

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

for a Declaratory Order and Accounting Order
Regarding the Classification of Certain
Facilities and Accounting Treatment Consistent
Therewith.

NO. _____

(PROPOSED) ORDER

On January 2, 2001, Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE") filed a petition for a declaratory order requesting the Commission adopt PSE's proposed classification of transmission and distribution facilities and for an accounting order authorizing PSE to reflect such classifications in its accounts.

PSE's Petition states that its proposed classification of transmission and distribution facilities, and the corresponding accounting treatment of such classifications in PSE's accounts, is an essential component to the demarcation of the boundaries of this Commission's jurisdiction and that of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC"). PSE states that such classifications serve the public interest by promoting greater certainty in regulation, and by avoiding regulatory conflicts. In that regard, PSE quotes FERC regarding this Commission's determination of its jurisdiction over local distribution facilities (i.e.,

1 facilities other than facilities used in transmitting electric power in interstate commerce):

2
3 [W]e intend to provide *broad deference to states in determining what*
4 *facilities are Commission-jurisdictional transmission facilities and*
5 *what facilities are state-jurisdictional local distribution facilities*, so
6 long as our comparability principles are not compromised and we are
7 able to fulfill our responsibilities under the statute.
8

9
10 Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission
11 Services by Public Utilities; Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting
12 Utilities, F.E.R.C. Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,048, at 30,345 (1997) (emphasis added) ("Order
13
14 888-A").
15
16

17 18 I. BACKGROUND

19 PSE is a public service company engaged in the generation, transmission, distribution
20 and sale at retail of electric energy in the State of Washington. As such, certain actions of
21 PSE are subject to the authority of the Commission to regulate the same, in the public
22 interest, pursuant to RCW 80.01.040 and other applicable public service laws.
23
24

25 FERC regulates facilities used by PSE in transmitting electric energy in interstate
26 commerce, pursuant to applicable provisions of the Federal Power Act. See FPA § 201; 16
27 U.S.C. §824.
28

29 FERC has, from time to time, issued orders that bear upon the lines of demarcation
30 between its regulatory authority and that of the state. See Promoting Wholesale Competition
31 Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities;
32 Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities, F.E.R.C. Stats. &
33 Regs. ¶ 31,036, at 31,770 (1996) ("Order 888"). In Order 888, FERC acknowledged, among
34 other things, that states have jurisdiction over local distribution facilities while the federal
35 government exercises jurisdiction over the rates, terms and conditions of unbundled retail
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

PERKINS COIE LLP
One Bellevue Center, Suite
1800
411 - 108th Avenue
Northeast
Bellevue, WA 98004-5584
(425) 453-6980

1 transmission in interstate commerce by public utilities.

2
3 The classification of transmission and distribution facilities for various regulatory
4 purposes may lead to uncertainty and potential conflicts regarding the boundaries of
5 federal/state jurisdiction. To avoid these issues and concerns, FERC has held:
6
7

8
9 As a means of facilitating jurisdictional line-drawing, we will entertain
10 proposals by public utilities, filed under section 205 of the FPA,
11 containing classifications and/or cost allocations for transmission and
12 local distribution facilities. However, *as a prerequisite to filing*
13 *transmission/local distribution facility classifications and/or cost*
14 *allocations with the Commission, utilities must consult with their state*
15 *regulatory authorities. If the utility's classifications and/or cost*
16 *allocations are supported by the state regulatory authorities and are*
17 *consistent with the principles established by the Final Rule, the*
18 *Commission will defer to such classifications and/or cost allocations.*
19 We encourage public utilities and their state regulatory authorities to
20 attempt to agree to utility-specific classifications and allocations that
21 the utility may file at the Commission.
22
23
24

25 Order 888, at 31,784 (emphasis added).

26
27 To this end, PSE requests that the Commission issue a declaratory order confirming
28 PSE's classification of transmission or distribution facilities, as PSE has proposed such
29 classifications in Exhibit A to its Petition. Such classifications are attached to this Order as
30 Appendix A. As discussed below, PSE states that it classified these facilities by application
31 of the seven indicators of local distribution promulgated by FERC for such purposes in
32 Order 888. PSE states that, taken together, application of the seven-factor test leads to the
33 conclusion that PSE's 230 kV (and above) facilities are transmission facilities. These
34 facilities connect PSE's systems to bulk transmission grids and support transfers to regional
35 markets. PSE also states that all of PSE's facilities of 34 kV or less are inherently
36 distribution facilities. As to PSE's 115 kV facilities, PSE states that application of the seven-
37 factor test, confirmed by PSE's power flow analysis,
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

