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) CASE NO. AVU-E-12-08 OF AVISTA CORPORATION FOR THE) CASE NO. AVU-G-12-07 AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES) AND CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC AND) NATURAL GAS SERVICE TO ELECTRIC) DIRECT TESTIMONY AND NATURAL GAS CUSTOMERS IN THE OF) STATE OF IDAHO TARA L. KNOX) FOR AVISTA CORPORATION (ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS)

1	I. INTRODUCTION
2	Q. Please state your name, business address and
3	present position with Avista Corporation.
4	A. My name is Tara L. Knox and my business address
5	is 1411 East Mission Avenue, Spokane, Washington. I am
6	employed as a Senior Regulatory Analyst in the State and
7	Federal Regulation Department.
8	Q. Would you briefly describe your duties?
9	A. Yes. I am responsible for preparing the
10	regulatory cost of service models for the Company, as well
11	as providing support for the preparation of results of
12	operations reports.
13	Q. What is your educational background and
13 14	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience?
13 14 15	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University
13 14 15 16	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in
13 14 15 16 17	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an
13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at Avista since 1991, I have attended several ratemaking
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at Avista since 1991, I have attended several ratemaking classes, including the EEI Electric Rates Advanced Course
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at Avista since 1991, I have attended several ratemaking classes, including the EEI Electric Rates Advanced Course that specializes in cost allocation and cost of service
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at Avista since 1991, I have attended several ratemaking classes, including the EEI Electric Rates Advanced Course that specializes in cost allocation and cost of service issues. I have also been a member of the Cost of Service
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	Q. What is your educational background and professional experience? A. I am a graduate of Washington State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in General Humanities in 1982, and a Master of Accounting degree in 1990. As an employee in the State and Federal Regulation Department at Avista since 1991, I have attended several ratemaking classes, including the EEI Electric Rates Advanced Course that specializes in cost allocation and cost of service issues. I have also been a member of the Cost of Service Working Group and the Northwest Pricing and Regulatory

Knox, Di 1 Avista Corporation professionals from regional utilities and utilities
 throughout the United States and Canada concerned with cost
 of service issues.

4 Q. What is the scope of your testimony in this 5 proceeding?

6 Α. testimony and exhibits will cover My the 7 Company's electric and natural gas cost of service studies performed for this proceeding. 8 Additionally, I am 9 sponsoring the electric and natural gas revenue 10 normalization adjustments to the test year results of 11 operations and the proposed Load Change Adjustment Rate 12 (LCAR) to be used in the Power Cost Adjustment (PCA). A 13 table of contents for my testimony is as follows:

14

Table of Contents

Page

15	I.	Introduction	1
16	II.	Revenue Normalization	3
17		Electric	3
18		Natural Gas	7
19	III.	Proposed Load Change Adjustment Rate	11
20	IV.	Electric Cost of Service	13
21		Illustration 1 Base Case Results	21
22	V.	Natural Gas Cost of Service	22
23		Illustration 2 Base Case Results	26

24

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in this case?

A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit 12 composed of six schedules as follows. Schedule 1, the proposed Load Change Adjustment Rate calculation; Schedule 2, the electric cost of service study process description; Schedule 3, the

> Knox, Di 2 Avista Corporation

1 electric cost of service study summary results; Schedule 4, 2 the cost of service workshop presentation; Schedule 5, the 3 natural gas cost of service study process description; and Schedule 6, the natural gas cost of service study summary 4 5 results.

- 6 Were these exhibits prepared by you or under your Q. 7 direction?
- 8 Yes, they were. Α.
- 9

II. REVENUE NORMALIZATION

10 Electric Revenue Normalization

11 Would you please describe the electric revenue Ο. 12 adjustment included in Company witness Ms. Andrews pro 13 forma results of operations?

14 Yes, I will. The electric revenue normalization Α. 15 adjustment represents the difference between the Company's 16 actual recorded retail revenues during the twelve months 17 ended June 2012 test period, and retail revenues on a 18 normalized (pro forma) basis. The total revenue 19 normalization adjustment increases Idaho net operating 20 income by \$1,724,000, as shown in adjustment column 2.09 on 21 page 7 of Ms. Andrews Exhibit No. 10, Schedule 1. The 22 revenue normalization adjustment consists of three primary 23 components: 1) re-pricing customer usage (adjusted for any 24 known and measurable changes) at base tariff rates 25 presently in effect, 2) adjusting customer loads and 26 revenue to a 12-month calendar basis (unbilled revenue Knox, Di 3 Avista Corporation

1 adjustment), and 3) weather normalizing customer usage and $revenue^1$. 2

3 Since these three elements are combined into a 0. single adjustment, would you please identify the impact 4 5 (before taxes and revenue related expenses) of each 6 component?

7 The re-pricing of billed usage comprises Α. Yes. 8 the majority of the change in test year revenue. The 9 combined impact of the rate increase effective October 1, 2011², and the elimination of revenue and amortization 10 11 expense from adder schedules (Schedule 59 Residential 12 Exchange, Schedule 91 Public Purpose Tariff Rider, Schedule 13 95 Optional Renewable Power, and Schedule 99 DSIT refund)³, 14 is an increase in net revenue of \$2,097,000. Re-pricing of 15 unbilled calendar usage and elimination of unbilled adder 16 schedule revenue and expense results in a net revenue 17 increase of $\$90,000^4$. Finally, the weather normalization 18 adjustment increases revenue by \$530,000. The combined 19 impact of these elements is an increase of \$2,717,000 20 which, after revenue-related expenses and income tax,

¹Documentation related to this adjustment is detailed in the Knox workpapers accompanying this case. ² IPUC Case No. AVU-E-11-01.

³ Municipal Franchise Fee and Power Cost Adjustment revenues are eliminated in separate adjustments.

⁴ The unbilled adjustment consists of removing June 2011 usage billed in July 2011 from the 12 Months Ended June 2012 test year, adding June 2012 usage billed in July 2012 to the 12 Months Ended June 2012 test year, and re-pricing the net adjustment to usage at October 1, 2011 base rates.

1 results in the increase to net operating income of 2 \$1,724,000.

3 Q. Would you please briefly discuss electric weather 4 normalization?

5 Α. Yes. The Company's electric weather normalization adjustment calculates the change in kWh usage 6 7 required to adjust actual loads during the twelve months 8 ended June 2012 test period to the amount expected if weather had been normal. This adjustment incorporates the 9 10 effect of both heating and cooling on weather-sensitive 11 customer groups. The weather adjustment is developed from 12 regression analysis of ten years of billed usage per 13 customer and billing period heating and cooling degree-day 14 data. The resulting seasonal weather sensitivity factors 15 (use-per-customer-per-heating-degree day and use-per-16 customer-per-cooling-degree day) are applied to monthly 17 test period customers and the difference between normal heating/cooling degree-days and monthly test 18 period observed heating/cooling degree-days. 19

20 Q. Have the seasonal weather sensitivity factors 21 been updated since the last rate case?

A. Yes. The factors used in the weather adjustment are based on regression analysis of monthly billed usage per customer from January 2001 through December 2010 which

> Knox, Di 5 Avista Corporation

is the most recent completed analysis. Autoregressive
 terms were included in the regressions in order to correct
 for autocorrelation in the data.

Q. What data did you use to determine "normal"
5 heating and cooling degree days?

6 Normal heating and cooling degree days are based Α. 7 on a rolling 30-year average of heating and cooling degreedays reported for each month by the National Weather 8 9 Service for the Spokane Airport weather station. Each year 10 the normal values are adjusted to capture the most recent 11 year with the oldest year dropping off, thereby reflecting 12 the most recent information available at the end of each 13 calendar year.

Q. Is this proposed weather adjustment methodology consistent with the methodology utilized in the Company's last general rate case in Idaho?

A. Yes, the process for determining the weather sensitivity factors and the monthly adjustment calculation is consistent with the methodology presented in Case No. AVU-E-11-01.

21 Q. What was the impact of electric weather 22 normalization on the twelve months ended June 2012 test 23 year?

1 Weather was slightly warmer than normal during Α. 2 the winter, and cooler than normal during the spring of 2012 as well as the summer of 2011 (with offsetting impacts 3 4 in June where it was necessary to both deduct heating 5 degree-days and add cooling degree-days). Overall, the 6 adjustment to normal required the addition of only 92 7 heating degree-days during the heating season⁵ and 4 cooling 8 degree-days during the cooling season. total The 9 adjustment to Idaho sales volumes was an addition of 10 6,207,276 kWhs which is approximately 0.2% of billed usage.

11

Natural Gas Revenue Normalization

12 Q. Would you please describe the natural gas revenue 13 adjustment included in Ms. Andrews pro forma results of 14 operations?

15 Α. Yes. The natural gas revenue normalization 16 similar to the electric adjustment adjustment is and 17 represents the difference between the Company's actual 18 recorded retail revenues during the twelve months ended 19 June 2012 test period and retail revenues on a normalized 20 (pro forma) basis. The adjustment includes the re-pricing 21 of pro forma sales and transportation volumes at present

⁵ The heating season includes the months of October through June. The cooling season includes the months of June through September. The early part of June typically requires heating whereas the end of June typically requires cooling, therefore, for normalization purposes June is treated as both a heating and cooling month.

1 rates using pro forma sales volumes that have been adjusted 2 for unbilled sales, abnormal weather, and any material customer load or schedule changes. The rates used exclude: 3 4 Temporary Gas Rate Adjustment Schedule 155, 1) which 5 reflects the approved amortization rate for prior deferred 6 natural gas costs approved in the Company's last PGA 7 filing, 2) Public Purposes Rider Adjustment Schedule 191, 8 and 3) Deferred State Income Tax Adjustment Schedule 1996.

9 Q. Does the Revenue Normalization Adjustment contain 10 a component reflecting normalized natural gas costs?

11 Yes. Purchase gas costs are normalized using the Α. natural gas costs approved by the Commission in Case No. 12 13 AVU-G-12-05, the Company's 2012 PGA filing, as set forth 14 under Schedule 150. These natural gas costs, effective 15 October 1, 2012, are applied to the pro forma retail sales 16 volumes so that there is a matching of revenues and natural 17 gas costs.

18 Q. Have you determined the impact of each of the 19 components of this adjustment?

20 A. Yes. The re-pricing of billed revenue and 21 natural gas costs <u>increased</u> margin⁷ by \$240,000. Re-pricing

⁶ Documentation related to this adjustment is detailed in the Knox workpapers accompanying this case.

⁷ The term "margin" in this context consists of revenues less gas costs and adder schedule amortization expenses but does not include the effect of revenue related expenses or income taxes.

1 unbilled revenue and natural gas costs <u>decreased</u> margin by 2 \$116,000, and the weather adjustment at present rates 3 increased margin by \$282,000.

The total net amount of the natural gas revenue normalization adjustment, which includes the related purchase gas cost normalization, is an <u>increase</u> to net operating income of \$275,000, as shown in adjustment column 2.01, on page 5 of Ms. Andrews Exhibit No. 10, Schedule 2.

9 Q. Would you please briefly discuss natural gas 10 weather normalization?

11 Α. Yes. The natural gas weather normalization 12 adjustment is developed from a regression analysis of ten 13 years of billed usage per customer and billing period 14 heating degree-day data. The resulting seasonal weather 15 sensitivity factors (use-per-customer-per-heating-degree 16 day) are applied to monthly test period customers and the 17 difference between normal heating degree-days and monthly 18 test period observed heating degree-days. This calculation 19 produces the change in therm usage required to adjust 20 existing loads to the amount expected if weather had been 21 normal.

22 Q. In your discussion of electric weather 23 normalization you indicated that the adjustment utilized 24 sensitivity factors from the ten year period January 2001

> Knox, Di 9 Avista Corporation

1 through December 2010. Is this true for natural gas as 2 well?

A. Yes, the natural gas weather adjustment utilized4 updated weather sensitivity factors.

Q. What data did you use to determine "normal"
heating degree days?

A. Normal heating degree-days are based on a rolling 30-year average of heating degree-days reported for each month by the National Weather Service for the Spokane Airport weather station. Each year the normal values are adjusted to capture the most recent year with the oldest year dropping off, thereby reflecting the most recent information available at the end of each calendar year.

Q. Is this proposed weather adjustment methodology consistent with the methodology utilized in the Company's last general rate case in Idaho?

A. Yes. The process for determining the weather sensitivity factors and the monthly adjustment calculation are consistent with the methodology presented in Case No. AVU-G-11-01.

21 Q. What was the impact of natural gas weather 22 normalization on the twelve months ended June 2012 test 23 year? A. Weather was slightly warmer than normal during the fall and winter months, largely offset by a cooler than normal spring. The adjustment to normal required the addition of 92 heating degree-days from October through June.⁸ The adjustment to sales volumes was an addition of 818,604 therms which is approximately 0.7% of billed usage.

8

III. PROPOSED LOAD CHANGE ADJUSTMENT RATE

9

Q. What is the Load Change Adjustment Rate?

10 Α. The Load Change Adjustment Rate (LCAR) is part of 11 the Power Cost Adjustment (PCA) mechanism that prices the change in power supply-related costs associated with the 12 13 change in actual retail loads from the retail loads that 14 were used to set the PCA base costs. The LCAR 15 determination process for all Idaho investor-owned 16 utilities was established in IPUC Case No. GNR-E-10-03, 17 Order No. 32206 which was approved on March, 15, 2011.

18 Q. How is the rate determined?

19 The proposed LCAR in this case is determined by Α. 20 requirement computing the proposed revenue on the 21 production and transmission costs contained within Ms. 22 Andrews' Idaho electric pro forma total results of

⁸Heating degree days that occur during July through September do not impact the natural gas weather normalization adjustment as the seasonal sensitivity factor is zero for summer months.

1 operations. The production/transmission revenue 2 requirement amount is then divided by the Idaho normalized 3 retail load used to set rates in order to arrive at the 4 average production and transmission cost-per-kWh embedded 5 in proposed rates. This amount is then multiplied by the 6 proportion of production and transmission costs classified 7 as energy-related in the cost of service study.

Q. Do you have an exhibit schedule that shows the
9 calculation of the proposed LCAR?

10 Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 1 begins with the Α. Yes. identification of the production and transmission revenue, 11 12 expense and rate base amounts included in each of Ms. 13 Andrews' actual, restating, and pro forma adjustments to 14 results of operations. The "Pro Forma Total Production and 15 Transmission Costs" on line 32 at the bottom of page 1 16 shows the resulting production and transmission cost 17 components.

18 Page 2 shows the revenue requirement calculation on 19 the production and transmission cost components. The rate of return and debt cost percentages on Line 2 are inputs 20 21 from the proposed cost of capital. The normalized retail 22 load on Line 10 comes from the workpapers supporting the 23 revenue normalization and energy efficiency load 24 Line 11 average adjustments. represents the total

> Knox, Di 12 Avista Corporation

1 production and transmission cost-per-kWh proposed to be 2 embedded in Idaho customer retail rates. Lines 12 and 13 3 are values taken from the cost of service study supporting 4 report titled Functional Cost Summary by Classification at 5 Uniform Requested Return representing total costs at unity. 6 Line 12 shows the amount of production and transmission 7 costs classified as energy related, while Line 13 shows the 8 total production and transmission costs in the study.

