



The amendments to the PCA deferral mechanism requested by the Company in greater detail are as follows:

- Changes in system load requirements

The cost of power to serve changes in system load requirements is not included as part of the PCA mechanism. The Company contends that this cost is substantial and needs to be reflected in the PCA mechanism.

System load requirements, the Company states, have been impacted by increases in both retail and wholesale loads. Retail loads have increased due to load growth and colder than normal weather. Changes in wholesale loads have also impacted the amount of power that needs to be purchased. Wholesale loads are impacted by the expiration of both purchase and sale contracts and by increased takes under contracts because of the high short-term market prices.

Holding system load requirements to levels from the last general rate case in the existing PCA mechanism, the Company states, must be changed.

- Actual thermal generation.

The current PCA mechanism models the amount of Colstrip and Kettle Falls thermal generation based on the short-term market price of power for the month and the incremental operating cost of the unit. Power supply expenses associated with thermal plant forced outages, the Company states, are not included in the current PCA mechanism because the mechanism is based on modeled rather than actual generation.

- Calculation of costs for deferral.

The power costs for deferral purposes under the existing PCA mechanism are limited to the effect of short-term market prices on short-term transactions, Rathdrum turbine generation and fuel cost, hydro electric generation, the modeled impact of thermal generation and PURPA contracts. The Company is proposing to amend the PCA mechanism to include the impact of changes in retail and wholesale system load requirements and changes in actual thermal generation. Specific power supply accounts included for deferral purposes under the amended PCA mechanism would include Account 447—Sales for Resale, Account 501—Fuel (thermal), Account 547—Fuel (combustion turbine), and Account 555—Purchased Power. Deferred costs would be based on the difference between the actual revenues and expenses recorded in these accounts, and the normalized level for these accounts approved by the Commission in the last general rate case.

- Centralia

The Centralia steam generating plant is included in the PCA based on fixed levels of “authorized” generation and “authorized” fuel costs. In May 2000 Centralia was sold. The Company is proposing to modify the PCA to reflect the elimination of Centralia generation and fuel costs as a result of the sale. The Company proposes to reflect a credit for Centralia operation and maintenance expense, depreciation, taxes and return on investment as these costs no longer exist as a result of the sale. Replacement power costs would be captured in the difference between actual and authorized levels of costs in Account 555—Purchased Power.

- Coyote Springs 2

The Coyote Springs 2 project is a combined-cycle natural gas-fired combustion turbine with generation output of approximately 280 MW. The project is fully licensed. Construction of this plant began in January 2001. Completion of the project is expected in the summer of 2002. Under the modified PCA mechanism proposed, the increase in fuel costs associated with the plant as well as the impact on sales for resale and purchased power will be reflected in the calculation of PCA deferral. In addition, the Company proposes to reflect a charge in the PCA mechanism for operating and maintenance expense, depreciation, taxes and return on investment associated with the Coyote Springs 2 project until such time as these costs are reflected in general rates.

- Portland General Electric (PGE) capacity sale

The PGE capacity contract revenues reflected in Account 447—Sales for Resale, the Company states, will be increased to include additional amortization for ratemaking purposes so that the total PGE contract revenue is equivalent to the revenue that would have occurred absent the monetization of the contract. Stated differently, the monthly PCA deferrals will not be impacted by the PGE contract monetization, because revenues will be adjusted to the level under the old contract and that same level of revenue is reflected in the authorized amounts from the last general rate case.

- Retail Load Revenue Adjustment

Since actual system load requirements will determine the actual power supply revenues and expenses under the Company’s proposed changes to the PCA, the Company states, that it is appropriate to include a revenue adjustment for the difference between actual and authorized

revenue in the amended PCA mechanism. Changes in wholesale sales contracts will be picked up in the calculation of the difference between actual and authorized revenues in Account 447. A retail revenue adjustment would be included to reflect the difference between actual and authorized retail revenue, adjusted for distribution costs to serve load growth.

Because the Company incurs incremental delivery cost to serve new load, the Company states it would not be appropriate to reflect the entire amount of difference between actual and authorized retail revenue in the deferral mechanism, as a portion of increased retail revenue is offset by increased costs to serve new load. The Company is proposing a distribution cost adjustment to retail revenue based on increases in customers by rate schedule. The difference between actual customers and authorized customers would be multiplied by distribution costs per customer from the Company's last cost-of-service study to arrive at the distribution cost adjustment.

- Risk Sharing

The Company is proposing to defer 90% of the differences described above under the amended PCA deferral mechanism. The remaining 10% of the differences would not be deferred and would impact earnings in the month they were incurred. The 90%/10% sharing would not be applied to the Centralia and Coyote Springs 2 adjustments for operation and maintenance expense, depreciation, taxes and return on investment. The 90%/10% sharing mechanism is being proposed as an incentive for the Company to keep power supply costs as low as possible and to reflect a sharing between customers and shareholders. The Company points out that it does not have any influence on the short-term market price of power.

