Exhibit No. MPP-1T Docket UE-090704/UG-090705 Witness: Michael P. Parvinen

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-090704

DOCKET UG-090705

TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL P. PARVINEN

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

General Ratemaking Policy; Company Conservation Phase-In Proposal; Company Production Factor Adjustment; Merger Commitment Compliance

November 17, 2009 Revised December 11, 2009

1		recommendation addressed in my testimony that the Commission should reject the
2		Company's proposed conservation phase-in adjustment. It also supports many other
3		ratemaking adjustments sponsored by other Staff witnesses for the Company's
4		electricity and natural gas results of operations.
. 5		I also present the Staff recommendation that the Commission should not
6		apply a power production adjustment in developing the Company's electricity
7		revenue requirement in this case, given the Company's updated forecast of reduced
8 .		electric loads.
9		My testimony informs the Commission of the Company's compliance with
10		relevant commitments ordered by the Commission in the recent merger proceeding,
11		Docket UE-070725.
12		Finally, I present an overview of the other witnesses testifying for Staff in
13		these dockets. That overview indicates that Staff recommends an increase to electric
14		revenues of \$5,826,516 \$7,238,781, or 0.3 0.4 percent, and an increase to natural gas
15		revenues of \$7,130,348 <u>\$7,926,564</u> , or 0.6 <u>0.7</u> percent. Staff used the Company's
16	ė.	September 28, 2009 Supplemental Filing as the starting point for the development of
17		these revenue requirement recommendations.
18		
19	Q.	Can you briefly summarize the main differences between the Company's
20	•	proposed electric revenue requirement and Staff's recommended electric
21	•	revenue requirement?
22	A.	Yes. The total difference is \$148 \$147 million (Company proposed \$154 million minus
23		Staff proposed \$6 \$7 million). The main differences between Staff and PSE are due to:

1 2 3 4		Rate of Return Power Supply Adjustments including O&M Pro forma Maintenance on Plant Additions Mint Farm Deferral Amortization Conservation Adjustment (Revenue Component)	\$37 million 48 million 26 million 17 million 10 million
5 6 7 8		Production Adjustment Other Adjustments	6 million 4 million
9	Q.	Can you briefly summarize the main differences between	een the Company's
10		proposed gas revenue requirement and Staff's recomm	nended <i>gas</i> revenue
11	,	requirement?	
12	A.	Yes. The total difference is \$22_\$21_million (Company pr	roposed \$29 million minus
13		Staff proposed \$7 \$8 million). The main differences between	veen Staff and PSE are due
14		to:	•
15 16 17 18 19		Rate of Return Properly Applied Pro Forma Definition Net Interest to IRS Other Adjustments	\$15 million \$4 million \$2 million \$1 million
20	Q.	Have you prepared any exhibits in support of your tes	timony?
21	A.	Yes, I have prepared Exhibit No. MPP-2 to assist the Con	nmission in identifying
22		each Staff witness and the particular contested and uncon-	tested adjustments each
23		witness sponsors. Page 1 of the exhibit addresses the Cor	npany's electric results of
24		operations. Page 2 does the same for the gas results of op	perations.
25			
26 27 28		III. A FUNDAMENTAL RATEMAKING ISSUE - PR ADJUSTMENTS	ROPER PRO FORMA
29	Q.	Please explain the purpose of this portion of your testi	mony.
30	A.	The purpose of this portion of my testimony is to identify	how the Commission
31		defines "pro forma adjustment", and to explain appropriate	te regulatory theory and
	mnea	THOMAS OF MICHAEL D. DARWINEN	Evhibit No. MDD 17

1		David C. Parcell provides Staff's recommendation on the cost of capital to be
2		used for ratemaking purposes. His overall rate of return recommendation is 7.89
3		7.91 percent, which is based on a 10 percent return on equity and a capital
4		structure containing 45 percent common equity.
5		
6	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
7	A.	Yes, it does.

8