9 The resulting load change adjustment rate on Line 14 10 is \$0.02768 per kWh or \$27.68 per MWh. The calculation of 11 the load change adjustment rate will be revised based on 12 the final production and transmission costs, and rate of 13 return, that are approved by the Commission in this case.

- 14
- 15

IV. ELECTRIC COST OF SERVICE

Q. Please briefly summarize your testimony related
to the electric cost of service study.

18 I believe the Base Case cost of service study Α. 19 presented in this case is а fair and reasonable 20 representation of the costs to serve each customer group. 21 The Base Case study shows Residential Service Schedule 1, 22 Extra Large General Service Schedule 25, Pumping Service 23 Schedule 31 and the Street and Area Lighting Schedules provide less than the overall rate of return under present 24

> Knox, Di 13 Avista Corporation

rates. General Service Schedule 11, Large General Service
 Schedule 21 and Extra Large General Service to Clearwater
 Paper Schedule 25P provide more than the overall rate of
 return under present rates.

5 Q. What is an electric cost of service study and 6 what is its purpose?

7 Α. electric cost of study An service is an 8 engineering-economic study, which separates the revenue, 9 expenses, and rate base associated with providing electric 10 service to designated groups of customers. The groups are 11 made up of customers with similar load characteristics and 12 facilities requirements. Costs are assigned or allocated 13 to each group based on (among other things), test period 14 load and facilities requirements, resulting in an 15 evaluation of the cost of the service provided to each 16 The rate of return by customer group indicates group. whether the revenue provided by the customers in each group 17 18 recovers the cost to serve those customers. The study 19 results are used as a guide in determining the appropriate 20 rate spread among the groups of customers. Exhibit No. 12, 21 Schedule 2 explains the basic concepts involved in 22 performing an electric cost of service study. It also 23 details the specific methodology and assumptions utilized 24 in the Company's Base Case cost of service study.

> Knox, Di 14 Avista Corporation

Q. What is the basis for the electric cost of
 service study provided in this case?

A. The electric cost of service study provided by the Company as Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 3 is based on the twelve months ended June 30, 2012 test year pro forma results of operations presented by Ms. Andrews in Exhibit No. 10, Schedule 1.

Q. Would you please explain the cost of service
9 study presented in Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 3?

10 Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 3 is composed of a Α. Yes. 11 series of summaries of the cost of service study results. 12 The summary on page 1 shows the results of the study by 13 FERC account category. The rate of return by rate schedule 14 and the ratio of each schedule's return to the overall 15 return are shown on Lines 39 and 40. This summary was 16 provided to Company witness Mr. Ehrbar for his work on rate spread and rate design. The results will be discussed in 17 18 more detail later in my testimony.

Pages 2 and 3 are both summaries that show the revenue-to-cost relationship at current and proposed revenue. Costs by category are shown first at the existing schedule returns (revenue); next the costs are shown as if all schedules were providing equal recovery (cost). These comparisons show how far current and proposed rates are

> Knox, Di 15 Avista Corporation

1 from rates that would be in alignment with the cost study. 2 2 shows the costs segregated into production, Page 3 transmission, distribution, and common functional 4 categories. Line 44 on page 2 shows the target change in 5 revenue which would produce unity in this cost study. Page 6 3 segregates the costs into demand, energy, and customer 7 classifications. Page 4 is a summary identifying specific 8 customer related costs embedded in the study.

9 The Excel model used to calculate the cost of service 10 and supporting schedules has been included in its entirety 11 both electronically and in hard copy in the workpapers 12 accompanying this case.

Q. Does the Company's electric Base Case cost of service study follow the methodology filed in the Company's last electric general rate case in Idaho?

16 In most respects, yes. In the last case (Case Α. 17 No. AVU-E-11-01) the Company's electric Base Case cost of 18 service study was prepared using the methodology presented in Case No. AVU-E-04-01 through Case No. AVU-E-09-01 except 19 20 that the peak credit classification of production and 21 transmission costs was revised. While a revision to the 22 peak credit classification of production and transmission 23 costs was also proposed in Case No. AVU-E-10-01, only the 24 classification of transmission costs as 100% demand-related

> Knox, Di 16 Avista Corporation

1 was accepted as part of the settlement in that case. In 2 this case the Company's Base Case cost of service study 3 utilizes the study methodology accepted in the Settlement 4 from Case No. AVU-E-10-01.⁹

5 Q. Given that the specific details of this 6 methodology are described in Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 2, 7 would you please give a brief overview of the key elements 8 and the history associated with those elements?

9 Α. Yes. Production costs are classified to energy 10 and demand in this case using the Company's traditional peak credit assignments derived from replacement cost of 11 Transmission costs are classified as 12 plant investment. 13 100% demand and allocated by the average of the 12 monthly 14 coincident peaks, as accepted in the Settlement in Case No. 15 AVU-E-10-01.

Distribution costs are classified and allocated by the basic customer theory¹⁰ accepted by the Idaho Commission in Case No. WWP-E-98-11. Additional direct assignment of demand related distribution plant has been incorporated to reflect improvements accepted by the Commission in Case No. AVU-E-04-01.

⁹ This methodology contains only one methodological difference from the studies presented from Case Nos. AVU-E-04-01 through AVU-E-09-01. Namely, transmission costs are classified as 100% demand-related. ¹⁰ Basic customer theory classifies only meters, services and street lights as customer-related plant; all other distribution facilities are considered demand-related

Administrative and general costs are first directly assigned to production, transmission, distribution, or customer relations functions. The remaining administrative and general costs are categorized as common costs and have been assigned to customer classes by the four-factor allocator accepted by the Idaho Commission in Case No. AVU-E-04-01.

Q. The settlement in Case No. AVU-E-11-01 required
 9 the convening of a public workshop regarding cost of
 10 service issues before the next rate case. Please explain.

A. In Order No. 32371 from Case No. AVU-E-11-01 and
AVU-G-11-01, the Commission approved an all-party
Settlement Stipulation. In Section 10 of the Settlement
Stipulation, beginning on page 5 it states:

15 The Parties have agreed to exchange information 16 and convene a public workshop, prior to the 17 Company's next general rate case, with respect to 18 the method of allocation of demand and energy 19 among the customer classes such as the possible 20 revised peak credit method of а for use 21 classifying production costs, as well as 22 consideration of the use of a 12 Coincident Peak 23 (CP) (whether "weighted" or not) versus a 7 CP or 24 other method for allocating transmission costs.

25 The workshop was convened on September 18, 2012 at the 26 Idaho Public Utilities Commission, and was attended by the key stakeholders regarding cost of service issues.¹¹ The
 Company's presentation from the workshop is included as
 Schedule 4 of Exhibit No. 12.

Q. Was any consensus reached among the Parties
regarding the alternative peak credit classification
approach?

7 No, there was not. Even though the system load Α. 8 factor approach to production peak credit, in the Company's 9 view, is simple and straightforward, related to the test 10 year under evaluation, and should provide a stable 11 relationship over time, the Parties could not agree that it provides for a better representation of production cost-12 13 causation than the traditional peak credit methodology. In 14 fact, certain parties suggested potentially removing 15 certain items, such as fuel, from the system load factor 16 methodology and classifying those costs as 100% energy 17 related.

18 Q. Was consensus reached among the parties as it 19 relates to the demand allocation factor for transmission 20 costs?

A. No consensus was reached. The general sentiment
among the parties on this issue, and even the peak credit

¹¹ Parties attending the workshop included Avista, IPUC Staff, Idaho Forest Group, Clearwater Paper, Idaho Conservation League, and Community Action Partnership Association of Idaho (CAPAI).

1 issue, is that there should be stability in methodology 2 over time, and that modifications to existing practices 3 should be well founded. Enough changes occur in cost 4 recovery relationships stemming from test year differences 5 without layering on changes to how the cost elements are 6 treated through a methodology change.

Q. Did the workshop influence your decision to propose the traditional peak credit methodology and unweighted 12CP demand for transmission in this case?

10 Α. Yes it did. First, it is important to note that 11 Company believes that the revised peak the credit methodology for classifying production costs into energy 12 13 and demand components which it proposed in Case No. AVU-E-14 11-01 is a preferable methodology. That being said, some 15 parties at the September 2012 workshop, and IPUC Staff in 16 particular, believe that methodological consistency is very 17 important, and that the Company's traditional peak credit 18 methodology is a valid approach for production cost 19 classification.

With that in mind, as well as to potentially limit the number of issues in this case, Avista is presenting the prior traditional peak credit methodology in the cost of service study. This methodology includes using 12 CP for allocating transmission costs instead of a weighted 12 CP

> Knox, Di 20 Avista Corporation

1 as proposed in the last case. The Company, however, is 2 proposing to continue to employ the recent change to 3 classify transmission costs as 100% demand-related.

Q. What are the results of the Company's electric
cost of service study presented in this case?

6 A. The following Illustration shows the rate of 7 return and the relationship of the customer class return to 8 the overall return (relative return ratio) at <u>present rates</u> 9 for each rate schedule:

10 Illustration 1

	<u>Rate of</u>	<u>Return</u>
Customer Class	Return	Ratio
Residential Service Schedule 1	5.74%	0.78
General Service Schedule 11/12	10.26%	1.40
Large General Service Schedule 21/22	8.40%	1.15
Extra Large General Service Schedule 25	7.10%	0.97
Extra Large General Service Clearwater		
Paper Schedule 25P	8.75%	1.20
Pumping Service Schedule 31/32	6.92%	0.95
Lighting Service Schedules 41 - 49	5.51%	0.75
Total Idaho Electric System	7.32%	1.00

11 As can be observed from the above table, residential, 12 extra large general service, pumping service and lighting 13 service schedules (1, 25, 31 and 41-49) show under-recovery 14 of the costs to serve them. The general service, large 15 general service, and extra large Clearwater Paper schedules 16 (11, 21, 25P) show over-recovery of the costs to serve Knox, Di 21 Avista Corporation

1 them. The summary results of this study were provided to 2 Mr. Ehrbar as an input into development of the proposed 3 electric rates.

4

5

V. NATURAL GAS COST OF SERVICE

Q. Please describe the natural gas cost of service
study and its purpose.

8 A natural gas cost of service study is Α. an 9 engineering-economic study which separates the revenue, 10 expenses, and rate base associated with providing natural 11 gas service to designated groups of customers. The groups 12 are made up of customers with similar usage characteristics 13 and facility requirements. Costs are assigned in relation 14 to each group's test year load and facilities requirements, 15 resulting in an evaluation of the cost of the service 16 provided to each group. The rate of return by customer 17 group indicates whether the revenue provided by the 18 customers in each group recovers the cost to serve those 19 customers. The study results are one of the key inputs in 20 determining the appropriate rate spread among the groups of 21 customers. Exhibit No. 12, Schedule 5 explains the basic 22 concepts involved in performing a natural gas cost of 23 service study. It also details the specific methodology 1 and assumptions utilized in the Company's Base Case cost of 2 service study.

3 Q. What is the basis for the natural gas cost of 4 service study provided in this case?

A. The cost of service study provided by the Company as Exhibit 12, Schedule 6 is based on the twelve months ended June 2012 test year pro forma results of operations presented by Ms. Andrews in Exhibit 10, Schedule 2.

9 Q. Would you please explain the natural gas cost of 10 service study presented in Schedule 6?

11 Exhibit 12, Schedule 6 is composed of a Α. Yes. 12 series of summaries of the cost of service study results. 13 Page 1 shows the results of the study by FERC account 14 The rate of return, and the ratio of each category. 15 schedule's return to the overall return, are shown on lines 16 38 and 39. This summary is provided to Mr. Ehrbar for his 17 work on rate spread and rate design, and the results will 18 be presented later in my testimony. Additional summaries 19 show the costs organized by functional category (page 2) 20 and classification (page 3), including margin and unit cost 21 analysis at current and proposed rates. Finally, page 4 is 22 a summary identifying specific customer related costs 23 embedded in the study.

The Excel model used to calculate the natural gas cost
 of service and supporting schedules has been included in
 its entirety both electronically and hard copy in the
 natural gas workpapers accompanying this case.

5 Q. Does the Natural Gas Base Case cost of service 6 study utilize the methodology from the Company's last 7 natural gas case in Idaho?

8 A. Yes. The Base Case cost of service study was 9 prepared using the methodology accepted by the Idaho 10 Commission in Case No. AVU-G-04-01, and presented in AVU-G-11 08-01, AVU-G-09-01, AVU-G-10-01 and AVU-G-11-01.

12 Q. What are the key elements that define the cost of 13 service methodology?

14 A. Allocations of natural gas costs reflect the 15 current Purchased Gas Adjustment methodology. Underground 16 storage costs are allocated by normalized winter 17 throughput.

18 Natural gas main investment has been segregated into 19 large and small mains. Large usage customers that take 20 service from large mains do not receive an allocation of 21 small mains. Meter installation and services investment is 22 allocated by number of customers weighted by the relative 23 current cost of those items. System facilities that serve 24 all customers are classified by the peak and average ratio

> Knox, Di 24 Avista Corporation

1 that reflects the system load factor, then allocated by 2 coincident peak demand and throughput, respectively.

3 General plant is allocated by the sum of all other 4 Administrative & general expenses are segregated plant. 5 into labor-related, plant-related, revenue-related, and 6 "other". The costs are then allocated by factors 7 associated with labor, plant in service, or revenue, respectively. The "other" A&G amounts get a combined 8 9 allocation that is one-half based on O&M expenses and one-10 half based on throughput. A detailed description of the 11 methodology is included in Exhibit 12, Schedule 5.

12 Q. What are the results of the Company's natural gas13 cost of service study?

14 I believe the Base Case cost of service study Α. 15 filing is a fair and reasonable presented in this 16 representation of the costs to serve each customer group. 17 The study indicates that General Service (primarily 18 residential) Schedule 101, Interruptible Service Schedules 19 131/132 and Transportation Service Schedule 146 are 20 providing less than the overall return (unity), and Large General Service Schedules 111/112 are providing more than 21 22 unity.

