule 175 revenue varies with the prevailing rate and the pattern of monthly usage. Average monthly payments are show in Figure 3-5 for both residential groups.




*Figure 3-5. Comparison of Average Monthly Natural Gas Schedule 175 Revenue per Customer*

In 2017 the average low-income customer Schedule 175 payments ranged from a low of $0.42 in August to a high of $5.09 in December with higher winter usage and the new higher Schedule 175 rate effective November 1, 2017. The impact of lower use per customer on Schedule 175 revenue is also evident in the chart with payments from low-income customers averaging $0.30 a month lower than all residential.

*Table 3-5. Monthly Natural Gas, Meters and Revenue, Low-Income and All Residential*

| | Jan-16 | Feb-16 | Mar-16 | Apr-16 | May-16 | Jun-16 | Jul-16 | Aug-16 | Sep-16 | Oct-16 | Nov-16 | Dec-16 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 21,914,729 | 16,787,450 | 12,859,745 | 9,114,929 | 4,269,068 | 3,281,704 | 2,537,766 | 2,130,642 | 2,604,714 | 4,453,518 | 8,310,385 | 17,650,621 | 105,915,271 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 18,879,152 | 15,475,562 | 12,055,204 | 8,827,648 | 4,825,298 | 4,036,778 | 3,447,475 | 3,133,744 | 3,526,926 | 5,021,986 | 8,073,365 | 15,685,499 | 102,988,637 |
| Number of Meters | 152,912 | 153,882 | 153,511 | 153,360 | 153,389 | 153,224 | 153,459 | 153,740 | 154,156 | 154,684 | 155,353 | 155,792 | 153,955 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 143 | 109 | 84 | 59 | 28 | 21 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 29 | 53 | 113 | 688 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 123 | 101 | 79 | 58 | 31 | 26 | 22 | 20 | 23 | 32 | 52 | 101 | 669 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 99,281 | 515,080 | 614,363 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 3.31 | 3.99 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 3.3% | 0.6% |
| **LOW-INCOME RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 1,842,271 | 1,415,648 | 1,106,775 | 807,695 | 370,814 | 279,876 | 209,911 | 171,755 | 210,739 | 374,915 | 716,016 | 1,439,708 | 8,946,123 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 1,626,019 | 1,339,897 | 1,067,510 | 812,655 | 451,415 | 378,120 | 320,282 | 289,906 | 320,924 | 452,761 | 719,374 | 1,305,303 | 9,084,165 |
| Number of Meters | 15,607 | 15,647 | 15,678 | 15,603 | 15,085 | 14,214 | 12,665 | 11,357 | 12,206 | 14,477 | 15,286 | 15,567 | 14,449 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 118 | 90 | 71 | 52 | 25 | 20 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 26 | 47 | 92 | 619 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 104 | 86 | 68 | 52 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 47 | 84 | 629 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,997 | 40,987 | 48,985 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 2.63 | 3.39 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 3.1% | 0.5% |

| | Jan-17 | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Apr-17 | May-17 | Jun-17 | Jul-17 | Aug-17 | Sep-17 | Oct-17 | Nov-17 | Dec-17 | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALL RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 28,097,989 | 22,824,741 | 17,107,156 | 11,663,543 | 7,585,209 | 3,624,139 | 2,244,626 | 1,945,490 | 2,351,286 | 5,277,069 | 11,805,965 | 18,233,568 | 132,760,781 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 24,698,422 | 20,121,375 | 15,196,675 | 10,587,506 | 7,285,546 | 4,192,134 | 3,126,045 | 2,905,889 | 3,213,633 | 5,429,458 | 10,536,640 | 15,711,736 | 123,005,058 |
| Number of Meters | 156,425 | 156,620 | 156,919 | 156,785 | 156,510 | 157,170 | 157,080 | 157,589 | 157,973 | 158,697 | 159,255 | 159,738 | 157,563 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 180 | 146 | 109 | 74 | 48 | 23 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 33 | 74 | 114 | 843 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 158 | 128 | 97 | 68 | 47 | 27 | 20 | 18 | 20 | 34 | 66 | 98 | 781 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 822,420 | 668,118 | 500,719 | 341,394 | 222,020 | 106,091 | 65,735 | 56,956 | 68,826 | 154,480 | 478,139 | 1,014,478 | 4,499,375 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 5.26 | 4.27 | 3.19 | 2.18 | 1.42 | 0.68 | 0.42 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.97 | 3.00 | 6.35 | 28.56 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.5% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.8% | 4.5% | 6.5% | 3.7% |
| **LOW-INCOME RESIDENTIAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Usage (therms) | 2,288,240 | 1,880,864 | 1,420,260 | 975,231 | 640,493 | 304,001 | 176,484 | 156,616 | 184,631 | 417,965 | 918,874 | 1,375,557 | 10,739,216 |
| Total Revenue ($) | 2,057,808 | 1,693,264 | 1,293,014 | 915,326 | 649,284 | 386,266 | 285,911 | 266,734 | 286,234 | 461,743 | 854,963 | 1,221,052 | 10,371,598 |
| Number of Meters | 15,588 | 15,617 | 15,628 | 15,538 | 15,364 | 14,377 | 11,815 | 10,781 | 11,497 | 14,386 | 14,844 | 14,829 | 14,189 |
| Avg Usage (therms) | 147 | 120 | 91 | 63 | 42 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 29 | 62 | 93 | 757 |
| Average Revenue ($) | 132 | 108 | 83 | 59 | 42 | 27 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 32 | 58 | 82 | 731 |
| Total Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 65,845 | 53,942 | 40,741 | 27,997 | 18,489 | 8,833 | 5,225 | 4,512 | 5,329 | 12,021 | 36,409 | 75,490 | 354,833 |
| Avg Schedule 175 Revenue ($) | 4.22 | 3.45 | 2.61 | 1.80 | 1.20 | 0.61 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.46 | 0.84 | 2.45 | 5.09 | 25.01 |
| Percent of Avg Bill | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.1% | 2.8% | 2.3% | 1.8% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 4.3% | 6.2% | 3.4% |

### *Summary – Task 3, Parts A and D*

The decoupling deferral tracker adjustment, Schedule 75 for electric and Schedule 175 for natural gas, has had a relatively small impact on low-income customer bills. In 2017, the first-year decoupling rates were effective the full calendar year, the average low-income customer paid $37 in Schedule 75 charges and $25 in Schedule 175 charges. These charges amounted to 2.9 percent of the average low-income electric bill and 3.4 percent of the average low-income natural gas bill. Looking forward to 2018, both Schedule 75 and Schedule 175 are expected to be negative effective November 1, 2018, resulting in a rebate from decoupling through October 2019.

On a percentage of bill basis there is no meaningful difference in decoupling charges between low-income and all residential customers. However, low-income use per customer averaged about 10 percent higher than average residential usage on the electric system and 10 percent lower on the natural gas system. This means that low-income electric customers have a 10 percent greater exposure (higher rebates and surcharges) to the decoupling rate than the average residential customer and low-income natural gas customers have a 10 percent lower exposure. Possible explanations for higher electric and lower natural gas use per customer in low-income residences are explored in Section 3 Part E.

## Low-Income Savings, Expenditures and Customers Served

Task 3, Part B is defined as follows:

> "3b) A summary of annual low-income conservation program savings, expenditures and customers served compared with the rest of the residential class, where low-income conservation programs are defined as the programs currently being run under Electric Schedule 90 and Natural Gas Schedule 190."

### *Conservation Program Savings*

Residential and low-income electric energy savings are shown in Table 3-6 and these results are partitioned into conservation (Table 3-7) and conversion of electric heat and hot water to natural gas Table 3-8.[38]

*Table 3-6. Total Electric Energy Savings - Conservation and Conversions (kWh)*

| Sector | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential | 25,397,486 | 16,082,204 | 43,063,551 | 33,376,237 |
| Low-Income | 400,247 | 829,091 | 546,066 | 710,204 |
| Percent Low-Income | 1.6% | 5.2% | 1.3% | 2.1% |

[38] The source of information for the energy savings tables is the set of Washington DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis for each year from 2014 through 2017.

*Table 3-7. I-937 Electric Conservation (kWh)*

| Sector | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential | 23,586,582 | 10,716,609 | 33,316,699 | 23,139,201 |
| Low-Income | 198,392 | 209,567 | 272,438 | 191,457 |
| Percent Low-Income | 0.8% | 2.0% | 0.8% | 0.8% |

*Table 3-8. Electric Conversion to Natural Gas Savings (kWh)*

| Sector | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential | 1,810,904 | 5,365,595 | 9,766,855 | 10,237,036 |
| Low-Income | 201,855 | 619,584 | 273,628 | 518,748 |
| Percent Low-Income | 11.1% | 11.5% | 2.8% | 5.1% |

The percentage of electric energy savings due to conversions is shown in Table 3-9. In 2017 this was about 31% for residential and about 73% for low-income.

*Table 3-9. Percentage Electric Savings Due to Conversions from Electric to Natural Gas*

| Sector | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential | 7.1% | 33.4% | 22.7% | 30.7% |
| Low-Income | 50.4% | 74.7% | 50.1% | 73.0% |

Residential and low-income natural gas energy savings are shown in Table 3-10.

*Table 3-10. Total Natural Gas Conservation Savings (therms)*

| Sector | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential | 355.443 | 343,395 | 367,891 | 773,030 |
| Low-Income | 14,944 | 13,154 | 18,490 | 3,034 |
| Low-Income as a Percentage of Other Residential | 4.2% | 3.8% | 5.0% | 0.4% |

Before turning to expenditures and customers served, we first provide a discussion of the low-income payment assistance and energy savings programs.

Avista service to low-income customers includes both bill assistance and low-income weatherization programs. Bill assistance programs are analyzed first, followed by low-income weatherization.

## *Low-Income Bill Assistance*

To assess the impact of the decoupling mechanism on Avista's low-income customers we evaluated the trends in bill assistance before and after decoupling implementation in January 2015. We analyzed each of the bill assistance programs that are available to assist Avista low-income customers including bill assistance funded by outside organizations. The purpose of these programs is to alleviate the home energy burden for low-income customers and to provide emergency assistance as required, while keeping service connected.

### *Low-Income Rate Assistance Program (LIRAP)*

LIRAP provides energy assistance grants to low-income customers in Washington, Idaho, and Oregon. LIRAP grants are used to help with paying off a portion of a past due energy bill to ease the energy burden on limited income customers below one-hundred and twenty-six percent (126%) of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Benefits for limited income households are based on eligibility and a percentage of the customers' utility bill.

LIRAP services are delivered by the Washington State Department of Commerce (DOC) in collaboration with a network of Community Actions Agencies (CAA) throughout the Avista service area in Washington State. The CAA's provide the client intake and eligibility determination services required to distribute LIRAP benefits.

The program is funded by rate payers through the LIRAP Tariff Rider applied to energy usage on both electric and natural gas customers. The LIRAP tariff rate for electric service is established through the rate setting process and decided by the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission. The level of LIRAP funding is determined by the Schedule 92 and Schedule 192 rate applied to the volumes of electric and natural gas sales, respectively. Table 3-11 presents the electric service LIRAP tariff rates in each of the listed rate schedules used to determine the available funding.[39]

To provide a simple combined view of the overall trends in the LIRAP electric service tariff rate since 2015 we calculated a weighted average $/kWh LIRAP rate. The calculation included all schedules listed in Table 3-11 except Schedules 41-48 since these schedules are not billed on a $/kWh basis.

The weights are based on the projected dollar sales of electricity in each of the affected rate schedules listed in Table 3-11.[40] Figure 3-6 illustrates that the weighted average LIRAP rate increased steadily since 2012 and has continued that trend after 2015 and through 2017. This trend is projected to continue with a proposed increase planned for October 1, 2018.

[39] DR Response: 073, Attach. A and DR Response: 073 Attach. A, Revised
[40] DR Response: 073, Attach. A and DR Response: 073 Attach. A, Revised

*Table 3-11. Electric Service LIRAP Tariff Rate*

| | | Effective Dates | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Schedules** | **01-Jan-12** | **01-Jan-13** | **01-Jan-14** | **01-Jan-15** | **01-Oct-15** | **11-Jan-16** | **01-Oct-16** | **01-Oct-17** | **01-Oct-18** |
| | | **(dollars per kWh)** | | | | | | | | |
| Residential | 1 and 2 | 0.00066 | 0.00068 | 0.00070 | 0.00081 | 0.00085 | 0.00091 | 0.00097 | 0.00104 | 0.00111 |
| General Service | 11, 12 | 0.00095 | 0.00098 | 0.00101 | 0.00117 | 0.00123 | 0.00132 | 0.00141 | 0.00151 | 0.00162 |
| Large General Service | 21, 22 | 0.00070 | 0.00072 | 0.00074 | 0.00085 | 0.00089 | 0.00095 | 0.00102 | 0.00109 | 0.00117 |
| Extra Large General Service | 25 | 0.00044 | 0.00045 | 0.00046 | 0.00053 | 0.00056 | 0.00060 | 0.00064 | 0.00068 | 0.00073 |
| Pumping | 30, 31, 32 | 0.00060 | 0.00062 | 0.00064 | 0.00074 | 0.00078 | 0.00083 | 0.00089 | 0.00095 | 0.00102 |
| **Weighted Average** | | **0.00067** | **0.00070** | **0.00072** | **0.00085** | **0.00090** | **0.00096** | **0.00103** | **0.00110** | **0.00118** |
| | | **(percent of base rates)** | | | | | | | | |
| Street & Area Lighting | 41-48 | 0.85% | 0.88% | 0.88% | 0.99% | 1.04% | 1.13% | 1.21% | 1.29% | 1.38% |




*Figure 3-6. Electric Service LIRAP Tariff (Weighted Average)*

Table 3-12 presents the natural gas service LIRAP tariff rate which is applied to therms of natural gas sales for each of the rate schedules listed to determine available funding. The LIRAP natural gas rate is established through the rate setting process and decided by the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission.

To provide a simple combined view of the overall trends in the LIRAP natural gas service tariff rate since 2012, we calculated a weighted average LIRAP rate for all affected rate schedules. The weights are based on the projected dollar sales of natural gas in each of the affected rate schedules listed in Table 3-12.

Figure 3-7 shows that the weighted average natural gas LIRAP tariff rate increased steadily since 2012 through 2017. The positive trend is expected to continue with a proposed increase in the natural gas service LIRAP tariff rate planned for October 1, 2018.

*Table 3-12. Natural Gas Service LIRAP Tariff Rate*

| | Schedules | Effective Dates ($/therm) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **01-Jan-12** | **01-Jan-13** | **01-Jan-14** | **01-Jan-15** | **01-Oct-15** | **11-Jan-16** | **01-Oct-16** | **01-Oct-17** | **01-Oct-18** |
| General Service | 101, 102 | 0.01094 | 0.01134 | 0.01145 | 0.01410 | 0.01478 | 0.01712 | 0.01832 | 0.01910 | 0.02044 |
| Large General Service | 111, 112 | 0.00917 | 0.00951 | 0.00960 | 0.01182 | 0.01239 | 0.01435 | 0.01535 | 0.01600 | 0.01712 |
| Extra Large General Service | 121, 122 | 0.00837 | 0.00868 | 0.00876 | 0.01079 | 0.01131 | 0.01310 | 0.01402 | 0.01462 | 0.01564 |
| Interruptible | 131, 132 | 0.00804 | 0.00834 | 0.00842 | 0.01037 | 0.01087 | 0.01259 | 0.01347 | 0.01404 | 0.01502 |
| Transportation | 146 | | | | | 0.00084 | 0.00097 | 0.00104 | 0.00083 | 0.00083 |
| **Weighted Average** | | **0.01043** | **0.01082** | **0.01093** | **0.01344** | **0.01396** | **0.01617** | **0.01730** | **0.01805** | **0.01933** |




*Figure 3-7. Natural Gas Service LIRAP Tariff (Weighted Average)*

### *Rate Discount Pilot Program for Seniors*

Avista has an experimental pilot program that offers a rate discount to fixed-income seniors and customers with disabilities whose household income is between one-hundred and twenty-six percent (126%) and two-hundred percent (200%) of the FPL. This program began October 1, 2015 and will end September 30, 2019, though it continues for those customers who are currently enrolled. The rate discount is limited to 800 customers (700 in Spokane County and 100 in Stevens, Lincoln and Ferry counties. The pilot program was only available through SNAP and Rural Resources for customers in Spokane, Stevens, Lincoln and Ferry counties. This program is an innovative approach for Avista and was implemented in the year that decoupling started.[41]

### *Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)*

LIHEAP is funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). It operates in every state and the District of Columbia, as well as on most tribal reservations and U.S. territories. The purpose of LIHEAP is to assist low-income households, particularly those with the lowest incomes who pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, primarily in meeting their immediate home heating and cooling needs. The primary factor determining eligibility is the household income level which must be at or below the LIHEAP State Poverty Guideline (Table 3-13).

*Table 3-13. LIHEAP Poverty Guidelines (2017)*

| Number of Persons in Household | State Poverty Guideline for LIHEAP | Number of Persons in Household | State Poverty Guideline for LIHEAP |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | $12,060 | 5 | $28,780 |
| 2 | $16,240 | 6 | $32,960 |
| 3 | $20,420 | 7 | $37,140 |
| 4 | $24,600 | 8 | $41,320 |

The LIHEAP statute defines home energy as a source of heating or cooling in residential dwellings. The LIHEAP block grant serving Avista customers is administered by the Washington State Department of Commerce (DOC) in collaboration with a network of CAAs' across the state.

Because LIHEAP is a Block Grant program, states are authorized to add additional criteria to determine the level of benefit provided to each eligible household such as hypothermia risk, crisis interventions, and high energy burden.

### *Project Share*

Project Share[42] is a donation-based program that helps keep homes warm through crisis situations like a sudden loss of income, expensive medical costs, malfunctioning heating equipment and other unforeseen circumstances that deplete available funds and make it difficult to pay household energy costs. The program is a partnership between utilities, fuel vendors and

[41] Cornwell, John, Avista Low-income Rate Assistance Program Rate Discount Pilot Impact and Process Evaluation, Primary Report Update. Evergreen Economics: July 11, 2017.
[42] Response to DR 045

community action agencies that provide emergency energy assistance to qualified households that have exhausted all other energy assistance resources.

The goal of Project Share is to help stabilize households-in-crisis for 30 days. People do not need to meet federal poverty guidelines to qualify, but they must contact their energy provider to make payment arrangements to avoid future emergencies.

- Project Share funds can help cover utility bills, deposits, deliverables – oil, wood, coal or propane – and furnace repairs.
- Project Share decisions are made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the Project Share Administration and Distribution of Funds Agreement.

Project Share currently receives donations from[43]:

- The Avista Corporation
- Avista employees
- Avista customers
- Ferry County PUD customers
- Inland Power & Light Corporation
- Inland Power & Light customers
- Modern Electric customers
- The Spokane AdFed Golf Tournament

### *Miscellaneous Bill Assistance*

The MISC[44] Assistance Category consists of several dozen organizations that provide energy assistance grants to Avista customers. These organizations include churches, social service and government agencies: such as the Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, the Department of Health and Human Services or the local Housing Authority. Energy Assistance is not the primary way that these organizations help individuals (it is not their core mission or function); however, during their service they may help individuals with their utility bill. Additionally, many of these organizations do not have an established source for funding to help with energy assistance. In receiving these assistance payments Avista customers are categorized as MISC within the Customer Care and Billing System.

[43] Funds raised from Utilities other than Avista provide bill assistance benefits to customers of those utilities and not to Avista customers.
[44] Response to DR 046.

## *Bill Assistance Funding Trends*

The bill assistance funding study period (2012-2017) provides three years of pre-decoupling data and three years of post-decoupling data. Figure 3-8 illustrates that between 2012 and 2014, combined bill assistance funding levels from all sources were stable ranging between $8.26 and $8.83 million per year.[45] In 2015 a significant decrease in funding was reported, from $8.7 in 2014 to $6.8 million in 2015.




*Figure 3-8. Value of All Bill Assistance Grants*

Figure 3-9 illustrates that funding levels for all of the four bill assistance programs decreased in 2015. The largest declines were the LIHEAP and MISC sources. Overall funding levels recovered in both 2016 and 2017; however, the recovery was not uniform for each funding source.




*Figure 3-9. Value of Bill Assistance by Funding Source*

Since 2015 the LIHEAP funding trend has been level while LIHEAP and MISC funding continued to slightly decline. However, LIRAP and Project Share both show significant increases

[45] DR Responses: 026 Attach. A, 027 Attach. A, 028 Attach. A, 048 Attach. A, 048 Attach. B

in funding levels, particularly Project Share which increased funding by $2,194,755 between 2015 and 2017. Project Share and LIRAP funding have made up for losses from LIHEAP and MISC funding reductions over the study period. Figure 3-9 reflects a shift in bill assistance funding with increased dependence on LIRAP and Project Share and reduced dependence on LIHEAP and MISC. This reflects a shift toward increased local and utility funding. LIHEAP funding like other federal block grants is subject to significant changes depending on Congressional Appropriations.

### *Number of Bill Assistance Grants*

Figure 3-10 shows a significant decrease in the combined number of grants from all funding sources provided in 2015, reflecting the decreased funding levels for each funding source in 2015.[46] This is followed by a recovery in the number of grants in 2016 and 2017.




*Figure 3-10. Number of Bill Assistance Grants Provided*

Figure 3-11 illustrates the trend in the number of bill assistance grants for each funding source.[47] The data reflects a continuing downward trend in the number of MISC bill assistance grants and a leveling-off of the number on LIHEAP bill assistance grants. Consistency with funding levels, the numbers of LIRAP and Project Share grants has increased annually since 2015 and has made up for the decreases in the LIHEAP and MISC bill assistance grants provided to Avista customers.

[46] Responses to DRs: 021 Attach. A, 021 Attach. B, 021 Attach. C, 022 Attach. A, 023 Attach. A, 024 Attach. A, 047 Attach. A.

[47] Response to DR's: 021 Attach. A, 021 Attach. B, 021 Attach. C, 022 Attach. A, 023 Attach. A, 024 Attach. A, 047 Attach. A, 026 Attach. A, 027 Attach. A, 028 Attach. A, 048 Attach. A, 048 Attach. B.




| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LIRAP | 5,603 | 7,303 | 7,159 | 6,621 | 6,718 | 8,130 |
| LIHEAP | 8,276 | 6,136 | 6,314 | 4,545 | 5,669 | 4,993 |
| Project Share | 5,245 | 5,827 | 5,745 | 3,942 | 6,134 | 8,904 |
| Miscellaneous | 4,108 | 4,103 | 4,069 | 3,104 | 2,342 | 2,328 |

*Figure 3-11. Number of Bill Assistance Grants by Funding Source*

### *Average Bill Assistance Grant*

Figure 3-12 presents the average grant levels of the bill assistance grants for each of the funding sources.[48] The average grant levels have remained relatively stable over the (2012-2017) evaluation period with a modest increase from $378 in 2015 to $397 in 2017.

[48] Response to DR's: 021 Attach. A, 021 Attach. B, 021 Attach. C, 022 Attach. A, 023 Attach. A, 024 Attach. A, 047 Attach. A, 026 Attach. A, 027 Attach. A, 028 Attach. A, 048 Attach. A, 048 Attach. B.




*Figure 3-12. Average Bill Assistance Grant by Funding Source*

## *Low-Income Weatherization Services*

Avista provides low-income customers with weatherization rebates to reduce costs of energy with the following qualifying conditions.[49]

- Primary fuel used for space heating must be Avista electric or natural gas service.
- Rebates must be submitted within a year of completion of energy efficiency measure,
- Only new equipment qualifies.
- All improvements must be agency or contractor installed.
- The rebates are available for primary residential single family up to a fourplex, including manufactured and modular homes.
- Rebates are not available for seasonal or recreational homes or condos.

Low-income weatherization rebates fund such measures as air sealing, attic insulation, wall insulation, duct sealing, and conversion from electric space heating and hot water to natural gas space heating and hot water. The community action agencies select the clients and determine the optimal measures for each home.

LIHEAP weatherization dollars and US Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) also fund weatherization services in homes of Avista low-income customers. However, the Company only tracks low-income weatherization work that is funded through the Avista Demand Side Management (DSM) Tariff Rider.

