The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Laurel Wright Submission Time: Jul 14 2021 10:55AM Email: Lkw83835@yahoo.com Telephone: 208-682-0658 Address: 11856 N Kelly Rae Dr Hayden, ID 83835

Name of Utility Company: Avista

Case ID: AVU-G-21-04

Comment: "I received a flier in my Avista bill this month that states they're asking the Idaho PUC to approve a rate increase of 13.5% in natural gas. It's the annual PGA. Avista states that one reason for the increase is the ending of a rebate customers are receiving from last year's PGA. That, to me, is no reason to jack up my bill. They say that their purpose is to increase annual natural gas revenues by 9 million dollars, or 13.5%. I can understand wanting to increase revenues. Everyone in the world would like to have a 13.5% increase in income. But we don't go to our neighbors and friends and stick our hands in their pockets and tell them that we just want 13.5% more money than we're getting currently. What the heck! The flier also states that Avista filed a second request for rate adjustment, which is the Deferred Balances Credit filing, which Avista states is to return to customers "deferred balances related to depreciation expense, Accumulated Funds Used During Construction (AFUDC), and CARES Act benefits." This will return to customers, according to the flier, \$1.9 million, or 2.9%. Avista goes on to state that "These rate adjustment filings are separate and distinct from the Settlement Stipulation filed on June 14, 2021, related to the pending general rate case filing, that, if approved, would reduce customer's natural gas bills by an overall 4.5%, also on Sept 1, 2021." So it looks to me like Avista is expecting the Settlement Stipulation to be approved, and that they will have to pay 4.5% back to their customers. In retaliation, they want to jack up my natural gas bill by 13.5%! (An additional 2.9% would be paid out to customers with the Deferred Balances Credit filing (the 2nd recent filing). Please do not approve Avista's filing for such a huge increase, especially since it appears that they're asking the customer to reimburse Avista for paying the customer in the Settlement Stipulation. If Avista got caught doing something financially unethical and have to return monies their customers (the Settlement Stipulation filed on 6/14/21), why should the customer then have to reimburse Avista to cover the cost of Avista's unethical behavior?? Sincerely, Laurel Wright <>< "
