

Puget rate design

WE-92-0499

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE:
T-1	6/19 9/23 ✓ ✓	Knutzen	(CAK-1) prefiled testimony Knutzen (revised pp)	
T-2	✓ ✓	Lynch	(CEL-1) (excluded p. 31, ll 22-23, to p. 32, ll. 1-2) prefiled testimony Lynch (revised pp)	
3	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-2) explanations of various GOS methods	
4	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-3) company's C-O-S study (revised).	
5	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-4)	(revised pp)
6	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-5) effect of choosing alternative methods	(revised pp)
7	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-6)	(revised)
T-8	9/24 ✓ ✓	Hoff	(DWH-1) (excluded p. 22, l. 13 - p. 23, l. 18) prefiled testimony Hoff	
9	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-2) Hoff stmt of experience	
10	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-3) final report, rate design task force	
11	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-4) final report, rate design collaborative	
12	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-5) note-superseded by Ex 21- tariff proposals	
13	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-6) customer allocation; calculation of basic charge	
14	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-7) pro forma and proposed revenue; rate impacts	
15	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-8) calculation of <sup>water heat</sup> interruption credit	
16	9/23 9/23 ✓ ✓	by agreement of counsel	deposition of Knutzen	
17	✓ ✓	"	deposition of Lynch	
18	✓ ✓	"	deposition of Hoff.	
19	✓ ✓	cross Lynch by Trunchero	(response to WIC file data req # 304) 200 highest hourly load, broken out into class	
20	✓ ✓	cross Lynch by Arnold	(response to SWAP data req # 212) 200 highest hourly load, by system	

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE: UE-92-0499
21	9/24 9/24 ✓ ✓	Cross Hoff by Trotter	(response to Dep. Reg #3). Revised Ex 12, which shows all changes req'd by revisions	
22	✓ ✓	"	(response to WICFUR # 310) avoided cost study (reference T-8, v. 8, l 20)	
23	✓ ✓	will be entered when rec'd, by agrmt of counsel	least-cost plan 1992-93 (2 volumes)	(rec'd 9/24/92)
24	✓ ✓	Cross Hoff by Arnold	(response to staff data req #10) support for 10% and 50% differential season.	
25	✓ ✓	"	(response to WICFUR # 319) backup power factor adjustment, cost to customers.	
26	4/43 5/10 ✓ ✓	by agrmt of counsel	(response to BR #1). #1 A update rec'd 1/22/93 parity ratios for proposed tariffs	
26A	update		(response to BR #2).	
27	✓ ✓	"	COS computer model (note updated February)	
27A	update		(response to BR #3) interpretation of graphs	
28	✓ ✓	"	showing residential impact #3A update rec'd 1/22/93	
28A	update		(response to BR #4) reconcile figures for cost of capacity & energy w/ LCP filing and avoided cost filing	
29	✓ ✓	"	(response to B Reg. #5). calculation how to derive its tailblock rates #5A update rec'd 1/22/93	
30	✓ ✓	"		
30A	update			
31	5/10 5/10 ✓ ✓	by agrmt of counsel	Hoff dep Feb 5	
32	✓ ✓	"	Uprch dep. Feb 5	
T-33	✓ ✓	(staff) Sorrells	replied Sorrells (w/ revisions 5/4/93)	
34	✓ ✓	"	(DRS-1) qualifications	
35	✓ ✓	"	(DRS-2) (response to deposition req. 11) COS report w/ transmission allocated same basis production plant	
36	✓ ✓	"	(DRS-3) COS report	
37	✓ ✓	"	(DRS-4) (response to record req #1) restating peak credit, assuming gas use for 200 peak hrs.	
38	✓ ✓	"	(DRS-5) water heat interruption on credit	
39	✓ ✓	re-direct Sorrells. (FEA)	(response to data req # 579) support for stmt Ex T-33, p. 8, ll. 17-19, that size transmission for energy reqts.	
T-40	✓ ✓	Knobloch	replied Knobloch.	