[49] Avista Website: Rebates: Washington - Avista

## *Avista Low-Income Weatherization Funding*

Avista's low-income home weatherization program is funded strictly through the company's DSM Tariff Rider. The DSM tariff rate for electric service is established through the rate setting process and decided by the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission. Table 3-14 presents the electric service DSM tariff rates which are applied to kWh sales in each of the listed rate schedules to determine the available funding.[50]

*Table 3-14. Electric Service DSM Tariff*

| | | Effective Dates ($/kWh) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Schedules** | **01-Aug-12** | **01-Aug-13** | **01-Aug-15** | **08-Apr-16** | **01-Aug-16** | **01-Aug-17** | **01-Sep-18** |
| Residential | 1, 2 | 0.00168 | 0.00268 | 0.00215 | 0.00201 | 0.00262 | 0.00344 | 0.00433 |
| General Service | 11, 12 | 0.00235 | 0.00365 | 0.00289 | 0.00272 | 0.00362 | 0.00463 | 0.00597 |
| Large General Service | 21, 22 | 0.00176 | 0.00276 | 0.00220 | 0.00208 | 0.00273 | 0.00366 | 0.00460 |
| Extra Large General Service | 25 | 0.00111 | 0.00176 | 0.00137 | 0.00129 | 0.00172 | 0.00232 | 0.00297 |
| Pumping | 30, 31, 32 | 0.00155 | 0.00245 | 0.00198 | 0.00190 | 0.00261 | 0.00341 | 0.00433 |
| Street & Area Lighting | 41-48 | 0.02030 | 0.03130 | 0.02400 | 0.02360 | 0.00862 | 0.01215 | 0.02017 |
| **Weighted Average** | | **0.00197** | **0.00311** | **0.00247** | **0.00234** | **0.00276** | **0.00364** | **0.00469** |

To provide a simple combined view of the overall trends in the electric service DSM tariff rate since 2015, we calculated a weighted average electric service DSM tariff rate for all affected rate schedules. The weights are based on the projected dollar sales of natural gas in each of the affected rate schedules listed in Table 3-14. Figure 3-13 illustrates the weighted average electric service DSM tariff rate from 2012 to 2018.[51] After increasing in 2013 the weighted average decreased until an increase in August 2016. It increased again in 2017 and is projected to increase in September of 2018.




*Figure 3-13. Electric Service DSM Tariff (Weighted Average)*

Table 3-15 presents the effective DSM natural gas tariffs for each customer class from August 1, 2012 to September 1, 2018.[52] The DSM natural gas tariff rates are applied to Therm of natural

[50] Response to DR 074 Attach. Revised
[51] Response to DR 074 Attach. Revised
[52] Ibid.

gas sales in each of the listed rate schedules determine the available funding for DSM services. The DSM tariff rate for natural gas service is established through the rate setting process and decided by the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission.

*Table 3-15. Natural Gas Service DSM Tariff*

| | Schedules | Effective Dates ($/therm) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 01-Aug-12 | 01-Nov-15 | 01-Jul-16 | 01-Jun-17 | 01-Sep-18 |
| General Service | 101, 102 | 0.02310 | 0.02750 | 0.03472 | 0.02229 | 0.03028 |
| Large General Service | 111, 112 | 0.01824 | 0.02095 | 0.02475 | 0.01581 | 0.01626 |
| Extra Large General Service | 121, 122 | 0.01630 | 0.01965 | 0.02176 | 0.01614 | 0.01276 |
| Interruptible | 131, 132 | 0.01476 | 0.02384 | 0.02300 | 0.01521 | 0.01132 |
| **Weighted Average** | | **0.02177** | **0.02578** | **0.03220** | **0.02071** | **0.02745** |

To provide a simple combined view of the overall trends in the DSM natural gas service tariff rate since 2015, we calculated a weighted average for all affected rate schedules. The weights are based on the projected dollar sales of natural gas in each of the affected rate schedules listed in Table 3-14.

Figure 3-14 illustrates the trend in the weighted average DSM natural gas tariff from August 1, 2012 to September 1, 2018.[53] The weighted average tariff increased from August 2012 through July 2016. It decreased in July 2017, and it is projected to be increased in September 2018. However, the weighted average projected DSM natural gas tariff rate, effective September 2018, is lower than the July 2016 rate.




*Figure 3-14. Natural Gas Service DSM Tariff (Weighted Average)*

[53] Ibid.

Low-income weatherization is funded as follows:

> "Avista is ordered through General Rate Case settlements to spend tariff rider funds on low-income weatherization. Since 2012, $2 million is set aside for Washington customers who meet the income qualification requirements. This has been allocated to six network agencies and since 2015 also includes a tribal housing authority. The division of $2 million is done by determining the meter count in each county the agencies serve. The percentage of meters is then applied to the $2 million to create an allocation by agency for weatherization and other energy efficiency improvements for the income qualified home." [54]

Figure 3-15 presents overall funding trends and separates funding levels for electric and natural gas customers.[55, 56] Since 2015 the weatherization allocation to electric customers decreased from 23% to 16% while the allocation to natural gas customers increased from 77% to 84% of the total allocation. Overall funding allocations have remained stable.




| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,989,852 | $1,974,533 | $1,909,936 | $1,939,835 | $1,983,215 | $1,937,085 |
| Electric | $343,833 | $429,520 | $370,496 | $446,208 | $474,472 | $312,831 |
| Natural Gas | $1,646,019 | $1,545,013 | $1,539,440 | $1,493,627 | $1,508,743 | $1,624,254 |

*Figure 3-15. Avista Low-Income Weatherization Funding Trends*

[54] Response to DR 075.
[55] For the purpose of this analysis the electric category includes electric-only customers while the natural gas category includes both natural gas-only customers and dual-service (natural gas and electric) customers.
[56] Responses to DR's: 033 Attach. A, 034 Attach. A, 035 Attach. A, 036 Attach. A

## *Number of Low-Income Weatherization Grants*

Figure 3-16 illustrates that the number of Avista low-income weatherization jobs increased from 2012 to 2013 when it reached its highest level during the study period.[57] The trend in the number of low-income weatherization grants then began a downward trend from 2013 through 2017. The decrease in the number of grants reflects the increasing average cost of the weatherization jobs.




| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 272 | 311 | 253 | 251 | 237 | 208 |
| Electric | 46 | 65 | 51 | 59 | 63 | 41 |
| Natural Gas | 226 | 246 | 202 | 192 | 174 | 167 |

*Figure 3-16. Number of Low-Income Weatherization Grants*

## *Average Weatherization Job Costs*

Figure 3-17 presents the average cost of low-income weatherization jobs for electric and natural gas customers.[58] While the average cost of both electric customer and natural gas customer jobs have increased consistently since 2013, the cost of natural gas jobs has increased at a faster rate.




| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Electric | $7,475 | $6,608 | $7,265 | $7,563 | $7,531 | $7,630 |
| Natural Gas | $7,283 | $6,281 | $7,621 | $7,779 | $8,671 | $9,726 |
| Average | $7,316 | $6,349 | $7,549 | $7,728 | $8,368 | $9,313 |

*Figure 3-17. Average Cost of Weatherization Jobs*

[57] Ibid.

[58] Responses to DR's: 029 Attach. A, 030 Attach. A, 031, 032 Attach. A, 033 Attach. A, 034 Attach. A, 035 Attach. A, 036 Attach. A, 049 Attach. A

## *Inflation Adjusted Funding Levels*

To account for the cost of living increases since 2012, we calculated inflation adjusted funding levels for both low-income bill assistance and low-income weatherization programs.

Figure 3-18 presents inflation adjusted bill assistance funding levels for Avista customers from all funding sources including LIRAP, LIHEAP, Project Share and MISC using the Bureau of Labor Statistics Inflation Adjustment Calculator.[59] The inflation adjusted data reflects the buying power of the funding based on the 2012-dollar value. The inflation adjusted curve in Figure 15 represents the trend in the buying power value of bill assistance over the evaluation period. Inflation adjusted bill assistance funding has increased since 2015 and 2017 levels and are above 2012 funding.




*Figure 3-18. Inflation Adjusted Bill Assistance (All Sources)*

Figure 3-19 presents inflation adjusted Avista low-income weatherization funding levels, using the Bureau of Labor Statistics Inflation Adjustment Calculator. Inflation adjusted Avista weatherization funding has decreased from 2012 to 2015 and continued to decrease through 2017.




*Figure 3-19. Inflation Adjusted Avista Weatherization Funding*

[59] https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

## *Summary – Task 3, Part B*

Avista low-income customers are provided with bill assistance and weatherization services funded by Avista and several other Federal, State, and community-based organizations. These services are provided in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Commerce, the Community Action Agency network across the State, the LIHEAP program, Project Share and directly through community-based groups.

We have provided an overview of all the bill assistance programs available to Avista customer from all funding sources. Since Decoupling was implemented in 2015 the level of bill assistance funding has increased. The increase in funding was driven by the Avista LIRAP program and the Project Share program each of which showed significant increases while LIHEAP funding remained level and MISC funding declined. Because of the increases in LIRAP and Project Share funding the number of customers receiving bill assistance increased from 18,212 to 24,355 households. During the same period average bill assistance benefits increased from $378 to $397 per grant.

While Avista customers receive weatherization services from several sources, only Avista weatherization is tracked by the Company and is analyzed in this evaluation. Avista weatherization funding remained level at approximately $2 million per year between 2012 and 2017. Inflation adjusted Avista weatherization funding decreased from 2012 to 2015 and continued to decrease through 2017.

During the 2015 to 2017 period the average Avista weatherization costs increased from $7,728 to $9,313 per customer. Because of increasing costs and level funding, the number of weatherization rebates decreased. Since decoupling was implemented in 2015, the number of weatherization rebates decreased from 251 to 208.

This analysis did not evaluate whether the low-income energy assistance programs reviewed in this report are adequate to meet the need. The RFP No. R -41321 provided two Attachments that address this question: *Attachment G - An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State*[60] and Attachment H - *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014*.61 We have analyzed these reports and have provided our findings in Section 8 (Low-Income Appendix) of this evaluation.

[60] *An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State,* Brian Kennedy, MS and D. Patrick Jones, Ph.D., Institute for Public Policy and Economic Analysis, May 2015.
[61] *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014*, Diana M. Pearce, PhD, Center for Women's Welfare and the School of Social Work at the University of Washington, Revised August 2015.

## Modifications to Low-Income Programs

Task 3, Part C is defined as follows:

> "(3c) A description of any modifications to conservation programs targeted to low-income customers since the inception of the Mechanisms including changes to funding levels as well as changes to specific measures."

The funding level for conservation programs targeted to low-income customers since the inception of the Mechanisms in 2015 is best reflected in Figure 3-19, for which the relevant portion is from 2015 onwards. As shown in this figure, Avista inflation-adjusted Weatherization funding increased from 2015 to 2016 and then dropped in 2017. The unadjusted amounts were $1,939,835 in 2015, $1,983,215 in 2016 and $1,937,085 in 2017, or essentially, about $2,000,000 per year. The adjusted amounts were $1,865,375 in 2015, $1,888,258 in 2016 and $1,814,694 in 2017, or roughly from about $1,900,000 to $1,800,000 per year in real dollars. From an administrative perspective, funding was essentially constant at $2,000,000 per year. In real terms, funding dropped to about $1,800,000 in 2017. This suggests that Avista might want to take inflation into account in carrying out the "carve out" for low-income in each year.

In 2015, the Company continued to reimburse Community Action Agencies for 100% of the cost of installation for a select group of pre-approved energy-efficiency measures (Table 3-16). The Company continued to offer an additional "Rebate List" of other energy efficiency measures (Table 3-17). Payment for measures on the "Rebate List" covers only the energy value of the measures. In this way, the CAAs are able to reliably secure funding for pre-approved measures and to leverage utility funds for partial funding of other measures that improve functionality of weatherization retrofits. Agencies can apply funds to electric or natural gas homes at their discretion and to charge a fifteen percent (15%) administration fee.

For 2016, the same system was continued, but with some changes in the measure tables. The 2016 group of pre-approved energy-efficiency measures is shown in Table 3-18. Partial rebate measures are shown in Table 3-19.

For 2017, the basic system was continued with changes in the measure tables. The 2017 group of pre-approved energy-efficiency measures is shown in Table 3-20. Partial rebate measures are shown in Table 3-21. There was also a clarification that measures found in Washington's Weatherization Manual priority list are deemed to be cost-effective and are paid at 100%, regardless of whether their computed Total Resource Cost (TRC) test value is below 1.0. Also, Health and Safety dollars may be used to fully fund measures on the partial rebate list, at the discretion of the CAAs.[62]

[62] Low-Income program changes are sourced from the Washington DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis studies for 2015, 2016 and 2017.

*Table 3-16. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2015)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • Air infiltration<br>• Insulation (floor, ceiling, wall)<br>• Duct sealing<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• Electric to Natural Gas Conversion (Space and Water Heat)<br>• ENERGY STAR Refrigerators | • Insulation (Wall, Ceiling, and Floor)<br>• Air infiltration<br>• Duct sealing<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• ENERGY STAR windows |

*Table 3-17. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2015)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • Duct insulation<br>• ENERGY STAR refrigerators (for replacement of a refrigerator that is not fully operational)<br>• High efficient water heater<br>• Electric to air source heat pump<br>• Electric to natural gas water heater<br>• ENERGY STAR windows | • Duct insulation<br>• High efficiency furnace<br>• High efficiency water heater |

*Table 3-18. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2016)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • Air infiltration<br>• Duct sealing<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• ENERGY STAR windows<br>• High efficiency air source heat pump (8 HSPF)<br>• Electric to air source heat pump<br>• Insulation for attic, walls, floors, and ducts | • Air infiltration<br>• Duct sealing<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• ENERGY STAR windows<br>• High efficiency furnace (90% AFUE)<br>• Insulation for attic, walls, floors, and ducts<br>**Fuel Conversion Measures**<br>• Electric to natural gas furnace<br>• Electric to natural gas furnace and water heat |

*Table 3-19. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2016)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • High efficiency water heaters (0.93 EF)<br>• ENERGY STAR refrigerators<br>• Ductless Heat Pumps | • High efficiency water heaters (0.62 EF)<br>**Fuel Conversion Measures**<br>• Electric to natural gas water heater |

*Table 3-20. Low-Income 100% Approved Measures (2017)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • Air infiltration<br>• Duct sealing<br>• Insulation for attic, walls, floors, and ducts<br>• LED lighting | • Air infiltration<br>• Duct sealing<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• ENERGY STAR windows<br>• High efficiency furnace (90% AFUE)<br>• High efficiency gas water heater<br>• Insulation for attic, walls, floors, and ducts<br>**Fuel Conversion Measures**<br>• Electric to natural gas furnace<br>• Electric to natural gas water heat<br>• Electric to ductless heat pump |

*Table 3-21. Low-Income Partial Rebate Measures (2017)*

| Electric Measures | Natural Gas Measures |
|---|---|
| • Heat pump water heaters<br>• ENERGY STAR refrigerators<br>• ENERGY STAR doors<br>• ENERGY STAR windows<br>• Electric to air source heat pump | |

## Effect on Low-Income vs. Average Residential

Task 3, Parts A and D are combined and are presented in Part A, above.

## Other Factors

In this section we examine additional contrast between low-income customers and other residential customers using premise specific data for nearly 130 thousand Avista residential customers in Spokane County.

The objective of Task 3 Part E, as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"To the extent data is available, Consultant should evaluate other factors such as household size, housing stock (e.g. mobile home, multifamily) and heat source (e.g., electric space heat) and the effect of seasonality when comparing the impact of decoupling on low-income customers versus other customer groups (such as average residential customers)."*

There were no specific evaluation questions related to this objective in the RFP.

Our team approached this task by first exploring the possibility of obtaining housing attribute data such as size and vintage of construction directly from Avista or from secondary sources such as the US Census. Avista does not maintain housing attribute data within their customer information system. We also explored using the American Community Survey (Census) and American Housing Survey (HUD) but found the data details did not provide the ability to drill down and compare households by income levels, energy usage and housing attributes at the same time.

We turned next to the possibility of acquiring detailed housing attribute data directly from the Spokane County Assessor office and merging the data with Avista's customer information. After some initial testing to see what data could be acquired and a subjective assessment of data quality, we decided to pursue the development of a site-specific data base combining Avista's billing data and low-income status information with Spokane County's assessor data. The resulting data base of nearly 130 thousand Avista customers in Spokane County provides the ability to drill down in ways that would not otherwise be possible to compare housing size, type, vintage and energy intensity between low-income and other residential customers.

### *Overview of Approach*

The approach of combining Avista residential billing records with assessor data was selected to overcome the lack of housing attribute data. Our team has had extensive experience combining county assessor data with utility data and we understand the rich analytical database that results from this effort. The resulting database is expected to provide a level of understanding and insights into contrasts between low-income and other residential customers that would not otherwise be possible in this evaluation.

Because of the time requirements involved with processing county assessor data and the fact that data structure, format and processes vary greatly between counties, we focused our effort exclusively on Spokane county which accounts for about 75 percent of all households within

Avista's Washington service territory. From the assessor data we compiled parcel-level housing attributes, including square footage, year built, number of bedrooms, heating and cooling method, housing type, and market value. From this data, we also inferred certain variables as follows:

- Owner occupancy was assigned by comparing the physical address of the parcel with the mailing address of the owner. The overall results compare favorably with Census estimates for the County.
- When possible, heating fuel was assigned based on the heating method.

Accuracy of assessor data tends to be highest for variables such as square footage of the structure, number of bedrooms and year built. Variables related to heating and cooling equipment tend to be less accurate and are often unavailable for a parcel.

To combine the county data with Avista data, we first summarized Avista's billing records to an individual premise level using standardized addresses. Low-income premises are flagged and the type of Avista service assigned as electric only, natural gas only or both. A low-income premise flag is assigned based on the existence of the premise in customer data of participants in one of Avista's low-income programs[63]. Site address is the information in common between the Avista records and assessor records. In order to increase the quality of the join, we first address standardized the two datasets using AccuMail software.[64] The datasets are address standardized, so an address-component-based match key can be used to join the Avista billing records with the Spokane county assessor data. There are limitations to joining utility records with assessor data in this manner, but the approach is highly accurate for single family housing. It tends to break down in instances where there is not a one-to-one correspondence between a utility premise record and a tax parcel record such as multifamily housing (one parcel and many utility customers).

A match key must be present in both the Avista data and the county assessor data for a premise to be retained for this analysis. Table 3-22 shows premise counts by residential group and service type that passed the match criteria.

[63] See Section 3a for more information.

[64] AccuMail is certified by the US Postal Service for address standardization and processing. Address standardization helps to improve match results. If addresses are incorrectly spelled, or components (eg, zip plus 4, pre- and post-directionals and/or city) are missing, or unit numbers are in the wrong position, the match routine will be less reliable.

*Table 3-22. Avista Customer Counts by Residential Group and Service Type*

| Avista Service Type | Residential | Low-Income | Total | Low-Income Percent | Service Type Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Electric Only | 14,373 | 4,150 | 18,523 | 22% | 14% |
| Gas Only | 14,527 | 892 | 15,419 | 6% | 12% |
| Electric and Gas | 81,115 | 14,876 | 95,991 | 16% | 74% |
| **Total** | **110,015** | **19,918** | **129,933** | **15%** | **100%** |

The merge results in nearly 130,000 Avista premises matched to Spokane assessor data, of which 15 percent are classified as low-income. Nearly three-fourths of the premises receive their electric and natural gas service from Avista. The remainder of this section compares housing attributes and energy usage between the two residential groups; low-income and other residential. For ease of discussion in the remainder of this section, we use the term "residential" to mean all other residential customers not identified as low-income.

## *Energy Usage*

Annual energy usage for 2017 is shown in Figure 3-20.




*Figure 3-20. Annual 2017 Unadjusted Billed Energy Usage per Premise*

Annual kWh usage for low-income premises was about 6 percent higher than residential premises in 2017. For natural gas the opposite is true with low-income premises using about 16 percent less therms over the year than residential. As will be shown below, low-income premises are smaller on average than residential. Figure 3-21 shows energy usage per square foot for both kWh and therms between the two groups.




*Figure 3-21. Annual 2017 Unadjusted Billed Energy per Square Foot*

With smaller homes using more electricity, the low-income group's kWh per square foot averaged over 40 percent higher than residential premises. Possible explanations for this difference are explored below. Therm usage per square foot is also higher for low-income premises, averaging 16 percent more in 2017 than residential.

## *Housing Characteristics*

Housing characteristics obtained from Spokane County Assessor records are shown in the table below. Mean values and differences between the two residential groups are shown for each of the characteristics listed. The last column shows the directional energy use impact of low-income relative to residential. For example, an upward arrow on a characteristic means that considering that attribute alone, low-income energy usage would be expected to be higher than residential usage. A listing of "electric" with a directional indicator means that the relative fuel usage impact only applies to electric and not natural gas usage.

*Table 3-23. Comparison of Housing Characteristics*

| Characteristic | Low-Income | Residential | Difference | Percent Difference | Relative Energy Use Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year Built | 1951 | 1968 | (18) | | ↑ |
| Finished Square Feet | 1,403 | 1,916 | (513) | -27% | ↓ |
| Market Value | $117,810 | $191,966 | -$74,155 | -39% | ↑ |
| Bedrooms | 2.8 | 3.2 | (0.44) | -14% | ↓ |
| Owner Occupied | 62% | 85% | -23% | | ↔ |
| Avista Natural Gas Service | 79% | 87% | -8% | | ↑ (Electric) |
| Air Conditioning | 21% | 47% | -26% | | ↓ (Electric) |

Low-income homes are 18 years older than residential homes on average. Older homes are more likely to have less thermally efficient building shells than newer homes. The impact of this characteristic is to increase low-income energy usage relative to the residential group. Low-income homes are about 500 square feet smaller on average compared to residential, a substantial twenty-seven percent (27%) percent difference. Market value and market value per

square foot are indicators of current quality of construction and building shell efficiency and suggest that low-income homes will use more energy than residential, all other things equal.

The number of bedrooms is not only another measure of size of home, it is a better correlate to size of household and baseload energy usage than is square feet. Fewer bedrooms in low-income housing suggest lower energy usage than residential. Average size of households may also vary between the two groups. Owner occupancy is lower in low-income housing than it is in residential. This variable says more about the occupant's ability to make energy efficiency improvement decisions than it does about relative energy usage.

The percent of the group with natural gas service from Avista is an indication of the predominance of natural gas heating. A lower percentage of low-income homes with natural gas service means a greater reliance on electricity and other fuels for space and water heating in low-income homes than found in the residential group. This characteristic coupled with the age and quality differences of the building shell are likely to explain a large proportion of the greater electric usage per square foot in low-income homes.

Assessor data regarding heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment is generally less reliable than square footage and year built. Still the data can be useful for comparing relative values between groups. Air conditioning is far less prevalent in low-income homes than it is in residential. This characteristic taken alone suggests less electric usage in low-income homes compared to residential.

### *Housing Type and HVAC Equipment*

It is important to keep in mind that the approach of combing utility records with assessor records results in a data set that is single family construction centric. Utility customers living in multifamily housing are largely omitted from the combined data base of 130 thousand premises. The percentage of the 130 thousand homes by type of housing and residential group is shown in Table 3-24.

*Table 3-24. Distribution of Housing Types*

| Housing Type | Low-Income | Residential |
|---|---|---|
| Condos and Townhomes | 1.2 | 2.2 |
| Mobile Homes | 10.1 | 3.9 |
| Plexes | 7.0 | 2.9 |
| Single Family | 81.6 | 91.0 |
| **Total** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

The nearly eighty-two percent (82%) of low-income customers in single family homes is nearly 10 percentage points lower than residential. That difference is made up by a higher percentage of low-income customers in mobile homes and plexes (duplexes, tri and quad).

The distribution of heating equipment is shown in the table below.

*Table 3-25. Distribution of Heating Equipment*

| Heating Equipment | Low-Income | Residential |
|---|---|---|
| Forced Air Furnace | 81.4 | 85.7 |
| Zonal | 14.0 | 7.9 |
| Heat Pump | 1.1 | 3.6 |
| Other | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| **Total** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

The majority of heating equipment is some form of forced air system. These include wall and floor systems as well as ducted systems. Zonal is more prevalent in low-income housing, not surprising given the smaller and less expensive housing stock of low-income customers.

Cooling equipment distribution is shown in the table below.

*Table 3-26. Distribution of Cooling Equipment*

| Cooling Equipment | Low-Income | Residential |
|---|---|---|
| Central Air Conditioning | 18.3 | 40.9 |
| Heat Pump | 1.1 | 3.6 |
| Other | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| None | 78.6 | 53.5 |
| **Total** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

Central air conditioning is far more prevalent in residential than low-income homes. Assessor data likely understates the prevalence of window units and these relatively inexpensive and inefficient systems are more likely to be found in low-income homes than residential.