1 The following Illustration shows the rate of return 2 and the relative return ratio at <u>present</u> <u>rates</u> for each 3 rate schedule:

4 Illustration 2

	Rate of	Return
Customer Class	Return	Ratio
General Firm Service Schedule 101	5.40%	0.92
Large Firm Service Schedule 111/112	7.98%	1.37
Interruptible Service Schedule 131/132	5.35%	0.92
Transportation Service Schedule 146	4.69%	0.80
Total Idaho Natural Gas System	5.84%	1.00

5 The summary results of this study were provided to Mr.
6 Ehrbar as an input into development of the proposed rates.

7 Q. Does this conclude your pre-filed direct 8 testimony?

cescimony:

9 A. Yes, it does.

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) CASE NO. AVU-E-12-08 OF AVISTA CORPORATION FOR THE) CASE NO. AVU-G-12-07 AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES) AND CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC AND) NATURAL GAS SERVICE TO ELECTRIC) EXHIBIT NO. 12 AND NATURAL GAS CUSTOMERS IN THE) STATE OF IDAHO) TARA L. KNOX FOR AVISTA CORPORATION (ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS)

AVISTA UTILITIES

AVERAGE PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION COST IDAHO ELECTRIC <u>TWELVE MONTHS ENDED JUNE 30, 2012</u>

Line	Column	Description of Adjustment	(000's)	Revenue	Expense	Plant	Accumulated Depreciation	Deferred Debits/Credits	Deferred Tax
1	1.00	Per Results Report	_ (000 3)	101.316	226.548	585.254	(213,725)	1.765	(61.642)
2	1.01	Deferred FIT Rate Base			-	-	-	-	(285)
3	1.02	Deferred Debits and Credits		-	(64)	-	-	(414)	-
4	1.03	Working Capital		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	1.04	Restate 2011 Capital		-	236	9,873	(4,733)	-	(835)
6	2.01	Eliminate B & O Taxes		-	-	-	-	-	-
7	2.02	Uncollect. Expense		-	-	-	-	-	-
8	2.03	Regulatory Expense		-	-	-	-	-	-
9	2.04	Injuries and Damages		-	-	-	-	-	-
10	2.05	FIT/DFIT/ ITC/PTC Expense		-	-	-	-	-	-
11	2.06	ID PCA		-	(9,871)	-	-	-	-
12	2.07	Nez Perce Settlement Adjustment		-	(18)	-	-	-	-
13	2.08	CS2 Levelized		-	235	-	-	-	-
14	2.09	Revenue Normalization		-	9,635	-	-	-	-
15	2.10	Misc Restating		-	-	-	-	-	-
16	2.11	Restate Incentives		-	-	-	-	-	-
17	2.12	Colstrip / CS2 Maintenance		-	1,339	-	-	-	-
18	2.13	Restate Debt Interest		-	-	-	-	-	-
19	3.01	Pro Forma Power Supply		(73,823)	(76,210)	-	-	-	-
20	3.02	Pro Forma Transmission Rev/Exp		371	3	-	-	-	-
21	3.03	Pro Forma Labor Non-Exec		-	290	-	-	-	-
22	3.04	Pro Forma Generation Major O&M		-	921	-	-	-	-
23	3.05	Pro Forma Employee Benefits		-	353	-	-	-	-
24	3.06	Pro Forma Insurance		-	-	-	-	-	-
25	3.07	Pro Forma Property Tax		-	380	-	-	-	-
26	3.08	Pro Forma IS/IT Costs		-	80	-	-	-	-
27	3.09	Planned Capital Add 2012		-	534	23,728	(13,617)	-	(1,765)
28	3.10	Planned Capital Add 2013 AMA		-	128	6,735	(6,162)	-	(661)
29	3.11	PF Energy Efficiency Load Adj.		-	(976)	-	-	-	-
30	3.12	O&M Offsets		-	(35)	-	-	-	-
31	3.13	Depreciation Study		-	(1,780)	-	-	-	-
32	Pro Forma T	otal		27,864	151,728	625,590	(238,237)	1,351	(65,188)

Production / Transmission

Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 1, p. 1 of 2

Exhibit No. 12

AVISTA UTILITIES

AVERAGE PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION COST IDAHO ELECTRIC <u>TWELVE MONTHS ENDED JUNE 30, 2012</u>

Proposed Production and Transmission Revenue Requirement

Calculation of Load Change Adjustment Rate

Line 1	Prod/Trans	Pro Forma Rate Base	(\$000's) 323,516	Debt Cost
2	Cost of Capital	Proposed Rate of Return	8.460%	3.01%
3	Rate Base	Net Operating Income Requirement	\$27,369	
4	Tax Effect	Net Operating Income Requirement (Rate Base x Debt Cost x -35%)	(\$3,408)	
5	Net Expense	Net Operating Income Requirement (Expense - Revenue)	123,864	
6	Tax Effect	Net Operating Income Requirement (Net Expense x35%)	(\$43,352)	
7	Total Prod/Trans	Net Operating Income Requirement	\$104,473	
8	1 - Tax Rate	Conversion Factor (Excl. Rev. Rel. Exp.)	0.65	
9	Prod/Trans	Revenue Requirement	\$160,727	l
10	Test Year WA No	ormalized Retail Load MWh	3,364,879	with EELA Billing Determinant Adjustment
11	Prod/Trans Rev R	Requirement per kWh	\$ 0.04777	
12	Cost of Service E	nergy Classified Production/Transmission Costs	\$94,413	Company Case at Unity AVU-E-12-08
13	Cost of Service T	otal Production/Transmission Costs	\$162,919	Company Case at Unity AVU-E-12-08
14	Load Change Adj	ustment Rate per kWh (Line 11 * Line 12 / Line 13)	\$ 0.02768	l

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 1, p. 2 of 2 1

1. ELECTRIC COST OF SERVICE

A cost of service study is an engineering-economic study, which apportions the revenue, expenses, and rate base associated with providing electric service to designated groups of customers. It indicates whether the revenue provided by customers recovers the cost to serve those customers. The study results are used as a guide in determining the appropriate rate spread among the groups of customers.

7 There are three basic steps involved in a cost of service study: functionalization, 8 classification, and allocation. See flow chart below.

9 First, the expenses and rate base associated with the electric system under study are 10 assigned to functional categories. The uniform system of accounts provides the basic segregation 11 into production, transmission, and distribution. Traditionally customer accounting, customer 12 information, and sales expenses are included in the distribution function, and administrative and 13 general expenses and general plant rate base are allocated to all functions. This study includes a 14 separate functional category for common costs. Administrative and general costs that cannot be 15 directly assigned to the other functions have been placed in this category.

Second, the expenses and rate base items that cannot be directly assigned to customer 16 groups are classified into three primary cost components: energy, demand or customer related. 17 18 Energy related costs are allocated based on each rate schedule's share of commodity consumption. 19 Demand (capacity) related costs are allocated to rate schedules on the basis of each schedule's contribution to peak demand. Customer related items are allocated to rate schedules based on the 20 21 number of customers within each schedule. The number of customers may be weighted by 22 appropriate factors such as relative cost of metering equipment. In addition to these three cost components, any revenue related expense is allocated based on the proportion of revenues by rate 23 schedule. 24

> Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 1 of 9

ELECTRIC COST OF SERVICE STUDY FLOWCHART



Pro Forma Results of Operations by Customer Group¹

1 Customer classes shown in this flowchart are illustrative and may not match the Company's actual rate schedules.

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 2 of 9

- 1 The final step is allocation of the costs to the various rate schedules utilizing the allocation 2 factors selected for each specific cost item. These factors are derived from usage and customer 3 information associated with the test period results of operations.
- 4

BASE CASE COST OF SERVICE STUDY

5

Production Classification (Traditional Peak Credit)

This study utilizes a Peak Credit methodology to classify production costs into demand and 6 energy classifications. The Peak Credit method acknowledges that baseload production facilities 7 provide energy throughout the year as well as capacity during system peaks. The demand/energy 8 ratio is determined by the relationship of the current replacement cost per KW generating capacity 9 of the Company's peaking units to the current replacement cost per KW generating capacity of the 10 11 Company's thermal or hydro plant. The peak credit ratio for thermal plant is 42.00% to demand 12 and 58.00% to energy. The peak credit ratio for hydro plant is 41.83% to demand and 58.17% to 13 energy. As an intermediate resource (between peaking and baseload), Coyote Springs II has been included with the thermal plant costs, whereas all other plants in the 340 to 349 FERC plant 14 15 accounts are considered peaking units. Fuel and load dispatching expenses are classified entirely to energy. Peaking plant related costs are classified entirely to demand. Purchased Power and 16 Other Power Supply expenses are classified to demand and energy by the relative amounts of 17 assigned and allocated Production Plant in Service. 18

19

Production Allocation

20 Production demand related costs are allocated to the customer classes by class contribution 21 to the average of the twelve monthly system coincident peak loads. Although the Company is 22 usually technically a winter peaking utility, it experiences high summer peaks and careful 23 management of capacity requirements is required throughout the year. The use of the average of 24 twelve monthly peaks recognizes that customer capacity needs are not limited to the heating season. Energy related costs are allocated to class by pro forma annual kilowatt-hour sales
 adjusted for losses to reflect generation level consumption.

3

Transmission Classification and Allocation

Transmission costs are classified as 100% demand related due in part to the fact that the facilities are designed for meeting system peak loads. These costs are then allocated to the customer classes by class contribution to the average of the twelve monthly system coincident peak loads (12CP). The use of the average of twelve monthly peaks recognizes that customer capacity needs are not limited to the heating season.

9

Distribution Facilities Classification (Basic Customer)

The Basic Customer method considers only services and meters and directly assigned Street Lighting apparatus (FERC Accounts 369, 370, and 373 respectively) to be customer related distribution plant. All other distribution plant is then considered demand related. This division delineates plant which benefits an individual customer from plant which is part of the system. The basic customer method provides a reasonable, clearly definable division between plant that provides service only to individual customers from plant that is part of the interconnected distribution network.

17

Customer Relations Distribution Cost Classification

18 Customer service, customer information and sales expenses are the core of the customer 19 relations functional unit which is included with the distribution cost category. For the most part 20 they are classified as customer related. Exceptions are sales expenses which are classified as 21 energy related and uncollectible accounts expense which is considered separately as a revenue 22 conversion item. Demand Side Management expenses (if any) recorded in Account 908 would be 23 considered separately from the other customer information costs. Any demand side management investment and amortization included in base rates would be classified implicitly to demand and energy by the sum of production plant in service, then allocated to rate schedules by coincident peak demand and energy consumption respectively. At this point in time, the Company's demand side management investments in base rates have been fully amortized except for some minor outstanding loan balances that will remain on the books until satisfied. All current demand side management costs are managed through the Schedule 91 Public Purpose Tariff Rider balancing account which is not included in this cost study.

8

Distribution Cost Allocation

Distribution demand related costs which cannot be directly assigned are allocated to 9 customer class by the average of the twelve monthly non-coincident peaks for each class. 10 11 Distribution facilities that serve only secondary voltage customers are allocated by the non-12 coincident peak excluding primary voltage customers or number of customers excluding primary 13 voltage customers. This includes line transformers, services, and secondary voltage overhead or underground conductors and devices. The costs of specific substations and related primary voltage 14 15 distribution facilities are directly assigned to Extra Large General Service customers based on their load ratio share of the substation capacity from which they receive service. 16

Most customer costs are allocated by average number of customers. Weighted customer allocators have been developed using typical current cost of meters, estimated meter reading time, and direct assignment of billing costs for hand-billed customers. Street and area light customers are excluded from metering and meter reading expenses as their service is not metered.

21

Administrative and General Costs

Administrative and general costs which are directly associated with production, transmission, distribution, or customer relations functions are directly assigned to those functions and allocated to customer class by the relevant plant or number of customers. The remainder of administrative and general costs are considered common costs, and have been left in their own functional category. These common costs are classified by the implicit relationship of energy, demand and customer within the four-factor allocator applied to them. The four-factor allocator consists of a 25% weighting of each of the following: 1) operating & maintenance expenses excluding resource costs, labor expenses, and administrative and general expenses; 2) operating and maintenance labor expenses excluding administrative and general labor expenses; 3) net production, transmission, and distribution plant; and 4) number of customers.

8

Revenue Conversion Items

9 In this study uncollectible accounts and commission fees have been classified as revenue 10 related and are allocated by pro forma revenue. These items vary with revenue and are included in 11 the calculation of the revenue conversion factor. Income tax expense items are allocated to 12 schedules by net income before income tax adjusted by interest expense.

For the functional summaries on pages 2 and 3 of the cost of service study, these items are assigned to component cost categories. The revenue related expense items have been reduced to a percent of all other costs and loaded onto each cost category by that ratio. Similarly, income tax items have been reduced to a percent of net income before tax then assigned to cost categories by relative rate base (as is net income).

The following matrix outlines the methodology applied in the Company Base Case cost ofservice study.

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 6 of 9

Line	Account	Functional Category	Classification	Allocation
	Production Plant	* *		
1	Thermal Production	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Thermal Peak Credit	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
2	Hydro Production	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Hydro Peak Credit	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
3	Other Production (Covote Springs)	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Thermal Peak Credit	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
4	Other Production	P = Production	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
	Transmission Plan			
5	All Transmission	T = Transmission	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
	Distribution Plan			
6	360 Land	D = Distribution	Demand	D03 Non-coincident Peak Demand (NCP)
7	361 Structures	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D06 Direct Assign Large / Non-coincident Peak Demand Excl DA
8	362 Station Equipment	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D06 Direct Assign Large / Non-coincident Peak Demand Excl DA
9	364 Poles Towers & Fixtures	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D07/D08 Direct Assign Large & Lights / NCP Excl DA / NCP Secondary
10	365 Overhead Conductors & Devices	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D07 Direct Assign Large / NCP Excl DA / NCP Secondary
11	366 Underground Conduit	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D07 Direct Assign Large / NCP Excl DA / NCP Secondary
12	367 Underground Conductors & Devices	D = Distribution	Demand	D04/D05/D07 Direct Assign Large / NCP Excl DA / NCP Secondary
13	368 Line Transformers	D = Distribution	Demand	D07 Non-coincident Peak Demand Secondary
14	369 Services	D = Distribution	Customer	C02 Secondary Customers unweighted Excl Lighting
15	370 Meters	D = Distribution	Customer	C04 Customers weighted by Current Typical Meter Cost
16	373 Street and Area Lighting Systems	D = Distribution	Customer	C05 Direct Assignment to Street and Area Lights
	General Plant			
17	All General	O=Other	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers
	Intengible Plant			
18	201 Organization	0-Other	Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	\$22,25% direct O&M 25% direct labor 25% not direct plant 25% number of customers
10	302 Erenchises & Consents Hudro Policonsing	$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Production}$	Domand/Energy by Hydro Poak Cradit	D01/E02 Coincident Bask Demand/Annual Constant, 25% Induction
20	202 Mise Intengible Plant Transmission Agreements	T = Transmission	Demand	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
20	303 Misc Intangible Plant - Traismission Agreements	$\Omega = \Omega$	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23.25% direct O&M. 25% direct labor. 25% net direct plant. 25% number of customers
21	505 Mise intaligible Flant - Software	0-0ulci	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Anocator	525 2576 direct Odivi, 2576 direct labor, 2576 het direct plant, 2576 humber of edistoniers
	Reserve for Depreciation/Amortizatio			
22	Intangible	P/T/O	Follows Related Plant	S01/S02/S23 Sum of Production Plant / Sum of Transmission Plant / Corp Cost Allocator
23	Production	P = Production	Follows Related Plant	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
24	Transmission	T = Transmission	Follows Related Plant	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
25	Distribution	D = Distribution	Follows Related Plant	D03/D04/D05/D06/D07/D08/C02/C04/C05 - See Related Plant
26	General	O=Other	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers
				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Other Rate Base			
27	252 Customer Advances for Construction	D = Distribution	Customer	S13 Sum of Account 369 Services Plant
28	282/190 Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	P/T/D/O	Follows Related Plant	S01/S02/S03/S04 Sums of Production / Transmission / Distribution / General Plant
29	Gain on Sale of General Office Building	O=Other	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers
30	Hydro Relicensing Related Settlements	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Hydro Peak Credit	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
31	Demand Side Management Investment	DSM	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
32	Working Capital	P/T/D/G	Demand/Energy/Customer as in related Plant	S06 Sum of Production, Transmission, Distribution, and General Plant
22	Production O&M			
33	I nermai	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Thermal Peak Credit	DU1/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
54 27	I nermai Fuei (501)	P = Production	Energy	EU2 Annual Generation Level Consumption
35	нуаго	$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Production}$	Demand/Energy by Hydro Peak Credit	DUI/EU2 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
				Exhibit No. 12

