Exhibit No. \_\_T (TES-1T)
Dockets UE-072300/
UG-072301/UG-080064
Witness: Thomas E. Schooley
REVISED June 25, 2008

## BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

DOCKET UE-072300 DOCKET UG-072301 (Consolidated)

**DOCKET UG-080064** 

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

**TESTIMONY OF** 

Thomas E. Schooley

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Adjustments for Meter Malfunctions

Revenue Allocation and Rate Design

**MAY 30, 2008** 

**REVISED June 25, 2008** 

| 1. |             | and 61; no increase to large volume customers on Schedules 41, 85, and contracts;       |
|----|-------------|---|
| 2. |             | and a rate decrease to Limited Interruptible customers on Schedule 86. Exhibit No.      |
| 3  |             | (JKP-10).   |
| 4  |             |   |
| 5  | Q.          | How are the parity ratios affected by the above percentage increases?                   |
| 6  | . <b>A.</b> | Schedule 23, Residential, stays at the same parity ratio as current rates. The          |
| 7  |             | schedules receiving above average increases move to a parity range of about 95% to      |
| 8  |             | 119%; and the schedules with no increase or a decrease will remain above parity by      |
| 9  |             | 133% to 146%. Exhibit No (JKP-5).   |
| 10 |             |   |
| 11 | , <b>Q.</b> | Does Staff accept the Company's proposed revenue allocation for gas service?            |
| 12 | A.          | Yes, with one exception for Schedule 86. Staff proposes an overall increase in revenue  |
| 13 |             | requirements of 4.1% 4.15% with gas costs, or approximately 13.0% 13.12% without ga     |
| 14 | •           | cost. Some customers will see delivery cost increases of 18.8%-19.0%. Staff's proposal  |
| 15 |             | results in rates for residential customers increasing 13.0% 13.1% on delivery costs, or |
| 16 |             | 4.4% overall. No customer group should receive a decrease in rates if most others are   |
| 17 |             | getting a substantial increase. Therefore, Staff recommends that Schedule 86 receive    |
| 18 |             | neither an increase nor a decrease, similar to Schedules 41 and 85.                     |
| 19 | ٠           |   |
| 20 | Q.          | Turning to rate design, please describe PSE's proposal for its natural gas rate         |
| 21 |             | schedules.  |
| 22 | A.          | PSE proposes that virtually all costs allocated to the customer portion of each rate    |
| 23 |             | schedule be collected on a per customer basis. These costs include the return on the    |
|    |             |   |