## *Summary – Task 3e*

In this section housing attributes and energy usage of low-income and other residential homes are compared using a data set developed for this evaluation of nearly 130,000 premises with Avista residential customer records combined with Spokane County Assessor data. The resulting data is single family centric, with multifamily underrepresented in the results. Data on heating and cooling equipment may also be incomplete or out of date for what is currently used at the premise. Notwithstanding these limitations, the data provide a rich set of information for insights between the differences of low-income and other residential premises.

The average low-income customers used six percent (6%) more electricity per premise in 2017 than other residential customers. Low-income homes were also substantially smaller. With higher use in smaller homes, electric use per square foot in low-income homes was about forty percent (40%) higher than for other residential customers. Analysis to determine why this is the case is beyond the scope of this evaluation but older less efficient homes and greater reliance on electric space heating in low-income homes are at least part of the explanation.

The average low-income customer used 16% less natural gas per premise than other residential customers. On a per square foot basis, natural gas use was sixteen percent (16%) higher in low-income homes than other residential. Much of this difference is likely due to older less efficient building shells in low-income housing units.

# Section 4. Analysis of Revenue Effects

In this section we examine the effects of the decoupling mechanisms on Avista's revenue. The objective of Task 4, as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"Analysis of the Mechanism's impact on Company revenues (i.e., whether there has been a stabilizing effect)."*

Relating to this objective are the following evaluation questions, also taken from the RFP:

> *"What impact did the Mechanisms have on the Company's revenues (i.e., whether there has been a stabilizing effect)?"*
>
> *What were the causes of the deviation of actual revenue-per-customer from authorized revenue-per-customer?"*
>
> *"Please provide analysis and trends on whether the rate cap was reached and the results of the earnings test."*
>
> *"What factors impacted the deferral and rate changes, and what was the magnitude of that impact? (e.g., weather, customer counts, conservation, economy, etc.)"*
>
> *"What was the impact of the Decoupling deferral on Avista's revenues and rates?"*
>
> *"What was the effect of updates to the decoupling baseline and resulting effects on deferrals under the mechanisms?"*

Our discussion in this section is organized by each of the evaluation questions listed above. Much of the data used to address these questions has been presented in earlier sections of this report and repeated here for ease of discussion and the convenience of the reader.

## Has Decoupling Stabilized Revenue

The question as stated in the RFP is:

> *"What impact did the Mechanisms have on the Company's revenues (i.e., whether there has been a stabilizing effect)?"*

This is a straightforward question and easy to answer by comparing actual revenue with actual revenue plus deferred revenue. Here the limiting factor is the relatively short three-year period that the mechanism has been in place. In order to answer this question, we calculated the annual variation in revenue over the 2015 to 2017 period with and without the revenue from decoupling deferrals. We used the coefficient of variation, calculated as the standard deviation divided by the mean, as our measure of variability. Figure 4-1 shows the results of our calculations for electric revenue.




*Figure 4-1. Electric Revenue Variability (2015-2017)*

The bars labeled "Without Decoupling" refer to base rate revenue only and does not include deferred revenue through the decoupling mechanism. Bars labeled "With Decoupling" include base rate and decoupling deferral revenue. Results are shown for both decoupled rate groups and their total. It is clear from the results shown in Figure 4-1 that there has been a stabilizing effect on revenue as a result of decoupling. For both rate groups, variability is roughly one third of the level without decoupling deferrals.

Variation in natural gas revenue is shown in Figure 4-2.




*Figure 4-2. Natural Gas Revenue Variability (2015-2017)*

Decoupling has also helped to stabilize natural gas revenues. Although the stabilizing effect is not as large for the natural gas rate groups as it is for electric rate groups, revenues from natural gas residential customers are about four percentage points less variable with decoupling than

without, a drop in variability of roughly 40%. Variability in the non-residential rate group is nearly two percentage points lower with decoupling, a roughly 30% drop in variability.

## Revenue Deviations from Planning Assumptions and Causes

Some of the revenue related evaluation questions have to do with the magnitude and causes for deviations from planning assumptions. These questions as stated in the RFP are:

> *"What were the causes of the deviation of actual revenue-per-customer from authorized revenue-per-customer?"*
>
> *"What factors impacted the deferral and rate changes, and what was the magnitude of that impact? (e.g., weather, customer counts, conservation, economy, etc.)"*

Actual and authorized revenue-per-customer is shown for electric rate groups in Table 4-1.

*Table 4-1. Authorized and Actual Electric Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | Authorized | Received | Percent Difference | Authorized | Received | Percent Difference |
| 2015 | $709 | $673 | -5.1% | $4,209 | $4,279 | 1.7% |
| 2016 | $735 | $685 | -6.8% | $4,453 | $4,396 | -1.3% |
| 2017 | $738 | $748 | 1.4% | $4,455 | $4,405 | -1.1% |

Avista received less decoupled revenue per customer from the residential group than was authorized in 2015 and 2016. This pattern was reversed in 2017 when Avista received 1.4% more revenue per customer than authorized. Decoupled revenue per customer for the non-residential rate group exceeded the authorized level in 2015 but fell short in 2016 and 2017. The percent difference shown for residential customers in Table 4-1 closely follows the difference between actual and planned use per customer examined in Section 2. Test year and actual electric usage, customer counts and use per customer are shown for each deferral year in Table 4-2.

*Table 4-2. Test Year and Actual Electric Usage, Customers and Use per Customer*

| | 2015 | | | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) |
| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 2,437,508 | 207,850 | 11,727 | 2,378,478 | 205,172 | 11,593 | 2,378,478 | 205,172 | 11,593 |
| Actual | 2,323,300 | 207,371 | 11,204 | 2,288,227 | 209,864 | 10,903 | 2,492,293 | 212,495 | 11,729 |
| Change from Test Year | (114,208) | (479) | (524) | (90,251) | 4,692 | (689) | 113,815 | 7,323 | 136 |
| Percent Change | -4.7% | -0.2% | -4.5% | -3.8% | 2.3% | -5.9% | 4.8% | 3.6% | 1.2% |
| | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 2,150,843 | 35,277 | 60,970 | 2,144,857 | 34,823 | 61,593 | 2,144,857 | 34,823 | 61,593 |
| Actual | 2,179,747 | 35,265 | 61,810 | 2,158,998 | 35,617 | 60,618 | 2,184,830 | 35,994 | 60,700 |
| Change from Test Year | 28,904 | (12) | 840 | 14,142 | 794 | (975) | 39,974 | 1,171 | (893) |
| Percent Change | 1.3% | 0.0% | 1.4% | 0.7% | 2.3% | -1.6% | 1.9% | 3.4% | -1.5% |

Because Avista's decoupling mechanism is structured to allow a certain level of revenue per customer, more or less customers than planned does not lead to greater deferral balances, all

other things equal. Avista relies on volumetric charges to recover a portion of fixed costs for all rate groups and fuels. This causes use per customer to be an important factor in determining deferral balances and decoupling rates through the decoupling mechanism. More specifically, changes in use per customer from levels used in the test year to set decoupled revenue will lead to positive or negative deferral balances depending on the direction of change, all other things equal. Higher use per customer will cause negative deferrals and lower use per customer will result in higher deferrals, again all other things equal.

Considering electric residential as an example, actual decoupled revenue per customer was 6.8% lower than authorized in 2016 (Table 4-1). During the same period customer counts were 2.3 percent higher than the test year and use per customer was 5.8% lower (Table 4-2). Higher than planned customer counts did not drive authorized revenue higher. Rather, as designed and expected, use per customer explains nearly all of the lower than authorized revenue per customer. A comparison of the values in Table 4-1 and Table 4-2 show that almost all of the variance in revenue per customer can be explained by differences in use per customer.

Two important factors causing use per customer to vary from test year are actual weather deviations from normal weather and acquired energy efficiency savings through Avista programs.[65] There are other factors of course but these two are either known in the case of energy efficiency or readily measurable in the case of weather. Changes due to weather are straightforward calculations. Avista provided the weather impacts and supporting monthly details by rate schedule showing the deviation in heating and cooling degree days from normal and the corresponding model coefficient on each weather term. Energy efficiency impacts are calculated as cumulative savings from Avista programs since the test year.

The results of these calculations are shown in Figure 4-3 for the electric residential rate group.




*Figure 4-3. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Residential*

Considering 2017 results, use per customer was 1.2% higher than test year assumptions. Weather impacts alone are estimated to have pushed electric residential use per customer 4.6% higher. The 2017 weather impact was largely offset by a 2.5% drop in use per customer due to

[65] For this analysis, normal weather is defined as a thirty-year average.

Avista's energy efficiency achievements. The "Other" category is simply the difference between the total and the readily quantifiable factors of weather and energy efficiency. Other unidentified factors have pushed use per customer lower and have been lessening in influence over time.

For electric residential customers it is clear that weather impacts on use per customer can be large and work in either direction. It is also true that energy efficiency impacts always push use per customer lower and that downward influence becomes more pronounced the further in time an evaluation year is from the test year. Cumulative energy efficiency savings will reset with a new rate case and test year.

Figure 4-4 shows a plot of total and each factor's influence on the percent change in use per customer from the test year for the electric non-residential rate group.




*Figure 4-4. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Electric Non-Residential*

Avista's energy efficiency achievements have been the primary factor influencing changing use per customer in the electric non-residential group. From having no influence in 2015 because they were implicitly included in test year assumptions, energy efficiency impacts more than offset weather and other factors in 2017 causing an overall drop in use per customer of 1.5%. Weather appears to be far less influential in electric non-residential customer usage than it is for the electric residential group. Other unidentified factors have pushed use per customer higher at a small but fairly consistent percentage over time. Actual and authorized revenue-per-customer is shown for natural gas rate groups in Table 4-3.

*Table 4-3. Authorized and Actual Natural Gas Decoupled Revenue per Customer*

| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **Authorized** | **Received** | **Percent Difference** | **Authorized** | **Received** | **Percent Difference** |
| 2015 | $280 | $245 | -12.5% | $4,509 | $3,835 | -14.9% |
| 2016 | $347 | $299 | -13.8% | $5,097 | $4,338 | -14.9% |
| 2017 | $351 | $364 | 3.7% | $5,128 | $4,828 | -5.9% |

For reasons discussed above for electric, the percent difference between authorized and actual revenue per customer shown in Table 4-3 closely follows the difference between actual and

planned use per customer. Test year and actual natural gas usage, customer counts and use per customer are shown for each deferral year in Table 4-4.

*Table 4-4. Test Year and Actual Natural Gas Usage, Customers and Use per Customer*

| | 2015 | | | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) | Usage (MWh) | Customers | Use per Customer (kWh) |
| | ---------- Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 117,011,207 | 150,186 | 779 | 120,721,607 | 148,995 | 810 | 120,721,607 | 148,995 | 810 |
| Actual | 103,436,220 | 151,254 | 684 | 108,796,187 | 153,995 | 706 | 131,782,922 | 157,563 | 836 |
| Change from Test Year | (13,574,987) | 1,068 | (95) | (11,925,420) | 5,000 | (104) | 11,061,315 | 8,568 | 26 |
| Percent Change | -11.6% | 0.7% | -12.2% | -9.9% | 3.4% | -12.8% | 9.2% | 5.8% | 3.2% |
| | ---------- Non-Residential ---------- | | | | | | | | |
| Test Year | 51,764,097 | 2,548 | 20,316 | 52,606,812 | 2,584 | 20,358 | 52,606,812 | 2,584 | 20,358 |
| Actual | 45,886,568 | 2,651 | 17,309 | 48,208,894 | 2,770 | 17,404 | 55,684,308 | 2,918 | 19,083 |
| Change from Test Year | (5,877,529) | 103 | (3,006) | (4,397,918) | 186 | (2,954) | 3,077,496 | 334 | (1,275) |
| Percent Change | -11.4% | 4.0% | -14.8% | -8.4% | 7.2% | -14.5% | 5.8% | 12.9% | -6.3% |

Considering natural gas non-residential as an example, actual decoupled revenue per customer was 14.9% lower than authorized in 2015 (Table 4-3). During the same period customer counts were 4.0 percent higher than the test year and use per customer was 14.8% lower (Table 4-4). Higher than planned customer counts did not drive authorized revenue higher. Rather, as designed and expected, use per customer explains nearly all of the lower than authorized revenue per customer. A review and comparison of the values in Table 4-3 and Table 4-4 also show that almost all of the variance in revenue per customer can be explained by differences in use per customer.

Two important factors causing use per customer to vary from test year are actual weather deviations from normal weather and acquired energy efficiency savings through Avista programs. There are other factors of course but these two are either known in the case of energy efficiency or readily measurable in the case of weather. Changes due to weather are also straightforward calculations. Avista provided the weather impacts and supporting monthly details by rate schedule showing the deviation in heating and cooling degree days from normal and the corresponding model coefficient on each weather term. Energy efficiency impacts are calculated as cumulative savings from Avista programs since the test year.

The results of these calculations are shown in Figure 4-5 for the natural gas residential rate group.




*Figure 4-5. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Residential*

Weather is clearly the predominant factor in understanding changes in residential therm use per customer from the test year. The total change in use per customer tracks the warmer than normal heating seasons in calendar years 2015 and 2016 and slightly colder than normal heating season in calendar year 2017. Energy efficiency impacts on use per customer usage are a small factor in understanding overall change from the test year. Natural gas prices have been persistently low, squeezing the cost effectiveness of natural gas efficiency programs. Other unidentified factors were small in 2015 and 2017 but relatively high in 2016. One possible explanation is that the 2016 weather adjustment was understated by the weather normalization model.

Figure 4-6 shows a plot of total and each factor's influence on the percent change in use per customer from test year assumptions for the natural gas non-residential rate group.




*Figure 4-6. Percentage Change in Use per Customer, Natural Gas Non-Residential*

Except for weather in 2017, all factors in each year have contributed toward lower use per customer than test year assumptions. Unlike any of the other electric or natural gas rate groups,

other factors are an important influence in each of the years examined. Other factors are by definition unquantified but could include increased efficiency outside of Avista's energy efficiency programs, lower use of natural gas due to fuel substitution (e.g. increased use of biomass in cogeneration) and cutbacks in customer facility operations. Weather is also influential although less so than natural gas residential customers. Energy efficiency impacts on use per customer usage are a small factor in understanding overall change from the test year. Again, this could be due in part to persistently low natural gas prices putting pressure on the cost effectiveness of natural gas efficiency programs.

Avista's electric and natural gas energy efficiency programs are discussed in detail in Section 3 and Section 6 of this report. An examination of actual weather experienced over the three evaluation years is presented in Section 2.

## Review of Rate Cap and Earnings Test

The question as stated in the RFP is:

*"Please provide analysis and trends on whether the rate cap was reached and the results of the earnings test?*

The earnings test is calculated to determine the amount of excess earnings, earnings over the allowed rate of return. If excess earnings exist, Avista shares 50 percent of the excess earnings with the residential and non-residential rate groups. Table 4-5 shows the level of shared revenue (50% of excess revenue) in each year for the electric system and natural gas system.

*Table 4-5. Earning Test Shared Revenue*

| Year | Electric | Natural Gas |
|---|---|---|
| | *(thousands of dollars)* | |
| 2015 | $899 | $0 |
| 2016 | $2,597 | $2,927 |
| 2017 | $1,493 | $2,600 |

Normalized revenue for the applicable year is used to determine the split of shared revenue between the two rate groups. Shared earnings are paid by Avista to each customer rate group through the decoupling rate established with each annual filing.

The decoupling settlement stipulates that the change in the decoupling rate cannot add more than 3 percent to expected revenue before the change. If necessary, decoupling rates are capped to a level that limits the expected change in revenue to 3 percent and the amount of revenue that was not allowed to be amortized in the new decoupling rate is carried forward. Table 4-6 shows the annual history of rate cap results for each fuel and rate group.

*Table 4-6. History of Rate Cap Results - Was Rate Cap Reached?*

| | Electric | | Natural Gas | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Deferral Year** | **Residential** | **Non-Residential** | **Residential** | **Non-Residential** |
| 2015 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| 2016 | No | No | Yes | No |
| 2017 | No | No | No | No |

On the electric side, the 3% cap on annual rate increases from the decoupling rate was only reached one out of six possible times. After reaching the rate cap based on 2015 results, the electric residential rate group did not reach the rate cap in 2016 and 2017. For natural gas, the rate cap was reached 3 of 6 times, twice for residential customers and once for non-residential. Electric non-residential is the only rate group that has not reached the rate cap. None of the four rate groups were subject to the decoupling rate cap in 2017, meaning there were no unamortized revenue balances to carry forward to 2018.

## Review of Deferrals

The question as stated in the RFP is:

> *"What was the impact of the Decoupling deferral on Avista's revenues and rates?"*
>
> *"What was the effect of updates to the decoupling baseline and resulting effects on deferrals under the mechanisms?"*

As reported earlier in this section, deferrals have had the effect of lowering the variability of annual revenue. This is true for all rate groups. Allowed electric revenue (revenue with deferrals), base rate revenue and decoupling deferrals are shown in Table 4-7.

*Table 4-7. Electric Revenue from Decoupled Rate Groups*

| | Revenue with Deferrals | | | Base Rate Revenue | | | Decoupling Deferrals | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Residential | Non-Residential | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Total |
| **Decoupled Year** | *(millions of dollars)* | | | *(millions of dollars)* | | | *(millions of dollars)* | | |
| 2015 | 217.2 | 213.8 | 431.0 | 210.0 | 216.2 | 426.2 | 7.2 | (2.4) | 4.8 |
| 2016 | 213.9 | 213.1 | 427.0 | 203.6 | 211.1 | 414.8 | 10.3 | 2.0 | 12.3 |
| 2017 | 220.0 | 214.9 | 434.9 | 222.1 | 213.2 | 435.3 | (2.1) | 1.7 | (0.4) |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 217.0 | 213.9 | 431.0 | 211.9 | 213.5 | 425.4 | 5.1 | 0.4 | 5.6 |
| Std Dev | 3.0 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 9.4 | 2.5 | 10.3 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 6.3 |
| Coefficient of Variation | 0.014 | 0.004 | 0.009 | 0.044 | 0.012 | 0.024 | NA | NA | NA |

The calculations for the coefficient of variation, a measure of variability, are also shown in Table 4-7. Allowed natural gas revenue (revenue with deferrals), base rate revenue and decoupling deferrals are shown in Table 4-8.

*Table 4-8. Natural Gas Revenue from Decoupled Rate Groups*

| | Revenue with Deferrals | | | Base Rate Revenue | | | Decoupling Deferrals | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decoupled Year | Residential | Non-Residential | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Total | Residential | Non-Residential | Total |
| | *(millions of dollars)* | | | *(millions of dollars)* | | | *(millions of dollars)* | | |
| 2015 | 108.5 | 36.9 | 145.4 | 103.2 | 35.2 | 138.3 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 7.0 |
| 2016 | 112.3 | 35.7 | 148.0 | 105.1 | 33.7 | 138.8 | 7.2 | 2.0 | 9.2 |
| 2017 | 121.5 | 38.8 | 160.3 | 123.5 | 38.0 | 161.5 | (2.0) | 0.8 | (1.1) |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 114.1 | 37.1 | 151.2 | 110.6 | 35.6 | 146.2 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 5.0 |
| Std Dev | 6.7 | 1.6 | 8.0 | 11.2 | 2.2 | 13.2 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 5.4 |
| Coefficient of Variation | 0.059 | 0.043 | 0.053 | 0.101 | 0.061 | 0.090 | NA | NA | NA |

Because deferred revenue has averaged above zero for all rate groups, deferrals have worked to increase revenue from base rates. As has been discussed, much of the increase has been due to lower use per customer due to weather, especially in electric residential, natural gas residential and natural gas non-residential. Avista's energy efficiency programs have also worked to lower use per customer, especially for electric rate groups. Going forward, weather could just as easily have the opposite effect causing negative deferrals and higher base rate revenue than revenue with deferrals. The same is not true for Avista's energy efficiency savings, which always work in the direction of lower use per customer and increasing deferred revenues. The impact of energy efficiency has been especially significant in explaining changes from test year assumptions in the electric non-residential group.

Deferral balances and decoupling rates are shown in Table 4-9.

*Table 4-9. Summary of Deferral Balances and Decoupling Recovery Rates*

| ---------- Electric ---------- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Residential Group | | | Non-Residential Group | | |
| | Notes | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Deferred Revenue ($) | | 7,167,748 | 10,288,205 | -2,092,790 | -2,373,472 | 1,967,777 | 1,735,911 |
| Requested Recovery ($) | A | 7,360,678 | 10,913,950 | -2,765,635 | -3,081,249 | 864,012 | 1,170,966 |
| Customer Surcharge (Rebate) Revenue ($) | | 6,485,021 | 10,913,950 | -2,765,635 | -3,081,249 | 864,012 | 1,170,966 |
| Carryover Deferred Revenue ($) | | 875,657 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Decoupling Rate (Schedule 75) ($/kWh) | B | 0.00263 | 0.00445 | -0.00116 | -0.00143 | 0.00040 | 0.00054 |
| Incremental Revenue (Percent) | | 3.00% | 2.00% | -5.78% | -1.40% | 0.40% | 0.14% |
| Limited by 3% Cap? | | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| ---------- Natural Gas ---------- | | | | | | | |
| | | Residential Group | | | Non-Residential Group | | |
| | Notes | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Deferred Revenue ($) | | 5,317,198 | 7,152,977 | -1,972,082 | 1,736,736 | 2,002,654 | 840,286 |
| Requested Recovery ($) | A | 5,750,096 | 7,652,369 | -3,441,586 | 1,879,152 | 2,212,881 | 407,719 |
| Customer Surcharge (Rebate) Revenue ($) | | 3,488,984 | 6,951,431 | -3,441,586 | 1,108,839 | 2,212,881 | 407,719 |
| Carryover Deferred Revenue ($) | | 2,261,112 | 700,938 | 0 | 770,313 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Decoupling Rate (Schedule 175) ($/therm) | B | 0.02927 | 0.05580 | -0.02720 | 0.02108 | 0.03904 | 0.00691 |
| Incremental Revenue (Percent) | | 3.00% | 3.00% | -10.08% | 3.00% | 2.95% | -6.13% |
| Limited by 3% Cap? | | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| A: Requested recovery is equal to deferred revenue after adjusting for shared excess earnings (if applicable), deferral balance carryover from prior year (if any), interest, and revenue related expenses. | | | | | | | |
| B: Decoupling rates Schedule 75 (electric) and Schedule 175 (natural gas) take effect on November 1st of the following year. For example, rates shown in the 2016 column have an effective date of November 1, 2017 | | | | | | | |

Comparing deferred revenue with the requested recovery shows the importance of deferral balances in determining decoupling rates. They are not the only factor, however, and in some instances other factors are actually larger than the deferral balance. This was the case for electric non-residential in 2016, for example, when the requested recovery was only 44 percent of deferred revenue ($ 864,012 / $ 1,967,777), due mainly to shared excess earnings.

The decoupling baseline or test year is another factor that comes into play when analyzing deferral balances and the impacts from various factors, such as energy efficiency. The test year used for 2015 deferral calculations was a projection of 2015. The test year for 2016 and 2017 is a 12-month period ending September 2014. The practical implication of this change in baseline for actual weather compared to normal weather are insignificant. However, Avista's energy efficiency programs have a greater impact the further in time the actual calendar year is from the test year. So, moving the baseline from 2015 to 12 months ending September 2014 resulted in a larger variance in use per customer due to Avista's energy efficiency programs. The same is true for the "other" category of factors impacting use per customer which would include efficiency gains outside of Avista's programs.

Removing the influence of weather from deferred revenue provides another way to view the impacts of Avista's energy efficiency achievements and "other" unexplained influences on deferral balances. Table 4-10 shows actual deferred revenue and deferred revenue estimated at normal weather.