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 7 of 9 IPUC Case No. AVU-E-12-08 Methodology Matrix Avista Utilities Idaho Jurisdiction Electric Cost of Service Methodology

Line	Account	Functional Category	Classification	Allocation
	Production O&M (continued)			
1	Water for Power (536)	P = Production	Energy	E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption
2	Other (Covote Springs)	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Thermal Peak Credit	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
3	Other Fuel (547)	P = Production	Energy	E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption
4	Other	P = Production	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
5	Purchased Power and Other Expenses (555 and 557)	P = Production	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
6	System Control & Misc (556)	P = Production	Energy	E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption
	Transmission O&M			
7	All Transmission	T = Transmission	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
	Distribution O&M			
8	580 OP Super & Engineering	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Other Dist Op Exp	S16 Sum of Other Distribution Operating Expenses
9	581 Load Dispatching	D = Distribution	Demand	D03 Non-coincident Peak Demand
10	582 Station Expenses	D = Distribution	Demand	S09 Sum of Account 362 Station Equipment
11	583 Overhead Lines	D = Distribution	Demand	S10 Sum of Accounts 364 and 365 Poles, Towers, Fixtures & Overhead Conductors
12	584 Underground Lines	D = Distribution	Demand	S11 Sum of Accounts 366 and 367 Underground Conduit & Underground Conductors
13	585 Street Lights	D = Distribution	Customer	S15 Sum of Account 373 Street Light and Signal Systems
14	586 Meters	D = Distribution	Customer	S14 Sum of Account 370 Meters
15	587 Customer Installations	D = Distribution	Customer	S13 Sum of Account 369 Services
16	588 Misc Operating Expense	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Other Dist Op Exp	S16 Sum of Other Distribution Operating Expenses
17	589 Rents	D = Distribution	Demand	D03 Non-coincident Peak Demand
18	500 MT Super & Engineering	D – Distribution	Demand/Customer from Other Dist Mt Exp	\$17 Sum of Other Distribution Maintenance Expanses
10	501 MT of Structures	D = Distribution	Demand	S08 Sum of Account 361 Structures & Improvements
20	502 MT of Station Equipment	D = Distribution	Demand	S00 Sum of Account 362 Station Equipment
20	593 MT of Overhead Lines	D = Distribution	Demand	S10 Sum of Accounts 364 and 365 Poles. Towers: Fixtures & Overhead Conductors
21	594 MT of Underground Lines	D = Distribution	Demand	S11 Sum of Accounts 366 and 367 Underground Conduit & Underground Conductors
23	595 MT of Line Transformers	D = Distribution D = Distribution	Demand	S11 Sum of Account 368 Line Transformers
24	596 MT of Street Lights	D = Distribution D = Distribution	Customer	S12 Sum of Account 373 Street Light and Signal Systems
25	597 MT of Meters	D = Distribution	Customer	S14 Sum of Account 370 Meters
26	598 Misc Maintenance Expense	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Other Dist Mt Exp	S17 Sum of Other Distribution Maintenance Expenses
	Crastemen Accounts Francesco			
27	001 Supervision	C = Customer Polations	Customer	S18 Sum of Other Customer Accounts Expanses Evaluding Uncollectibles
21	901 Supervision	C = Customer Relations	Customer	CO2/CO6 Customers Weighted by Est. Mater Pagding Time/Direct Assign Hendbilled Cus
20	902 Customer Pacerds & Collections	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C05/C00 Customers weighted by Est. Weier Keading Time/Direct Assign Handbilled Cust
30	904 Uncollectible Accounts	R = Revenue Conversion	Revenue	P01 Retail Sales Revenue
31	905 Misc Cust Accounts	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
22	Customer Service & Info Expense			
32	907 Supervision	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
33	908 Customer Assistance	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
34	908 DSM Amortization Expenses	DSM	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
35	909 Advertising	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
36	910 Misc Cust Service & Info	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
	Sales Expenses			
37	911 - 916	C = Customer Relations	Energy	E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 8 of 9

Line Account		Functional Category	Classification	Allocation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Admin & General Expenses 920 - 927 & 930 -935 Assigned to Production 920 - 927 & 930 -935 Assigned to Transmission 920 - 927 & 930 - 935 Assigned to Distribution 920 - 927 & 930 - 935 Assigned to Customer Relations 920 - 935 Assigned to Other 928 FERC Commission Fees 928 IPUC Commission Fees 928 IPUC Commission Fees	P = Production T = Transmission D = Distribution C = Customer Relations O=Other P = Production R = Revenue Conversion	Demand/Energy from Production Plant Demand/Energy from Transmission Plant Demand/Customer from Distribution Plant Customer Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator Energy Revenue	 Sum of Production Plant Sum of Transmission Plant Sum of Distribution Plant C01 All Customers unweighted S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption R01 Retail Sales Revenue
8	Intangible	P/T/O	Demand/Energy/Customer as in related Plant	S01/S02/S23 Sum of Production Plant / Sum of Transmission Plant / Corp Cost Alloctor
9	Production	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Peak Credit as in related Plant	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
10	Transmission	T = Transmission	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Demand (12CP)
11	Distribution	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer as in related Plant	D03/D04/D05/D06/D07/D08/C02/C04/C05 - See Related Plant
12	General	O=Other	Demand/Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers
	Taxes			
13	Property Tax	P/T/D/O	Demand/Energy/Customer from related Plant	S01/S02/S03/S04 Sums of Production / Transmission / Distribution / General Plant
14	State kWh Generation Taxes	P = Production	Demand/Energy by 1/2 Fuel, 1/2 Transmission	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
15	Misc Production Taxes	$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Production}$	Demand/Energy by 1/2 Fuel, 1/2 Transmission	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
16	Misc Distribution Taxes	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Distribution Plant	S03 Sum of Distribution Plant
17	Idaho State Income Tax	R = Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R03 Revenue less Expenses Before Income Taxes less Interest Expense
18	Federal Income Tax	R = Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R03 Revenue less Expenses Before Income Taxes less Interest Expense
19	Deterred FIT	R = Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R03 Revenue less Expenses Before Income Taxes less Interest Expense
	Other Income Related Item			
20	CS2 Levelized Return and Boulder Write-off Amort.	P = Production	Demand/Energy by Peak Credit as in related Plant	D01/E02 Coincident Peak Demand/Annual Generation Level Consumption
	Operating Revenues		P	
21	Sales of Electricity- Retail	R = Revenue from Rates	Revenue	Input Pro Forma Revenue per Revenue Study
22	Sales for Resale (447)	P = Production	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
25	Salas of Water & Water Power (453)	D = Distribution R = Production	Demand	D01 Coincident Peak Domand (12CP)
24	Rept from Production Property (454)	P = Production	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
26	Rent from Transmission Property (454)	T = Transmission	Demand/Energy from Transmission Plant	S02 Sum of Transmission Plant
27	Rent from Distribution Property (454)	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Distribution Plant	S03 Sum of Distribution Plant
28	Other Electric Revenues - Generation (456)	$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Production}$	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
29	Other Electric Revenues - Wheeling (456)	T = Transmission	Demand/Energy from Transmission Plant	S02 Sum of Transmission Plant
30	Other Electric Revenues - Energy Delivery (456)	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Distribution Plant	S03 Sum of Distribution Plant
	Salaries & Wages (allocation factor input Operation & Maintenance Expenses			
31	Production Total	P = Production	Demand/Energy from Production Plant	S01 Sum of Production Plant
32	Transmission Total	T = Transmission	Demand/Energy from Transmission Plant	S02 Sum of Transmission Plant
33	Distribution Total	D = Distribution	Demand/Customer from Distribution Plant	S03 Sum of Distribution Plant
34	Customer Accounts Total	C = Customer Relations	Customer	S18 Sum of Other Customer Accounts Expenses Excluding Uncollectibles
35	Customer Service Total	C = Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All Customers unweighted
36	Sales Total	C = Customer Relations	Energy	E02 Annual Generation Level Consumption
37	Admin & General Total	O=Other	Energy/Customer by Corp Cost Allocator	S23 25% direct O&M, 25% direct labor, 25% net direct plant, 25% number of customers

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 2, p. 9 of 9

	Sumcost Scenario: AVU-E-12-08 Company Case AVU-E-10-01 Settlement Method		AVISTA UTILITIES Cost of Service Ba For the Twelve Mo	; sic Summary nths Ended June	30, 2012	la	laho Jurisdiction Electric Utility			10-10-12
	(b) (c) (c)	d) (e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(i)	(k)	(1)	(m)
		-, (-,	(7	Residential	General	Large Gen	Extra Large	Extra Large	Pumping	Street &
			System	Service	Service	Service	Gen Service	Service CP	Service	Area Lights
	Description		Total	Sch 1	Sch 11-12	Sch 21-22	Sch 25	Sch 25P	Sch 31-32	Sch 41-49
	Plant In Service									
1	Production Plant		402,565,000	149,638,011	40,682,236	80,301,297	34,458,283	89,941,661	6,239,766	1,303,746
2	Transmission Plant		193,225,000	78,729,256	19,788,854	37,732,611	15,884,481	37,989,699	2,676,142	423,958
3	Distribution Plant		449,614,000	225,605,267	64,270,329	110,145,165	9,287,020	2,737,865	15,430,461	22,137,894
4	Intangible Plant		54,867,000	23,810,109	6,166,529	9,958,073	3,823,947	9,725,364	922,792	460,186
5	General Plant		88,487,000	48,015,959	11,628,726	13,352,814	3,786,351	8,559,695	1,659,918	1,483,536
6	Total Plant In Service		1,188,758,000	525,798,603	142,536,673	251,489,960	67,240,083	148,954,284	26,929,078	25,809,319
	Accum Doprociation									
7	Droduction Diant		(17/ 500 000)	(64.010.090)	(17 611 062)	(21 926 500)	(14 042 000)	(20,000,750)	(2 705 760)	(545 124)
/ 8	Transmission Plant		(174,398,000)	(04,910,969) (26.01/ 017)	(17,044,002)	(34,820,300)	(14,943,996) (5 //30 105)	(39,000,750)	(2,703,700)	(303, 134) (1/1, 032)
9	Distribution Plant		(151 682 000)	(75 312 738)	(20,623,837)	(12,077,075)	(2,961,053)	(731 153)	(5 147 372)	(9 603 132)
10	Intangible Plant		(11,443,000)	(5,817,267)	(1,434,259)	(1.838.075)	(587,737)	(1.397.545)	(207,226)	(160,891)
11	General Plant		(34,403,000)	(18.668.200)	(4.521.151)	(5,191,462)	(1.472.101)	(3.327.937)	(645.362)	(576,786)
12	Total Accumulated Depreciation		(438,181,000)	(191,623,212)	(50,989,034)	(92,057,846)	(25,395,084)	(57,444,367)	(9,620,582)	(11,050,875)
	·			, , , , ,	(, , ,	、 · · · · ·	, · · · ,		(, , ,	、 · · · ,
13	Net Plant		750,577,000	334,175,391	91,547,639	159,432,113	41,844,999	91,509,917	17,308,496	14,758,444
14	Accumulated Deferred FIT		(119,554,000)	(52,622,048)	(14,256,245)	(25,204,201)	(6,885,548)	(15,403,257)	(2,673,478)	(2,509,223)
15	Miscellaneous Rate Base		8,007,000	3,223,674	914,043	1,813,323	519,015	1,185,858	181,919	169,167
16	Total Rate Base		639,030,000	284,777,017	78,205,437	136,041,236	35,478,467	77,292,518	14,816,938	12,418,388
17	Revenue From Retail Rates		248,720,000	99.497.000	32,432,000	51,400,000	16.036.000	41.091.000	4.859.000	3,405,000
18	Other Operating Revenues		29,727,000	11,482,225	3,089,386	5,992,225	2,405,525	6,094,169	487,054	176,415
19	Total Revenues		278,447,000	110,979,225	35,521,386	57,392,225	18,441,525	47,185,169	5,346,054	3,581,415
	Operating Exponses									
20	Draduction Exponses		121 242 000	12 622 102	12 108 017	24 352 003	10 513 028	28 162 848	1 0/5 /60	131 561
20	Transmission Expenses		10 671 000	43,033,193	1 092 855	24,332,773	877 233	20,103,040	1,743,400	23 413
22	Distribution Expenses		11 311 000	5 419 369	1 684 669	2,000,015	255 627	97 643	373 434	910 172
22	Customer Accounting Expenses		4 343 000	3 248 473	675 400	175 647	64 162	113 336	53 439	12 544
24	Customer Information Expenses		601,000	490.809	96,818	6.057	44	5	6,640	626
25	Sales Expenses		4,000	1,357	399	813	355	991	68	17
26	Admin & General Expenses		23,863,000	12,589,773	3,107,324	3,796,522	1,066,358	2,428,810	461,067	413,147
27	Total O&M Expenses		172,035,000	69,730,858	18,855,482	32,985,930	12,777,706	32,902,644	2,987,901	1,794,479
າຊ	Taxos Othor Than Incomo Taxos		0 171 000	3 705 7/1	1 035 428	1 038 010	614 626	1 454 900	107 275	1// 020
20 20	Other Income Polated Items		9,171,000 207.000	3,793,741	1,035,426	70 951	24 515	02 012	6/12	144,920
27	Depreciation Expense		377,000	141,752	37,707	77,031	54,515	72,713	0,413	1,450
30	Production Plant Depreciation		8 771 000	3 284 857	887.308	1,746,702	748 439	1.941.191	134 816	27.687
31	Transmission Plant Depreciation		3,550,000	1 446 443	363,568	693,237	291.835	697,961	49,167	7,789
32	Distribution Plant Depreciation		13,770,000	6,991,324	2,124,901	3.257.960	269,195	48.617	474,761	603.243
33	General Plant Depreciation		9,283,000	5,037,261	1,219,947	1,400,818	397,219	897,981	174,139	155,635
34	Amortization Expense		472,000	185,047	48,113	93,090	39,422	98,111	6,905	1,312
35	Total Depreciation Expense		35,846,000	16,944,931	4,643,837	7,191,808	1,746,110	3,683,860	839,788	795,666
36	Income Tax		14,195,000	4,008,667	2,920,617	3,773,418	747,990	2,285,559	298,625	160,125
37	Total Operating Expenses		231,644,000	94,622,149	27,495,271	45,969,016	15,920,947	40,419,875	4,320,102	2,896,640
38	Net Income		46,803,000	16,357,077	8,026,115	11,423,208	2,520,578	6,765,294	1,025,952	684,775
39	Rate of Return		7 32%	5 74%	10 26%	8 40%	7 10%	8 75%	6 92%	5 51%
40	Return Ratio		1.00	0.78	1.40	1.15	0.97	1.20	0.95	0.75
41	Interest Expense		19,235,000	8,571,876	2,354,008	4,094,883	1,067,913	2,326,529	445,994	373,797
42	Revenue Related Operating Expenses		1,259,000	503,646	164,168	260,183	81,173	207,999	24,596	17,236

