EXHIBIT NO. KRK-14T DOCKET NOS. U-101217 WITNESSES: KARL R. KARZMAR

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

Docket No. U-101217

For a Declaratory Order Regarding the Transfer of Assets to Jefferson County Public Utility District.

TESTIMONY OF KARL R. KARZMAR

ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC. IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT STIPULATION

DECEMBER 21, 2010

 Please state your name and the party for whom you are appearing. My name is Karl R. Karzmar, and I am appearing on behalf of Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE"). My qualifications are presented in Exhibit No. KRK-2. Are you the same Karl R. Karzmar who filed testimony on July 15, 2010? Yes. This additional testimony supplements my testimony filed on July 15, 2010, Exhibit No. KRK-1CT, and supports the Settlement Stipulation filed in this proceeding on December 15, 2010. What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
 Energy, Inc. ("PSE"). My qualifications are presented in Exhibit No. KRK-2. Are you the same Karl R. Karzmar who filed testimony on July 15, 2010? Yes. This additional testimony supplements my testimony filed on July 15, 2010, Exhibit No. KRK-1CT, and supports the Settlement Stipulation filed in this proceeding on December 15, 2010. What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
 Are you the same Karl R. Karzmar who filed testimony on July 15, 2010? Yes. This additional testimony supplements my testimony filed on July 15, 2010, Exhibit No. KRK-1CT, and supports the Settlement Stipulation filed in this proceeding on December 15, 2010. What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
 Yes. This additional testimony supplements my testimony filed on July 15, 2010, Exhibit No. KRK-1CT, and supports the Settlement Stipulation filed in this proceeding on December 15, 2010. What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
Exhibit No. KRK-1CT, and supports the Settlement Stipulation filed in this proceeding on December 15, 2010.What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
proceeding on December 15, 2010. What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
What is PSE's position regarding the Settlement Stipulation filed in this
nuosooding?
proceeding?
PSE recommends that the Commission issue an order approving the Settlement
Stipulation signed by PSE, Commission Staff and the Public Utility District #1 of
Jefferson County ("JPUD"). The Settlement Stipulation meets the objectives PSE
sought through its Petition for Declaratory Order Regarding the Transfer of
Assets to JPUD, and PSE believes the Settlement Stipulation is in the public
interest.

1	Q.	Please explain why PSE believes this Settlement Stipulation is in the public
2		interest.
3	A.	The proposed Settlement Agreement satisfies the public interest because it sets
4		forth a practical and efficient procedure to address all aspects of PSE's Petition for
5		a Declaratory Order Regarding the Transfer of Assets to JPUD. The Settlement
6		Stipulation provides for clarity and certainty with regard to certain contingencies
7		bearing upon the resolution of litigation threatened by JPUD. Finally, the
8		procedure set forth in the Settlement Stipulation will save the Commission and all
9		parties to this proceeding time, effort, and resources, and produce a full and
10		timely resolution of all the issues in this docket.
11	Q.	The Settlement Stipulation refers to certain regulatory approvals that must
12		be satisfied as a condition precedent to closing the transactions contemplated
13		by the Asset Purchase Agreement. What regulatory approvals are being
14		referred to in the Settlement Stipulation?
15	А.	One of the contingencies to PSE's obligation to close the transactions
16		contemplated by the Asset Purchase Agreement is that all "Necessary Approvals"
17		shall have been obtained and be in effect on the closing date, all on terms
18		acceptable to PSE, in its reasonable discretion. This contingency is set forth at
19		paragraph 7.2 of the Asset Purchase Agreement. "Necessary Approvals" is
20		further defined to include, among other matters, "WUTC Confirmations." The
21		term "WUTC Confirmations" refers to an order from the Commission confirming
22		that (a) the amount of the Purchase Price is an amount that is sufficient to fully

1		compensate PSE customers for the sale of the Assets; (b) the provisions of this
2		Agreement pertaining to PSE's transition of its responsibilities to provide
3		electrical service to its customers in the Service Territory are sufficient and
4		consistent with PSE's public service obligations; and (c) by operation of RCW
5		80.12.020(2), WUTC approval is not required prior to the transfer of the Assets to
6		JPUD.
7	Q.	Does paragraph 14 of the Settlement Stipulation provide the confirmations
8		that PSE is seeking for purposes of paragraph 7.2 of the Asset Purchase
9		Agreement?
10	A.	If the Commission issues an order that contains the declarations set forth in
	л.	
11		paragraph 14 of the Settlement Stipulation, then PSE will be able to advise JPUD,
12		in accordance with paragraph 7.2 of the Asset Purchase Agreement, that the
13		WUTC Confirmations have been provided on terms acceptable to PSE. Based
14		upon such order, it will be clear that no further action is required by the
15		Commission to approve the transfer of the Assets to JPUD. It will also be clear
16		from such an order that the \$103,000,000 purchase price sets a ceiling for
17		ratemaking purposes, and that PSE has no obligation to obtain more than
18		\$103,000,000 in connection with this transaction as a basis from which to
19		subsequently determine an allocation of the sale proceeds as between PSE's
20		customers and shareholders. Such an order would also confirm that the
21		provisions of the Asset Purchase Agreement that pertain to the transfer of service
22		and the obligation to serve customers in Jefferson County are sufficient and

consistent with PSE's public service obligations. If the Commission does not
issue such an order, or issues an order that does not contain the declarations set
forth in paragraph 14 of the Settlement Stipulation, or issues an order that
otherwise qualifies the declarations set forth in paragraph 14 of the Settlement
Stipulation, then PSE would need to carefully consider this action before drawing
any conclusions with respect to the contingencies to close the transactions
contemplated by the Asset Purchase Agreement.

- 8 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 9 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7