*Table 4-10. Deferred Revenue at Normal Weather*

| ---------- Electric ---------- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Residential Group** | | | **Non-Residential Group** | | |
| | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Deferred Revenue | 7,167,748 | 10,288,205 | -2,092,790 | -2,373,472 | 1,967,777 | 1,735,911 |
| Weather Impact on Deferrals | 2,416,743 | 5,587,227 | -8,618,230 | -451,215 | 465,250 | -1,646,265 |
| Deferred Revenue at Normal Weather | 4,751,005 | 4,700,978 | 6,525,440 | -1,922,257 | 1,502,527 | 3,382,176 |
| ---------- Natural Gas ---------- | | | | | | |
| | **Residential Group** | | | **Non-Residential Group** | | |
| | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Deferred Revenue | 5,317,198 | 7,152,977 | -1,972,082 | 1,736,736 | 2,002,654 | 840,286 |
| Weather Impact on Deferrals | 5,739,128 | 4,720,021 | -1,961,267 | 1,262,997 | 967,162 | -380,599 |
| Deferred Revenue at Normal Weather | -421,930 | 2,432,956 | -10,815 | 473,739 | 1,035,492 | 1,220,885 |

Deferred revenue at normal weather is calculated by subtracting the weather impacts on deferrals from actual deferred revenue. The weather impact is estimated using Avista's weather adjustment coefficients as reported in weather adjustment calculations workbooks.[66] Deferred revenue at normal weather shows the same patterns of influence of Avista's energy efficiency programs and other unidentified factors on deferred revenue. Consider, for example, the electric non-residential rate group. Deferred revenue estimated at normal weather was negative in 2015 and increasingly positive in 2016 and 2017. This is the same pattern shown in Figure 4-4 where the net influence of Avista's energy efficiency programs and other factors excluding weather

[66] See Data Request number 76.

lead to higher use per customer in 2015 (and negative deferrals) and progressively lower use per customer (and positive deferrals) in 2016 and 2017.

## Summary – Task 4

Avista's decoupling mechanism has had a stabilizing effect on revenue, reducing variability to between 30 and 70 percent of variability without decoupling. On the electric side, the 3% cap on annual rate increases from the decoupling rate was only reached one out of six possible times when it came into effect for electric residential in 2015. For natural gas, the rate cap was reached 3 of 6 times, twice for residential customers and once for non-residential. Electric non-residential is the only rate group that has not reached the rate cap. *None of the four rate groups were subject to the decoupling rate cap in 2017.*

Because deferred revenue has averaged above zero for all rate groups, deferrals have worked to increase revenue from base rates. Much of the increase has been due to lower use per customer due to weather, especially in electric residential, natural gas residential and natural gas non-residential. Avista's energy efficiency programs have also worked to lower use per customer, especially for electric rate groups. The impact of energy efficiency has been especially significant in explaining changes from test year assumptions in the electric non-residential group.

# Section 5. Fixed Costs and Charges, Non-Decoupled Customers

In this section we examine fixed costs and fixed charges for electric and natural gas customer classes.

The objective of Task 5, as stated in the request for proposal, is shown below:

> *"Analysis of the extent to which fixed costs are recovered in fixed charges for the customer classes, excluded from the Mechanisms."*

Relating to this objective is the following evaluation question, also taken from the RFP:

> *"How much of the Company's fixed costs recovered from non-decoupling customer classes are recovered in fixed charges?"*

The scope of this section was expanded to include decoupled electric and natural gas customer classes to facilitate comparison to customer classes excluded from the decoupling mechanisms. To address the evaluation objective, it is necessary to compare revenues from fixed charges to fixed costs for these customer classes. Fixed cost and revenue collected from fixed charges was provided by Avista in response to data request (DR) 89. Beginning with electric customer classes, we examine the recovery of fixed cost through fixed charges and the relationships presented in the data. Throughout the discussion it is useful to keep in mind that the basis for cost allocation changed between 2015 and 2016/2017.[67]

## Electric Customers

Annual revenue from fixed charges and fixed costs are shown for electric customer classes in Table 5-1.

*Table 5-1. Electric Revenue from Fixed Charges and Fixed Cost (thousands of dollars)*

| | | Decoupled | | | | Non-Decoupled | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Residential | General Service | Large General Service | Pumping Service | Extra Large General Service | Street & Area Lighting |
| | | Schedules | | | | | |
| | Total | 1, 2 | 11, 12 | 21, 22 | 31, 32 | 25 | 41-49 |
| 2015 | | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 52,730 | 21,450 | 6,728 | 12,061 | 527 | 5,292 | 6,672 |
| Fixed Cost | 382,117 | 191,696 | 43,845 | 86,254 | 9,376 | 43,585 | 7,360 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 13.8% | 11.2% | 15.3% | 14.0% | 5.6% | 12.1% | 90.7% |
| 2016 | | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 52,943 | 21,969 | 6,883 | 11,447 | 546 | 5,271 | 6,828 |
| Fixed Cost | 400,668 | 202,356 | 47,747 | 87,775 | 9,116 | 45,439 | 8,235 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 13.2% | 10.9% | 14.4% | 13.0% | 6.0% | 11.6% | 82.9% |
| 2017 | | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 53,013 | 22,226 | 6,955 | 11,396 | 533 | 5,426 | 6,475 |
| Fixed Cost | 408,126 | 210,268 | 48,363 | 86,777 | 9,144 | 45,287 | 8,286 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 13.0% | 10.6% | 14.4% | 13.1% | 5.8% | 12.0% | 78.1% |

[67] For 2015 the cost of service study used for the General Rate Case (GRC) for electric (UE-140188) and natural gas (UG-140189) was the basis for cost allocation factors. The cost of service study used for the GRC for electric (UE-150204) and natural gas (UG-150205) was the basis for cost allocation factors used for 2016 and 2017. These cost allocation factors were adjusted for actual customer counts and usage levels for the analysis reported in this section.

Over the 2015-2017 period fixed charges for total electric have averaged slightly higher than 13 percent of fixed cost. The percentage has fallen slightly since 2015. The customer class that covers the highest percentage of fixed costs through fixed charges is street and area lighting, just over 90 percent in 2015 and falling to 78 percent in 2017. The customer class collecting the smallest percentage of fixed costs through fixed charges is pumping services. Pumping services have averaged a little less than 6 percent recovery of fixed cost through fixed charges. About 11 percent of residential fixed costs are recovered through fixed charges. The percentage has fallen from 11.2 percent in 2015 to 10.6 percent in 2017. The percentage of fixed cost recovered through fixed charges from general services and large general services have each fallen about one percentage point between 2015 and the two-year period 2016 and 2017.

## Natural Gas Customers

Annual revenue from fixed charges and fixed costs are shown for natural gas customer classes in Table 5-2.[68]

*Table 5-2. Fixed Cost and Fixed Charges, Non-Decoupled Natural Gas Customer Classes*

| | | Decoupled | | | Non-Decoupled | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Residential | Large General Service | High Load Factor Large General Service | Interrupt-ible Service | Transportation Service |
| | | Schedules | | | | |
| | Total | 101, 102 | 111, 112 | 121, 122 | 131, 132 | 146 |
| ---------- 2015 ---------- | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 19,519 | 16,471 | 2,748 | 70 | 0 | 229 |
| Fixed Cost | 81,405 | 63,593 | 13,652 | 1,166 | 173 | 2,822 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 24.0% | 25.9% | 20.1% | 6.0% | 0.0% | 8.1% |
| ---------- 2016 ---------- | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 20,544 | 16,896 | 3,324 | 78 | 0 | 245 |
| Fixed Cost | 84,923 | 69,266 | 11,542 | 818 | 184 | 3,113 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 24.2% | 24.4% | 28.8% | 9.6% | 0.0% | 7.9% |
| ---------- 2017 ---------- | | | | | | |
| Revenue from Fixed Charges | 21,184 | 17,287 | 3,536 | 108 | 0 | 253 |
| Fixed Cost | 89,681 | 72,938 | 12,464 | 793 | 179 | 3,308 |
| Percent Recovered from Fixed Charges | 23.6% | 23.7% | 28.4% | 13.7% | 0.0% | 7.6% |

Over the 2015-2017 period fixed charges for total natural gas have averaged around 24 percent of fixed cost. Residential customers cover the highest percentage of fixed costs through fixed charges, ranging from a high of 25.9 percent in 2015 to a low of 23.7 in 2017. The two non-residential decoupled customer classes have both seen a marked increase in the percentage of fixed costs recovered through fixed charges since 2015. This sort of change is likely due to rate restructuring between the UG-140189 and UG-150205.

Non-decoupled customer classes recover the smallest percentage of fixed cost through fixed charges. Fixed charges revenue as a percentage of fixed cost is zero for interruptible services.

[68] Avista's natural gas cost of service studies use different customer groupings than the decoupling mechanism. The cost of service roll-up does not differentiate Schedules 112, 122, or 132 which were excluded from the decoupling mechanism. Consequently the 111/112 and 121/122 columns overstate the decoupled amounts and the Schedule 131/132 column understates non-decoupled sales service. The difference is not considered material for the cost of service portion of this evaluation.

Fixed costs are a very small level of the total costs for this customer class. The percentage of fixed cost recovered through fixed charges from transportation service has averaged a little less than 8 percent and has been falling between 2015 and 2017.

## Summary – Task 5

Avista recovers about 13 percent of total electric fixed cost through fixed customer charges, trending only slightly lower over the 2015-2017 period. On the natural gas side, fixed charges have averaged nearly 24 percent of fixed costs between 2015 and 2017. The percentage has moved higher for decoupled natural gas non-residential customer classes and lower for residential.

*This page left intentionally blank*

# Section 6. Analysis of Conservation Achievement

In this section of the evaluation, we use results of DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analyses and the Annual Conservation Plans. There are three questions (Figure 6-1):

- First, what is the impact of conversions from electric to natural gas on decoupling revenue?
- Second, has decoupling had an impact on natural gas conservation savings?
- Third, has decoupling had an impact on electric conservation savings (leaving out the commitment to an additional five-percent (5%) energy saving)?

Conservation achievement through regional market transformation (which Avista co-funds through the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance) is left out of all analysis in this section of the report.

First, we examine the impact of fuel conversions on decoupling revenue. Then we examine whether decoupling has had an impact on energy savings.

**Task 6:** An analysis of each Mechanism's impact on conservation achievement, in total and by sector (residential, low-income, non-residential), and identification of conclusive or meaningful trends in the performance of the Company's electric and natural gas conservation programs since the inception of the Mechanisms (did the Company achieve a higher level of savings with the mechanisms in effect). This analysis should be based on information already available as part of the Company's biennial conservation achievement evaluations filed with the Commission including changes to program delivery strategies as reported in annual evaluations, significant changes in program budgets, or reported savings levels.

6a For the electric and gas conservation programs, what impact has the shift in customers (electric to natural gas) due to fuel conversions had on decoupling revenue?

6b Have the Mechanisms had an impact on natural gas conservation savings?

6c Have the Mechanisms had an impact on electric conservation savings (not including the decoupling commitment to an additional 5% savings)?

*Figure 6-1. Task 6 - Conservation Achievement*



Exhibit No. 1
Case Nos. AVU-E-19-0_ and AVU-G-19-0_
P. Ehrbar, Avista
Page 167 of 224

## What is the Impact of Fuel Conversion on Decoupling Revenue?

Evaluation question 6a (Figure 6-1) asks, "For the electric and gas conservation programs, what impact has the shift in customers (electric to natural gas) due to fuel conversions had on decoupling revenue?" The goal is to decrease electric usage by increasing sales of natural gas. First, three observations to set the context:

- For 2015, there was no decoupling revenue, so there was no fuel conversion effect on decoupling revenue for 2015.
- For 2016, decoupling revenue was limited to a partial collection (or rebate) of revenue from decoupling in November, phased in using billing cycles and full collection in December. For January through October of 2016 there was no decoupling revenue recovery or rebate. This means any effect demonstrated for calendar 2016 is quite small.
- For 2017, there is a full year of application of the decoupling adjustment to customer bills. This means calendar 2017 is the first year to show the full effect of decoupling revenue recovery and/or rebate.

For the fuel conversion program, change is directional. Fuel conversion operates in only one way, from electric to natural gas. Conversion begins by disconnection of electric end-use equipment, so analysis begins on the electric side. From an electric perspective, yearly kWh conversion savings as a percentage of overall savings achievement by group is shown for Electric Residential in Table 6-1 and for Electric Nonresidential in Table 6-2:[69] From an electric perspective,

- the residential percentage converted for 2016 is about 23 percent of residential overall savings achievement; for 2017 it is just under 31 percent (Table 6-1).
- and for low-income, conversion is about 50 percent of overall savings achievement for 2016; for 2017 it is 73 percent (Table 6-1).
- low-income converted kWh is just under 3 percent of residential converted kWh in 2016; for 2017 it is 5 percent (calculated from "Converted kWh" columns in Table 6-1).
- the non-residential percentage of overall conservation achievement due to conversions is 2.1 percent for 2016; for 2017 it is 2.6 percent (Table 6-2).

[69] 2016 Washington DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effective Analysis, June 1, 2017, Table ES-1; 2017 Washington DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effective Analysis, June 1, 2018, Table ES-1.

*Table 6-1. Electric Residential Conversions as Percentage of Conservation Achievement (kWh)*

| Electric Residential kWh (Including Low Income) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decoupled Group | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
| | kWh | Converted kWh | Percentage Converted | kWh | Converted kWh | Percentage Converted |
| Residential | 43,083,551 | 9,766,855 | 22.7% | 33,376,237 | 10,237,036 | 30.7% |
| Low Income | 546,066 | 273,628 | 50.1% | 710,204 | 518,748 | 73.0% |
| Total | 43,629,617 | 10,040,483 | 23.0% | 34,086,441 | 10,755,784 | 31.6% |

*Table 6-2. Electric Non-Residential Conversion as Percentage of Conservation Achievement (kWh)*

| Electric Nonresidential kWh | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decoupled Group | 2016 | | | 2017 | | |
| | kWh | Converted kWh | Percentage Converted | kWh | Converted kWh | Percentage Converted |
| Nonresidential | 38,226,357 | 805,779 | 2.1% | 41,930,099 | 1,070,262 | 2.6% |

**Residential Electric:** The Schedule 75 Residential electric decoupling rate (from Task 2) is $0.00263 per kWh for the first rate-year and $0.00445 for the second rate-year (in the case of the Residential Electric group, for both years, these are surcharges to customers). Since the specially defined year for application of rates runs for the twelve months from November through October, the electric decoupling rate for the 2016 cannot be used for the full calendar 2016 (the value is zero for January through October of 2016, then $0.00263 per kWh for November and December 2016).

This value also applies for January through October 2017. The value for the second rate-year applies to the last two months (November and December) of 2017. Converted kWh is taken from the Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (see note in Table 6-3). The ratio of Residential kWh usage per time block as shown in the columns of Table 6-3 is developed from monthly energy use, summed over each time block and then divided by the total Residential energy use. This ratio is used to spread the application of the Converted kWh.[70] As shown in the last row and final column of Table 6-3, conversion from electric to natural gas is estimated to cause $29,389 of fixed cost Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment over November 2016 through December 2017.

[70] Electric usage (kWh per month) is shown in Section 2 of this evaluation. No allocation is perfect and other allocations could also be used. Reporting of conserved kWh is typically on a first-year projected basis for projects completed during a calendar year. Converted kWh is treated on the same basis for allocations to table columns and estimation of the total.

Dollar values in the columns result from the application of electric decoupling rate values. The value shown, $29,389, is an estimate. This estimate is determined in part by the allocation of full year Converted kWh savings by time blocks to which the different values of Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment apply.[71]

The values in the row next to the bottom row of the table are *the Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment surcharges which would have applied if there had been no conversion* and equipment had remained in place connected to the electric system. Since these devices were disconnected from the system, customers retained a net value of $29,389. From a Company perspective this represents a net loss of $29,389 of Electric Residential Decoupling Revenue.

*Table 6-3. Residential Fuel Conversion Program Savings*

| Allocation of Residential Electric Decoupling Revenue Based on Gross Verified Savings ( kWh) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Converted kWh 16-17** | **Jan-Oct 16** | **Nov+Dec 16** | **Jan-Oct 17** | **Nov+Dec 17** | **Total** |
| **Converted kWh 16-17** | 16,541,961 | | | | | |
| **Residential kWh** | | 1,852,650,051 | 416,441,453 | 2,062,581,745 | 439,889,023 | 4,771,562,272 |
| **Weights** | | 0.3883 | 0.0873 | 0.4323 | 0.0922 | 1.0000 |
| **Allocated Converted kWh** | 16,541,961 | 6,422,732 | 1,443,711 | 7,150,519 | 1,524,999 | 16,541,961 |
| **Decoupling Rate** | | 0 | 0.00263 | 0.00263 | 0.00445 | |
| **Decoupling Revenue** | | | $3,797 | $18,806 | $6,786 | $29,389 |
| | | | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge |
| The Converted kWh 16-17 is from Page 2, Table 2: Washington Electric Portfolio Evaluation Results, Appendix C (2016-2017 Electric Impact Evaluations) of the Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018. Electric Residential and Electric Residential Low Income conversions have been combined. | | | | | | |

For Residential Electric, each time block in which the decoupling rate is applied represents a surcharge to the customers and would have been paid by the customers if they had not disconnected equipment from electric service. However, here we examine the loss of kWh sales due to conversion away from Electric Residential service, so the surcharges that would have been paid by customers are not paid, representing a gain for the customers and a loss of Electric Residential decoupling revenue to the Company.[72] The Company would eventually recover this revenue through future decoupling rate adjustments and surcharges so that the net effect is a transfer of income from all customers within the rate group to those customers that convert from electric to natural gas.

**Nonresidential Electric:** The Schedule 75 Nonresidential Group electric decoupling rate is negative $0.00144 for the first rate-year (a rebate to customers) and positive $0.00040 (a surcharge to customers) for the second rate year. Since the specially defined year for application of rates runs from November through October, the decoupling rate for the 2016 (negative

[71] Results are not directly metered, they are modelled using assumptions.

[72] We treat conversion here the same way that conservation is treated. If conservation occurs during a calendar year, its value for that year is counted ("first year energy savings"). Generally, this is a modeled value based on a combination of empirical measurement and engineering analysis and assumptions. It is not the actual metered value for that year, except in special projects with quasi-experimental or experimental designs.

$0.00144) can be used for the two months to which it applies in calendar 2016. This is also the rate for January through October 2017. The positive value of $0.00040 then applies for November and December of 2017.

Results for Nonresidential Electric conversions are shown in Table 6-4. The values in the table represent what would have happened if the electric equipment was not disconnected. In this instance, a negative decoupling rate for the first rate-year (a rebate) has a much larger effect than the customer surcharge Electric Decoupling Rate Adjustment for the two months to which it applies in the second rate-year. The net result is a rebate of $11,807. However, in fact, the customers did disconnect the electric equipment. So, on the electric side their net rebate was foregone and can be treated as a cost of $11,807. This means the Company gained $11,807 by not having to pay out this amount in rebates to customers.

*Table 6-4. Allocation of Nonresidential Revenue based on Gross Verified Savings (kWh)*

| Allocation of Nonresidential Electric Decoupling Revenue Based on Gross Verified Savings ( kWh) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Converted kWh 16-17 | Jan-Oct 16 | Nov+Dec 16 | Jan-Oct 17 | Nov+Dec 17 | Total |
| Converted kWh 16-17 | 1,810,107 | | | | | |
| Nonresidential kWh | | 1,797,755,804 | 345,379,736 | 1,820,084,174 | 259,943,247 | 4,223,162,961 |
| Weights | | 0.4257 | 0.0818 | 0.4310 | 0.0616 | 1.0000 |
| Allocated Converted kWh | 1,810,107 | 7,041,738 | 1,352,839 | 7,129,197 | 1,018,187 | 16,541,961 |
| Decoupling Rate | | 0 | -0.00144 | -0.00144 | 0.00040 | |
| Decoupling Revenue | | | -$1,948 | -$10,266 | $407 | -$11,807 |
| | | | Rebate | Rebate | Surcharge | Rebate |
| The Converted kWh 16-17 is from Page 2, Table 2: Washington Electric Portfolio Evaluation Results, Appendix C (2016-2017 Electric Impact Evaluations) of the Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018. Nonresidential Groups E2A (General Services)), E2B (Large General Services Included in Decoiupling) and E2C (Pumping) conversions have been combined. | | | | | | |

**Residential Natural Gas:** By means of similar calculations, the new sales of therms effect on Residential Natural Gas decoupling revenue from increased gas sales is shown in the bottom two rows of Table 6-5. Here the magnitude of the change is only $1,079. Since natural gas sales were increased and the Natural Gas Residential Group Decoupling Rate Adjustment is on a per therm sold basis, the Natural Gas Residential Group received an additional cost of $1,079. From a Company perspective this is $1,079 in additional Residential Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue.

*Table 6-5. Residential Gas Decoupling Revenue Based on Gross Verified Savings (therms)*

| Allocation of Residential Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue (Gross Verified Savings - Therms) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conversion Increased Sales (2016-2017) (Therms) | Jan-Oct 16 | Nov+Dec 16 | Jan-Oct 17 | Nov+Dec 17 | Total |
| Converted Therms 16-17 | 1,136,582 | | | | | |
| Residential Therms | | 79,954,265 | 25,961,006 | 192,721,248 | 30,034,533 | 328,671,052 |
| Weights | | 0.2433 | 0.0790 | 0.5864 | 0.0914 | 1.0000 |
| Allocated Converted Therms | 1,136,582 | 276,491 | 21,839 | 12,806 | 1,170 | 312,306 |
| Decoupling Rate | | 0 | 0.02927 | 0.02927 | 0.05580 | |
| Decoupling Revenue | | | $639 | $375 | $65 | $1,079 |
| | | | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge |
| The Converted Therms 16-17 is from Page 20, Table 2-15: Residential Reported Participation and Savings, Appendix D (2016-2017 Natural Gas Impact Evaluation) of the Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018. Natural Gas Residential and Natural Gas Low Income conversions have been combined. | | | | | | |

**Nonresidential Natural Gas:** By means of similar calculations, the converted portions of decoupling revenue for residential natural gas is shown in the bottom two rows of Table 6-6. Here the magnitude of the change is $1,384. Since there is a per therm surcharge for additional natural gas sales for the Nonresidential Natural Gas Group, this results in an additional Nonresidential Decoupling Revenue Charge of $1,384. This is a cost to customers of $1,384 and from a Company perspective an increase in Nonresidential Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue of $1,384.

*Table 6-6. Nonresidential Gas Decoupling Revenue (Gross Verified Savings - therms)*

| Allocation of Nonresidential Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue (Gross Verified Savings - Therms) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conversion Increased Sales (2016-2017) (Therms) | Jan-Oct 16 | Nov+Dec 16 | Jan-Oct 17 | Nov+Dec 17 | Total |
| Converted Therms 16-17 | 88,088 | | | | | |
| Nonresidential Therms | | 36,397,057 | 10,570,164 | 44,277,280 | 11,884,139 | 103,128,640 |
| Weights | | 0.3529 | 0.1025 | 0.4293 | 0.1152 | 1.0000 |
| Allocated Converted Therms | 88,088 | 31,089 | 9,029 | 37,820 | 10,151 | 88,088 |
| Decoupling Rate | | 0 | 0.02108 | 0.02108 | 0.03904 | |
| Decoupling Revenue | | | $190 | $797 | $396 | $1,384 |
| | | | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge | Surcharge |

The Converted Therms 16-17 is from Page 19, Table 2-14: Avista Nonresidential Reported Participation and Savings, Appendix D (2016-2017 Natural Gas Impact Evaluation) of the Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018. Natural Gas General Service and Natural Gas Large General Service Included (Decoupled Groups G2A & G2B) have been combined.

## Summary - Impact of Fuel Conversion on Decoupling Revenue

The impact of fuel conversion on decoupling revenue is small.

- For residential customers, there was a decoupling tariff adjustment of (cost to the customer) $29,389 for disconnecting electric service to equipment. Adding natural gas equipment as replacements, additional natural gas sales caused a decoupling tariff adjustment (cost to the customer) of $1,079, for a net cost to customers of $29,868. At the same time, net residential effect on Residential (combined) Electric and Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue was a gain of $29,868 to the Company.
- For Nonresidential customers, there was a decoupling tariff adjustment (cost to the customer) of $11,807 which would have been rebated had equipment remained in place. In addition, there was a cost to the customer of $1,384 for the decoupling cost adder per therm for additional therm sales, for a net cost of $13,191. From the Company's perspective, this is a gain of $13,191 in Nonresidential (combined) Electric and Natural Gas Decoupling Revenue benefit.