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 3, p. 1 of 4 Sumcost Scenario: AVU-E-12-08 Company Case AVU-E-10-01 Settlement Method Transmission By Demand 12 CP Idaho Jurisdiction Electric Utility

1	0.	10	1	2
	υ-	ιu	- 1	L

	Transmission By Demand 12 CP									
	(b)	(c) (d) (e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(I)	(m)
				Residential	General	Large Gen	Extra Large	Extra Large	Pumping	Street &
			System	Service	Service	Service	Gen Service	Service CP	Service	Area Lights
	Description		Total	Sch 1	Sch 11-12	Sch 21-22	Sch 25	Sch 25P	Sch 31-32	Sch 41-49
1	Functional Cost Components a	t Current Return	1 by Schedule	47.0/0.000	14 / 01 7/ 5	27 021 027	11 (00 107	22 440 070	2 150 000	4/2 0/4
1	Production		136,364,788	47,060,028	14,621,765	27,931,027	1 724 447	32,448,878	2,150,089	462,864
2	Distribution		21,009,704 55 /12 000	7,000,000 26,205 511	2,701,310	4,044,099	1,730,047	4,092,231	200,429	40,000
3 1	Common		35 252 510	20,303,311	5 008 969	5 551 676	1,092,702	309,000	660 / 138	2,333,203 568,334
5	Total Current Rate Revenue	_	248 720 000	99 497 000	32 432 000	51 400 000	16.036.000	41 091 000	4 859 000	3 405 000
0			210//20/000	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	02/102/000	0111001000	10,000,000	11,071,000	1,007,000	011001000
	Expressed as \$/kWh									
6	Production		\$0.04053	\$0.04180	\$0.04412	\$0.04129	\$0.03896	\$0.03770	\$0.03809	\$0.03328
7	Transmission		\$0.00645	\$0.00683	\$0.00815	\$0.00672	\$0.00579	\$0.00545	\$0.00511	\$0.00292
8	Distribution		\$0.01647	\$0.02344	\$0.03048	\$0.01977	\$0.00364	\$0.00043	\$0.03118	\$0.16774
9	Common	_	\$0.01048	\$0.01631	\$0.01512	\$0.00821	\$0.00505	\$0.00416	\$0.01170	\$0.04086
10	Total Current Melded Rates		\$0.07392	\$0.08837	\$0.09787	\$0.07599	\$0.05344	\$0.04774	\$0.08608	\$0.24480
11	Functional Cost Components a	it Uniform Curre	125 440 121	40.040.202	12 454 074	27 222 057	11 7E1 270	21 407 141	0 170 011	102 042
12	Transmission		21 /00 270	40,909,202 8 756 180	2 200 804	21,233,931 A 106 570	1 766 654	1 225 172	2,170,311	402,003
12	Distribution		56 126 482	29 467 448	8 428 038	12 355 724	1 110 937	330 840	1 813 571	2 619 924
14	Common		35 434 128	19,156,149	4 648 672	5.391.551	1,525,634	3 446 346	667.697	598.078
15	Total Uniform Current Cost	—	248,720,000	106,349,060	28,932,579	49,177,812	16,154,596	39,409,519	4,949,216	3,747,217
							., . ,			
	Expressed as \$/kWh									
16	Production		\$0.04032	\$0.04349	\$0.04121	\$0.04026	\$0.03916	\$0.03649	\$0.03845	\$0.03466
17	Transmission		\$0.00639	\$0.00778	\$0.00664	\$0.00620	\$0.00589	\$0.00491	\$0.00527	\$0.00339
18	Distribution		\$0.01668	\$0.02617	\$0.02543	\$0.01827	\$0.00370	\$0.00038	\$0.03213	\$0.18835
19	Common		\$0.01053	\$0.01701	\$0.01403	\$0.00797	\$0.00508	\$0.00400	\$0.01183	\$0.04300
20	Total Current Uniform Melded	Rates	\$0.07392	\$0.09446	\$0.08/31	\$0.0/2/1	\$0.05383	\$0.04578	\$0.08768	\$0.26940
21	Pavanua to Cost Patio at Current I	Datos	1.00	0.94	1 1 2	1.05	0.00	1.04	0.08	0.01
21		illico i	1.00	0.71	1.12	1.00	0.77	1.01	0.70	0.71
	Functional Cost Components a	It Proposed Retu	urn by Schedule	9						
22	Production	•	140,184,410	48,492,742	14,991,954	28,713,644	12,016,444	33,285,836	2,212,176	471,615
23	Transmission		23,642,289	8,489,027	2,892,935	4,935,990	1,896,563	5,067,511	316,703	43,559
24	Distribution		59,930,158	28,698,341	10,740,181	14,513,912	1,189,616	399,779	1,924,395	2,463,934
25	Common		36,356,143	18,958,890	5,146,930	5,731,454	1,565,377	3,688,875	682,726	581,892
26	Total Proposed Rate Revenue	<u>;</u>	260,113,000	104,639,000	33,772,000	53,895,000	16,668,000	42,442,000	5,136,000	3,561,000
07	Expressed as \$/kWh		* 0.04177	* 0.04007	* 0.04504	* 0.04045	* 0.04004	* 0.000/7	#0.00010	\$0,00001
27	Production		\$0.04166	\$0.04307	\$0.04524	\$0.04245	\$0.04004	\$0.03867	\$0.03919	\$0.03391
28	I ransmission Distribution		\$0.00703 ¢0.01701	\$0.00754 \$0.02E40	\$0.00873	\$0.00730	\$0.00632	\$0.00589	\$0.00561 ¢0.02400	\$0.00313 ¢0.17714
29	Common		\$0.01781	\$0.02549 \$0.01684	\$0.03241	\$0.02140	\$0.00390	\$0.00040	\$0.03409 \$0.01210	\$0.17714
30	Total Proposed Melded Rates		\$0.01000	\$0.01004	\$0.01333	\$0.00047	\$0.00522	\$0.00423	\$0.01210	\$0.04103
51	Total Troposca Molaca Nates		\$0.07750	φ0.07274	<i>Q</i> 0 .10171	\$0.07700	ψ0.00004	\$0.04751	ψ0.07077	ψ0.23001
	Functional Cost Components a	t Uniform Reque	ested Return							
32	Production	•	139,481,645	50,383,935	14,040,165	27,994,752	12,077,948	32,260,841	2,229,521	494,483
33	Transmission		23,437,170	9,549,442	2,400,283	4,576,766	1,926,703	4,607,949	324,602	51,424
34	Distribution		60,656,479	31,751,124	9,094,204	13,465,411	1,207,871	362,167	1,970,308	2,805,394
35	Common	_	36,537,706	19,741,741	4,792,223	5,566,316	1,574,598	3,556,553	688,952	617,321
36	Total Uniform Cost		260,113,000	111,426,243	30,326,875	51,603,244	16,787,120	40,787,511	5,213,383	3,968,622
	European de Calendaria									
07	Expressed as \$/kWh		* 0.04145	* 0.04475	*0.04007	* 0.04100	#0.0400 5	* 0.00740	\$0,00050	
3/ 20	Production		\$0.04145	\$0.04475	\$0.04237	\$0.04139	\$0.04025	\$0.03748	\$0.03950	\$0.03555
ა <u>ბ</u>	n di 151111551011 Distribution		\$U.UU67/ \$0.01003	\$U.UU848 \$0.02020	\$U.UU/24 \$0.00744	¢0.000// ¢0.01001	\$0.00042 \$0.00402	\$0,000 D\$	\$0.005/5 \$0.02101	\$U.UU3/U \$0 20140
39 40	Common		₽0.01003 \$0.01086	₽0.02020 \$0.01753	₽0.02744 \$0.01446	\$0.01331 \$0.01331	30.00403 \$0.00525	∌0.00042 \$Ո ՈՈ/1Չ	30.03491 \$0.01771	\$0.20109 \$0.01139
41	Total Uniform Melded Rates	_	\$0.07730	\$0,09897	\$0.09152	\$0.07629	\$0.05594	\$0.04738	\$0.09236	\$0,28532
	. stal station molded rates		<i>40.0110</i> 0	+0.07077	+0.0710Z	~0.0/0Z/		φ0.0 τ <i>ι</i> 00	+0.07200	÷0.20002
42	Revenue to Cost Ratio at Propose	d Rates	1.00	0.94	1.11	1.04	0.99	1.04	0.99	0.90
10	Current Dourses to D 10	+ Datis	0.07	0.00	1 07	1.00	0.07	1 01	0.00	<u> </u>
43 44		ol raliu	0.96 11 393 000	0.89 11 929 000	(2 105 000)	1.00	0.96	(303 000)	0.93	0.86 564 000
44	i ai yet Nevenue IIIci ease		11,373,000	11,727,000	(2,100,000)	203,000	101,000	(000,000)	334,000	504,000

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08

T. Knox, Avista Schedule 3, p. 2 of 4

	Sumcost		AVISTA UTILITIES	S			Idaho Jurisdictio	on		
	Scenario: AVU-E-12-08 Compar AVU-E-10-01 Settlement Method	ny Case d	Revenue to Cost E For the Twelve Mo	By Classification S onths Ended June	Summary 30, 2012		Electric Utility			10-10-12
	Transmission By Demand 12 CF	0								
	(b)	(c) (d) (e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(I)	(m)
			a .	Residential	General	Large Gen	Extra Large	Extra Large	Pumping	Street &
	Description		System	Service	Service	Service	Gen Service	Service CP	Service	Area Lights
	Description	t Datum by Cal	I Otal	Sch I	Sch 11-12	Sch 21-22	Sch 25	SCN 25P	SCN 31-32	Sch 41-49
1	Enorgy	t Return by Sci		22 521 602	10 /37 176	20 521 022	0 7 2 7 7 0 0	25 109 940	1 660 200	100 060
ו 2	Domand		99,303,249 121 7/1 170	32,331,002 48 056 808	10,437,170	20,331,033	0,737,229	25,190,040	7 788 187	400,009
2	Customer		27 473 580	18 008 500	5 522 690	703 018	1,230,232	5 276	2,700,407	1,112,307
4	Total Current Rate Revenue		248,720,000	99,497,000	32,432,000	51 400 000	16.036.000	41.091.000	4,859,000	3 405 000
·			21017201000	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	02/102/000	0111001000	10/000/000	11/07 1/000	1,007,000	011001000
	Expressed as Unit Cost									
5	Energy	\$/kWh	\$0.02957	\$0.02889	\$0.03150	\$0.03035	\$0.02912	\$0.02927	\$0.02957	\$0.02876
6	Demand	\$/kW/mo	\$16.47	\$17.46	\$20.82	\$17.41	\$13.03	\$12.27	\$12.54	\$26.84
7	Customer	\$/Cust/mo	\$18.54	\$15.62	\$23.13	\$47.07	\$375.18	\$439.66	\$24.50	\$1,225.62
	Cost Classifications at Uniform	n Current Retu	rn							
8	Energy		98 939 877	33 556 100	9 876 410	20 114 130	8 774 446	24 521 928	1 682 297	414 565
9	Demand		121,619,568	52,793,443	14,088,965	28,393,268	7,339,470	14,882,475	2,859,134	1 262 812
10	Customer		28,160,555	19,999,517	4.967.205	670.413	40.679	5.116	407.785	2.069.840
11	Total Uniform Current Cost		248,720,000	106,349,060	28,932,579	49,177,812	16,154,596	39,409,519	4,949,216	3,747,217
					., . ,.					
	Expressed as Unit Cost									
12	Energy	\$/kWh	\$0.02940	\$0.02980	\$0.02980	\$0.02974	\$0.02924	\$0.02849	\$0.02980	\$0.02980
13	Demand	\$/kW/mo	\$16.45	\$19.18	\$17.81	\$16.39	\$13.18	\$11.50	\$12.86	\$30.47
14	Customer	\$/Cust/mo	\$19.00	\$16.53	\$20.81	\$44.89	\$376.66	\$426.35	\$24.91	\$1,340.57
15	Revenue to Cost Ratio at Current	Rates	1.00	0.94	1.12	1.05	0.99	1.04	0.98	0.91
	Cost Classifications at Propos	sed Return by S	schedule							
16	Energy		101,745,475	33,300,372	10,651,891	20,999,090	8,935,553	25,742,689	1,709,204	406,677
17	Demand		129,723,846	51,611,403	17,384,713	32,156,285	7,691,075	16,693,907	3,005,406	1,181,057
18	Customer		28,643,678	19,727,226	5,735,396	739,625	41,372	5,404	421,389	1,973,266
19	Total Proposed Rate Revenu	е	260,113,000	104,639,000	33,772,000	53,895,000	16,668,000	42,442,000	5,136,000	3,561,000
	Expressed as Unit Cost									
20	Energy	\$/kWh	\$0.03024	\$0 02958	\$0 03214	\$0 03105	\$0 02978	\$0 02991	\$0 03028	\$0 02924
21	Demand	\$/kW/mo	\$17.55	\$18 75	\$21.98	\$18.56	\$13.81	\$12.89	\$13.52	\$28.49
22	Customer	\$/Cust/mo	\$19.33	\$16.30	\$24.02	\$49.52	\$383.08	\$450.36	\$25.74	\$1,278.02
	Cost Classifications at Uniform	n Requested R	eturn							
23	Energy	quootou	101.178.013	34.315.179	10.099.826	20.569.136	8.972.935	25.076.643	1,720,353	423.943
24	Demand		129,574,068	56,303,142	15,038,521	30,328,109	7,772,653	15,705,622	3,066,004	1,360,017
25	Customer		29,360,919	20,807,922	5,188,529	706,000	41,533	5,247	427,026	2,184,662
26	Total Uniform Cost		260,113,000	111,426,243	30,326,875	51,603,244	16,787,120	40,787,511	5,213,383	3,968,622
	Expressed as Unit Cost									
27	Fnerav	\$/kWh	\$0 03007	\$0 03048	\$0 03048	\$0 03041	\$0 02990	\$0 02913	\$0 03048	\$0.03048
28	Demand	\$/kW/mo	\$17 52	\$20.45	\$19 N1	\$17 50	\$13.96	\$12.13	\$13.70	\$32.81
29	Customer	\$/Cust/mo	\$19.81	\$17.19	\$21.73	\$47.27	\$384.56	\$437.26	\$26.08	\$1,414.94
30	Dovonuo to Cost Datis at Dra	ad Datas	1 00	0.04	1 1 1	1 04	0.00	1.04	0.00	0.00
30	Revenue to Cost Ratio at Propose	eu Rales	1.00	0.94	1.11	1.04	0.99	1.04	0.99	0.90
31	Current Revenue to Proposed Co	st Ratio	0.96	0.89	1.07	1.00	0.96	1.01	0.93	0.86
20	Annual Consumption (m/M/b/o)		2 261 070	1 175 007	201 074	676 200	200 002	<u>840 777</u>	56 M	12 010
32 32	Monthly Average NCP Demand	(k\\))	5,304,079 615 990	229 AN7	65 917	111 380	100,092 16 112	107 884	18 526	2 15,910
00		()	100,105	100 052	10.005	1 2/15	0	1 1	1 264	120
34	Monthly Average Number of Cus	stomers	123,495	100,853	19,090	1,Z4J	7	I	1,304	129