PERKINS COIE LLP
One Bellevue Center, Suite
1800
411 - 108th Avenue
Northeast
Bellevue, WA 98004-5584
(425) 453-6980

1 demonstrates that, with one exception discussed below, these facilities are distribution
2 facilities, in that they function to serve local loads and rarely, if ever, serve to transfer power
3 to other markets.
4

5
6 Further, as also discussed below, PSE requested that the Commission issue an
7 accounting order authorizing the Company to apply such classification of transmission and
8 distribution facilities in PSE's accounts and reports to the Commission, under and in light of
9 the seven-factor test promulgated by FERC in Order 888.
10

11
12 On February 23, 2001, Commission Staff ("Staff") submitted comments on PSE's
13 Petition. Staff recommended that the Commission issue a declaratory order adopting PSE's
14 classification of transmission and distribution facilities, as PSE has proposed such
15 classifications in Exhibit A to its Petition. Staff recommended that any such declaratory
16 order note that such classification does not set a precedent for other utilities and that the
17 facilities classification is unique to PSE. Staff also recommended that the Commission issue
18 an accounting order authorizing PSE to apply such classification of transmission and
19 distribution facilities in PSE's accounts and reports. Staff recommended that any such
20 accounting order clarify that until a new depreciation study is approved by the Commission,
21 the transmission and distribution classification, and its accounting treatment, should not
22 result in revised depreciation rates for the items so classified.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

II. ANALYSIS

A. Seven-Factor Test

In its Petition, PSE applied FERC's seven-factor test and proposes the classification of transmission and distribution facilities set forth in Appendix A.¹ An explanation of how PSE considered these factors and applied was set forth in the Affidavit of J. Chris Reese, PSE's System Planning Manager, attached to the Petition ("Reese Affidavit"). The seven factors applied to so classify, pursuant to Order 888, are:

- (1) Local distribution facilities are normally in close proximity to retail customers.
- (2) Local distribution facilities are primarily radial in character.
- (3) Power flows into local distribution systems; it rarely, if ever, flows out.
- (4) When power enters a local distribution system, it is not reconsigned or transported on to some other market.
- (5) Power entering a local distribution system is consumed in a comparatively restricted geographical area.

¹ PSE notes that the seven-factor test is not rigid and is intended by FERC to be a flexible test that can account for unique regional or local conditions:

The seven-factor test is intended to provide sufficient flexibility to take into account unique local characteristics and historical usage of facilities used to serve retail customers. We specifically stated in the Final Rule that we will consider jurisdictional recommendations by states that take into account other technical factors that states believe are appropriate in light of historical uses of particular facilities. Moreover, we will defer to facility classifications and/or cost allocations that are supported by state regulatory authorities.

Order 888, at 30,342.

PERKINS COIE LLP
One Bellevue Center, Suite
1800
411 - 108th Avenue
Northeast
Bellevue, WA 98004-5584
(425) 453-6980

1 (6) Meters are based at the transmission/local distribution
2 interface to measure flows into the local distribution system.
3

4 (7) Local distribution systems will be of reduced voltage.
5

6 **B. First Factor**
7

8 Under FERC's seven-factor test, the first indicator of whether facilities are local
9 distribution facilities is whether such facilities are normally in close proximity to retail
10 customers. PSE states that this indicator was satisfied for each distribution facility so
11 classified in Appendix A.
12
13

14 PSE applied this factor in the context of its electrical system. PSE assessed proximity
15 with regard to population density, geographic and electrical considerations. For example,
16 geographic distances covered by distribution facilities to customers can be significant in rural
17 areas, which have low customer densities. Given that PSE serves retail customers only in the
18 greater Puget Sound area, which has both densely populated and sparsely populated areas,
19 PSE applied the close proximity factor within the appropriate geographic, demographic and
20 electrical contexts.² Reese Affidavit, ¶ 8.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **C. Second Factor**
31