## Have the Mechanisms had an Impact on Natural Gas or Electric Conservation?

This question combines evaluation analysis questions 6b and 6c in Figure 6-1. For electric conservation savings, the decoupling commitment to an additional five-percent (5%) savings is excluded from analysis: the question concerns conservation beyond the five-percent decoupling commitment. We first look at conservation savings totals. The look at totals (electric and natural gas separately) is followed by examination of conservation savings for each of the three electric decoupling groups (residential, low-income, non-residential). Then, we examine each of the three natural gas decoupling groups (residential, low-income and non-residential). *In each of these analyses, we conclude there is no evidence that the decoupling mechanisms had an impact as a driver (either positive or negative) on Conservation Achievement. However, we find that decoupling is important in removing barriers to Conservation Achievement.*[73]

### *Decoupling and Conservation Achievement (Totals): Perspective*

Electric conservation is primarily influenced by the I-937 Energy Independence Act[74], rather than by decoupling, but decoupling does have an important role in removing barriers to Conservation Achievement. The role of the decoupling factor is to eliminate a financial disincentive so that other factors may operate as drivers; but it does not drive conservation programs.

Beyond the current I-937 Energy Independence Act conservation effort, Avista is a national leader in Smart Cities[75], Distributed Energy Resources (DER) and microgrid development[76]. These are major efforts that go beyond decoupling. The future is likely a combination (yet unnamed) of DSM, DERs, Smart Cities, an ecology of microgrids and nanogrids, and likely also integrates elements of climate adaptation.

#### ***Business Planning: Electric and Natural Gas 2012-2017***

For perspective, we drop back in time, prior to the current decoupling because Avista has a deep history in DSM planning. For example, the Business Plan for 2012[77] notes that "Avista has

---

[73] In response to DR 94, Avista states: "With or without Decoupling, Avista will make any necessary investments required in order to ensure high quality service for our customers. That said, decoupling positively effects how Avista now looks upon proliferation of distributed generation (net metering) in our system. Without decoupling, it is entirely reasonable to think from a regulatory and policy position, Avista would seek to minimize the amount of net metering on our system. With decoupling, that is not the case, similar to the goal of decoupling to remove any disincentive towards promoting energy conservation/efficiency." We do not disagree with this statement; however, we think that decoupling is important in removing barriers to Conservation Achievement.

[74] Washington, I-937: Utilities must pursue all conservation that is cost-effective, reliable and feasible. They need to identify the conservation potential over a 10-year period and set two-year targets. See: http://www.commerce.wa.gov/growing-the-economy/energy/energy-independence-act/. In response to DR 093, Avista states: "Avista does not feel that decoupling is a driver nor a barrier removal mechanism on conservation achievement. Given the requirements under the Energy Independence Act (EIA/I-937) to pursue all cost-effective, reliable, and feasible savings, that is the primary driver of conservation achievement."

[75] Data Response 043 (University District Smart City Accelerator Initiative).

[76] Data Response 044 (Micro-Transactive Grid). Avista has also done earlier work with microgrids and is viewed in the industry as a leader.

[77] Response to Data Request 016 (Annual DSM Plans), 2012 DSM "Revised" Business Plan, Avista Utilities, Revised December 7, 2011.

continually been providing energy efficiency programs, uninterrupted, since November 1st, 1978." That is forty (40) years of DSM planning and program implementation if we count the current year (2018). The 2012 Business Plan goes on to say: "[t]he Company's planning process builds on previous years experiences and addresses a number of challenges in regard to achieving energy acquisition targets, meeting cost-effectiveness criteria and satisfying regulatory reporting requirements."[78] Avista has substantial depth in DSM planning and program operation, as well as experience with evolving legislative and Commission targets that orient and drive the DSM planning function. Against this deep background, decoupling affects the current context in which conservation takes place. However, decoupling does not drive Conservation Achievement. Rather, the annual DSM plans are technical documents informed by technical concerns and directives to develop energy savings targets. The 2012 through 2014 plans are not influenced by decoupling (which began in 2015).

> As part of the pending General Rate Case Settlement Agreement in Docket Nos. UE-140188 and UG-140189, the Company agreed, in consideration for receiving a full electric decoupling mechanism, to increase its electric energy conservation achievement by 5% over the conservation target approved by the Commission, beginning with the 2014-2015 biennial target. The scope of the DSM Business Plan covers the majority of the acquisition eligible to achieve this target but does not include efficiencies achieved through distribution or generation facilities. Since the planning process has led to the expectation that the acquisition target will be achieved, the Company has not designed, and is not currently considering any contingency programs to increase acquisition to meet the target.

*Figure 6-2. Planning for Decoupling 5%*

Beginning with the 2012 Business Plan (completed in 2011) and moving forward, the first mention of decoupling occurs in the Business Plan for 2015 (Figure 6-2).[79] Here, the electric planning targets contain the five percent (5%) adder to DSM energy savings which is a part of the decoupling order. Since the electric adder was already covered within the flexibility of the planning process, no action was required to specifically further consider or address decoupling. There is no indication of any other influence of decoupling on planning for conservation achievement in the 2015 plan.

There are similar mentions of decoupling in the 2016 plan[80] and the 2017 electric plan[81]. While each plan is a comprehensive document, usually of 150 or more pages, there are no further

[78] Ibid., Executive Summary, P. 2.

[79] Response to Data Request 016 (Annual DSM Plans), Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2015 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 31, 2014, P. 9. Of course, the addition of the five-percent (5%) itself is an effect of decoupling. It was added and agreed to part of the decoupling agreement. At the policy/management levels decoupling had this influence on the DSM Plan that drives conservation. However, Task 6 directs that this addition to Conservation Achievement planning and accomplishment not be included in the analysis in this Section of the evaluation. We note it here for completeness.

[80] Response to Data Request 016 (Annual DSM Plans), Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2016 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 26, 2015, P7 & P, 8.

[81] Response to Data Request 016 (Annual DSM Plans), Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2017 Electric Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, P. 6 & P. 23.

substantive considerations of decoupling in any of the plans for 2015 through 2017. Similarly, there are no mentions of decoupling in the plans from 2012 through 2017 for natural gas.

*We conclude from the analysis of Business Plans and Evaluations for 2012 through 2017 that decoupling had no independent effect on electric or natural gas planning beyond the 5% adder.* Next, we examine Conservation Achievement directly in the series of Avista evaluations.

***Total Conservation Achievement: Electric and Natural Gas: 2012-2017***

To assess the role of decoupling in Conservation Achievement, we examine the Annual Conservation Reports & Cost Effectiveness Analyses for Washington for 2012 through 2017.[82] The Annual Conservation Reports & Cost Effectiveness Analyses report electric and natural gas conservation achievement against planning target goals. The Biennial Conservation Plan (BCP) for Washington's Energy Independence Act (Initiative 937 or I-937) provided energy savings targets for 2014 through 2015.

- In the 2014-2015 Biennium, Avista acquired 70,959 MWh (verified gross savings) in Washington or 104% of its two-year electric target of 68,204 MWh.[83] The five-percent (5%) decoupling adder did not apply in this Biennium.
- In 2016, Avista acquired 71,572 MWh (I-937 total adjusted reported gross savings) in Washington, or 130% percent of its I-937 target of 54,978 MWh.[84] The five-percent (5%) decoupling adder is included.
- In 2016-17, Avista acquired 139,450 MWh (total verified gross savings) in Washington, or 183% percent of its I-937 target of 141,331 MWh. The five-percent (5%) decoupling adder is included.[85]

With exceptionally high achievement levels for 2015-2017, the five percent (5%) conservation achievement for decoupling was easily surpassed.[86] The Annual Conservation Reports & Cost Effectiveness Analyses for 2012 through 2017 contain no further mention or analysis of decoupling. There are no mentions of decoupling from 2012 through 2017 for natural gas. *We conclude from the analysis of the Annual Conservation & Cost Effectiveness Reports for 2012 through 2017 that at the level of total achievement, decoupling had no independent effect on driving overall electric conservation achievement.* The substantial increase in performance for residential, low-income and non-residential from 2015 to 2016 is attributed "…to the increasing popularity of LED light, TLED lighting and Fuel Conversions."[87] This finding was repeated in the 2017 evaluation.[88]

---

[82] Responses to Data Requests 017, 018 and 070 (Annual Conservation Reports and Cost Effectiveness for 2012 through 2017).
[83] Washington 2015 Annual Conservation Report (ACR) & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, May 31, 2016, P. 4.
[84] Washington 2016 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2017, P. 18.
[85] These results have been updated to correct an error using numbers provided verbally by Avista during the report presentation/review meeting. Numbers reported here are slightly less than those in the Washington 2017 Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018, Executive Summary, P. 1.
[86] Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018, P. 17.
[87] Washington 2016 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2017, P. 7,
[88] Washington 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2018, P. 6.

Also, "[a]t the start of 2017, the Washington electric tariff rider was underfunded by $8,283,048."[89] "The primary driver for the underfunded balance was the unanticipated high participation in the non-residential lighting program in 2017."[90] Similarly, for natural gas the tariff rider balance was underfunded by $1,410,964 at the start of 2017 and there was an underfunded balance of $626,653 at year-end.[91] These budget figures illustrate the positive operation of decoupling. Decoupling is not a driver for energy conservation. *But it facilitates pursuit of all cost-effective energy conservation in accord with Commission direction.* Anyone who has been present in a non-decoupled utility when a planned program budget cap is reached has heard staff telling customers that the budget cap has been reached, so they should consider tracking when the program will reopen in the next year and get their application in immediately. From experience, we have seen major programs (elsewhere) that are open for applications for one or two days a year. With decoupling, that barrier is removed; so, programs can follow the direction of I-937 to pursue all cost-effective conservation.

### *Residential Electric Group*

As shown in the accompanying graph (Figure 6-3), residential electric conservation achievement dips in 2015 (as decoupling starts, but before decoupling has any effect on customer bills), jumps in 2016 (which has negligible bill effect from decoupling) and dips back to the 2014 pre-decoupling level in 2017 (the first full year subject to the decoupling adder each month). However, the reasons for these changes have little or nothing to do with decoupling.

For 2013, a major concern in planning was how to deal with the Washington I-937 Standards for the 2014-2015 Biennium.[92] For example, an agreement was reached holding that the unit energy savings used by the third-party completing Avista's CPA (used to establish the I-937 target) will remain fixed for the duration of that biennium, and there was a resolution of the problem of different market forecasting methods used by NEEA, reducing uncertainty for the Company. There were no major changes to residential electric programs. Decoupling was not mentioned in analysis or presentation.

In the 2015 Business Plan, Avista noted that "…falling avoided costs permeate throughout all phases of DSM operations and will require considerable innovation and flexibility in order to continue to deliver value to the customer."[93]

[89] Ibid., P. 4.
[90] Ibid., P. 4.
[91] Ibid., P. 4.
[92] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, November 1, 2013, Pp. 14-18.
[93] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2015 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 31, 2014, P. 4.




*Figure 6-3. Conservation Achievement - Residential Electric*

Further, the bundling of measures into programs was creatively optimized as follows. "The Company provides the highest possible value for the cost-effectiveness metric applicable to each program, maximizing the residual benefits (benefits less costs) of the applicable metric.

This choice plays an important role in the Company's planning process and the development of the final portfolio in three ways:[94]

1. By maximizing the portfolio residual benefits the Company will seek to add measures and programs to the extent that the incremental benefits of that resource option exceed the incremental cost. This approach precludes the rejection of measures or programs that favorably contribute to the cost-effectiveness of the portfolio but are not able to bear the non-incremental infrastructure cost that would be assigned to the program.
2. By only burdening measures and programs with the costs that are incremental to them at each level of aggregation, the potential for a 'death spiral' is reduced. If each measure were required to bear their fully allocated (including non-incremental) costs, incrementally cost-effective measures would potentially fail and, by being excluded from the portfolio, increase the non-incremental cost allocation to be borne by other measures.
3. In comparison to simply establishing a benefit-to-cost ratio in excess of 1.00 as a target, Avista's chosen approach leads to a larger portfolio as well as one which has higher residual benefits. It does this by providing a means for accepting cost-effective but marginal measures and programs that favorably contribute to the portfolio's residual benefits but may reduce the overall portfolio benefit-to-cost ratio."

Residential program and approaches were continued from the prior year. All analysis and discussion for 2015 was based on policy approaches and technical considerations. Decoupling

[94] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2015 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 31, 2014, P. 7.

was not mentioned in analysis or presentation.[95] Similarly, discussion followed technical and policy approaches. Decoupling was not discussed in the 2016 plan,[96] or the 2017 plan.[97]

### *Low-Income Electric Group*

As shown in Figure 6-4, low-income electric conservation achievement rises slightly from 2014 to 2015 (as decoupling starts, but before decoupling has any effect on customer bills), jumps in 2016 (which has negligible bill effect from decoupling) and dips back to slightly below the 2014 pre-decoupling level in 2017 (the first full year subject to the decoupling adder each month). However, the reasons for these changes have to do with program realities rather than with decoupling.

Avista uses a system of pre-approved measures to facilitate low-income weatherization work by the implementation agencies. Avista also notes that "CAP agencies individually prioritize and treat their clients based upon a number of characteristics. Several of the characteristics used to prioritize clients are related to resource cost-effectiveness, but cost-effectiveness based specifically upon the TRC or UCT test is not an explicit priority for the CAP agency."[98] There were no major changes in electric low-income programs. Decoupling was not mentioned in analysis or presentation for 2014.

For 2015, the approach to implementation of low-income weatherization was continued from 2014, with the same budget commitment. Decoupling was not mentioned in the analysis or presentation of Annual Conservation Plans for 2014, 2015, 2016 or 2017. For 2017, Avista notes openness to working towards a waiver for low-income electric customers like the waiver in effect for low-income natural gas customers.[99]




*Figure 6-4. Conservation Achievement - Low-Income Electric*

[95] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2015 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 31, 2014, P. 10.
[96] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2016 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 26, 2015, Pp. 9-10.
[97] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Electric Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2015, Pp. 7-8.
[98] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, November 1, 2013, P. 19.
[99] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Electric Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, P. 10.

## *Nonresidential Electric Group*

As shown in Figure 6-5, Nonresidential electric conservation achievement rises slightly in 2015 (as decoupling starts, but before decoupling has any effect on customer bills), jumps in 2016 (which has negligible bill effect from decoupling) and then rises further in 2017 (the first full year subject to the decoupling adder each month). However, the reasons for these changes have to do with I-937 planning and program-level realities, rather than decoupling.[100]

Avista provides both prescriptive and site-specific programs (which may be proposed by the customer). Two improvements were:

- Revisions to the site-specific program implementation processes to improve clarity and promote the timely movement of projects through the pipeline.
- The establishment of two checklists (or "Top Sheets"), one prior to contracting and one prior to the payment of the incentive, in order to ensure consistent documentation and treatment of each project as it progresses through these processes towards completion.




*Figure 6-5. Nonresidential Electric Conservation Achievement (MWh)*

There were also three changes to Washington Schedule 90, affecting electric programs:

- Shift the maximum energy simple payback for incentive eligibility from eight years to thirteen years for lighting measures with independently verified lives of 40,000 hours or more (e.g. LED lighting).
- Increase the maximum incentive from 50% of customer incremental cost to 70% of customer incremental cost for (1) typical lighting measures (those with lives under 40,000 hours) with energy simple paybacks under three years and (2) all other measures with energy simple paybacks less than five years.
- Clarification regarding how incentive caps apply to prescriptive measure applications.

Otherwise, non-residential electric programs for 2014 continued as in the prior years and marketing continued to be based primarily on an account manager approach. There were no major changes in electric non-residential programs. Decoupling was not mentioned in analysis or presentation for 2014.

[100] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014-2017 Demand-Side Management Business Plans.

For 2015, the 2014 program was continued with some technical adjustments. Decoupling was not mentioned in the analysis or presentation for 2015,[101] 2016,[102] or 2017.[103]

### *Residential Natural Gas Group*

Leading up to the planning study and following direction from the Commission, Avista was continuing the Washington natural gas portfolio under a gross Utility Cost Test (UCT) metric rather than the previously applied net TRC. This was the first time that the Company employed the UCT test as the primary metric for optimizing portfolio performance.[104] This switch to the UCT has its source in the fall in the commodity cost of natural gas due to extensive fracking in the US[105]. Successful technological improvements in fracking have caused avoided cost to fall dramatically. This change has also meaningfully lowered the cost-effectiveness of much natural gas DSM,[106] with some carryover to electric DSM. Since residential natural gas programs were resumed using the UCT test, these programs were evolved to meet the UCT test and continued.

As shown in Figure 6-6, residential natural gas Conservation Achievement dropped from 2014 to 2015, then rose in 2016 and rose again in 2017 (the first year in which customers experienced the decoupling bill adder each month). However, the reasons for these changes have to do with program realities, rather than with decoupling. Decoupling was not mentioned in analysis or presentation for 2014. Residential natural gas programs continued from 2014 through 2015, 2016 and 2017,[107] again with no mention of decoupling in either analysis or presentation.




*Figure 6-6. Residential Natural Gas Conservation Achievement*

[101] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2015 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 31, 2014, Pp. 12-14.
[102] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2016 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, October 26, 2015, Pp. 11-12.
[103] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Electric Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, Pp. 7-8.
[104] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, November 1, 2013, P. 4.
[105] Estimate of the percentage of regional US natural gas that is fracked range from about 50% to 70%, depending on region. The cost reduction caused by fracking is estimated to be from about $180 to $430 per residential customer per year. This is the equivalent of a very substantial customer discount program and it applies to all customers, not only low-income households.
[106] It also translated into lower avoided cost for electricity from natural gas generation, but generally electric measures remained cost-effective.
[107] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Gas Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, Pp. 5-7.

## *Low-Income Natural Gas Group*

The low-income programs are special since though they are referenced to cost-effectiveness, it is understood that low-income customers are not able to receive weatherization services unless the cost is fully paid by the utility or other transfer such as federal and state funding and voluntary contributions. Low-income weatherization is substantially supplemented by state and federal funding. As with electric low-income weatherization, "CAP agencies individually prioritize and treat their clients based upon a number of characteristics. Several of the characteristics used to prioritize clients are related to resource cost-effectiveness, but cost-effectiveness based specifically upon the TRC or UCT test is not an explicit priority for the CAP agency."[108] Federal and state policy substantially guides low-income weatherization.

As shown in Figure 6-7, low-income Conservation Achievement dipped from 2014 to 2015, then increased dramatically in 2016 and dropped to below the pre-decoupling 2014 level in 2017. These changes were not driven by decoupling. Decoupling was not mentioned in analysis or presentation in 2014, 2015, 2016 or 2017 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analyses. In 2017, natural gas low-income programs operated using a waiver system for natural gas measures that permits full-funding of those measures.[109,110]




*Figure 6-7. Low-Income Natural Gas Conservation Achievement*

For low-income customers, "[t]he list of measures offered is derived from the Department of Commerce's Weatherization Manual. To guide the agency toward projects that are most beneficial for the Company's energy efficiency efforts, in most cases an "Approved" list of measures is provided that allows for full reimbursement of those that in most cases have a Total Resource Cost (TRC) of 1 or better. For efficiency measures with a TRC less than 1, a "Rebate"

[108] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, November 1, 2013, P. 19.
[109] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Electric Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, P. 10.
[110] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Gas Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, P. 8.

that is equal to the Company's avoided cost of energy is provided as the reimbursement to the Agency."[111]

### *Nonresidential Natural Gas Group*

Nonresidential natural gas Conservation Achievement (Figure 6-8) rises dramatically from 2014 to 2015 (as decoupling starts, but before decoupling has any effect on customer bills. Then achievement drops dramatically from 2015 to 2016 (which has negligible bill effect from decoupling). Achievement then from 2016 to 2017, reaching to a point just above the 2014 (pre-decoupling) level in 2017 (the first full year with the decoupling adder).




*Figure 6-8. Nonresidential Natural Gas Conservation Achievement*

Schedule 190 (natural gas efficiency, Washington only) was modified as follows:[112]

- Decrease the incentives of each of the incentive tiers by approximately 1/3rd due to the decrease in avoided costs.
- Eliminate the maximum energy simple payback of thirteen years for incentive eligibility.
- Clarification regarding how incentive caps apply to prescriptive measure applications.

The revisions to the Washington Schedule 190 tariff were part of a larger interim planning process designed to optimize the natural gas DSM portfolio for improved performance against a gross UCT cost-effectiveness metric. Decoupling was not mentioned in the analysis or presentation in 2014, 2015, 2016 or 2017.[113]

## Summary - Impact on Conservation Achievement

In this section of the evaluation, we have shown that decoupling was an important factor facilitating Conservation Achievement, but not a driver of Conservation Achievement. On the

[111] Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Gas Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, P. 8.
[112] Avista Utilities Washington/Idaho 2014 Demand-Side Management Business Plan, November 1, 2013, P. 23.
[113] Avista Washington 2014 Annual Conservation Report (ACR) & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, May 29, 2015; Avista Washington 2015 Annual Conservation Report & Cost Effectiveness Analysis, May 31, 2016; Avista Washington 2016 DSM Annual Conservation Report & Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, June 1, 2017; Avista Utilities Washington 2017 Gas Demand-Side Management Annual Conservation Plan, November 15, 2016, Pp. 8-9.

electric side the I-937 ten-year plan was the primary driver. On the natural gas side, Commission direction towards use of the gross UCT test was a primary driver (in maintaining or expanding programs that were not cost-effective using the net TRC test). On both the electric and natural gas sides, the size of the signal from decoupling was too small to be of meaningful impact on Conservation Achievement, and, in any case, the signal is neutral.

Considered subjectively, these decoupling signals were even smaller because so many other programmatic and policy efforts occurred at the same time. Also, the price signals were mixed as to sign (plus or minus). It comes down to the fact that decoupling is known to be a way to remove the "throughput" barrier to energy conservation, but not as a stimulus to energy conservation. The removal of a barrier does not in itself provide a "pull" towards energy efficiency. Based on this analysis, we conclude that there is no evidence that decoupling has any meaningful impact as a driver for energy Conservation Achievement. However, in the presence of a strong driver like I-937 or a strong driver like Commission direction to use the gross UCT test, it provides revenue stability and more timely revenue recovery and so is a part of a "package" in that it eliminates the "throughput" incentive. Decoupling comes in when a program is exceeding its planning target, sometimes by a large amount. Where a non-decoupled utility will turn away energy conservation customers, having reached its budget cap, Avista has demonstrated that a decoupled utility can keep on servicing to acquire all cost-effective energy conservation.[114] This is also the perspective of the Regulatory Assistance Project (Figure 6-9).[115]

> Decoupling eliminates a strong disincentive to invest in energy efficiency. By itself, however, decoupling does not provide the utility with a positive incentive to invest in energy efficiency or other customer-sited resources, but it does remove the utility's natural antagonism to such resources due to their adverse impact on short-run profits.

*Figure 6-9. Regulatory Assistance Project on Decoupling*

We should note as a qualification that our conclusions are based on analysis of fourteen months of application of the decoupling adjustments (Schedules 75 and 175) on customer bills, for the last two months of calendar 2016 and calendar year 2017. It is possible that long-run impacts might be different. There is also a lagged impact on decoupling revenue from conservation achievements that leads to higher decoupling revenue collected from the rate group achieving the savings. Essentially what current program participants in a rate group do not pay toward fixed costs through volumetric charges is collected from everyone else in the rate group through future decoupling revenues. Conservation savings cumulate until a rate case resets the test year

[114] Another benefit of decoupling is illustrated in comparison to the alternative of assigning all variable costs to variable charges and all fixed costs to fixed charges. This alternative would require a large, non-bypassable fixed fee each month and result in a low volumetric charge. This would create difficult economics for low and moderate-income customers and very efficient customers. It would raise strong barriers to the dollar value of conservation to customers when it comes to the "please pay" amount on customer bills. Again, however, this is an instance of decoupling removing barriers to energy conservation. It is not a case of decoupling acting as a driver to stimulate energy conservation.

[115] Regulatory Assistance Project, Revenue Regulation and Decoupling, A Guide to Theory and Application. Second Printing, November 2016 (https://www.raponline.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/rap-revenue-regulation-decoupling-guide-second-printing-2016-november.pdf).

incorporating recent program savings into the new base. This is true regardless of the prevailing decoupling rate at the time of conservation savings. Electric to natural gas conversions result, with a lag, in higher electric decoupling revenue to recover fixed electric system costs that conversion participants are no longer paying and lower natural gas decoupling revenue to refund the over collection of natural gas system fixed cost by the same conversion participants.

# Section 7. Analysis of Possible Adverse Impacts

Decoupling is a purposive reform designed "…to ensure that utilities have a reasonable opportunity to earn the same revenues that they would under conventional regulation, independent of changes in sales volume."[116] An optimal decoupling mechanism would achieve revenue neutrality while removing the inherent management and organizational drive to increase energy sales ("the throughput incentive").

Sometimes, purposive programs have unintended side effects. Here we focus on possible adverse impacts caused by or associated with decoupling (Figure 7-1).