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-E-12-08 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 3, p. 3 of 4

	Sumcost Scenario: AVU-E-12-08 Company Case AVU-E-10-01 Settlement Method	AVISTA UTILITIES Customer Cost An For the Twelve Mo	S alysis onths Ended June	30, 2012	I	daho Jurisdiction Electric Utility	1		10-10-12
	(b) (c) (d) (e	e) (f) System	(g) Residential Service	(h) General Service	(i) Large Gen Service	(j) Extra Large Gen Service	(k) Extra Large Service CP	(I) Pumping Service	(m) Street & Area Lights
	Description Meter Services	I OTAI	SCN I & Rilling Costs	SCN 11-12 by Schedule	SCN 21-22	SCN 25 Rate of Retur	SCN 25P	SCN 31-32	Scn 41-49
		s, meter reduing	a Dining 003t.	by Schedule	arnequested				
	Rate Base								
1	Services	45,622,000	37,307,157	7,359,316	450,806	0	0	504,721	0
2	Services Accum. Depr.	(16,622,000)	(13,592,556)	(2,681,306)	(164,247)	0	0	(183,891)	0
3	I otal Services	29,000,000	23,/14,602	4,678,010	286,558	0	0	320,830	0
4	Meters	20,634,000	11,920,038	6,231,158	1,759,439	35,061	6,159	682,146	0
5	Meters Accum. Depr.	(1,530,000)	(883,864)	(462,037)	(130,461)	(2,600)	(457)	(50,581)	0
6	Total Meters	19,104,000	11,036,173	5,769,121	1,628,977	32,461	5,702	631,565	0
7	Total Rate Base	48,104,000	34,750,775	10,447,131	1,915,536	32,461	5,702	952,395	0
8	Return on Rate Base @ 8.46%	4.069.603	2.939.919	883.828	162.054	2,746	482	80.573	0
9	Revenue Conversion Factor	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711	0.63711
10	Rate Base Revenue Requirement	6,387,629	4,614,482	1,387,253	254,360	4,310	757	126,467	0
	Fynenses								
11	Services Depr Exp	1,255,000	1 026 270	202,445	12 401	0	0	13.884	0
12	Meters Depr Exp	1.533.000	885.597	462,943	130.717	2.605	458	50.680	0
13	Services Operations Exp	333,000	272.309	53,716	3.290	0	0	3,684	0
14	Meters Operating Exp	545,000	314,841	164,582	46,472	926	163	18,017	0
15	Meters Maintenance Exp	29,000	16,753	8,758	2,473	49	9	959	0
16	Meter Reading	430,000	336,412	66,362	4,152	16,671	1,852	4,551	0
17	Billing	2,945,000	2,402,643	473,952	29,652	2,865	318	32,505	3,065
18	Total Expenses	7.070.000	5.254.824	1.432.757	229,157	23,116	2.800	124.280	3.065
19	Revenue Conversion Factor	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010	0.995010
20	Expense Revenue Requirement	7,105,456	5,281,177	1,439,943	230,306	23,232	2,814	124,904	3,081
21	Total Meter, Service, Meter Reading, and	13,493,085	9,895,660	2,827,195	484,666	27,542	3,571	251,370	3,081
22	Total Customer Bills	1,481,940	1,210,233	238,734	14,936	108	12	16,373	1,544
23	Average Unit Cost per Month	\$9.11	\$8.18	\$11.84	\$32.45	\$255.02	\$297.57	\$15.35	\$2.00
		Distrib	ution Fixed Co	sts per Custo	mer				
24	Total Customer Related Cost	29,360,919	20,807,922	5,188,529	706.000	41,533	5 247	427.026	2 184 662
25	Customer Related Unit Cost per Month	\$19.81	\$17.19	\$21.73	\$47.27	\$384.56	\$437.26	\$26.08	\$1,414.94
26	Total Distribution Demand Related Cost	51,861.024	24,639.071	7.079.654	15,152,454	1,384.083	426.568	1,989.689	1,189,506
27	Dist Demand Related Unit Cost per Month	\$35.00	\$20.36	\$29.65	\$1,014.49	\$12,815.59	\$35,547.33	\$121.52	\$770.41
28	Total Distribution Unit Cost per Month	\$54.81	\$37.55	\$51.39	\$1,061.76	\$13,200.15	\$35,984.59	\$147.60	\$2,185.34



Avista Utilities

Cost of Service / Rate Design Workshop

September 18, 2012 IPUC Workshop

Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 1 of 14

Settlement Stipulation (AVU-E-11-01)

10. <u>Cost of Service</u>. The Parties have agreed to exchange information and convene a public workshop, prior to the Company's next general rate case, with respect to the method of allocation of demand and energy among the customer classes such as the possible use of a revised peak credit method for classifying production costs, as well as consideration of the use of a 12 Coincident Peak (CP) (whether "weighted" or not) versus a 7 CP or other method for allocating transmission costs. This workshop will also address the merits of inclining or declining block rates for service schedules 11, 21, 25 and 31.





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 2 of 14

Workshop Topics

Item # 1 – Peak Credit Classification Method

Item # 2 – Allocation of Transmission Costs

Item # 3 – Merits of Inclining or Declining Block Rates





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 3 of 14

Item #1 - Peak Credit Classification Method

- 1. Review Previous Peak Credit Methodology
- 2. Discuss Avista Proposed Peak Credit Methodology
- 3. Why the change is preferable from Avista's viewpoint
- 4. Is the Proposed Peak Credit Methodology stable over time?



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 4 of 14

Prior Method

Avista's electric system resource costs were classified to energy and demand using a comparison of the replacement cost-per-kW of the Company's peaking units, to the replacement cost-per-kW of the Company's thermal and hydro generating facilities (separately).

- Created separate peak credit ratios applied to thermal plant and hydro plant.
- Transmission costs were assigned to energy and demand by a 50/50 weighting of the thermal and hydro peak credit ratios.
- Fuel and load dispatching expenses were classified entirely to energy.
- Peaking plant related costs were classified entirely to demand.



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 5 of 14

Proposed Method

Uses the system load factor to determine peak credit ratio.

- Stemmed from discussions at the February 2011 Cost of Service workshop.
- The Classification ratio is applied to all production costs.
- Calculation: One minus the load factor equals the demand percentage or peak credit ratio.

Net effect – slightly increases the overall production costs that are classified as demand-related.

- Using the prior method, approximately 32% of total production costs were classified as demand-related.
- Under the proposed load factor peak credit method, 36.4% of total production costs would be classified as demand-related.





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 6 of 14

Why does Avista view this methodology to be preferable?

- Tied to the Company's actual use of the system in the test year.
- Actual load factor represents current use of the system vs. historical replacement cost analysis which is based on vintage investments.
- Less complicated single ratio applied to all production costs vs. multiple ratios, weight dependent on each cost item's relationship to plant investment.
- Overall weighted demand/energy relationship stays the same when power costs are updated – not impacted by swings in the cost of fuel, unlike prior method.



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 7 of 14

7

Will the new methodology provide a "stable" demand/energy classification over time?

- Avista believes the proposed method will be more consistent over time versus the prior method.
- Proposed method demand proportion has varied from 34% to 39% in the last 5 years a range of 5%.
- Prior method demand proportion has varied from 23% to 34% in the last 5 years a range of 11% (driven in part by the cost of fuel)



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 8 of 14

Item #2 – Allocation of Transmission Costs

Historically, transmission costs were included in the production peak credit classification as they were considered extension of generation facilities

• Demand classified portion allocated to customer classes by 12 CP (average of the 12 monthly system coincident peak hours)

In the Settlement approved in AVU-E-10-01, the methodology was changed to now classify transmission costs as 100% demand.

- This is consistent with traditional NARUC approach.
- While the Settlement approved transmission classification as 100% demand, it kept the 12 CP allocation and required February 2011 workshop to discuss alternatives.
- In the AVU-E-11-01 general rate case, Avista proposed a <u>weighted</u> 12 CP allocation for transmission costs (stemming from February 2011 workshop discussions).





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 9 of 14

Item #2 – Allocation of Transmission Costs (continued)

Workshop Discussion – "consideration of the use of a 12 CP (whether "weighted" or not) versus a 7 CP or other method for allocating transmission costs".

- 1. 12 CP (average of the monthly system coincident peaks)
 - Captures relative contribution to demand throughout the year
 - Aligns with FERC Open Access transmission cost methodology
- 2. Weighted 12 CP see Handout
 - Weighted by Relative Monthly System Peaks
 - Captures seasonal impacts of capacity utilization
- 3. 7 CP (average of 4 winter and 3 summer monthly system coincident peaks)
 - Assumes no transmission demand cost in shoulder months



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 10 of 14

Item #3 – Merits of Inclining or Declining Block Rates for Schedules 11, 21, 25 and 31





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 11 of 14

Present Base Rates

Schedule 1 (Residential)

Basic Charge	\$5.25
First 600 kWh	7.848¢
Over 600 kWh	8.764¢

Schedule 11 (General Service)

Basic charge	\$10.00
First 3,650 kWh	9.338¢
Over 3,650 kWh	6.958¢
Demand over 20 kW	\$5.25

Schedule 21 (Large General Service)

First 250,000 kWh	6.039¢
Over 250,000 kWh	5.154¢
Demand 1st 50 kW	\$350
Over 50 kW	\$4.75

Schedule 25 (Extra Large General Service)

First 500,000 kWh	5.047¢
Over 500,000 kWh	4.275¢
Demand 1st 3,000 kVa	\$12,500
Over 3,000 kVa	\$4.50

Schedule 31 (Pumping)

12

Basic charge	\$8.00
1st block	8.939¢
2nd block	8.939¢
3rd block	7.620¢



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 12 of 14

Support for Declining Block Rates – Schedules 11, 21, and 25:

- Generally, the incremental fixed costs required to provide service to commercial and industrial customers do not increase proportionately with increasing energy usage.
 - As most of the Company's fixed costs of service are recovered through the energy charges (and demand charges where applicable), larger use customers are generally less costly to serve than smaller use customers on an embedded cost per kWh basis, as fixed costs are spread over a larger base of usage.
 - Within the Company's commercial and industrial schedules, there is also a substantial range of energy usage. Therefore, declining block rates for commercial and industrial customers generally reflect the cost of providing service within rate schedules, as well as across rate schedules.

Implementing rate structure changes can create potential customer bill volatility resulting from the new rate structure.





Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 13 of 14

Merits for Inclining Block Rates:

- Sends a conservation price signal, and penalizes large users.
- Can promote fuel conversion electric to natural gas fuel switching for residential customers.



Exhibit No. 12 Case Nos. AVU-E-12-08 and AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 4, Page 14 of 14

NATURAL GAS COST OF SERVICE STUDY

1
•

A cost of service study is an engineering-economic study, which apportions the revenue, expenses, and rate base associated with providing natural gas service to designated groups of customers. It indicates whether the revenue provided by customers recovers the cost to serve those customers. The study results are used as a guide in determining the appropriate rate spread among the groups of customers.

7 There are three basic steps involved in a cost of service study: functionalization,
8 classification, and allocation. See flow chart.

9 First, the expenses and rate base associated with the natural gas system under study are 10 assigned to functional categories. The uniform system of accounts provides the basic segregation 11 into production, underground storage, and distribution. Traditionally customer accounting, 12 customer information, and sales expenses are included in the distribution function and 13 administrative and general expenses and general plant rate base are allocated to all functions. This 14 study includes a separate functional category for common costs. Administrative and general costs 15 that cannot be directly assigned to the other functions have been placed in this category.

Second, the expenses and rate base items are classified into three primary cost components: 16 17 Demand, commodity or customer related. Demand (capacity) related costs are allocated to rate schedules on the basis of each schedule's contribution to system peak demand. Commodity 18 (energy) related costs are allocated based on each rate schedule's share of commodity 19 20 consumption. Customer related items are allocated to rate schedules based on the number of customers within each schedule. The number of customers may be weighted by appropriate 21 factors such as relative cost of metering equipment. In addition to these three cost components, 22 23 any revenue related expense is allocated based on the proportion of revenues by rate schedule.

> Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 1 of 9

NATURAL GAS COST OF SERVICE STUDY FLOWCHART



Pro Forma Results of Operations by Customer Group¹

1 Customer classes shown in this flowchart are illustrative and may not match the Company's actual rate schedules.

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 2 of 9

- 1 The final step is allocation of the costs to the various rate schedules utilizing the allocation 2 factors selected for each specific cost item. These factors are derived from usage and customer 3 information associated with the test period results of operations.
- 4

BASE CASE COST OF SERVICE STUDY

5

Production - Purchased Gas Costs

The Company has no natural gas production facilities to serve its retail customers. The natural gas costs included in the production function include the cost of gas purchased to serve sales customers, pipeline transportation to get it to our system, and expenses of the gas supply department.

The demand and commodity components of account 804 have been determined directly from the weighted average cost of gas (WACOG) approved in the most recent purchased gas adjustment (PGA) filing effective October 1, 2012. The allocation of these costs agrees with the gas costs computation used to determine pro forma results of operations.

The expenses of the gas supply department recorded in account 813 are classified as commodity related costs. The gas scheduling process includes transportation customers, so estimated scheduling dispatch labor expenses are allocated by throughput. The remaining gas supply department expenses are allocated by sales volumes.

18

Underground Storage

Underground storage rate base, operating and maintenance expenses are classified as
 commodity related and allocated to customer groups by winter throughput. This approach was
 proposed by commission Staff and accepted by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission in Case No.
 AVU-G-04-01.

23

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 3 of 9 1

Distribution Facilities Classification (Peak and Average)

2 Distribution mains and regulator station equipment (both general use and city gate stations) 3 are classified Demand and Commodity using the peak and average ratio for the distribution system. Peak demand is defined as the average of the five-day sustained peaks from the most 4 recent three years. Average daily load is calculated by dividing annual throughput by 365 (days in 5 the year). The average daily load is divided by peak load to arrive at the system load factor of 6 34.40%. This proportion is classified as commodity related. The remaining 65.60% is classified 7 as demand related. Meters, services and industrial measuring & regulating equipment are 8 classified as customer related distribution plant. Distribution operating and maintenance expenses 9 10 are classified (and allocated) in relation to the plant accounts they are associated with.

11

Customer Relations Distribution Cost Classification

12 Customer service, customer information and sales expenses are the core of the customer relations functional unit which is included with the distribution cost category. For the most part 13 14 these costs are classified as customer related. Exceptions include uncollectible accounts expense, 15 which is considered separately as a revenue conversion item, and any Demand Side Management amortization expense recorded in Account 908. Any demand side management investment costs 16 17 and amortization expense included in base rates would be included with the distribution function 18 and classified to demand and commodity by the peak and average ratio. At this point in time, the Company's demand side management investments in base rates have been fully amortized. All 19 current demand side management costs are managed through the Schedule 191 Public Purpose 20 21 Tariff Rider balancing account which is not included in this cost study.

