EXHIBIT NO. ___(MRM-1T)
DOCKET NO. UE-13___
WITNESS: MATTHEW R. MARCELIA

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

For an Accounting Order Approving the Allocation of Proceeds of the Sale of Certain Assets to Public Utility District #1 of Jefferson County.

Docket No. UE-13

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF MATTHEW R. MARCELIA ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

OCTOBER 31, 2013

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.** PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF 2 3 MATTHEW R. MARCELIA 4 5 I. INTRODUCTION 6 Q. Please state your name and business address. 7 A. My name is Matthew R. Marcelia. I am employed as Director of Tax for Puget 8 Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE" or "the Company"). My business address is 10885 9 NE Fourth Street, Bellevue, WA 98009-9734. 10 Q. Have you prepared an exhibit describing your professional qualifications? Yes, I have. It is Exhibit No. ___(MRM-2). 11 A. What is the purpose of your testimony? 12 Q. 13 My testimony will address the calculation and allocation of gain resulting from A. the involuntary liquidation of PSE's assets and future business opportunities in 14 15 Jefferson County, Washington. II. 16 THE GAIN CALCULATION 17 Q. Please explain the components of the gain calculation. 18 A. In Exhibit No. ___(MRM-3), I summarize the financial results relevant to the gain 19 calculation associated with the forced sale of PSE's Jefferson County assets 20 ("Assets") to Public Utility District No. 1 of Jefferson County ("JPUD"). For 21 purposes of this discussion, I will divide the transaction into three parts: (a) the

transfer of Assets, (b) transaction costs, and (c) ancillary items. The combined effect of these elements of the transaction results in the gain to be allocated in this proceeding.

- Q. Please explain the "Assets Transferred" section of Exhibit No. ___(MRM-3) and the proceeds that are reported in the Exhibit.
- A. The Assets in question are the transmission and distribution facilities, and associated real property, specifically described in an Asset Purchase Agreement, dated June 11, 2010 ("APA"). This list of Assets is set forth in Exhibit A to the APA. No Assets other than those specifically identified on Exhibit A (as amended) were included in the sale. The APA and a Customer Transition Agreement, dated as of February 4, 2013 ("CTA"), provided PSE compensation for various costs incurred in connection with the transactions, but when I refer to the "Assets" I am only referring to the Assets that are specifically described in Exhibit A (as amended) of the APA.

Exhibit No. ____(MRM-3) refers to "Assets Owned as of June 11, 2010" and "Assets from June 12, 2010 - March 31, 2013." This distinction is derived from the APA. The APA included a list of Assets in service as of June 11, 2010 and established a purchase price for those Assets of \$103,000,000. These Assets are referred to in Exhibit No. ____(MRM-3) as the "Assets Owned as of June 11, 2010" and the proceeds of the sale of these Assets can be seen on line 1 of the Exhibit.

At the time the APA was executed, JPUD lacked the resources it needed to close the transaction. However, the APA contained a three-year contingency period to enable JPUD sufficient time to acquire these resources. After the APA was negotiated, PSE placed additions and improvements to the Assets in service commensurate to the needs of the service area. Anticipating these needs, section 2.4 of the APA required a "true-up" to the Asset list and the purchase price as of the cutover date (i.e. March 31, 2013). Exhibit No. ___(MRM-3) refers to these Assets as "Assets from June 12, 2010 - March 31, 2013."

- Q. How was the amount of proceeds determined for the sale of the Assets owned as of June 11, 2010?
- A. This amount was determined though a negotiated settlement under JPUD's threat of condemnation. The analyses supporting this settlement are fully described in the Testimony of Karl R. Karzmar, former Director of Regulatory Relations for PSE, filed in the Commission in Docket No. U-101217, *In the Matter of the Petition of Puget Sound Energy, Inc., For a Declaratory Order Regarding the Transfer of Assets to Jefferson County Public Utility District.*
- Q. How was the amount of proceeds determined for the sale of the Assets placed in service between June 12, 2010 and March 31, 2013?
- A. Section 2.4 of the APA provides that Assets placed in service between June 12, 2010 and the cutover date (i.e. March 31, 2013) were to be charged to JPUD at their net book value. As a result, there is no gain or loss associated with the transfer of these Assets to JPUD. They were transferred at their net book value.

A. The "Net Book Value" on line four of Exhibit No. ___(MRM-3) represents the unrecovered portion of the investors' investment in the Assets. It is the amount of capital that has not yet been returned to the investors. It represents the amount of the Assets that has not yet been consumed in providing service to customers.

