Exh. JES-4 Dockets UE-220066, UG-220067, UG-210918 Witness: Jennifer E. Snyder

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY,

Respondent.

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

For an Order Authorizing Deferred Accounting Treatment for Puget Sound Energy's Share of Costs Associated with the Tacoma LNG Facility DOCKETS UE-220066, UG-220067, UG-210918 (consolidated)

EXHIBIT TO TESTIMONY OF

JENNIFER E. SNYDER

STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PSE Response to UTC Staff Data Request No. 307 - AMI Implementation Plan Customer Costs

July 28, 2022

Exh. JES-4 Docket UE-220066, UG-220067, UG-210918 Page 1 of 1

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Dockets UE-220066 & UG-220067 Puget Sound Energy 2022 General Rate Case

DATA REQUEST DIRECTED TO: Catherine A. Koch REQUESTED BY: Jennifer E. Snyder

UTC STAFF DATA REQUEST NO. 307: Re: AMI

Please describe how PSE considered individual customer or participant costs (such as, but not limited to, the incremental cost for a smart thermostat) associated with customer facing use cases developed in the AMI Benefit Implementation Plan, Exh. CAK-7, Appendix C.

Response:

Puget Sound Energy's ("PSE") AMI Implementation Plan is based on the individual program and use case benefits and timelines developed through the "Maximizing Customer Benefits through PSE's Advanced Metering Infrastructure" report ("AMI Report") as discussed in the Second Exhibit to the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Sanem I. Sergici, Exh. SIS-3.

The framework used to evaluate the benefits of PSE's AMI investment compares the costs of the AMI-enabled and AMI-enhanced use cases against the benefits that those use cases are expected to yield. The cost/benefit framework detailed in the AMI Report takes the "utility cost perspective," taking into account costs associated with capital investment costs, program administration and program implementation costs such as incentives. For example, PSE, in the smart thermostat program, assumes that it may offer participants incentives ranging from \$50 to \$200 per year. The same level of incentive is assumed for the grid-interactive water heating load control program. If PSE obtains approval from the Commission to proceed with these customer-facing programs, PSE will factor in participant costs in its program design and deployment (i.e., deciding on the level of incentives), along with other program implementation and administrative costs.