22

Distribution Cost Allocation

Demand related distribution costs are allocated to customer groups (rate schedules) by each groups' contribution to the three year average five-day sustained peak. Commodity related

> Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 4 of 9

distribution costs are allocated to customer groups by annual throughput. Distribution main investment has been segregated into large and small mains. Small mains are defined as less than four inches, with large mains being four inches or greater. The small main costs use the same demand and commodity data, but large usage customers (Schedules 131, and 146) that connect to large system mains have been excluded from the allocations.

Most customer related costs are allocated by the annualized number of customers billed during the test period. Meter investment costs are allocated using the number of customers weighted by the relative current cost of meters in service at December 31, 2011. Services investment costs are allocated using the number of customers weighted by the relative current cost of typical service installations. Industrial measuring and regulating equipment investment costs are allocated by number of turbine meters which effectively excludes small usage customers.

12

Administrative and General Costs

General and intangible rate base items are allocated by the sum of Underground Storage 13 14 and Distribution plant. Administrative and general expenses are segregated into plant related, 15 labor related, revenue related and other. The plant related items are allocated based on total plant in service. Labor related items are allocated by operating and maintenance labor expense. 16 17 Revenue related items are allocated by pro forma revenue. Other administrative and general expenses are allocated 50% by annual throughput (classified commodity related) and 50% by the 18 sum of operating and maintenance expenses not including purchased gas cost or administrative & 19 20 general expenses. Whenever costs are allocated by sums of other items within the study, 21 classifications are imputed from the relationship embedded in the summed items.

22

Special Contract Customer Revenue

Three special contract customers receive transportation service from the Company. Rates for these customers were individually negotiated to cover any incremental costs and retain some

> Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 5 of 9

1 contribution to margin. The rates for these customers are not being adjusted in this case. The 2 revenue from these special contract customers has been segregated from general rate revenue and 3 allocated back to all the other rate classes by relative rate base. In treating these revenues like 4 other operating revenues their system contribution reduces costs for all rate schedules.

5

Revenue Conversion Items

In this study uncollectible accounts and commission fees have been classified as revenue related and are allocated by pro forma revenue. These items vary with revenue and are included in the calculation of the revenue conversion factor. Income tax expense items are allocated to schedules by net income before income tax less interest expense.

For the functional summaries on pages 2 and 3 of the cost of service study, these items are assigned to the component cost categories. The revenue related expense items have been reduced to a percent of all other costs and loaded onto each cost category b that ratio. Similarly, income tax items have been assigned to cost categories by relative rate base (as is net income).

The following matrix outlines the methodology applied in the Company Base Case naturalgas cost of service study.

Exhibit No. 12 Case No. AVU-G-12-07 T. Knox, Avista Schedule 5, p. 6 of 9 IPUC Case No. AVU-G-12-07 Methodology Matrix Avista Utilities Idaho Jurisdiction Natural Gas Cost of Service Methodology

Line	Account	Functional Category	Classification	Allocation
1	Underground Storage Plant 350 - 357 Underground Storage	Underground Storage	Commodity	E08 Winter throughput
	Distribution Plant			
2	374 Land	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other Dist Plant	S05 Sum of accounts 376-385
3	375 Structures	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other Dist Plant	S05 Sum of accounts 376-385
4	376(S) Small Mains	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D02/E06 Coincident peak, annual therms (both excl lg use cust)
5	376(L) Large Mains	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D01/E01 Coincident peak (all), annual throughput (all)
6	378 M&R General	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D01/E01 Coincident peak (all), annual throughput (all)
7	379 M&R City Gate	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D01/E01 Coincident peak (all), annual throughput (all)
8	380 Services	Distribution	Customer	C02, Customers weighted by current typical service cos
9	381 Meters	Distribution	Customer	C03, Customers weighted by average current meter cos
10	385 Industrial M&R	Distribution	Customer	C06, Large use customers
11	387 Other	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other Dist Plant	S05 Sum of accounts 376-385
	General Plant			
12	389-399 All General Plant	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from UG & D Plant	S03 Sum of Underground Storage and Distribution Plant in Service
	Intangible Plant			
13	303 Misc Intangible Plant	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service
14	303 Computer Software	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from UG & D Plant	S03 Sum of Underground Storage and Distribution Plant in Service
	Reserve for Depreciation			
15	Underground Storage	Underground Storage	Commodity same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
16	Distribution	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
17	General	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
18	Intangible	Distribution/Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
	Other Rate Base			
19	Accumulated Deferred FIT	All	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Plant in Service	S17 Sum of Total Plant in Service
20	Constuction Advances	Distribution	Customer	C10 Residential only
21	Gas Inventory	Underground Storage	Commodity from Underground Storage Plant	S14 Sum of Underground Storage Plant in Service
22	Gain on Sale of Office Bldg	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from UG & D Plant	S03 Sum of Underground Storage and Distribution Plant in Service
23	DSM Investment	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D01/E01 Coincident peak (all), annual throughput (all)
	Purchased Gas Expenses			
24	804 Purchased Gas Cost	Production	Demand/Commodity from PGA Tracker WACOG	D05/E07 PGA Demand / PGA Commodity
25	813 Other Gas Expenses	Production	Commodity	E01/E04 Annual Throughput / Annual Sales Therms
	Underground Storage O&M			
26	814 - 837 Underground Storage Exp	Underground Storage	Commodity	E08 Winter throughput

Line Account		Functional Category	Classification	Allocation			
	Distribution O&M						
1	870 OP Super & Engineering	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service			
2	871 Load Dispatching	Distribution	Commodity	E01 Annual throughput			
3	874 Mains & Services	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from related plant	S06 Sum of Mains and Services Plant in Service			
4	875 M&R Station - General	Distribution	Demand/Commodity from related plant	S08 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - General Plant in Service			
5	876 M&R Station - Industrial	Distribution	Customer from related plant	S19 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - Industrial Plant in Service			
6	877 M&R Station - City Gate	Distribution	Demand/Commodity from related plant	S09 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - City Gate Plant in Service			
7	878 Meter & House Regulator	Distribution	Customer from related plant	S07 Sum of Meter and Installation Plant in Service			
8	879 Customer Installations	Distribution	Customer	C05. Customers weighted by average current meter cos			
9	880 Other OP Expenses	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from other dist expense	esS04 Sum of Accounts 870 - 879 and 881 - 894			
10	881 Rents	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from other dist expense	esS04 Sum of Accounts 870 - 879 and 881 - 894			
11	885 MT Super & Engineering	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service			
12	886 MT of Structures	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other Dist Plant	S05 Sum of accounts 376-385			
13	887 MT of Mains	Distribution	Demand/Commodity from related plant	S21 Sum of Distribution Mains Plant in Service			
14	889 MT of M&R General	Distribution	Demand/Commodity from related plant	S08 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - General Plant in Service			
15	890 MT of M&R Industrial	Distribution	Customer from related plant	S19 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - Industrial Plant in Service			
16	891 MT of M&R City Gate	Distribution	Demand/Commodity from related plant	S09 Sum of Meas & Reg Station - City Gate Plant in Service			
17	892 MT of Services	Distribution	Customer from related plant	S20 Sum of Services Plant in Services			
18	893 MT of Meters & Hs Reg	Distribution	Customer from related plant	S07 Sum of Meter and Installation Plant in Service			
19	894 MT of Other Equipment	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service			
	Customer Accounting Expenses						
20	901 Supervision	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
21	902 Meter Reading	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
22	903 Customer Records & Collections	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
23	904 Uncollectible Accounts	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R03 Retail Sales Revenue			
24	905 Misc Cust Accounts	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
	Customer Service & Info Expenses						
25	907 Supervision	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
26	908 Customer Assistance	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
27	908 DSM Amortization	Distribution	Demand/Commodity by Peak & Average	D01/E01 Coincident peak (all), annual throughput (all)			
28	909 Advertising	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
29	910 Misc Cust Service & Info	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			
	Sales Expenses						
30	911 - 916 Sales Expenses	Customer Relations	Customer	C01 All customers (unweighted)			

Line Account		Functional Category	Classification	Allocation
	Admin & General Expenses			
1	920 Salaries	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
2	921 Office Supplies	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
3	922 Admin Expense Transferred - Credit	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
4	923 Outside Services	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
5	924 Property Insurance	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Plant in Service	S17 Sum of Total Plant in Service
6	925 Injuries & Damages	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
7	926 Pensions & Benefits	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Labpr O&M	S13 O&M Labor Expense
8	927 Franchise Requirements	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
9	928 Regulatory Commission	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
10	928 Commission Fees	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R01 Retail Sales Revenue
11	930 Miscellaneous General	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
12	931 Rents	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Other O&M	S02/E01 50% O&M excl Gas Purchases and A&G / 50% throughput
13	935 MT of General Plant	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Plant in Service	S17 Sum of Total Plant in Service
	Depreciation Expense			
14	Underground Storage	Underground Storage	Commodity same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
15	Distribution	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
16	General	Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
17	Intangible	Distribution/Common	Demand/Commodity/Customer same as related plant	Allocations linked to related plant accounts
	C		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ľ
	Taxes			
18	Property Tax	All	Demand/Commodity/Customer from related plant	S14/S15/S16 Sum of UG Plant/Sum of Dist Plant/Sum of Gen Plant
19	Miscellaneous Dist Tax	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service
20	State Income Tax	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R02 Net Income before Taxes less Interest Expense
21	Federal Income Tax	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R02 Net Income before Taxes less Interest Expense
22	Deferred FIT	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R02 Net Income before Taxes less Interest Expense
23	ITC	Revenue Conversion	Revenue	R02 Net Income before Taxes less Interest Expense
	Operating Revenues			
24	Revenue from Rates	Revenue	Revenue	Pro Forma Revenue per Revenue Study
25	Special Contract Revenue	All	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Rate Base	S01 Sum of Rate Base
26	Off System Sales	Production	Commodity from PGA Tracker	E04 Sales Therms
27	Miscellaneous Service Revenue	Distribution	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Dist Plant	S15 Sum of Distribution Plant in Service
28	Rent From Gas Property	All	Demand/Commodity/Customer from Rate Base	S01 Sum of Rate Base
29	Other Gas Revenue	Underground Storage	Commodity from Underground Storage Plant	S14 Sum of Underground Storage Plant in Service

	Sumcost Company Base Case AVU-G-04-01 Method	AVISTA UTILITIES Cost of Service General Summary For the Year Ended June 30, 2012			S eneral Summary d June 30. 2012	N: Id	/	10-Oct-12	
	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g) Residential	(h) Large Firm	(j) Interrupt	(k) Transport
Line	Description				System	Service	Service	Service	Service
LINE	Plant In Service				TOLAI	301101	Schiff	301131	SCI1 140
1	Production Plant								
2	Underground Storage Plan	t			10,832,000	7,986,151	2,606,033	40,792	199,024
3	Distribution Plant				160,940,000	134,562,866	24,897,046	381,443	1,098,645
4	Intangible Plant				2,880,000	2,391,170	460,142	7,063	21,625
5	General Plant				21,237,000	17,624,022	3,400,338	52,203	160,437
6	Total Plant In Service				195,889,000	162,564,209	31,363,559	481,502	1,479,731
7	Accum Depreciation Production Plant								
8	Underground Storage Plan	t			(3,970,000)	(2,926,978)	(955,128)	(14,951)	(72,944)
9	Distribution Plant				(56,320,000)	(47,953,864)	(7,900,330)	(122,542)	(343,264)
10	Intangible Plant				(1,273,000)	(1,056,672)	(203,614)	(3,126)	(9,589)
11	General Plant			_	(7,261,000)	(6,025,711)	(1,162,587)	(17,848)	(54,854)
12	Total Accumulated Depre	ciation			(68,824,000)	(57,963,224)	(10,221,659)	(158,467)	(480,650)
13	Net Plant				127,065,000	104,600,985	21,141,900	323,035	999,081
14	Accumlulated Deferred FIT				(24,281,000)	(20,150,297)	(3,887,603)	(59,683)	(183,417)
15	Miscellaneous Rate Base				8,146,000	6,128,328	1,854,175	28,951	134,547
16	Total Rate Base				110,930,000	90,579,015	19,108,473	292,302	950,211
17	Revenue From Retail Rates	5			63,338,000	47,851,692	14,995,946	201,088	289,275
18	Other Operating Revenues				156,000	127,635	26,644	408	1,314
19	Total Revenues				63,494,000	47,979,327	15,022,590	201,496	290,588
	Operating Expenses								
20	Purchased Gas Costs				33,351,000	23,596,182	9,619,766	133,184	1,868
21	Underground Storage Expe	enses			275,000	202,750	66,161	1,036	5,053
22	Distribution Expenses				4,972,000	4,151,083	748,901	9,399	62,617
23	Customer Accounting Expe	enses			2,306,000	2,227,555	76,950	571	923
24		enses			399,000	392,154	0,015	5	21
20	Admin & General Expenses	e			5 900 000	2,949 1 632 931	1 130 6/8	18 5/1	108 877
27	Total O&M Expenses	3			47,206,000	35,205,607	11,658,293	162,736	179,364
28	Taxes Other Than Income 1	Γονος			1 024 000	854 789	159 613	2 117	7 152
20 29	Depreciation Expense	anes			1,024,000	004,709	159,015	2,447	7,152
30	Underground Storage Plan	t Depr			165,000	121,650	39,697	621	3,032
31	Distribution Plant Depreciat	tion			4,076,000	3,415,369	623,992	9,436	27,203
32	General Plant Depreciation				1,974,000	1,638,170	316,065	4,852	14,913
33	Amortization of Intangible F	Plant		_	549,000	455,625	87,881	1,349	4,145
34	I otal Depr & Amort Exper	nse			6,764,000	5,630,814	1,067,634	16,259	49,292
35 36	Total Operating Expenses	6			2,021,000 57,015,000	43,085,932	13,497,159	4,408 185,849	246,060
37	Net Income				6,479,000	4,893,395	1,525,430	15,646	44,529
38	Rate of Return				5 84%	5 40%	7 98%	5.35%	4 69%
39	Return Ratio				1.00	0.92	1.37	0.92	0.80
20						0.02		0.02	0.00
40	Interest Expense				3,339,000	2,726,434	575,166	8,798	28,601