Q. How is the Total Gain on line six of MRM-3 calculated?

A. The "Total Gain" on line six of Exhibit No. ___(MRM-3) is calculated by subtracting the net book value from the proceeds of the sale of the Assets, then removing the transaction and other costs.

Q. What transaction costs were incurred in the transaction?

A. PSE incurred \$2.5 million in transaction costs. Transaction costs include costs incurred in connection with the transfer of the Assets (e.g., legal, consulting, escrow, labor, and other costs and expenses typically incurred in connection with transactions of this nature). In this category, I also include various transition costs incurred by PSE in connection with the transition of the Jefferson service territory from PSE to JPUD.

As summarized in Exhibit No. ____(MRM-4), the main components of the transaction costs were labor costs, legal costs, costs to sever customer billing data, and overheads. Pursuant to the APA, the parties initially agreed to each be responsible for their own transaction costs. However, due to the unique nature of some of the transition costs incurred by PSE pursuant to the CTA, PSE required an \$800,000 "Transition Payment" from JPUD to reimburse PSE for these

2

4

5

7

9

10

11

15

17

21

also loses its ability to earn on these assets. The utility loses a revenue source in addition to the loss of its assets.

Q. What unusual and extraordinary circumstances did you consider?

- A. Many of these circumstances are covered in greater detail by the testimony of other witnesses in this proceeding, but I would summarize these unusual and extraordinary circumstances as follows:
 - This transaction involved the forced sale of the Assets to a public utility district, which is a municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Washington, under threat of condemnation. PSE was not a willing seller and the decision to enter into the transaction was based upon an assessment of litigation risk. The forced liquidation of a portion of our service area is both an unusual and extraordinary circumstance.
 - The Assets in question comprised the entirety of PSE's utility operating system in Jefferson County. The involuntary conversion of all of the Company's assets in an area where investments were made by the Company, for approximately 96 years, with a reasonable expectation to be able to continue to serve its customers, is both an unusual and extraordinary circumstance.
 - The liquidated Assets were included in the rate base of the utility, such that the investors lost the ability to earn on this investment in the future. The risk of losing the return on this investment by reason of a forced liquidation of the Assets is both an unusual and extraordinary circumstance.

• The sale of the Assets was concurrent with PSE being relieved of, and JPUD assuming, the public utility obligations to the customers within the area. As a result, PSE lost its ability to conduct its business in an established market.

In addition to these circumstances I considered the consequences to PSE's remaining customers associated with the forced sale of Assets to JPUD. These consequences are addressed in detail in the testimony of Mr. Jon A. Piliaris. Mr. Piliaris has assessed the impact of the transaction on the Company's remaining customers and concludes that these customers were not adversely affected by the sale.

- Q. Is your proposed allocation consistent with direction the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission ("Commission") has provided the Company in connection with prior transactions?
- A Yes. However, I do not believe that the Commission has addressed the facts presented in this case in a prior decision. In the very different case of voluntary sales, the Commission has looked carefully at the context of the sale and allocated gain on the basis of the relative equities, by application of the principles that the rewards of a transaction should follow the relative risk assumed by the parties and that the benefits of the transaction should follow burdens of prior ownership. I applied these equitable principles in determining my proposed allocation of gain.

 Many of the consequences of the transaction that I considered in making this determination are addressed, in detail, in the testimony of Jon A. Piliaris, Exhibit No. ___(JAP-1T).

By operation of the terms and conditions of the APA and the CTA, the Company was successful in placing the majority of transactional risk on the departing customers. The investors, however, primarily bear the risk of reinvestment, while the remaining customers bear little or no transactional risk. The burden of prior ownership was carried by the investors, who paid for the assets, and the departing customers who paid their fair share of the cost of the service that they received. Under these facts and taking guidance from the precedent that the Commission has applied under the very different circumstances presented by voluntary transactions, I arrived at an allocation of 75% of the gain to investors and 25% to the remaining customers.

IV. ACCOUNTING FOR THE GAIN

- Q. Please explain the specific accounting that would be required to account for the gain as you have discussed it here, beginning with the gain allocated to the Company.
- A. The gain is currently sitting on the balance sheet in FERC Account 25300061,

 Deferred Credits Jefferson County, as a credit balance. The gain allocated to
 the Company will be moved from FERC Account 25300061 and credited to
 FERC Account 421.1, Gain on Disposition of Property, on the income statement.
- Q. What is the accounting for the portion of the gain allocated to remaining customers who weren't harmed by the transaction?
- A. The portion of the gain allocated to remaining customers will be amortized from FERC Account 25300061 to FERC Account 407 over 48 months.