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE:
41	5/10 5/10 ✓ ✓	(FEA) Knobloch	(TJK-1) 4 schedules. - proposed increases, rates of return, indices & subsidies	
42	✓ ✓	Cross Knobloch by Van Nostrand (P.C)	(response to FEA data ref # 525) basis for stant peak credit method not well recognized.	
T-43	✓ ✓	Lazar	prefiled test. Lazar (JL-1)	
44	✓ ✓	"	qualif (JL-2) (6 pp) peak credit method for 1993 rate case.	
45	✓ ✓	"	(JL-3) (15 pp). Co's Integrated Resource Plan, Appendix F (1992-93)	
46	✓ ✓	"	(JL-4) (14) alternative COS Study results	
47	✓ ✓	"	(JL-5) (6 pp). application of cost-of-service principles	
48	✓ ✓	"	(JL-6) (7 pp) residential rate design	
49	✓ ✓	"	(JL-7) (6 pp). state energy strategy & fuel choice	
50	✓ ✓	Cross Lazar by Van Nostrand	(Resp data ref # 531) cost estimates for interruptible water heater controllers	
51	✓ ✓	"	(test. from 1987 BPA rate case) & cost of water heater controllers	
52	✓ ✓	"	(resp to data ref # 534) contracts and rates vs large new loads (T-43, p. 68, ll. 11-15).	
53	5/11 5/11 ✓ ✓	(BOMA).		
T-54	✓ ✓	Saleba	prefiled test. Saleba (incl App. A & B)	
55	✓ ✓	Cross Saleba by Van Nostrand	(resp. BOMA to Puyt resp # 558)	
56	✓ ✓	Cross Saleba by Adams	study of classification & allocation methods page from 1961 Bonbright book, & minimum systems method	
57	✓ ✓	"	June 11, 1992, Paul Cowl letter to NARUC committee commenting on draft, & customer method (GCC-test.)	
T-58	✓ ✓	(SWAP) Carter	prefiled test. Carter	
59	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-2) qualifications	
60	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-3) demand usage comparison, SWAP vs other Schedule 31 customers.	

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE:
61	5/11 5/11	(SWAP) Carter	(GCC-4) (2pp) demand usage comparison, SWAP vs. other Sched 46 customers	
62	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-5) (1 p) rate parity to COS, SWAP and other primary service	
63	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-6) (1 p) rate parity w/ COS, SWAP and other high voltage service	
64	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-7) (1 p.) comparison average Sched 31 customer, Grant, Seattle & existing/proposed Puget rates	
65	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-8) (1 p) (resp to WICFUR reg # 319). calculation vs power factor adjustment	
66	✓ ✓	"	(GCC-9) (1 p.) annual capacitor cost vs "Puget penalty!"	
67	✓ ✓	Cross Carter by Van Nostrand.	(resp to Puget Reg # 501) proposed definition of "customers like SWAP"	
68	✓ ✓	"	(resp to Puget Reg # 502) demand & energy info for customer accts in Ex 60.	
69	✓ ✓	"	demand usage comparison - SWAP customers.	
70	✓ ✓	"	demand usage comparison - SWAP vs other Sched 31 customers.	
71	✓ ✓	"	rate parity to COS, SWAP & other primary service (and GCC-5)	
72	✓ ✓	"	rate parity to COS, SWAP & other high voltage service (and GCC-6).	
T-73	✓ ✓	(WICFUR) Schoenbeck	(DWS-1) (37pp +) prefiled test. Schoenbeck, w/ Apps. A, B, C.	
74	✓ ✓	Cross Schoenbeck by Van Nostrand	portion of Integrated Resource plan, page C-6, re combustion turbines	
75	✓ ✓	"	(WICFUR response to co 516) backup for 29/71% split (T-73, p. 11, ll 3-4)	
T-76	✓ ✓	(co rebuttal) Lynch	(CEL-7) prefiled test rebuttal Lynch	
77	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-8)	
78	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-9)	
79	✓ ✓	"	(CEL-10).	
80	✓ ✓	Cross Lynch by Trotter	(resp to Staff data reg # 2311) identify base & resource costs using new test yr & revenue reqmt	

NO.	ID/ADM	WITNESS	DESCRIPTION	CAUSE:
81	5/11 ✓	by a prmt of counsel	(Resp BR 6) rerun study w/ staff revenue re prmt and staff /COS; 800 kWh recommendation?	
82	5/11 ✓	"	(Resp BR 7).	
T-83	5/11 ✓ ✓	(rebuttal) Hoff	(DWH-9) Replied Hoff rebuttal.	
84	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-10) Comparison of proposals for rate spread	
85	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-11) distribution of month of peak for Sched 31 and Sched 49	
86	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-12) evaluation plan for experimental rates	
87	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-13) Schedule 25 inputs - 1 <sup>st</sup> block demand = 1/2 2 <sup>nd</sup> block, 0% change in bills	
88	✓ ✓	"	(DWH-14). revised proposed Sched. 43.	
89	✓ ✓	Cross Hoff by Adams.	pages re statistics from 1992 annual report (pp 46-47), re growth	
90	✓	by a prmt of counsel	(Resp. BR 8)	
91				
92				
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				