	Sumcost Company Base Case AVU-G-04-01 Method	AVIST. Summa For the	A UTIL ary by Year	-ITIES Functio Ended	on with Margin Anal June 30, 2012	Natural Gas Utility with Margin Analysis Idaho Jurisdiction ne 30, 2012							
	(b)	(b) (c) (d) (e)		(e)	(f)	(g) Residential	(h) Large Firm	(j) Interrupt	(k) Transport				
					System	Service	Service	Service	Service				
Line	Description				Total	Sch 101	Sch 111	Sch 131	Sch 146				
	Functional Cost Componer	nts at Cur	rent F	Rates									
1	Production				33,521,417	23,716,754	9,668,921	133,864	1,878				
2	Underground Storage				1,415,902	953,474	436,491	4,833	21,105				
3	Distribution				19,044,897	15,749,532	3,127,224	35,691	132,449				
4	Common			_	9,355,784	7,431,932	1,763,310	26,700	133,843				
5	Total Current Rate Reve	nue			63,338,000	47,851,692	14,995,946	201,088	289,275				
0 7	Total Margin Revenue a	enue ⊨xp t Current	Rates		33,168,720	23,482,973	5 422 333	68 948	289 275				
•	rotar margin revolue a	c ourroint	lititot	•	00,140,214	24,000,110	0,122,000	00,040	200,210				
	Margin per Therm at Current	Rates											
8	Production				\$0.00424	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00073				
9	Underground Storage				\$0.01806	\$0.01780	\$0.01999	\$0.01223	\$0.00817				
10	Common				\$0.24295 \$0.11035	\$0.29399 \$0.13973	\$0.14319	\$0.09036	\$0.05125 \$0.05170				
12	Total Current Margin Melo	ded Rate i	oer Th	erm –	\$0.38460	\$0.45488	\$0.24827	\$0.17456	\$0.11193				
					•••••	•••••	•	•	• • • • •				
4.5	Functional Cost Components at Uniform Current Return												
13	Production				33,521,417	23,716,754	9,668,921	133,864	1,878				
14	Distribution				1,301,729	1,018,713	332,425 2 634 104	5,203	25,381 111 077				
16	Common				9 362 360	7 515 337	2,034,104	26 977	135 854				
17	Total Uniform Current Cos	st		-	63,338,000	48,507,517	14,319,643	203,444	307,397				
18	Exclude Cost of Gas w / Rev	enue Exp			33,188,726	23,482,973	9,573,613	<u>132,</u> 140	0				
19	Total Uniform Current Ma	rgin		_	30,149,274	25,024,544	4,746,030	71,303	307,397				
	Margin par Thorm at Uniform	Current	Doturn										
20	Production	Current	Vetuin		\$0 00424	\$0,00436	\$0 00436	\$0 00436	\$0,00073				
21	Underground Storage				\$0.01763	\$0.01902	\$0.01522	\$0.01317	\$0.00982				
22	Distribution				\$0.24330	\$0.30346	\$0.12061	\$0.09469	\$0.05583				
23	Common			_	\$0.11943	\$0.14029	\$0.07711	\$0.06830	\$0.05257				
24	Total Current Uniform Ma	rgin Melde	ed Rat	e per	\$0.38460	\$0.46712	\$0.21731	\$0.18052	\$0.11894				
25	largin to Cost Ratio at Current Rates		1.00	0.97	1.14	0.97	0.94						
	Eurotional Cost Compone	ate at Pro	nosor	l Dator									
26	Production	its at Fiu	poser		33.521.324	23.716.688	9.668.895	133.864	1.878				
27	Underground Storage				1,920,688	1,319,496	564,632	6,688	29,872				
28	Distribution				22,530,362	18,595,034	3,734,430	44,235	156,663				
29	Common			_	9,926,626	7,899,855	1,860,727	28,083	137,961				
30	Total Proposed Rate Re	venue			67,899,000	51,531,073	15,828,685	212,869	326,373				
31	Exclude Cost of Gas w / Rev	enue Exp	d Dot	-	33,188,634	23,482,908	9,573,586	132,140	226 272				
32	Total Margin Revenue a	u Kal	.62	34,710,300	20,040,105	0,255,096	80,729	320,373					
	Margin per Therm at Propose	ed Rates											
33	Production				\$0.00424	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00073				
34	Underground Storage				\$0.02450	\$0.02463	\$0.02585	\$0.01693	\$0.01156				
35 35	Common				au.∠o/41 ¢n 10eeo	ΦU.34710 ¢n 11716	\$0.17099	φυ.11199 \$0.07110	JU.UDUDZ SU UZZZZ				
37	Total Proposed Margin M	elded Rat	e per ⁻	Therm	\$0.44278	\$0.52356	\$0.28640	\$0.20438	\$0.12629				
				_									
20	Functional Cost Componer	nts at Uni	form I	Propos	sed Return	22 746 690	0 660 005	100 004	1 070				
30	Underground Storage				33,321,324 1 88∕1 239	23,7 10,000	3,000,095 152 222	100,004 7 ADR	1,070				
40	Distribution				22.559.790	19.136.920	3.206.979	46.115	169.777				
41	Common				9,933,648	7,988,967	1,776,102	28,388	140,191				
42	Total Uniform Proposed C	Cost		_	67,899,000	52,231,774	15,105,298	215,462	346,466				
43	Exclude Cost of Gas w / Rev	enue Exp		_	33,188,634	23,482,908	9,573,586	132,140	0				
44	I otal Uniform Proposed N			34,710,366	28,748,866	5,531,712	83,322	346,466					
	Margin per Therm at Uniform	Propose	d Retu	ırn									
45	Production				\$0.00424	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00436	\$0.00073				
46	Underground Storage				\$0.02404	\$0.02593	\$0.02076	\$0.01796	\$0.01340				
47	Distribution				\$0.28778	\$0.35722	\$0.14684	\$0.11675	\$0.06569				
48	Common	Aorain M-		ate	\$0.12672	\$0.14913	\$0.08132	\$0.07187	\$0.05425				
49		nargin ivie	ided R	aie pi	Φ U.44278	φ υ. ວ 3664	₽U.∠ 3328	φ υ.∠10 95	φυ.1340 0				
50	Margin to Cost Ratio at Pro	posed R	ates		1.00	0.98	1.13	0.97	0.94				
51	Current Margin to Propose	d Cost Ra	atio		0.87	0.85	0.98	0.83	0.83				

 Sumcost
 AVISTA UTILITIES
 Natural Gas Utility

 Company Base Case
 Summary by Classification with Unit Cost Analysis
 Idaho Jurisdiction
 10-Oct-12

 AVU-G-04-01 Method
 For the Year Ended June 30, 2012
 (b)
 (c) (d) (e) (f) (g)
 (h) (j) (k)

			Residential	Large Firm	Interrupt	Transport
Lino	Description	System	Service	Service	Service	Service
LINE	Description	TULAI	3011101	Scillin	301131	301140
	Cost by Classification at Current Return by Schedul	e				
1	Commodity	34,160,448	23,838,005	9,991,218	172,884	158,342
2	Demand	15,568,367	11,351,736	4,131,987	27,201	57,443
3	Total Current Bate Bevenue	13,609,184	12,661,951	872,741	1,003	73,489
4		03,330,000	47,001,092	14,995,940	201,000	209,275
	Revenue per Therm at Current Rates					
5	Commodity	\$0.43577	\$0.44497	\$0.45747	\$0.43770	\$0.06127
6	Demand	\$0.19860	\$0.21190	\$0.18919	\$0.06886	\$0.02223
7	Customer	\$0.17361	\$0.23635	\$0.03996	\$0.00254	\$0.02844
8	Total Revenue per Therm at Current Rates	\$0.80797	\$0.89322	\$0.68662	\$0.50910	\$0.11193
	Cost per Unit at Current Rates					
9	Commodity Cost per Therm	\$0.43577	\$0.44497	\$0.45747	\$0.43770	\$0.06127
10	Demand Cost per Peak Day Therms	\$24.94	\$23.55	\$32.33	\$12.37	\$4.72
11	Customer Cost per Customer per Month	\$15.09	\$14.28	\$56.65	\$83.60	\$1,224.82
	On at her Olean Mandian at Uniform Original Datum					
12	Cost by Classification at Uniform Current Return	24 021 210	24 006 700	0 692 672	174 002	167 665
12	Demand	15 512 7/6	11 562 903	3,002,072	28 310	63 214
14	Customer	13,794,035	12.937.824	778.652	1.041	76.518
15	Total Uniform Current Cost	63,338,000	48,507,517	14,319,643	203,444	307,397
	Cost per Therm at Current Return					
16	Commodity	\$0.43412	\$0.44812	\$0.44334	\$0.44076	\$0.06488
17	Demand	\$0.19789	\$0.21584	\$0.17666	\$0.07167	\$0.02446
18	Customer	\$0.17596	\$0.24150	\$0.03565	\$0.00264	\$0.02961
19	Total Cost per menn at Current Return	ф0.607 <i>91</i>	φ0.90547	\$0.05505	\$0.51507	φ0.11094
	Cost per Unit at Uniform Current Return					
20	Commodity Cost per Therm	\$0.43412	\$0.44812	\$0.44334	\$0.44076	\$0.06488
21	Demand Cost per Peak Day Therms	\$24.85	\$23.99	\$30.19	\$12.87	\$5.19
22	Customer Cost per Customer per Month	\$15.29	\$14.59	\$50.55	\$86.75	\$1,275.30
23	Revenue to Cost Ratio at Current Rates	1.00	0.99	1.05	0.99	0.94
	Cost by Classification at Proposed Return by Sched	lule				
24	Commodity	35,512,391	24,784,909	10,371,125	178,930	177,427
25	Demand	17,107,424	12,536,458	4,468,962	32,747	69,257
26	Customer	15,279,184	14,209,705	988,597	1,193	79,690
27	Total Proposed Rate Revenue	67,899,000	51,531,073	15,828,685	212,869	326,373
	Revenue per Therm at Proposed Rates					
28	Commodity	\$0.45301	\$0.46265	\$0.47486	\$0.45300	\$0.06865
29	Demand	\$0.21823	\$0.23401	\$0.20462	\$0.08291	\$0.02680
30	Customer	\$0.19491	\$0.26525	\$0.04526	\$0.00302	\$0.03084
31	Total Revenue per Therm at Proposed Rates	\$0.86615	\$0.96191	\$0.72475	\$0.53893	\$0.12629
	Cost par Unit at Branspad Pates					
32	Commodity Cost per Therm	\$0.45301	\$0.46265	\$0.47486	\$0.45300	\$0.06865
33	Demand Cost per Peak Day Therms	\$27.40	\$26.00	\$34.97	\$14.89	\$5.69
34	Customer Cost per Customer per Month	\$16.94	\$16.03	\$64.17	\$99.38	\$1,328.16
	Cost by Classification at Uniform Proposed Return					
35	Commodity	35,374,366	24,965,244	10,041,098	180,260	187,764
30	Demand	17,047,939	12,762,074	4,176,242	33,968	75,655
38	Total Uniform Proposed Cost	67 899 000	52 231 77/	15 105 208	215 /62	346 466
50	Total Onionn'i Toposed Cost	07,033,000	52,251,774	13,103,230	210,402	340,400
	Cost per Therm at Proposed Return					
39	Commodity	\$0.45125	\$0.46601	\$0.45975	\$0.45637	\$0.07265
40	Demand	\$0.21747	\$0.23822	\$0.19122	\$0.08600	\$0.02927
41	Customer	\$0.19743	\$0.27075	\$0.04066	\$0.00312	\$0.03213
42	I otal Cost per Therm at Proposed Return	\$0.86615	\$0.97499	\$0.69162	\$0.54549	\$0.13406
	Cost per Unit at Uniform Proposed Return					
43	Commodity Cost per Therm	\$0.45125	\$0.46601	\$0.45975	\$0.45637	\$0.07265
44	Demand Cost per Peak Day Therms	\$27.31	\$26.47	\$32.68	\$15.45	\$6.21
45	Customer Cost per Customer per Month	\$17.16	\$16.36	\$57.64	\$102.85	\$1,384.13
46	Revenue to Cost Ratio at Pronosed Pates	1 00	0 00	1 05	0 00	0.04
47		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07
41	current Revenue to Froposed Cost Ratio	0.93	0.92	0.99	0.93	0.63

	Sumcost AVISTA UTILITIES Company Base Case Customer Cost Ana AVU-G-04-01 Method For the Year Ender			LITIES ost Anal Ended	ysis June 30, 2012	Natural Gas Utility Idaho Jurisdiction							10-Oct-12
	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)		(g) Residential		(h) Large Firm		(j) Interrupt		(k) Transport
l ine	Description				Total		Sch 101		Sch 111		Sch 131		Sch 146
	Meter, Servic	es. Met	ter Re	eading	& Billing Costs	b١	/ Schedule a	at F	Requested R	ate	of Return	<u>ו</u>	0011110
	Rate Base												
1	Services				49,451,000	\$	48,578,554	\$	844,170	\$	1,973	\$	26,303
2	Services Accum. Depr.				(22,558,000)	\$	(22,160,017)	\$	(385,084)	\$	(900)	\$	(11,999)
3	I otal Services				26,893,000		26,418,537		459,086		1,073		14,305
4	Meters				21,321,000	\$	18,565,797	\$	2,658,436	\$	5,024	\$	91,743
5	Meters Accum. Depr.				(4,746,000)	\$	(4,132,699)	\$	(591,761)	\$	(1,118)	\$	(20,422)
6	Total Meters				16,575,000		14,433,099		2,066,675		3,906		71,321
7	Total Rate Base				43,468,000		40,851,635		2,525,761		4,978		85,625
8	Return on Rate Base @ 8.4	6%			3 677 393		3 456 048		213 679		421		7 244
9	Revenue Conversion Factor	, o			0.63711		0.63711		0.63711		0.63711		0.63711
10	Rate Base Revenue Requi	rement			5,771,990		5,424,571		335,389		661		11,370
	-												
11	Expenses Services Depr Exp				1 224 000	¢	1 202 405	¢	20 805	¢	40	¢	651
12	Meters Depr Exp				632,000	Ψ ¢	550 330	Ψ ¢	78 802	Ψ ¢	1/0	Ψ ¢	2 710
13	Services Maintenance Exp				418 000	φ S	410 625	\$	7 136	\$	143	ŝ	2,713
14	Meters Maintenance Exp				415.000	\$	361.372	\$	51,745	\$	98	\$	1.786
15	Meter Reading				252.000	\$	247.676	\$	4.304	\$	3	\$	17
16	Billing				1,702,000	\$	1,672,795	\$	29,069	\$	23	\$	113
47	T / 1 C				4 0 40 000		4 4 4 5 00 4		404.050				5 500
17	I otal Expenses				4,643,000		4,445,204		191,950		338		5,509
10	Expense Revenue Require	ment			4 666 289		0.995009 4 467 501		192 913		0.995009 340		0.995009
15	Expense Revenue Require	ment			4,000,200		4,407,001		132,310		040		0,000
20	Total Meter, Service, Met	er Read	ing, a	nd	10,438,280		9,892,072		528,301		1,001		16,906
21	Total Customer Bills				901,972		886,495		15,405		12		60
22	Average Unit Cost per Mont	h			\$11.57		\$11.16		\$34.29		\$83.41		\$281.77
Fixed Costs per Customer													
23	Total Customer Related Cost				15,476,695		14,504,456		887,957		1,234		83,048
24	Customer Related Unit Cost p	er Month	٦		\$17.16		\$16.36		\$57.64		\$102.85		\$1,384.13
25	Other Non-Gas Costs				19,233,671		14,244,410		4,643,754		82,088		263,419
26	Other Non-Gas Unit Cost per	Month			\$21.32		\$16.07		\$301.44		\$6,840.63		\$4,390.31
27	Total Fixed Unit Cost per M	onth			\$38.48		\$32.43		\$359.09		\$6,943.48		\$5,774.44