**Exhibit No. DPK-1T**

**Dockets UE-090704 UG-090705**

**Witness: Danny P. Kermode**

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**  **Complainant,****v.****PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,**  **Respondent.** | **DOCKET UE-090704****DOCKET UG-090705****(*Consolidated)*** |
|  |  |

**TESTIMONY OF**

**DANNY P. KERMODE**

**STAFF OF**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND**

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

***Working Capital***

**November 17, 2009**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[I. INTRODUCTION 1](#_Toc246088114)

[II. SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY 3](#_Toc246088115)

[III. INVESTOR-SUPPLIED WORKING CAPITAL 4](#_Toc246088116)

[A. Overview of Company Proposal 4](#_Toc246088117)

[B. C*omputation* of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital 6](#_Toc246088118)

[C. *Allocation* of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital 9](#_Toc246088119)

[D. Summary 13](#_Toc246088120)

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit No. DPK-2, Staff Schedule of Investor-Supplied Working Capital

Exhibit No. DPK-3, Staff Schedule of the Allocation of Investor-Supplied Working Capital

# I. INTRODUCTION

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

A. My name is Danny P. Kermode. My business address is The Richard Hemstad Building, 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W., P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504. My email address is dkermode@utc.wa.gov.

**Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

A. I am employed by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (“Commission”) as a Regulatory Analyst.

**Q. How long have you been employed by the Commission?**

A. I have been employed by the Commission since 1996.

**Q. Please describe your educational background.**

A. I graduated in 1982 from Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona with a Bachelor of Science in Accounting. Later that same year, I attended San Carlos University in the Philippines for postgraduate studies in economic analysis and quantitative business analysis. I am licensed in Washington as a Certified Public Accountant (“CPA”).

 In 1992 and 1993, I was a member of the faculty at the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (“NARUC”) Annual Regulatory Studies Program, held at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan. I taught classes in Financial and Regulatory Accounting Standards and in Deferred Tax Accounting. In 2008 and 2009, I was a member of the faculty at the NARUC Utility Rate School in San Diego, California. In addition, in 2008 and 2009 I also taught regulatory accounting at the Institute of Public Utilities’ Advanced Regulatory Studies Program.

 I published an article in the Journal of the American Water Works Association titled *Contributions in Aid of Construction: IRS Final Regulations* (2002). I later published an article in the National Regulatory Research Institute’s Journal of Applied Regulation titled *Regulatory Provision of Income Taxes for S Corporations and Other Nontaxable Business Forms* (2004).

**Q. Please d**escribe **your professional background.**

A. I am a financial professional with 25-plus years experience in private practice, industry, and government. I spent 10 years as a CPA in private practice in Phoenix, Arizona, from 1983 to 1993, where I was an expert witness in a number of utility cases before the Arizona Corporation Commission, the state’s public utility regulatory body.

 From 1994 to 1996, I was the controller for the Rocky Mountain Institute, a large internationally-recognized non-profit organization that conducts research and performs services in the energy field.

 Since my employment at the Commission in 1996, I have testified in numerous cases including three PacifiCorp general rate cases, Dockets UE-032065, UE-050684, and UE-061546, and two Avista general rate cases, Dockets UE-070804 and UE-090134. I testified on accounting and income tax issues in the 2001 rate case of Olympic Pipeline Company, Docket TO-011472. I also testified in four water company general rate cases: American Water Resources, Docket UW-980258; Rainier View Water Co., Inc, Docket UW-010877; Marbello Water Company, Docket UW-041181, and Iliad Water Service, Inc., Docket UW-060343. I also testified regarding income taxes in the Verizon Northwest, Inc. general rate case, Docket UT-040788.

# II. SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

**Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this general rate case of Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (“PSE” or “the Company”)?**

A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the allowances for investor-supplied working capital, as presented by PSE for its electric operations on line 45 in Company witness Story’s Exhibit JHS-4, Page 4-A and for its natural gas operations on line 45 in Company witness Stranik’s Exhibit No. MJS-4, Page 4-A. I propose corrections to the beginning amounts for working capital in the columns labeled “Actual Results of Operations” of their exhibits. The results of these corrections are incorporated into Staff witness Breda’s Exhibit No. KHB-2, Page 2.1, Line 40 and Exhibit No. KHB-3, Page 3.1, Line 37.

Q. Have you prepared any exhibits in support of your testimony?

A. Yes. I have prepared the following exhibits in support of my testimony:

* Exhibit No. DPK-2, Staff Computation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital
* Exhibit No. DPK-3, Staff Allocation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital.

# III. DISCUSSION

## A. Overview of Investor-Supplied Working Capital

**Q. Does the Company provide for working capital in its filing?**

A. Yes. PSE included working capital in its electric operations rate base in the amount of $130.7 million, as shown in Company witness Story’s Exhibit JHS-3, Page 3.04. For its natural gas operations, rate base includes $51.1 million for working capital, as shown in Company witness Stranik’s Exhibit No. MJS-3, Page 3.04.