32 The second indicator looks to whether the facilities in question are primarily radial in
33 character. PSE states that with few exceptions, the distribution facilities listed in Exhibit A
34 satisfy this criteria.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 _____
43
44 ² Sparse customer densities have also led to the use of higher distribution equipment voltages
45 to serve loads within broader geographic areas, as compared to urban electric systems. Therefore,
46 the interpretations of the first, fifth and seventh distribution indicators are also dependent on the
47 characteristics of PSE's entire electric system.

1 The phrase "primarily radial" means, in a distribution system context, that the end-use
2 customer is served from a limited set of closely coupled electrical sources during a given
3 period. PSE also considered the term "radial" to apply to open-looped systems where the
4 end-use customer's load is normally served from a single source but can be physically
5 switched to another source. PSE also considered radial facilities to be closed-looped systems
6 constructed for the primary purpose of serving local loads. PSE asserts that such radial
7 systems were constructed to serve local loads, not to move power between markets. Reese
8 Affidavit, ¶ 7.
9

10 Additionally, PSE states that it considered all connection lines to distribution
11 substations, including those that are locally looped, to be primarily radial in character. PSE's
12 decision to provide more than one line to a distribution substation is driven by the retail
13 customers' need for additional reliability. The presence of the loop does not meaningfully
14 enhance the system's ability to move power to other markets. Reese Affidavit, ¶ 7.
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 **D. Third Factor**

28 The third indicator addresses power flows. PSE determined that, for each of the
29 distribution facilities identified in Appendix A, power flows into, and rarely out of, its local
30 distribution system. In this regard, PSE examined the third indicator (power flows) in
31 conjunction with the fourth indicator (transfer to other markets). In other words, PSE
32 considered such power flows in relation to whether such power was transferred to other
33 markets (i.e., the fourth indicator). PSE's local distribution system extends throughout the
34 greater Puget Sound area. PSE's 230 kV lines serve to integrate PSE's local distribution
35 system, but have been classified as transmission due to other factors in the seven-part test.
36 Reese Affidavit, ¶¶ 7, 8 and 9.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

 The phrase "into local distribution systems" raises the question of whether the flow is

PERKINS COIE LLP
One Bellevue Center, Suite
1800
411 - 108th Avenue
Northeast
Bellevue, WA 98004-5584
(425) 453-6980

1 unidirectional in nature, (i.e., to PSE retail load rather than to another market). As
2
3 determined by PSE's power flow analysis, PSE states that power on radial and locally looped
4
5 facilities flows directly to local loads, without re-entering the transmission network at some
6
7 other point to reach another market. In Whatcom County, for example, local generation can
8
9 cause power to flow from one portion of PSE's local distribution system to another portion of
10
11 PSE's local distribution system, but not to other markets. Reese Affidavit, ¶¶ 8, 9 and 11.

12
13 **E. Fourth Factor**

14
15 The fourth indicator considers whether power that enters a local distribution system is
16
17 reconsigned or transported on to some other market. In the case of the distribution facilities
18
19 identified in Appendix A, the facilities PSE identifies as distribution facilities do not
20
21 reconsign or transport power to other markets.

22
23 Other markets in the context of the seven-factor test refers to wholesale bulk power
24
25 locations where there are multiple wholesale buyers and sellers. PSE considered high voltage
26
27 lines used to move power between markets, such as power system interties, to be
28
29 transmission facilities. Powerflow studies were used to identify other system facilities that
30
31 give meaningful support to wheeling transactions between markets. Reese Affidavit, ¶¶ 6, 8
32
33 and 9.

34
35 Applying this indicator, PSE states that as determined by PSE's power flow analysis,
36
37 PSE's 115 kV facilities were classified as facilities not providing meaningful support to
38
39 wheeling transaction to other markets.³ Therefore, as applied, PSE argues that this indicator
40
41

42
43
44 ³ An exception to this classification is PSE's 115 kV Anderson Canyon-Beverly Line. This
45
46 line was classified as transmission because it is non-radial in nature, connects commercial markets
47
and has traditionally and contractually been used as part of PSE's cross-Cascade mountain range
transmission capacity to access, for example, the Mid-Columbia wholesale power market.