**Task 7: Analysis of Possible Adverse Impacts**

Identification of any conclusive evidence to suggest that the Mechanisms adversely impacted customer service, distorted price signals for customers resulting in lower participation in conservation programs, or eroded Avista's incentive to control costs and improve efficiency and/or Washington required service quality measures.

*Figure 7-1. Identify Adverse Impacts*

## Are there Adverse Effects?

Both formal learning and lessons of experience teach us that any rationally designed and purposive program may develop unanticipated side effects.[117] No matter how skilled the development, or the degree of integrity and insight from which a program springs, or the ability of policy reform to achieve intended results in actual practice, any reform may have unanticipated and unintended consequences.[118] The high-level question in this section of the evaluation is to determine if there is any conclusive evidence to suggest that the Mechanisms adversely impacted Avista's customer service, created price signals that lowered participation in

[116] Lazar, Jim, "Examples of Good, Bad, and Ugly Decoupling Mechanisms", presentation to NARUC Symposium: Aligning Regulatory Incentives with Demand-Side Resources. San Francisco, California August 2, 2006 (https://pubs.naruc.org/pub.cfm?id=4AC7A83F-2354-D714-5130-4C68971713CB).

[117] Although the recognition of unintended/unanticipated consequences is currently attributed to Merton, Merton himself notes a deep historic chain of prior writers: "In some one of its numerous forms, the problem of the unanticipated consequences of purposive action has been treated by virtually every substantial contributor to the history of social thought." See: Merton, Robert K, "The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 1, No. 6 (December., 1936), pp. 894-904. Beyond this, by observation, intelligent animals experience unanticipated consequences, so it is quite likely that, being a phenomenon observed in animals, experiential recognition of unintended consequences is older than human history. This observation of the historically deep experience of unanticipated consequences fits with the Darwinian model for both biological and social evolution.

[118] Following Donald Campbell, the terms "program" and "reform" are used interchangeably: a new approach or program, such as decoupling – a policy reform effected in governance and institutional practice is both a program and a reform.

conservation programs, or eroded Avista's incentive to control costs and improve efficiency and/or Washington required service quality measures.[119]

Following the research questions for this evaluation, we focus on three sub-areas:

- Did decoupling impact Avista's service quality, on the Washington required service quality measures?
- Were there decoupling price signals that resulted in lower participation in conservation programs?
- Did decoupling erode Avista's incentive to control costs and improve efficiency?

## *Customer Service and Service Quality Indices (SQI)*

Avista implements the State of Washington required Service Quality Indices (SQI) and reliability measures.[120] The existence of this series of yearly reports permits examination of customer service metrics to see if service goals have been met since the beginning of decoupling in 2015 and/or since the first impact of decoupling on energy bills in November 2016.

First, we examine Avista Service Quality Indices following decoupling to see if service goals were met, keeping in mind that calendar 2017 is the only year fully within the "after decoupling" time window from a customer perspective. As shown in the tables for 2015, 2016 and 2017 service goals were achieved each year. *There were no negative effects on these SQI indicators.*

We may also note that there were no positive effects on the SQI indicators. For example, "Percent of customers satisfied with our Contact Center services, based on survey results" was about 96% for 2015, 93% for 2016 and 94% for 2016, so within a band of 3%. The complex nature of the formation of indicator values in terms of context (for example, weather) and human behavior suggests that as a methodological rule, key performance indicators (KPIs) not be over-interpreted. We expect yearly results on each KPI to dance around from year to year within a reasonably judgmentally assessed neutral bandwidth without the size or direction of differences conveying meaning. A sense for defining a "neutral band" is developed from practical experience.

Conceptually this "neutral band" is made up of movements in indicators that result from a very large mix of small influences from a large range of factors including both proximate and remote influences. In addition, many of the active factors are likely random. So, performance tables like Table 7-1 through Table 7-7 usually cannot be used to analyze these small differences (positive or negative).

Though not useful for assessing small differences, KPIs provide a powerful tool so that regulators can monitor a utility's performance. The primary use of the KPIs is to make achievement of regulatory goals explicit. This is shown, using check boxes in the final columns

[119] Sometimes side effects may be anticipated by some parties while the preponderance of parties involved in shaping, managing and implementing a program may not see a side effect, except retrospectively. In such a case we might say, retrospectively, that the effect was "hidden in plain sight".

[120] The Washington required Service Quality Indices are provided by Avista in response to H. Gil Peach & Associates LLC Data Request No. 52.

of Table 7-1 through Table 7-3. Where there has been a regulatory reform such as decoupling, a secondary use of KPIs is in review to determine if there has been a correlated systematic structure of change in KPI results (either a directionally consistent string of positive or negative results by year (regardless of size) or a directionally consistent string of large positive or negative results by year). While for decoupling the primary question concerns possible adverse effects, results might be positive as well as negative.

If either a directionally consistent string of small changes or a directionally consistent string of large changes is found, then the question shifts from correlation to possible causation. For example, in Washington it would not be unusual to find that severe weather events or severe weather patterns is the primary cause for change in KPI results. Also, we have sometimes found that when customer contact or services are outsourced, change can be due to performance of a particular service vendor or replacement by a different service vendor.

We find no directionally consistent string of either small or large changes in this analysis. There are no meaningful patterns evident in these tables of this section of the study (Section 7). Performance is high and consistently high. There are no meaningful negative or positive effects on any of the Section 7 KPIs.

*Table 7-1. 2015 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52*

| Customer Service Measures | Benchmark | 2015 Performance | Achieved |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of customers satisfied with our Contact Center services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 96.1% | ✓ |
| Percent of customers satisfied with field services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 96.8% | ✓ |
| Number of complaints to the WUTC per 1,000 customers, per year | Less than 0.40 | 0.17 | ✓ |
| Percent of calls answered live within 60 seconds by our Contact Center | At least 80% | 80.7%* | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to electric system emergencies, per year | No more than 80 minutes | 44 Minutes | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to natural gas system emergencies, per year | No more than 55 minutes | 51 Minutes | ✓ |

* Results for 2015 on percent of calls answered live within 60 seconds by the Avista Contact Center include all calls received for the year, including the nearly 56,000 calls answered during the November Wind Storm event from November 17 through November 27, 2015.

*Table 7-2. 2016 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52*

| Customer Service Measures | Benchmark | 2016 Performance | Achieved |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of customers satisfied with our Contact Center services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 92.7% | ✓ |
| Percent of customers satisfied with field services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 94.7% | ✓ |
| Number of complaints to the WUTC per 1,000 customers, per year | Less than 0.40 | 0.25 | ✓ |
| Percent of calls answered live within 60 seconds by our Contact Center | At least 80% | 81.7% | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to electric system emergencies, per year | No more than 80 minutes | 39.3 Minutes | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to natural gas system emergencies, per year | No more than 55 minutes | 48.4 Minutes | ✓ |

*Table 7-3. 2017 Indicators of Customer Service Quality – DR 52*

| Customer Service Measures | Benchmark | 2017 Performance | Achieved |
|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of customers satisfied with our Contact Center services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 93.6% | ✓ |
| Percent of customers satisfied with field services, based on survey results | At least 90% | 95.2% | ✓ |
| Number of complaints to the WUTC per 1,000 customers, per year | Less than 0.40 | 0.16 | ✓ |
| Percent of calls answered live within 60 seconds by our Contact Center | At least 80% | 81.5% | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to electric system emergencies, per year | No more than 80 minutes | 39.9 Minutes | ✓ |
| Average time from customer call to arrival of field technicians in response to natural gas system emergencies, per year | No more than 55 minutes | 50.29 Minutes | ✓ |

Next, as shown in Table 7-4, for customer service measures that were collected both before and after decoupling, there is no change in the perceived level of customer service by customers. Given the very small fluctuations in year-to-year, these results are stable from 2012 through 2017. There were no negative effects on these "before and after" SQI indicators.

*Table 7-4. Customer Service Indicators for Before and After Decoupling – DR 52*

| Customer Service Measure | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent Satisfied with Contact Center Services | 93.1% | 94.1% | 94.9% | 96.1% | 92.7% | 93.6% |
| Percent Satisfied with Field Services | 93.3% | 95.2% | 94.4% | 96.8% | 94.7% | 95.2% |
| Percent Calls Answered in 60 Seconds | 83.7% | 82.8% | 82.9% | 80.7% | 81.7% | 81.5% |
| Note: Percent Satisfied includes customers who were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their service. | | | | | | |
| Note: Results for 2015 on percent of calls answered live within 60 seconds by the Avista Contact Center include all calls received for the year, including the nearly 56,000 calls answered during the November Wind Storm event from November 17 through November 27, 2015. | | | | | | |

For electrical reliability (Table 7-5) two measures are reported. The System Average Interruption Frequency Index (SAIFI) and the System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI). SAIFI indicates the frequency of long-term (greater than five minutes) service interruptions. Reliability improves as SAIFI becomes smaller. The System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI) measures the duration of long-term (greater than five minutes) service interruptions. Reliability improves as SAIDI becomes smaller. As shown in Table 7-5, values of SAIFI and SAIDI change from year to year. The highest values for both occur in 2017, the first full post decoupling year. However, this fluctuation does not provide conclusive evidence of a meaningful change. One would need to see a pattern (beginning with the values of the 2017 indicators) that continues for more years before drawing a systematic conclusion (negative or positive).[121] For electric reliability, there is no conclusive evidence of an adverse effect.

[121] Also, one would need to see if there is an explanation for the fluctuation in sources other than decoupling, such as weather. Avista, in response to Data Request 080, fills out the contextual background needed to more fully understand fluctuation in SAIFI and SAIDI (emphasis in italic added): "As noted on pages 53-57 of Avista's Customer Service Quality and Electric System Reliability report for 2017, *approximately two-thirds of the utility's system performance each year is subject to random forces such as weather patterns and storms, or other random events such as an outage caused by a car striking a pole, which factors are generally beyond the control of the utility. Consequently, there is a natural variation in results (both up and down) from year to year, due largely to the interaction of these random factors. The "direction" of the annual results and the magnitude of the variation generally reflects the combination of the frequency and magnitude of weather-related events, the contribution of other randomly-occurring factors,* as well as the effect of standardized adjustments made to the yearly results based on "major event days" (please see footnote 47 on page 54 of the above-mentioned Service Quality and Reliability report for 2017). As an illustration of these principles in action, Avista's SAIFI score for 2016 was the lowest value recorded since our 2005 baseline year, while the 2017 result was the fifth highest recorded over the same period. Likewise, the annual score for SAIDI in 2016 was the third lowest measured since 2005, while the value for 2017 was the second highest measured over the same period of time. *Generally, the results for 2017 reflect the greater storm activity we experienced compared with 2016, combined with the relatively small downward adjustment in the numbers based on minimal major events in 2017.*" We accept this explanation for this evaluation.

*Table 7-5. Indicators of Electric Service Reliability – DR 52*

| Electric Service Reliability Measure | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SAIFI | System Average Interruption Frequency Index | 1.14 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 1.05 | 0.86 | 1.20 |
| SAIDI | System Average Interruption Duration Index | 138 | 138 | 139 | 163 | 133 | 183 |
| Note: The System Average Interruption Frequency Index or "SAIFI" is the average number of sustained interruptions (outages) per customer for the year. | | | | | | | |
| Note: The System Average Interruption Duration Index or "SAIDI" is the average duration of sustained interruptions (outages) per customer for the year (measured in minutes). | | | | | | | |

Beginning January 1, 2016, Avista introduced a new set of indicators, which can also be considered a very visible tool to motivate staff with the Customer Service Guarantee to Washington customers.[122] There are seven specific performance guarantees. Missing the goal for performance on a guarantee will result in a payment of fifty dollars ($50) as a credit on the customer bill.[123] As shown in Table 7-6 and Table 7-7, Avista's performance on these new indicators is very good, with an error rate of about five out of a thousand (0.0053) for 2016 and of about two out of a thousand (0.0023) in 2017.

Taken together, these service quality results show no adverse impacts of decoupling on service quality. There are only two measurement years for these results and the values are so small relative to the number of customers that weather and small influences and random factors are likely to predominate in generating results. Several years of measurement or the occurrence of large effects in results would be needed to demonstrate correlation and then call for a search for causation. With the data that exists, there is no indication of adverse effect of decoupling on customer service.

[122] See: Response to Data Request 081 and: https://www.myavista.com/about-us/contact-us/customer-service-guarantees.

[123] Subject to conditions. There is no payment if a customer cancels or misses an appointment or if the Company reschedules an appointment with at least 24-hours' notice; or, if there is a major weather event that impacts a large number of customers or lasts for a longer period of time, such as a major snow, ice, or wind storm; or, if there is an action or default by someone other an Avista employee or outside of Avista's control; or, if construction is required before service can be energized, evidence that all required government inspections have been satisfied has not been received by Avista, required payments to Avista have not been received, or service has been disconnected for non-payment or there has been theft/diversion of electric service; or, when power is interrupted for less than five minutes, power is interrupted because of work on a meter, or the safety of the public or of Avista employees or the imminent failure of Avista equipment was a factor causing the interruption in service.

*Table 7-6. 2016 Customer Service Guarantee - DR 52*

| Customer Service Guarantee | Successful | Missed | $ Paid |
|---|---|---|---|
| Keeping Our Electric and Natural Gas Service Appointments scheduled with our customers | 1,477 | 10 | $500 |
| Restore service within 24 hours of a customer reporting an outage (excluding major storm events) | 26,344 | 1 | $50 |
| Turn on power within a business day of receiving the request | 3,380 | 3 | $150 |
| Provide a cost estimate for new electric or natural gas service within 10 business days of receiving the request | 5,024 | 0 | $0 |
| Investigate and respond to a billing inquiry within 10 business days if unable to answer a question on first contact | 1,760 | 0 | $0 |
| Investigate a reported meter problem or conduct a meter test and report the results within 20 business days | 309 | 2 | $100 |
| Notify customers at least 24 hours in advance of a planned power outage lasting longer than 5 minutes | 30,336 | 349 | $17,450 |
| **Totals** | **68,630** | **365** | **$18,250** |

*Table 7-7. 2017 Customer Service Guarantee - DR 52*

| Customer Service Guarantee | Successful | Missed | $ Paid |
|---|---|---|---|
| Keeping Our Electric and Natural Gas Service Appointments scheduled with our customers | 1,584 | 11 | $550 |
| Restore service within 24 hours of a customer reporting an outage (excluding major storm events) | 30,669 | 23 | $1,150 |
| Turn on power within a business day of receiving the request | 9,557 | 0 | $0 |
| Provide a cost estimate for new electric or natural gas service within 10 business days of receiving the request | 3,929 | 0 | $0 |
| Investigate and respond to a billing inquiry within 10 business days if unable to answer a question on first contact | 1,623 | 0 | $0 |
| Investigate a reported meter problem or conduct a meter test and report the results within 20 business days | 1,082 | 1 | $50 |
| Notify customers at least 24 hours in advance of a planned power outage lasting longer than 5 minutes | 17,079 | 115 | $5,750 |
| **Totals** | **65,523** | **150** | **$7,500** |

## Price Signals and Conservation Participation

Decoupling does not change the overall amount of fixed cost to be recovered. It changes the timing of recovery and reduces volatility by recovering fixed cost not already recovered from volumetric charges. These amounts are recovered in small yearly increments.[124] Determination of the revenue requirement associated with fixed cost is a step in the process of developing a cost of service analysis. Cost of service analysis is a separate form of analysis that occurs independent of the form of recovery. The decoupling mechanism recovers fixed cost outside of volumetric rates annually and balances any under-recovery or over-recovery annually. In the absence of decoupling, the utility would either over or under recover its fixed costs.

With or without decoupling, once established as a revenue requirement, the established fixed cost is allocated to customer groups. Projected recovery involves construction of planning targets (projections based on experience). In decoupling, fixed costs are recovered in the volumetric charge (if energy usage matches planned energy usage); or if there is under-recovery, are set to be recovered through an adjustment in volumetric rates in the following rate year, subject to certain control tools, including the three-percent (3%) cap. Similarly, any over-recovery is refunded through a reduction in volumetric rates in the following rate year. The decoupling allocation of fixed costs for a customer group is based on the group's actual energy use in relation to the group's projected energy use.

Historically (and contrary to what might be expected from the term "fixed" cost), many fixed costs are recovered in volumetric revenue (cost per unit of energy). In Avista's decoupling, two separate time windows are used: a *measurement time window*, during which the data for decoupling adjustment for the next implementation time window is collected; and a *rate year*, an *implementation time window* in which the resulting rate adjustment is applied. In Avista's decoupling, the measurement time windows are calendar years. When, during a measurement window calendar year, a group decreases energy usage so that the average usage for the group is below the planning projection for that group for that year, the decoupling adjustment automatically makes up the lost revenue in the next rate year 12-month implementation window by requiring an increase in the group's volumetric cost per unit (cost per kWh or cost per therm). Conversely, if in a measurement time window calendar-year the average usage for a group exceeds the planning projection, the mechanism will require a reduction in unit cost for the next 12-month implementation time window (rate year).

***Given the decoupling price signals observed, did decoupling price signals influence energy conservation effort?***

**Calendar 2015:** The answer is "no" for 2015. While the first measurement window was calendar 2015, no decoupling amounts were billed to customers during 2015.

[124] The more frequent yearly rate effect with decoupling should sum to the (theoretical) less frequent aggregated rate recovery impact (without decoupling) over a set of rate cases.

**Calendar 2016:** The answer is "no" for 2016 because the signal was too small to influence changes in energy conservation. Any changes in energy conservation effort in 2016 would be due to other factors.

In fact, the rate impact of decoupling for the electric decoupled groups was negligible in 2016 (Table 7-8). The first 12-month implementation time window (rate year) ran from November 2016 through October 2017. As shown in the table, no decoupling amounts were billed from January through October 2016 so there could have been no influence for most of the year. Price signals were present only in November and December.

Since energy bills are sent using billing cycles (allocated throughout the days of a month) the price signal phased in across the month of November. The first price signal fully experienced by decoupled customers occurred in December 2016.

Further, response to a very small price signal usually occurs with a lag. If a response were beginning to be developed, it would not be detectable until 2017. Also, except for special cases, from experience December is not a likely month for focus on energy conservation projects.[125] Private life, vacation time, the holidays and the weather tend to envelop people in December. Institutional efforts tend to slow down, to return to vigor in January.

*Table 7-8. Electric Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2016*

| Group | Jan-Oct | Nov | Dec | Total (2016) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| E1: Residential | 0% | 1.1% | 2.8% | 0.4% |
| E2A: General Services | 0% | 0.4% | -1.2% | -0.1% |
| E2B: Large General Services | 0% | -0.6% | -1.5% | -0.2% |
| E2C: Pumping | 0% | -0.4% | -1.3% | -0.1% |

*Table 7-9. Natural Gas Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2016*

| Group | Jan-Oct | Nov | Dec | Total (2016) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| G1: Residential | 0% | 1.2% | 3.3% | 0.6% |
| G2A: General Services | 0% | 1.3% | 3.0% | 0.5% |
| G2B: Large General Services | 0% | 1.4% | 7.3% | -14.7% |

Similarly, the rate impact of decoupling for the natural gas decoupled groups was also negligible in 2016 (Table 7-9). As with decoupled electric service, natural gas service provided no decoupling price signals until November 2016. As with decoupled electric service, the signal for decoupled natural gas service was phased in over the days of November due to billing cycles. As shown in the table, price signals for G1: Residential and for G2A General Services are negligible, so any changes in conservation effort in 2016 would be due to factors other than the price signal from decoupling. For G2B: Large General Services, there is an anomaly in the data due to a base problem that occurred in December (and continued through January 2017), so data from Table 7-9 cannot be used.

[125] An exception is auto plants which typically take advantage of holiday expectations to shut down for a week in December to implement physical changes in the plant.

**Calendar 2017:** The answer is also "no" for calendar 2017. Calendar 2017 is the first full year of customer experience with the decoupling price signals. But, for both electric and natural gas, the size of both monthly and yearly signals is small (Table 7-10 and Table 7-11). Likely, these changes would not be noticed. If small changes were to be noticed (positive or negative), drawing of conclusions or taking actions that might affect conservation would likely occur with a lag. If were to be an effect, it would not be expected in the first quarter of 2017; and likely not until the fourth quarter of 2017 or after.

As a customer strategy, it remains true that participation in conservation programs can substantially lower energy bills. Almost always, this will much more than offset a number of small rate increases over a number of years. A small rate increase or decrease does not have a signal strength to outbalance the cost advantage of using fewer units of energy. And, of course, the price signal from fixed cost will occur anyway, with or without decoupling. Only the timing would be different.

For 2016, the 3% cap came into play for the E1: Residential electric group, so there was a limit on the decoupling adder for 2016 and a deferral carryover to 2017. However, there was no deferral carryover from the 2017 rate year to the 2018 rate year. For natural gas, the 3% cap came into play for the G1: Residential electric group in 2016, creating a deferral carried over into 2017. For this group, there was also a cap for 2017 and a deferral carryover into 2018. However, the carryover into 2018 was small. Sustained or snowballing deferral can have an impact on GAAP accounting, which requires that revenues must be recovered within two years.[126] Avista refers to decoupling deferrals that go unreported in revenue due to GAAP accounting rules as contra-decoupling deferrals. Contra-decoupling deferrals were recorded for natural gas in both 2015 and 2016. What happens next depends on the weather. Through 2017, decoupling is operating as expected (as planned) and is not presenting price signals that would adversely affect conservation.

In summary, analysis of price signals and conservation shows no adverse effect from Avista's decoupling on energy conservation.

[126] In the Response to Data Request 064, Avista indicates ways in which the mechanism could be improved: "GAAP reporting rules do not allow for recognition of revenues from a mechanism like decoupling in excess of the amount expected to be recovered within 24 months of the end of the deferral period." One solution would be moving to a July 1 effective date for implementation of rate changes. Another would be "to make the mechanism more symmetrical so that in rebate years some benefit could be withheld to offset future surcharges. Please see the Company's response to Decoupling_DR_058 regarding the higher likelihood of surcharges than rebates due to continued energy efficiency implementation." We support the proposal for a July 1 effective date and exploration of seeking more symmetry.

*Table 7-10. Electric Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2017*

| Group | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total (2017) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E1: Residential | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 3.5% | 4.6% | 3.0% |
| E2A: General Services | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.1% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.2% | -1.1% | -0.6% | 0.3% | -1.0% |
| E2B: Large General Services | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.6% | -1.6% | -1.5% | -0.7% | 0.4% | -1.3% |
| E2C: Pumping | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.5% | -1.6% | -1.7% | -1.8% | -1.8% | -1.8% | -1.7% | -1.0% | 0.2% | -1.7% |

*Table 7-11. Natural Gas Decoupling Signal as Percentage of Average Bill for Calendar 2017*

| Group | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total (2017) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G1: Residential | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 2.5% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.8% | 4.5% | 6.5% | 3.7% |
| G2A: General Services | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 3.1% | 3.0% | 2.9% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.8% | 3.0% | 4.4% | 6.1% | 3.6% |
| G2B: Large General Services | 3.7% | 3.4% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.2% | 4.5% | 7.6% | 3.7% |

## *Cost Control and Operational Efficiency*

We find no indication of any adverse effect of decoupling on the utility's incentive to control costs. Avista's perspective is that "[t]he adoption of decoupling has not resulted in a change of efforts by the Company to operate efficiently, rather the Company has, prior to decoupling, and with decoupling, strived to be as efficient as possible while at the same time providing safe and reliable service for our customers."[127] Further, the Company points out that "[t]he decoupling mechanisms provide recovery of fixed costs, on a revenue per customer basis, that were approved by the Commission in a prior general rate case for recovery. To the extent those fixed costs increase, or escalate, over time, the mechanisms do not provide for recovery of the change in costs above the approved level already embedded in the allowed revenue per customer. The Company continues to bear the risk of changes in costs between general rate cases, and therefore must (and has) manage the business in a prudent manner."[128]

By removing the focus on sales, decoupling may permit utility executive management to focus more effectively on other goals. Because cost recovery proceeds in a decoupled utility following a target revenue requirement that has already been projected in a commission proceeding, costs have been anticipated. A focus on cost control can function within this *already established revenue requirement* to improve earnings. This does not mean that current cost-control projects derive directly from decoupling. Avista has continually developed cost-control projects prior to decoupling. However, with decoupling, Avista cannot increase profits by increasing sales but can *only positively improve profits by improving cost control and operational efficiency*. The nature of this relationship under decoupling has been described by the Regulatory Assistance Project (Figure 7-2).