- Balancing Account Trigger

The current trigger for implementing a PCA rebate or surcharge is \$3 million or about 2.5% of base revenues. Only two surcharges or rebates can be in place at one time. Two surcharges or rebates amount to \$6 million or about 5% of base revenues. The Company is proposing to raise the limit on surcharges or rebates to \$12 million or about 10% of base revenues. The Company suggests, however, that this limit be a guideline rather than a hard and fast rule. If circumstances arise that justify either a different trigger or limit amount, the Company proposes that it have the flexibility to structure its request to meet the circumstances.

- Interest on Balancing Account

The Company proposes that the amended PCA mechanism include a calculation of interest using the same methodology approved for calculating interest on deferred natural gas cost balances (i.e., the customer deposit rate—reference O.N. 28624, Case No. AVU-G-00-4).

- Periodic Reporting

The Company notes that it currently provides reports to the Commission on a monthly basis related to the deferrals and will continue to do so under the amended PCA mechanism. The reports would include all calculations and accounting entries.

The Company in its filing requested that its Application be processed under Modified Procedure, i.e. by written submission rather than by hearing. Reference Rules of Procedure, IDAPA 31.01.01.201-204. At Staff's request, the Commission agreed to defer any decision regarding Modified Procedure until after Staff and parties had completed their analysis. On February 1, 2001, the Commission issued Notices of Application and Intervention Deadline. Potlatch Corporation was the only party to intervene. Reference Order No. 28638.

Staff reports that it has now completed its analysis. Based on discussions with the Company and a more complete understanding of the Company's Application and the ramifications of the proposed changes, Staff notes its concurrence with the Company's request for Modified Procedure. Pursuant to agreement of all parties, Staff proposes a standard three-week comment period beginning March 14, 2001, to be followed by a one-week period for Company reply.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that the Commission has preliminarily found that the public interest regarding proposed modifications to the Company's existing Power Cost Adjustment (PCA) methodology may not require a hearing to consider the issues presented and that the Application may be processed under **Modified Procedure**, i.e., by written submission rather than by hearing. Reference Commission Rules of Procedure, IDAPA 31.01.01.201-204.

YOU ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED that the Commission will not hold a hearing in this proceeding unless it receives written comment opposing the use of Modified Procedure and stating why Modified Procedure should not be used. Reference IDAPA 31.01.01.203.

YOU ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED that **the deadline for filing written comments or protests** with respect to the Application and the Commission's use of Modified Procedure in Case

No. AVU-E-01-01 is **Wednesday, April 4, 2001** Persons desiring a hearing must specifically request a hearing in their written protests or comments.

YOU ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED that pursuant to agreement of the parties and the Commission the following **additional scheduling** is adopted:

April 11, 2001                      Avista Corporation deadline for filing reply comments.

YOU ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED that if no written comments or protests are received within the deadline, the Commission will consider the matter on its merits and enter its Order without a formal hearing. If comments or protests are filed within the deadline, the Commission will consider them and in its discretion may set the matter for hearing or may decide the matter and issue its Order on the basis of the written positions before it. Reference IDAPA 31.01.01.204.

YOU ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED that the Application and Company proposed modifications to the Power Cost Adjustment (PCA) methodology have been filed with the Commission and are available for public inspection during regular business hours at the Commission's office and at the Idaho offices of Avista Corporation. Written comments concerning this Application should be mailed to the Commission and the Company at the addresses reflected below.

COMMISSION SECRETARY  
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
PO BOX 83720  
BOISE, IDAHO 83720-0074

Street Address for Express Mail:

472 W. WASHINGTON ST  
BOISE, ID 83702-5983

DAVID J. MEYER, ESQ.  
SENIOR VP AND GENERAL COUNSEL  
AVISTA CORPORATION  
1411 E. MISSION AVE  
PO BOX 3727  
SPOKANE, WA 99220-3727  
And  
THOMAS D. DUKICH, DIRECTOR  
RATES & TARIFF ADMINISTRATION  
AVISTA CORPORATION  
1411 E. MISSION AVE  
PO BOX 3727  
SPOKANE, WA 99220

All comments should contain the case caption and case number shown on the first page of this document.

**ORDER**

In consideration of the foregoing and as more particularly described above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED and the Commission in Case No. AVU-E-01-01 does hereby approve the above schedule for Modified Procedure.

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this \_\_\_\_\_ day of December 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DENNIS S. HANSEN, PRESIDENT

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL KJELLANDER, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jean D. Jewell  
Commission Secretary

vld/O:AVU-E-01-01\_sw2