**Q. Please briefly discuss working capital and its significance in rate making.**

A. Working capital is a measure of financial liquidity reflecting a company’s ability to meet its day-to-day operational requirements inherent in a business cycle. A business cycle is made up of three basic stages – production, sales and collection of revenue from customers. The costs of production and sales are incurred prior to collection of the related revenues. Working capital is customarily defined as the funds needed by a company to pay its current obligations while waiting for payment from its customers.

From the regulatory perspective, working capital is measured to quantify the amount of investment associated with it. This measured amount is then included in rate base in order to provide a return on the related investment.

**Q. What methodology did PSE use to compute its proposed working capital amounts?**

A. The Company used the balance-sheet approach, more commonly known as the “Investor-Supplied Working Capital” approach, for both its electric and natural gas operations.

Q. Please explain the basic concept of the Investor-Supplied Working Capital method.

A. Broadly speaking, the Investor-Supplied Working Capital method measures the difference between the capital invested in a business and the long-term investments in the business. Investor-supplied working capital is the amount of invested capital that is provided by investors, and available for the Company’s use, over and above the Company’s investments in operating plant, non-operating plant, and other specific items of investment. The excess of invested capital over total investment represents investor-supplied working capital.

 Commonly, investor-supplied working capital is first derived as a total company amount and then that total amount is allocated to the different operating and non-operating segments of the business.

**Q. Did you review the Company’s investor-supplied working capital amounts it proposes to include in its electric and gas rate bases?**

A. Yes. My review encompassed PSE’s *computation* of total investor-supplied working capital and its *allocation* of that total to its gas and electric operations.

## B. Computation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital

**Q. Is the methodology PSE used to *compute* total investor-supplied working capital consistent with the method it used in its prior general rate case, Dockets UE-072300 and UG-072301?**

A. Yes. As it did in that last general rate case, the Company develops a single combined computation for its natural gas and electric operations, although the schedule is filed as separate identical exhibits in each witness’ testimony.[[1]](#footnote-1) Prior to its last general rate case, the Company computed investor-supplied working capital for its electric and gas segments individually through separate schedules for each segment. Performing separate computations of investor-supplied working capital tended to understate the proper amount of investor-supplied working capital.

**Q. Please describe your review of the Company’s computation of total investor-supplied working capital.**

A. Total investor-supplied working capital is a computation involving balance sheet accounts. In order to confirm the Company’s numbers, I reviewed the balance sheet accounts of PSE’s trial balance for the test year and compiled each grouping of accounts directly from that data. This allowed me not only to confirm the groupings provided by PSE in its working capital computation, but also to review the reasoning the Company used for its classifications

**Q. Does Staff propose any adjustment to the Company’s calculation of total investor-supplied working capital?**

A. Yes. Exhibit No. DPK-2,Staff Computation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital, presents an adjustment to the Company’s computation of its beginning total investor-supplied working capital.

**Q. Please generally describe Exhibit No. DPK-2.**

A. Exhibit No. DPK-2 is a one-page exhibit that is based upon the Company’s average-of-monthly averages (“AMA”) of its balance sheet accounts for the test year ended December 31, 2008. Column (a) of the schedule provides a description of the line items in the schedule. Column (b) shows PSE’s computation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital for the test year. Column (c) reflects Staff’s adjustment to total investor-supplied working capital. Column (d) is the Staff adjusted total investor-supplied working capital amount. The schedule follows the same Investor-Supplied Working Capital format used by the Company in its case.

Starting at the line 1 of the exhibit, the schedule begins with the computation of Average Invested Capital. Following the Total Average Invested Capital (line 14), the computations for Average Operating Investments for Electric, Gas, Construction Work in Progress, and Non-Operating Investments are shown. The exhibit reflects the Total Average Investment at line 63. Lastly, line 65 shows Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital before allocation.

Q. Please explain the adjustment Staff proposes to the Company’s computation of total investor-supplied working capital?

A. Staff’s proposed adjustment removes from total working capital, two amounts related to the Crystal Mountain environmental remediation: 1) a Crystal Mountain insurance receivable of $7.5 million; and 2) an offsetting accrued liability of $624,000. Removing these amounts from working capital results in their inclusion in non-operating investments.

 Staff removes these Crystal Mountain amounts from working capital because Commission has not approved any deferral or petition for recovery of the costs. Although the Company requested deferral of the costs in Docket UE-070724, the request was later withdrawn.[[2]](#footnote-2)

 The net effect of Staff’s adjustment increases non-operating investments by $6.9 million, which reduces total investor-supplied working capital by the same amount and results in a Staff total investor-supplied working capital of $188.5 million.

## C. Allocation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital

Q. Briefly describe how total investor-supplied working capital, once computed, is *allocated* to the different business segments.

A. Once total investor-supplied working capital is derived, it must be allocated to the different operating and non-operating segments of the Company. To correctly allocate, we must assume a relationship between the total working capital amount and each of the operating segments. The assumption we make is that the relationship of total investor-supplied working capital to total average investment is the same relationship that each segment’s working capital has to its related investment.