> Decoupling does not guarantee utilities a level of earnings, only an assurance of a level of revenue. If the utility reduces costs, it increases earnings, just as it would under traditional regulation. Also, because the utility cannot increase profits by increasing sales, improved operational efficiency is the only means by which it can boost profits.
>
> Source: The Regulatory Assistance Project, Revenue Regulation & Decoupling: A Guide to Theory and Application. Montpelier, Vermont: Regulatory Assistance Project, June 2011, P. 45.

*Figure 7-2. Increasing Earnings in a Decoupled Utility (RAP)*

[127] Response to DR 063.
[128] Response to DR 063.

The Company has provided examples of ways that it is lowering operational expenses to benefit customers:[129]

**Careful evaluation of each component of overall compensation.**

We note that utilities typically re-evaluate each element of overall compensation yearly or every few years. This cost-control tool is likely the same focus that would be implemented with or without decoupling. Whether or not deriving specifically or in part from decoupling in the current context, this is an approach to reducing operational expenses.

**A current hiring restriction which requires approval of the hiring manager, as well as the President of Avista, the CFO, the CEO and the Sr. VP for Human Resources for all replacement or new hire positions.**

This step is not a standard cost-control tool and may or may not be related to the influence of decoupling. It is unusual for a utility to implement this level of review for all replacement or new hire positions, although utilities may find it prudent to implement controls from time to time or (alternatively) to open up for new hiring in certain areas or for certain scarce special skills from time to time. Whether or not deriving specifically or in part from decoupling in the current context, this is an approach to lower operational expenses.

However, from an independent outside perspective, a potential problem we notice is that staffing cuts might be a little too deep. We see senior people with great command, knowledge and years of experience in their assigned areas; we see some staff assigned to understudy senior staff to provide for a system of succession and backup.[130] We do not see the new hires in general training or expected staffing depth for intermediate analysts or assistant analysts that would be typical staffing for a utility in the past. This helps in short term cost control, but we would like to see more staffing depth to insure hard won experience and tacit knowledge is not lost should one or two senior staff decide to retire.[131] We have a sense that staffing is a bit thin compared with other utility clients with whom we recently have been engaged for projects. What works as a short-run cost savings may not work as well long-term and may have long-term unintended consequences.

---

[129] Response to DR 063.

[130] In the response to DR 055, Avista notes that DSM staffing has been essentially stable from 2012 through 2017, though organization has been rationalized: "The number of energy efficiency staff has remained relatively stable over the years, but the structure has changed over time. Some years the staff levels have increased or decreased, including part timers, to meet the needs of programs and support staff. Starting in 2010 the structure included program managers, engineers, and account executives (for commercial customers) that reported to a Director along with a small group of EM&V and analytics staff that reported to a different Director. In June 2014 there was a reorganization and the program managers, engineers, and EM&V/analytics staff all started reporting to the same new Director. The account executives, of which only a portion of their time is for energy efficiency for commercial customers, continue to report to a different Director who oversees a range of customer services. From time to time the program managers have shifted programs around to better meet the needs of the programs and the inclusion of new programs as well in response to the discontinuation of some programs." Our concern is limited to Rate & Regulatory staffing and DSM staffing – we did not look at other areas of the Company.

[131] In some ways, utilities are like university research labs – it may take one to five years of application to sufficiently learn a functional area.

**Effective January 1, 2014, Avista no longer contributes toward medical insurance premiums for the retiree medical plan.**

**Beginning January 1, 2020, a new calculation method will shift more expenses to retirees.**

**To reduce the number of medical office visits, the Company is providing web and phone based 24/7 telemedicine and there is an on-site clinic.**

**Beginning in 2017, the Company has offered a High Deductible Health Plan along with the current self-insured plan.**

Medical costs are an area that requires constant vigilance for cost-control. Medical cost-control steps (no longer contributing to premiums for the retiree medical plan, shifting more expenses to retirees, introducing a telemedicine option and offering a High Deductible Health Plan option) are all ways to reduce Company medical costs.

Since escalation of medical costs has been a very visible and long-term social problem in the United States, it is likely that the medical area would have been similarly addressed with or without decoupling. Whether or not deriving specifically or in part from decoupling, these steps lower operational expenses.

**Effective January 1, 2014 the defined benefit pension plan was closed to all non-union employees hired or re-hired after January 1, 2014. This transfers risk to employees. The Company also now offers a lump sum payout to non-union employees, further reducing risk to the Company.**

Utilities typically subscribe to high quality market surveys that provide industry benchmarks for employee salaries and benefits and then adjust salaries and benefits where possible to approximate these national benchmarks. This is one of the reasons why utility pay and benefit packages are generally better than those offered in most sectors of the national economy or in local communities.

We note the general trend across business sectors towards the replacement of defined benefit pensions by 401K plans. Although comparatively slow to develop in the utility industry, this is now also a utility industry trend, and so would be indicated by a relevant market study. However, benchmarking and market matching, while a very useful indicator approach may not be a fully adequate criterion in this area: additional criteria might be relevant and provide an alternative perspective. In the short-run, most employees will be in the defined benefit retirement system so there should be no short-run downside. In the intermediate and long-term, transferring retirement risk for employee families from the Company to the individual employees may have unintended effects.

From the end of WWII through the early 1970s, the United States experienced relatively high economic stability and shared economic growth. Since then, from a working person's perspective, not so much. This is in part because productivity gains have not transferred to workers while costs have increased so that the economy is much more fragile than surface appearance would suggest.

Since most of our analysis is based on looking backwards in time to evaluate how things have worked up to the present, we need to also make the jump to facing forward. If we envision the general economic situation in the United States as it belatedly and finally tries to come to grip with climate change and finds the situation so far advanced that adaptation has become extremely difficult, we get a very different picture than if we look back to the era that ended in about 1972. There is no guarantee of economic stability and there appears to be an increasing risk of political instability, so economics might be working within a different and reduced context. We have the sense that it is not unlikely that there will be growing percentages of customers in need of assistance, and that utilities may be needed as anchors for good jobs if there is a general economic recession ahead.

Other possible concerns are the thin profit margin for producers of fracked natural gas and the steep decline curve for fractured gas vs. conventional gas wells[132]; as well as the push towards exporting natural gas which would likely raise prices in the United States as a firm export market is established. However, we understand that Company projections of both price and supply indicate reliable supply at reasonable prices into the future.

One of the characteristics that makes utilities strong and able as organizations has been career commitment, which likely changes when defined benefit pensions end. Individual employees, like other nano-investors are largely at the mercy of the market. Non-professional, non-insider investors are typically hurt during cyclical market downturns and in the unusual or extreme events that exceed the "design basis" for normal projected market returns (extreme events like 9/11 or the so called "Great Recession" from which wages have not recovered). Climate change affects global availability of food, changes living conditions on most of the planet, increasingly acidifies the oceans and causes great migrations and problems of immigration.

In these changes, small investors, such as employees, likely do better in the long-run with an institutional guarantee between them and the downside effects of markets which, over a lifetime, tend to show patterns of stable growth punctuated by severe market events. In addition, with market fluctuations due to climate change and shortages, markets are not likely to be reliable for

[132] Fracked natural gas currently makes up roughly 70% of natural gas in the US and producers are having trouble making a profit due to both over-investment based on speculative financing and the sharp depletion curve for fracked natural gas compared with conventional natural gas. Fracked natural gas is a low-cost solution, but is economically fragile even without taking in to account local physical environmental damage to air quality, water supplies and land, as well as health effects and global climate deterioration due to fugitive methane release associated with fracking. We note in this connection that the current administration is facilitating methane release to the atmosphere and so is accelerating climate problems. On the positive side, the discovery of rock fracturing technology and the rapid expansion and further development of fracturing technology has become equivalent to a very large subsidy that benefits low-income and all other natural gas customers. However, as has been typical of the natural gas supply curve in the past, eventually the supply curve will turn down. At the same time, climate is warming will create a declining need for heating. For this critique, please see McLean, Bethany, "The Next Financial Crisis Lurks Underground," *New York Times*, September 1, 2018 (https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/01/opinion/the-next-financial-crisis-lurks-underground.html). Also see: McLean, Bethany, *Saudi America: The Truth about Fracking and how It's Changing the World*. New York, New York: Columbia Global Reports, 2018.

the average investor. During this time, it might be valuable for utilities to restore defined benefit pensions to enable them to be an anchor in their communities and regions.

**The Company is introducing more automation for IS/IT and is working towards providing longer contracts to venders in return for discounts.**

From experience, the Information Services/Information Technologies areas have long been somewhat independent of utility organizational cultures. Utilities are very reliant on data and computer systems, yet these systems tend to be operated somewhat by their own internal logics which can sometimes present unexpected yet necessary new costs. Working towards discounts from venders in these areas is a useful approach to cost-control. Whether or not deriving specifically or in part from decoupling, this step lowers operational expenses.

We also make the following observations:

- In our interactions with management and staff, we found no indications of any lack of attention to cost control and operational efficiency. We believe that the company maintains a careful and prudent approach to controlling costs and we found no indication of any form of dysfunction or fractionalization within the organization.
- We found dedication to high performance, individual and group achievement of strong technical proficiency and a sense of personal and business commitment to public service.
- We found no indication of any cynicism, apathy or disaffection during the formal workday or in informal discussions with management and staff. Staff holds each other, corporately, to high standards.
- As noted previously, in the discussion of service quality, the service quality indicators (SQI) are good, which is an indirect indication of operational efficiency.

One additional aspect of operational efficiency is the relation of rate of return compared with utility cost of capital. This is not specifically a decoupling question, but it arises in decoupling. The concern is that if rate of return is consistently higher than utility cost of capital there could be an advantage in "gold plating" activities subject to the rate of return. As shown in Table 7-12 this relationship does not hold for Avista and so, no adverse effect of this type exists in Avista's decoupling.[133]

[133] DR 066 Attachment A. The Averch–Johnson effect is the academic name for what, in industry jargon, is usually referred to as "gold plating" or "high-grading". This is a theoretical "moral hazard" of regulated companies to engage in excessive amounts of capital accumulation in order to expand the volume of their profits. If companies' profits to capital ratio is regulated at a certain percentage then, depending on the gap there may be a strong incentive for companies to over-invest in order to increase profits overall. Investment is then optimized not for operational efficiency, but for administratively supported profit maximization. We do not see this happening with Avista decoupling. See: Averch, Harvey; Johnson, Leland L. (1962). "Behavior of the Firm Under Regulatory Constraint". *American Economic Review*. 52 (5): 1052–1069.

*Table 7-12. Rate of Return vs. Cost of Capital – DR 066, Revised, Attachment A*

| ---------- Washington Electric ---------- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Normalized Rate of Return | 7.16% | 7.57% | 7.92% | 7.33% | 7.33% | 7.34% |
| Authorized Rate of Return | 7.91% | 7.64% | 7.64% | 7.32% | 7.29% | 7.29% |
| Normalized Return on Equity | 8.70% | 9.90% | 10.60% | 9.40% | 9.40% | 9.40% |
| Authorized Return on Equity | 10.20% | 9.80% | 9.80% | blackbox | 9.50% | 9.50% |
| ---------- Washington Natural Gas ---------- | | | | | | |
| | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Normalized Rate of Return | 5.44% | 6.23% | 5.79% | 6.14% | 7.96% | 7.84% |
| Authorized Rate of Return | 7.91% | 7.64% | 7.64% | 7.32% | 7.29% | 7.29% |
| Normalized Return on Equity | 5.20% | 7.20% | 6.40% | 7.00% | 10.70% | 10.40% |
| Authorized Return on Equity | 10.20% | 9.80% | 9.80% | blackbox | 9.50% | 9.50% |

Notes: The Authorized Rate of Return for 2015 has been corrected as per discussion in the presentation/review meeting. The number in the original table was 7.64; the corrected entry is 7.32. The term "blackbox" means the information is not available because it is sealed by a settlement agreement.

We see no current adverse impact on cost control and operational efficiency.

## Summary – Task 7 (Adverse Impacts)

We find no conclusive evidence of current adverse impact of decoupling on cost control, operational efficiency, price signals or service quality. We have expressed two concerns for the intermediate to long-term for two cost-control approaches: making hiring reviews more extensive and so possibly creating some short-staffing problems over time; and moving away from defined benefit pensions. We address these two concerns in the Recommendations section.

*This page left intentionally blank*

# Section 8. Low-Income Appendix

The Avista Decoupling Evaluation RFP No. R-41321 provided two related Attachments to the Scope of Work: Attachment G - An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State[134] and Attachment H - The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014.[135] Attachment G provides an estimate of how many Avista customers are below the Federal Poverty Level in counties served by Avista. Attachment H estimates the level of income required by households to achieve self-sufficiency without public assistance. We reviewed these two documents and correlated findings with the low-income energy assistance information that we reviewed for Task 3. This Appendix summarizes findings.

## Attachment G - Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty

This study provides estimates of the number of Avista low-income customers in the State of Washington. The estimates are based primarily on Census Tract data, particularly the American Community Survey which provides counts of household at different poverty levels for each census track. Within each tract, the study provides an estimated count of households with income at or below five multiples of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL): 50%, 125%, 150%, 185% and 200%.

Table 8-1 combines information from Attachment G with information provided in DR's related to Task 3 and compares the number of Avista low-income customers served by one or more energy assistance programs to the number of households estimated to be at or below 150% of the FPL.[136]

The sources and descriptions of data for each of the columns in Table 8-1 are presented below.[137]

- Columns (1,2) *An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State*. These are Census 5-year rolling estimates for the period 2009-2013.
- Column (3) *An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State,* is based on an estimate of the number of households at or below 150% of the FPL as reported in Attachment G.
- Column (4) DR 47 A, is the average number of bill assistance grants from all funding sources provided to Avista customers annually during the period 2012-2017.[138]
- Column (5) DR 49 A, is the average number of Avista Weatherization rebates annually during the period 2012-2017.

[134] *An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State,* Brian Kennedy, MS and D. Patrick Jones, Ph.D., Institute for Public Policy and Economic Analysis, May 2015.
[135] *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014*, Diana M. Pearce, PhD, Center for Women's Welfare and the School of Social Work at the University of Washington, Revised August 2015.
[136] One hundred and fifty percent (150%) of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) is the national LIHEAP eligibility standard used in most states to determine eligibility for energy assistance.
[137] Responses to DR's: 047 Attach. A, 036 Attach. A
[138] The data from Attachment G covered the period 2009-2013. Based on the data available in evaluation DRs for columns (4) and (5) we used the average number of customers served over the 2012-2017 period. While the data does not match chronologically, using averages helps to eliminate yearly variations.

- Column (6) = [Column (4) + Column (5)]/Column (3), an estimate of the percentage of LIHEAP Eligible Households served by energy assistance and Avista Weatherization.[139]

*Table 8-1. 150% of Poverty or Less - Receiving Bill Assistance or Avista Weatherization*

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| County | Estimated Households | Avista Residential Customers | Estimated Households Eligible for LIHEAP | Avista Customers Receiving Bill Assistance | Avista Customers Receiving Weatherization Assistance | % of LIHEAP Eligible Customers Receiving Energy Assistance |
| Adams | 5,747 | 4,540 | 1,692 | 399 | 8 | 24% |
| Asotin | 9,052 | 9,294 | 2,264 | 848 | 32 | 39% |
| Ferry | 1,669 | 1,630 | 667 | 189 | 1 | 28% |
| Franklin | 2,683 | 167 | 61 | - | | 0% |
| Grant | 1,163 | 10 | 3 | - | | 0% |
| Klamath | NA | NA | NA | 1 | | NA |
| Klickitat | 3,656 | 763 | 263 | 21 | 1 | 9% |
| Lincoln | 4,463 | 3,462 | 866 | 252 | 3 | 29% |
| Shoshone | NA | NA | NA | 1 | | NA |
| Skamania | 764 | 320 | 82 | 6 | 1 | 8% |
| Spokane | 186,259 | 169,287 | 43,613 | 13,044 | 182 | 30% |
| Stevens | 17,569 | 19,972 | 6,113 | 1,754 | 17 | 29% |
| Whitman | 16,630 | 17,437 | 7,322 | 1,040 | 15 | 14% |
| **Total** | **249,657** | **226,882** | **62,946** | **17,553** | **260** | **28%** |

This analysis finds that on average approximately 28% of the estimated LIHEAP eligible households (150% of Poverty or less) receive some type of energy assistance from one or more of the following programs: LIRAP, LIHEAP, Project Share, MISC or Avista Low-income Weatherization. The percentage of estimated LIHEAP eligible customers receiving assistance in each county ranged from 8% to 38%.

## Attachment H - The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State 2014

This report[140] presents and analyzes the Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State in 2014. This measure describes how much income families of various sizes and composition need to make ends meet without public or private assistance in each county of Washington State. The Self-Sufficiency Standard is a measure of income adequacy based on the costs of basic needs for working families: housing, child care, food, health care, transportation, and miscellaneous items, as well as the cost of taxes and the impact of tax credits. The Standard is intended to provide a more detailed, up-to-date, accurate, and comprehensive measure of economic well-being than the Federal Poverty Level.

[139] It should be noted that Avista customers receive weatherization assistance from other programs such as the US Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, which were not documented in this evaluation, since these services are not tracked by Avista. See Avista Response to Data Request No. 029(1).
[140] Pearce, Diana M., op cit.

We reviewed Attachment H and extracted the Self-Sufficiency Standard for the same 11 counties analyzed for Attachment G above. Table 8-2 provides a summary of the percentage of the FPL that a family would need to earn to achieve Self-Sufficiency in each of the 11 counties. This percentage varies from a low of 171% to a high of 235% of FPL to achieve Self-Sufficiency, depending on location and household composition.

*Table 8-2. Self-Sufficiency Standard Expressed as a Percentage of Poverty*

| County | One Adult One Preschooler | | One Adult One Preschooler One School-Age | | Two Adults One Preschooler One School-Age | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Self-Sufficiency Standard | | | | | |
| | Annual | Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) | Annual | Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) | Annual | Percentage of Federal Poverty Level (FPL) |
| Adams | $30,449 | 194% | $37,601 | 190% | $45,295 | 190% |
| Asotin | $29,993 | 191% | $34,815 | 176% | $42,549 | 178% |
| Ferry | $30,919 | 197% | $43,738 | 221% | $50,680 | 212% |
| Franklin | $35,210 | 224% | $46,078 | 233% | $52,936 | 222% |
| Grant | $32,229 | 205% | $38,810 | 196% | $46,653 | 196% |
| Klickitat | $31,915 | 203% | $44,088 | 223% | $50,998 | 214% |
| Lincoln | $28,991 | 184% | $33,805 | 171% | $41,563 | 174% |
| Skamania | $33,187 | 211% | $40,340 | 204% | $47,776 | 200% |
| Spokane | $36,023 | 229% | $46,453 | 235% | $53,136 | 223% |
| Stevens | $34,009 | 216% | $44,912 | 227% | $51,805 | 217% |
| Whitman | $38,420 | 244% | $48,209 | 244% | $55,552 | 233% |

The variation of Washington's Self-Sufficiency Standard by county for each of three family types is illustrated in Figure 8-1. While there is meaningful variation across both family types and counties, results cluster somewhat above 200% of FPL. We can, conservatively, use 200% of the FPL to estimate need. In a more rigorous approach, we would need to take both family type and county directly into account, but since 200% is above the 150% of FPL or lower percentages used for some Avista low-income programs we can reasonably use 200% for practical purposes. Attachment G provides an estimate of the number of Avista customers at or below 200% of poverty as illustrated in Table 8-3.










*Figure 8-1. Variation of Self-Sufficiency Standard across Washington Counties*

In Attachment G, using calculations based on the American Community Survey, Kennedy and Jones estimate that, on average, thirty-seven and one-half percent (37.5%), of Avista Customers are at or below 200% of FPL (Table 8-3).[141]

During the period 2012-2017, bill assistance or Avista Weatherization services were provided to 17,813 customers per year.[142] Based on the Self-Sufficiency Standard model this service record comprises about twenty-one percent (21%) of the 85,159 Avista customers whose incomes are at or below the Self-Sufficiency Standard, when approximated at 200% of the FPL.

*Table 8-3. Results at 200% Poverty based on American Community Survey*

| County | American Community Survey Estimated Households | Total Avista Customers (Households) | Estimated Avista Customers: 200% FPL | Estimated Share of Avista Customers: 200% FPL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | 5,747 | 4,540 | 2,310 | 50.90% |
| Asotin | 9,052 | 9,294 | 3,488 | 37.50% |
| Ferry | 1,669 | 1,630 | 813 | 49.90% |
| Franklin | 2,683 | 167 | 85 | 51.10% |
| Grant | 1,163 | 10 | 5 | 49.80% |
| Klickitat | 3,656 | 763 | 376 | 49.20% |
| Lincoln | 4,463 | 3,462 | 1,242 | 35.90% |
| Skamania | 764 | 320 | 100 | 31.30% |
| Spokane | 186,259 | 169,287 | 59,532 | 35.20% |
| Stevens | 17,569 | 19,972 | 8,412 | 42.10% |
| Whitman | 16,630 | 17,437 | 8,796 | 50.40% |
| Total | 249,657 | 226,882 | 85,159 | 37.50% |

## Making Sense of Federal Poverty Level vs. Income Insufficiency

Pearce compares several "benchmarks of income", including the Self-Sufficiency Wage, Welfare (TANF, SNAP & WIC), the Federal Poverty Level, the full-time minimum wage for Washington and the Department of Housing and Urban Development Income Limits for three levels of low-income (the top level is the highest income eligible for federal housing assistance: 80% of area median income; in addition, there is a Low-income Limit and a Very Low-income Limit). Each of these is a separate indicator that a household is in a situation of income difficulty.[143]

Of these benchmarks, the most used in the United States is a multiple of the federal poverty level (FPL), yet this is also one of the most challenged indicators. The fact that almost no agency uses the FPL, but, instead, agencies use a multiple of the FPL for program eligibility suggests that problems with the FPL are universally recognized. The FPL was created using 1950s data in the early 1960s. It assumes a stereotypical 1950s family with a single wage earner and a full-time unwaged person at home to do the work of raising children, housework, and meal preparation. In the 1950s, one wage earner could typically support a family, unlike today when it usually takes two fulltime workers to earn slightly more than one worker earned in the 1950s, accounting

[141] *An Estimate of the Number of Households in Poverty Served by Avista Utilities in Washington State,* Brian Kennedy, MS and D. Patrick Jones, Ph.D., Institute for Public Policy and Economic Analysis, May 2015, page 7.
[142] This is the sum of totals for columns 4 and 5 in Table 8-1.
[143] Pearce, Diana M, op cit., Pp. 28-29.

for inflation.[144] In low-income families, typically older children also do part-time work to bring in money for the household and (for some) volunteer for the armed services when they become of age in order to be able to send money back to their parents and keep their family viable. Also, as pointed out by Pearce, the official FPL was based on a single indicator (the cost of the lowest level of food that could sustain a family), which was then multiplied by the number three. Each year, this highly flawed indicator[145] is adjusted for inflation using one of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) consumer price indexes (CPIs). This type of adjustment is itself flawed because the BLS CPI seriously underestimates inflation over a period of years. The outcome is a severely underestimated benchmark sequentially adjusted each year by a flawed multiplier, so it is often argued that the FPL is severely flawed. Indeed, the Census Bureau itself states, "the official poverty measure should be interpreted as a statistical yardstick rather than as a complete description of what people and families need to live."[146]

In contrast, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development benchmark of 80% of area median income automatically adjusts each year as incomes change,[147] though it is sensitive only to the median of the income distribution and not sensitive to the increasingly severe income inequality that we experience.

The most well-grounded method is the Self-Sufficiency Standard benchmark used by Pearce and developed jointly by Wider Opportunities for Women and the Ford Foundation. This method is the current version of the household budget approach in use by social workers for the past one-hundred years. It is updated every few years by changes to the costs of items required by households for a lower-moderate level of living and is based on family size and the ages of persons in the household. Table 8-4 illustrates the specific items that comprise the Washington Self-Sufficiency Standard for Spokane County in 2014.[148] Pearce has calculated a specific Self-Sufficiency Standard for each county in Washington State. These studies are repeated approximately every three years.

If we were to use the Poverty Guidelines (only) for Spokane County in 2001, one-hundred and fifty percent (150%) of poverty for a single adult is $12,885. In 2017, it is $18,090. This is an increase of about 140% between 2001 and 2017 (Table 8-5). If we were to use the Self-Sufficiency Standard (only), for Spokane County in 2001, the standard for a single adult is $14,910. For 2017, it is $18,972. This is an increase of about 127%, yet there is another factor

[144] Though disposable income is less for today's two-income families than it was for counterpart single-income families in the 1950s.
[145] Highly flawed since based on a single indicator and because the diet selected is no longer available and since the food items required several hours of work to make the food edible. It was a good effort for the time; there was no official poverty indicator before this.
[146] Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, "Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the U.S.: 2012," U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P60-245, Washington, D.C. (U.S. Government Printing Office), http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p60-245.pdf (accessed June 24, 2014).
[147] Due to a long-term shortage of public housing, although the upper eligibility limit is 80% of area median income, most apartments that become available are assigned to households with lower incomes.
[148] Pearce, Diana M, op cit., P. 103.

to take in to account: the amounts for both 2001 and 2017 are higher for the Self-Sufficiency Standard than for the Poverty Guidelines.

While there is not much difference for a single adult, the real strength of the Self-Sufficiency Standard is shown in the remaining columns of these tables. The Self-Sufficiency Standard takes in to account, not only family size, but also ages of household members and it is based on actual cost of essential items for a specific year. The size of the gap between these two methods is about ten percent (10%) for the single adult in 2017, fifty-six percent (56%) for a household with one adult and one preschooler, and about fifty-two percent (52%) for a household with two adults, one preschooler and one school-age child. As has been noted by Pearce, the relative failure of CPI measured inflation is demonstrated in the method's inability to capture the actual differences measured in the Self Sufficiency Standard approach.[149]

The Washington Self Sufficiency Standard is based on the family budget method and is updated every three years to capture data on changes to the costs of items required by households, characterized by family structure and the age of household members. The Standard is based on achieving a lower-moderate level of living and is calculated at the county level. In contrast, federal poverty guidelines, though based on the number of members of a household, are not based on family structure and not age adjusted or based on county-level costs. The CPI tends to lack adequate information while the Self Sufficiency Standard does not.

*Table 8-4. Monthly Costs included in the Self-Sufficiency Standard - Spokane 2014*

| MONTHLY COSTS | Adult | Adult + Preschooler | Adult + Infant Preschooler | Adult + Preschooler School-age | Adult + School-age Teenager | 2 Adults + Infant | 2 Adults + Preschooler School-age | 2 Adults + Infant Preschooler School-age |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Housing | $571 | $773 | $773 | $773 | $773 | $773 | $773 | $1,105 |
| Child Care | $0 | $692 | $1,492 | $1,224 | $532 | $800 | $1,224 | $2,024 |
| Food | $245 | $371 | $487 | $560 | $647 | $593 | $768 | $850 |
| Transportation | $257 | $266 | $266 | $266 | $266 | $507 | $507 | $507 |
| Health Care | $113 | $392 | $405 | $410 | $439 | $451 | $467 | $479 |
| Miscellaneous | $119 | $249 | $342 | $323 | $266 | $312 | $374 | $497 |
| Taxes | $189 | $435 | $654 | $591 | $365 | $513 | $615 | $935 |
| Earned Income Tax Credit (-) | $0 | ($33) | $0 | $0 | ($157) | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Child Care Tax Credit (-) | $0 | ($60) | ($100) | ($100) | ($63) | ($50) | ($100) | ($100) |
| Child Tax Credit (-) | $0 | ($83) | ($167) | ($167) | ($167) | ($83) | ($167) | ($250) |
| **SELF-SUFFICIENCY WAGE** | | | | | | | | |
| HOURLY | $8.49 | $17.06 | $23.59 | $22.05 | $16.49 | $10.84 per adult | $12.67 per adult | $17.18 per adult |
| MONTHLY | $1,494 | $3,002 | $4,152 | $3,881 | $2,903 | $3,816 | $4,461 | $6,047 |
| ANNUAL | $17,923 | $36,023 | $49,825 | $46,573 | $34,830 | $45,796 | $53,532 | $72,564 |
| **EMERGENCY SAVINGS** (Monthly Contribution) | $36 | $81 | $109 | $105 | $95 | $50 | $61 | $79 |

[149] Pearce, Diana M., Attachment H – *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington State, 2014*, op cit., P. 27

*Table 8-5. 150% Poverty Guidelines (2001 vs. 2017)*

| Independent of County (2001 vs. 2017) 150% Poverty Guidelines (Only) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **Single Adult** | **One Adult with One Preschooler** | **Two Adults with One Preschooler and One School-Age Child** |
| 2001 | $12,885 | $17,415 | $26,475 |
| 2017 | $18,090 | $24,360 | $36,900 |
| Percent Change | 140% | 140% | 139% |

*Table 8-6. Self-Sufficiency Standard Spokane County (2001 vs. 2017)*

| Spokane County (2001 vs. 2017) Self-Sufficiency Standard (Only) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **Single Adult** | **One Adult with Preschooler** | **Two Adults with One Preschooler and One School-Age Child** |
| 2001 | $14,930 | $25,094 | $39,428 |
| 2017 | $18,972 | $38,103 | $56,010 |
| Percent Change | 127% | 152% | 142% |

*Table 8-7. 150% of FPL vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard, Spokane County, 2001*

| Spokane County (2001) 150% Poverty Guidelines vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Calculation Method** | **Single Adult** | **One Adult with Preschooler** | **Two Adults with One Preschooler and One School-Age Child** |
| 150% FPL | $12,885 | $17,415 | $26,475 |
| Self-Sufficiency Standard | $14,930 | $25,094 | $39,428 |
| Percent Difference | 116% | 144% | 149% |

*Table 8-8. 150% of FPL vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard, Spokane County, 2017*

| Spokane County (2017) 150% Poverty Guidelines vs. Self-Sufficiency Standard | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Calculation Method** | **Single Adult** | **One Adult with Preschooler** | **Two Adults with One Preschooler and One School-Age Child** |
| 150% FPL | $18,090 | $24,360 | $36,900 |
| Self-Sufficiency Standard | $18,972 | $38,103 | $56,010 |
| Percent Difference | 105% | 156% | 152% |

A useful analysis of what happened to the CPI is provided by ShadowStats (Figure 8-2). In this figure, the top line (blue) is the ShadowStats CPI and the bottom line (red) is the BLS CPI. Note that the two measures are nearly identical until about 1983 at which point they begin to diverge. The two curves continue with very similar shapes, except for the growing spread of vertical distance between comparable points on each curve. The ShadowStats CPI continues the original method of the BLS CPI (and the method for a price index as described in older economic textbooks). Changes in the original BLS CPI method were introduced gradually under both Republican and Democrat administrations. These changes have academic explanations yet tend to move the indexed inflation down, having the effect of making things look better than they

are.[150] They function to lower social security increases, wage increases indexed to the BLS CPI and other government program expenditures tied to the CPI. The latest BLS innovation is movement towards a "chained CPI" which used geometric rather than arithmetic means. This will also make the CPI register weaker inflation than that known to the population through lived experience.




*Figure 8-2. Historical Divergence of BLS CPI (Courtesy of ShadowStats.com)*

## Level of Rigor

These differences in methods have several implications in the estimation of the number of low-income customers. Table 8-1 suggests that about twenty-eight percent (28%) of Avista's residential service population is low-income, based on the one-hundred and fifty percent (150%) of poverty level criterion, as in most states. Table 8-3 shows that if a two-hundred percent (200%) of poverty criterion is chosen, the result is about thirty-seven percent (37.5%) of residential customers. The Self Sufficiency Standard approach tends to center on two-hundred percent (200%) though it varies with family type and by county. In Table 8-2, values range from 174% to 233% depending on county and family type.

The result in the number (and percentage) of low-income households in Avista's service territory depends on the method of analysis selected. Selection of method depends on a choice of level of rigor. Most utilities simply go with a percentage like one-hundred and fifty percent (150%) of poverty because it is simple. It is administratively convenient since the appropriate poverty

[150] (http://www.shadowstats.com/alternate_data/inflation-charts) ShadowStats charts must be published without modification in any way and must contain, under the chart, "Courtesy of ShadowStats.com" See also: Boring, Perrianne, "If You Want to Know the Real Rate of Inflation, Don't Bother with the CPI", Forbes, February 3, 2014 (https://www.forbes.com/sites/perianneboring/2014/02/03/if-you-want-to-know-the-real-rate-of-inflation-dont-bother-with-the-cpi/#47059396200b). For an opposing perspective, see Greenlees, John S. and Robert B. McClelland, "Addressing Misconceptions about the Consumer Price Index." *Monthly Labor Review*, August 2008, Pp. 3-19 (https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2008/08/art1full.pdf).

numbers and program guidelines are published each year in the Federal Register and a multiple of Poverty can be easily implemented.

A middle level of rigor would look more closely at the variations from a textbook approach in calculating the BLS CPI and choose, instead, the ShadowStats CPI (which is proprietary but easy to access by crossing a paywall). Or, by melding the BLS CPI and the ShadowStats CPI using a simple ratio following a study of both methods. This approach would offer the same administrative convenience as a low rigor approach but would be more accurate.

A high level of rigor would use neither the official definition of Poverty based on the original flawed analysis and flawed updates produced by the government using the BLS CPI (as modified away from original BLS practice and textbook method many times). A high level of rigor would begin with the existing work on the Self Sufficiency Standard, calculated and updated for Washington approximately every three years by the Center for Women's Health at the University of Washington School of Social Work. This is the most truthful and realistic method. However, it would require calculation by county and it would be tailored to family structure by ages of household members and not only to family size. Strictly, it would have to be administratively applied at a county level, and provision of different levels of eligibility by county could be an administrative concern. The problem is not just optics, but, for example, households located near county borders or other possible needs for exceptions. However, if this high-rigor method were used for analysis, an administrative simplification could be employed for program administration.

The implication of this analysis is that more households need help than are indicated by the Poverty Guidelines as adjusted by the BLS CPI. We recommend using the using the Self Sufficiency Standard. However, we are aware that rigor in analysis might need to be accompanied by simplification to meet the needs of program administration.

At the same time, in evolving the structure and scope of payment assistance and weatherization assistance, the cost to customers providing the assistance must be considered and balanced. Customers just above the cutoff for eligibility are in essentially the same financial bind as customers eligible for assistance, so attention could be focused on "feathering out" assistance at the top of the eligibility range, or to exempting from tariffs that support assistance to low-income customers those customers who are in income groups just above the eligibility range.

## Understanding Low-Income within the Overall Allocation of Income

If we consider the allocation of income for Washington, the income donut shown in Figure 8-3 provides an image that is easy to remember. This is the income donut for 1990, computed from census data.[151] For comparison, the income donut for 2000 was computed[152] and is shown in Figure 8-4.

If we compare the two donuts, we see that income for the upper twenty percent (20%) of households by income moved up by eight percent (8%) from 1990 to 2000. The bottom twenty percent of households dropped from five percent (5%) to four percent (4%). The lower middle dropped one percent (1%), the middle five percent (5%) and the upper middle dropped two percent (2%).




*Figure 8-3. Income Donut for Washington State (Census 1990)*

From the end of WWII through the early 1970s, the United States increasingly took on many characteristics of an economic democracy as income shares increased throughout most of society and shares to upper income groups dropped; for example, the upper one percent (1%) lost income share during this era. From about 1970 or 1972, the process reversed, and income flow has concentrated more and more toward the very top of the distribution of income to households. Within the upper five percent (5%) this flow to the top repeats very strongly; within the upper 1% the pattern again repeats but more intensely.

The two income donuts shown only indicate a little of this change. However, income inequality is increasing dramatically. As suggested by the two figures presented, income share is taken from the bottom through the upper middle and transferred into the top quintile. However, within

[151] Source: Columns 1 and 2 from Table P080, Household Income in 1989, Census 1990 Summary Tape File 3 - Sample Data.
[152] Source: Columns 1 and 2 from Table P52, Household Income in 1999, Census 2000 Summary File 3 - Sample Data.

the top quintile the same pattern of extraction and allocation occurs with income moving from the lower parts of the top quintile to the upper one percent (1%).




*Figure 8-4. Income Donut for Washington State (Census 2000)*

This pattern of income allocation creates a dilemma for providing support for low-income households, since income share is being taken from those households that would normally have been able to support some form of low-income assistance in the past. This is a dilemma for funding low-income weatherization and payment assistance and should be taken in to account in informing development of a low-income rate. Balance is very important.

# Section 9. Weather Appendix

Everyone knows the weather is changing. The NW Climate Hub[153] has issued a drought forecast (Figure 9-1) as of July 31, 2018, beginning in August 2018. The forecast includes a map of potential wildland fire areas (Figure 9-2). While these projections become a quickly dated and one-time forecast, they report on an underlying change in the weather. The projections are consistent with rapid (in geologic time) climate warming. Nearly every year now, there is more warm weather, including warm evenings. The trees from California up through British Columbia (and over to Colorado and Utah) are stressed and thousands are dying. The "new normal" is a warming trend with statistical fluctuation. The "new normal" also is a process (flow) variable – it is not static, but moving. It is getting warmer and warmer and there is no apparent end to the warming on a typical human scale of time.

**A combination of high temperatures, low humidity, and dry to record-dry conditions has increased fire danger.**

- Wildfires continue to threaten lives, property, crops, rangeland, and forests.
- Drier-than-normal conditions are expected to continue across most of the region, which will perpetuate fire danger. CURRENT CONDITIONS
- OR and WA have been experiencing dry weather. Combined with high temperatures, this led to the designation of moderate drought in the Olympic Peninsula, abnormal dryness in parts of eastern WA, and the introduction of severe drought across the Cascades and into the Willamette Valley last week. Southern ID and the panhandle are abnormally dry with some areas of moderate drought.
- According to the Northwest River Forecast Center, monthly precipitation through July 30, 2018, is below 50% of normal. Over the last 90 days, precipitation totals for parts of western OR and WA were the lowest they've been in at least 40 years.

*Figure 9-1. Drought Conditions*

[153] https://www.drought.gov/drought/sites/drought.gov.drought/files/StatusUpdate_PNW_July31Final.pdf.




*Figure 9-2. Wildland Fire Potential Outlook*

Within this context of changing weather, the first thing to note in the two figures below (Figure 9-3 and Figure 9-4) is the increasing prevalence of warm years with fewer heating degree days and more cooling degree days. The orange bars denote years that are warmer than normal. Although there is statistical variation, the orange bars are mostly stronger than the blue bars and are increasingly frequent. Occasional years with more heating degree days occur, but years with more heating degree days are becoming scarcer. The bars each represent the difference in heating or cooling degree days to a base of 65° Fahrenheit, calculated using a rolling thirty-year average (normal) weather.[154]




*Figure 9-3. Pattern of Heating Degree Days (Spokane)*

[154] Beginning in 1947 values are from the Spokane airport (GEG) weather station. Values in Figure 9-3 and Figure 9-4 run from 1976 through 2017 (a range of 42 calendar years).

## Sequences of Warm and Cold Years

Looking at Figure 9-3 or Figure 9-4, the frequency of cold years is decreasing, but also warm years tend to run in series and their values are becoming stronger, while cool years run in short blocks of one or two years and their strength is becoming weaker (as indicated by the length of the bars).

For decoupling designs, this pattern is important. In the abstract, we might think of a deferral mechanism as easily balancing over two years if the pattern of years is alternately warm and cold. But since warm years are occurring in runs and the runs are appearing longer for warm years (as well as warm years becoming stronger), this factor should be considered in decoupling design in relation to defeating any "snowballing" effect, especially for natural gas rate groups. If the pattern holds, we can expect declining need for heating in Winter. Avista's decoupling design is special in that it allows for ratchetting decoupling rates to amortize higher levels of deferral balances (it works on *incremental* changes); a good design feature. A practical implication of this ratchetting will be decoupling rates that may look high as a percent of total revenue (exceed the three percent (3%) cap, since the mechanism works incrementally each year), until the rates reset following a normal or colder than normal year or in the next rate case.[155]




*Figure 9-4. Pattern of Cooling Degree Days (Spokane)*

[155] In this paragraph, we use "normal" in the "old normal" sense of a 30-year moving average rather than in the sense of the recent flow of the "new normal" which might be based on fifteen years or most recent seven years, for example. The "old normal" is a flow variable, as is the "new normal". From a mathematical perspective, the rate of flow increases substantially in a smaller set of most recent years. The mathematics reflects physical change.

## Zero Heating Degree Days

Using data from the Spokane airport weather station (GEG), we can project the approximate year when there will be zero heating degree days (HDD). The practical implication of an indicator that tends towards zero HDD is that the need to turn on heat for buildings tends towards zero. In a simple regression of HDD on year, beginning in 1947 (when Spokane's weather station was moved to the airport), it is easy to see that HDD is declining over time (Figure 9-5). Using the parameter estimates from Table 9-1, we get a constant of 20,890 and a slope of -7.120. Using the standard equation of:

$$y = mx + b,$$

Or, in this application:

$$HDD = (-7.120)(YEAR) + 20{,}890$$
$$0 = (-7.129)YEAR + 20{,}890$$
$$(7.129)(YEAR = 20{,}890$$
$$YEAR = (20{,}890)/(7{,}129)$$
$$YEAR = 2934$$

Solving for the case in which HDD = 0, we get the year 2934

$$2934 - 2018 = 916$$

Or, about 916 years from now.

*Table 9-1. Model Summary and Parameter Estimates*

**Model Summary and Parameter Estimates**

Dependent Variable: HDD65

| | Model Summary | | | | | Parameter Estimates | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Equation | R Square | F | df1 | df2 | Sig. | Constant | b1 |
| Linear | .101 | 7.750 | 1 | 69 | .007 | 20890.153 | -7.120 |

The independent variable is Year.

This is a very *conservative* estimate, since we use airport data rather than a carefully developed climate model. Also, since the strength of the climate warming has shown itself only since about the year 2000, data from 1947 (the year our data series begins) is likely not relevant. In fact, even the "old normal" method would employ 30 years of data, rather than 71 years.




*Figure 9-5. Regression of HDD on Year*

If we reduce the years in the analysis to the 18 most current and re-run the analysis using the airport data beginning in 2000, the year in which HDD is zero is 2175 (or 157 years from now). If we re-run using only the 8 most recent years beginning in 2010, the year in which HDD is zero is 2104 (86 years from now). Figure 9-6 and Figure 9-7 show these relationships for different numbers of analysis years, reaching back from the most current data which is for calendar 2017.




*Figure 9-6. Year in which HDD = Zero is Reached, Using different Numbers of Analysis Years*




*Figure 9-7. Years from 2018 until Zero HDD, using different Numbers of Analysis Years*

We need to note that these are only the results of standard regression analysis and not science. Climate scientists tend to be very careful and conservative and do not like to project for more than about 100 years since the error bands around their results increase with time and there may be points of inflection and dialectical oppositions that are not yet well understood.[156] However, we are in a constantly moving new normal and these estimates are an attempt developing useful indicators rather than science.[157] The range of 916 to 86 years is a large range (note that we have not provided error bands). Yet a very big thing is happening, irreversible on a typical human scale. And, the reason for looking at most recent years is connected to physical phenomena with an increasing flow rates. So, how one interprets these numbers and these calculations depends on one's sense of physics.

While science must be quite conservative almost all of the time, persons with business sense and those with responsibility for public administration must be more practical so as to be aware in advance of things "hidden in plain sight." We suggest these calculations be considered as indicators, each with a different number of data points (calendar years of weather information from past years). Each of the indicators can be calculated each year so as to form a data series

[156] An example of dialectical tension is that physical constants such as the estimate of 100 years for carbon (as a generic for greenhouse gas) to reach a sink (or 20 years for fugitive methane) are unlikely to hold as sinks become overloaded. Vegetation as a source of carbon sequestering is expected to reverse at some point and become a carbon source (for example, from forest fires as trees and grass are increasingly stressed). Another tension is the expectation that primary ocean currents may change. Another is that air rivers have changed and are continuing to change, altering the behavior of hurricanes and rain storms. Another is the loss of snow cover which shifts wide areas from reflection to absorption. Dialectical analysis is required to take these kinds of factors into account.

[157] Why doesn't science give us more certain answers to our weather questions? Because it is young and underdeveloped. If we date modern science somewhat conservatively from the date of founding of the Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge in 1660, that is only 358 years ago, essentially a blink of the eye. To help with understanding time, the Long Now foundation advocates thinking in 10,000-year blocks and would write the founding year as 01660, while this report is submitted in 02018. If one thinks in a 10,000-year block, then science in 02018 is essentially new and primitive. However, a system of moving indicators may be relevant for organizational decision making.

constructed as a moving average in the same way that the traditional 30-year "normal" is calculated.

It is not good enough to revert to the 30-year normal. Clearly, the curves in Figure 9-6 and Figure 9-7 show fluctuation and this should be considered; but they also show an increasing tendency to bring the zero HDD year rapidly closer in time. For practical decisions, the decision-maker might maintain and review each indicator and act on those that appear most relevant to the purpose at hand. This analysis suggests that the 30-year normal is no longer a useful indicator. It is not a good indicator of the moving new normal.

We suggest, for now, running 30 years, 20 years, 15 years and 10 years and developing the curves for these indicators and then carrying the indicators into the future. We suggest that the 20-year indicator is the right one to rely on right now, that the 30-year indicator is not a good fit right now due to systematic changes in the weather (climate warming), and the 15-year and 10-year indicator will be more sensitive but also less stable than the 20-year indicator. The 30-year and the 20-year indicators will, of course, get better over time assuming the climate turn is the "new normal" and more and more warm years replace the cooler years at the beginning of each moving average. Figure 9-8 shows that the 20-year, 15-year, and 10-year averages are quicker to register the decline in HDD than the 30-year measure, though as the downward trend in HDD continues, the curves are converging.[158]




*Figure 9-8. Thirty Year Average vs. Other Averages for HDD*

An implication for Demand-Side Management is that the effect of going to a 20-year moving average will be to create stronger cost-effectiveness results for cooling measures and somewhat weaker cost-effectiveness results for heating measures.

[158] See also: Drury, Matt and Mallorie Gattie-Garza, "Climate Change and its Effect on Weather Data". Pp, 9-1 to 9-11 in *Proceedings of the 2016 American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings.* Washington, DC: ACEEE, 2016. Drury and Gattie-Garza suggest applying simple regression analysis to project HDD and CDD over the life of a DSM project rather than use backward looking weather normalization averages. Projections based on regression models may be more useful than weather normalization by means of backwards-looking moving averages.

This page left intentionally blank

## Section 10. Recommendations

(1) The decoupling mechanisms have worked as expected to stabilize revenue without impacting utility operations and energy efficiency programs. We also found no evidence of adverse impacts to any customer groups. We recommend the electric and natural gas mechanisms be continued and certain modifications be considered.

(2) If practical for Avista, move the decoupling tariff effective date up from November 1st to July 1st to substantially increase the likelihood that reported revenue will be collected within two years, as required by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(3) Avista might consider adjusting the low-income "carve out" each year for inflation to keep its value more stable between rate cases.

(4) We have a sense that staffing is a bit thin compared with other utility clients with whom we recently have been engaged for projects. What works as a short-run cost savings may not work as well long-term. We recommend consideration of some additional hiring of some additional staff in Rates and in DSM (not short-term supplementary or temporary arrangements).

(5) We notice that as a cost savings measure, Avista has moved from a defined benefit pension system to a system that puts employees at individual risk in developing funding for retirement. We agree this will represent cost-savings in the short term. Although such change is currently viewed as normal in the industry, reflecting the market in this case may not be useful long-term. Thinking of the five most recent "crashes" including the recent "Great Recession", Avista might want to consider a plan that would enable some form of pension that places institutional strength between employees as individual "nano-investors" and market forces.

(6) Continue to work towards a possible low-income rate. Households in need of income to meet the expectations of American households prior to the income allocation reversal that began in the early 1970s, are likely about one-half of residential households (or at least 37.5%, as shown in the low-income appendix). A low-income rate would provide an additional tool to maintain service for all customers.

(7) In the low-income area, consider either moving to a higher level of rigor in evaluation and program administration by using the Self-Sufficiency standard; or use the 200% of the Federal Poverty Level as the program guideline for need for program payment assistance and weatherization services.

(8) Consider a redefinition of normal weather that moves away from the 30-year moving average to a 20-year moving average, and also maintain a moving average indicator for 15 years and 10 years to see how that behaves empirically, since "normal" has become a flow variable and it is rapidly getting warmer as a secular trend.

# Avista Decoupling Evaluation

H. Gil Peach & Associates, LLC

16232 NW Oakhills Drive

Beaverton, Oregon 97006

(503) 645-0716

hgp@adapt.global

www.peachandassociates.net

Exhibit No. 1
Case Nos. AVU-E-19-0_ and AVU-G-19-0_
P. Ehrbar, Avista
Page 224 of 224