For example, if the computed total investor-supplied working capital is two percent of the total average investment, then it is assumed that each segment’s working capital will also be two percent of each segment’s average investment. This relationship is called the “Working Capital Ratio”. To allocate total investor-supplied working capital, the Working Capital Ratio is applied to each operating segment’s total average investment. The result is the working capital allowance included in rate base for PSE’s electric and gas operations.

Q. Please summarize the Company’s proposed allocation of its total investor-supplied working capital?

A. PSE is proposing a total investor-supplied working capital of $195 million. Of that amount, the Company proposes to allocate $130.7 million to its electric operations and $51.1 million to its gas operations. The remaining $13.6 million is allocated to non-operating.

**Q. Is the methodology used by PSE to *allocate* total investor-supplied working capital consistent with the method it used in its prior general rate case?**

A. No. In the prior case, PSE did not reduce the gas operation’s total investment by Construction Work in Progress (“CWIP”) in order to compute the Working Capital Ratio, even though in the same case it reduced the electric operation’s total investment for CWIP.

 In contrast, in the current case, the Company has proposed a CWIP deduction for both operating segments including its gas segment.[[3]](#footnote-3) However, as discussed below, that change did not go far enough to be fully consistent with Staff’s position that all CWIP should be removed prior to computing the Working Capital Ratio. Staff, therefore, presents an adjustment to remove all CWIP from the development of the Working Capital Ratio.

 Other than this change, the Company’s methodology for the allocation of total investor-supplied working capitalis consistent with the prior case and has been accepted by Staff.

Q. Please discuss in more detail your adjustment to the Company’s computation of the Working Capital Ratio?

A. In Company witness Story’s Exhibit No. JHS-3, Page 3.04 for PSE’s electric operations and Company witness Stranik’s Exhibit No. MJS-3, Page 3.04 for PSE’s natural gas operations, the Company correctly reduces total investment by the amount of its CWIP. However, the Company’s CWIP adjustments only reduce the electric computation by CWIP solely related to electric operations. Similarly, total investment for gas is reduced only for gas-related CWIP.

 The Working Capital Ratio should be computed without the inclusion of any CWIP because CWIP does not use or produce working capital and, therefore, should not be used as a component of a working capital allocator. Therefore, all CWIP must be removed prior to the computation of the Working Capital Ratio. Staff’s proposed adjustment reduces total investment for the additional CWIP amounts not recognized by the Company in its allocation to both its electric and gas operations.

**Q. Does Staff’s adjustment affect the total investor-supplied working capital computed on your Exhibit No. DPK-2?**

A. No. This adjustment does not affect Staff’s total investor-supplied working capital, which stays at $188.5 million. It does, however, effect the allocation of the $188.5 million to the different business segments, including non-operating.

**Q. What is the result of Staff’s adjustment to the allocation of total working capital to the different operating segments.**

A. This adjustment to the Working Capital Ratio, combined with the decrease in total investor-supplied working capital, decreases the Company’s amount allocated to electric operations by $3 million, whereas the Company’s amount allocated to gas operations increases by only $173,813. The amount of total working capital allocated by PSE to non-operating decreases by $4.0 million, as a result of Staff’s adjustment.

Q. Have you prepared an exhibit that summarizes Staff’s allocation of its total investor-supplied working capital?

A. Yes. Exhibit No. DPK-3, Staff Allocation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital, compares the Company and Staff proposed allocation of total investor-supplied working capital. As shown on Exhibit No. DPK-3, after its proposed adjustments, Staff allocates $127.7 million to electric operations, $51.3 million to gas operations, and the remaining $9.5 million to non-operating.

**Q. Please describe your Exhibit No. DPK-3, Allocation of Total Investor-Supplied Working Capital.**

A. Exhibit No. DPK-3 is a one-page exhibit that presents the allocation of total investor-supplied working capital that was computed on Exhibit No. DPK-2. Column (a) of the schedule provides a description of the line items in the schedule. Column (b) shows the Company’s proposed allocation computations and results. Column (c) shows the Staff proposed adjustment for additional CWIP to the Company’s allocation. Column (d) is the result of Staff’s adjusted allocation of its total investor-supplied working capital amount.

## D. Summary

**Q. Please describe the result of all Staff adjustments affecting investor-supplied working capital.**

A. Staff’s review of the Company’s proposed total investor-supplied working capital resulted in a change in the Allowance for Working Capital, as shown in the “Actual Results of Operations” columns in Company witness Story’s Exhibit JHS-4, Page 4-A, line 45 for electric operations and in Company witness Stranik’s Exhibit No. MJS-4, Page 4-A, line 45 for natural gas operations.

 The total result of Staff adjustments is a $6.8 million decrease to total investor-supplied working capital. Staff’s proposals decrease electric revenue requirement by $377,957 and gas revenue requirement by $22,052.

**Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

A. Yes.

1. Exhibit No. JHS-3, Page 3.04 and Exhibit No. MJS-3, Page 3.04. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In March 2008, PSE withdrew its petition explaining the insurance carrier agreed to cover the costs under PSE’s general liability policy. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Exhibit No. MJS-3, Page 3.04 at 2:68-94. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)