1 supports PSE's classification of radial and locally looped systems as distribution. Reese
2 Affidavit, ¶¶ 6, 8 and 9.
3

4
5 **F. Fifth Factor**
6

7 This indicator considers whether power entering a local distribution system is
8 consumed in a comparatively restricted geographical area. The Petition states that all the
9 distribution facilities listed in Exhibit A are distribution facilities in relation to this
10 consideration. As with the first and seventh indicators, PSE viewed this indicator in the
11 context of the Company's electrical system and retail load within the greater Puget Sound
12 area. When power enters PSE's local distribution system, it is consumed within the
13 corresponding geographic area. In contrast, PSE treated transmission facilities as lines that
14 provide pathways for power that is not necessarily consumed within the geographical area
15 served at retail by PSE and corresponding to PSE's local distribution system. Reese
16 Affidavit, ¶ 8.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 **G. Sixth Factor**
28

29 The sixth factor looks to whether meters are based at the transmission/local
30 distribution interface to measure flows into the local distribution system. Various power
31 metering devices are used throughout PSE's system, not exclusively limited to transmission-
32 distribution interfaces. However, PSE states that each of the facilities identified as
33 distribution facilities in Appendix A are distribution facilities under this factor because each
34 of these facilities has such transmission-distribution interface metering. Reese Affidavit,
35 ¶ 10.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **H. The Seventh Factor**
44

45 The seventh factor addresses whether the facilities will be of reduced voltage. As a
46 practical matter, PSE states that it classified facilities with an
47

1 operating voltage of 230 kV and above as transmission facilities, because such facilities
2
3 connect PSE's system to the bulk transmission grids of other utilities, and support transfers
4
5 between regional markets. Similarly, PSE considered facilities operating at 34 kV or less as
6
7 inherently distribution facilities and incapable of meaningful transmission between markets.
8
9 Other facilities, primarily 115 kV facilities, merited a more detailed study of such facilities'
10
11 function and purpose. Reese Affidavit, ¶¶ 6, 7 and 8.⁴

12
13 In this regard, FERC Order 888, and more specifically the seven-factor test, provides
14
15 a process to differentiate between the transmission and distribution facilities. PSE considered
16
17 "reduced voltage" as a term relative to its system and customer load characteristics. In that
18
19 respect, as distances between energy sources and loads increase, lower voltages are not
20
21 efficient at distributing power to customers. The size of a customer's load, or other economic
22
23 considerations, may drive the need for higher distribution line voltages. Reese Affidavit, ¶¶ 6,
24
25 7 and 8.

26 27 **III. ACCOUNTING TREATMENT**

28
29 PSE requests that, if the Commission adopts PSE's proposed classification, the
30
31 Company would account for such classification by making adjustments to its Electric Plant
32
33 Chart of Accounts. Under WAC 480-100-031, this Commission utilizes the "uniform system
34
35 of accounts" applicable to Class A and B electric utilities published by [FERC]." Under the
36
37 FERC's Uniform System of Accounts, 18 C.F.R. Part 101, FERC requires utilities to classify
38
39 and report the original cost of the utility's transmission and distribution plant. For
40
41 transmission plant facilities, FERC requires the utility to report miscellaneous power plant
42
43 equipment, land and land rights, structures and improvements, station equipment towers and
44

45
46
47

⁴ See footnote three above.

1 structures, poles and fixtures, overhead conductors and devices, underground conduit,
2
3 underground conductors and devices and roads and trails, each of which is used in connection
4
5 with transmission operations or purposes or is used primarily as transmission facilities. See
6
7 Sections 350-359 of Part 101. Likewise, under FERC's Uniform System of Accounts,
8
9 utilities are required to report distribution facilities such as land and land rights, structures
10
11 and improvements, station equipment, storage battery equipment, poles, towers and fixtures,
12
13 overhead conductors and devices, underground conduit, underground conductors and devices,
14
15 each of which is used in connection with distribution operations or distribution purposes. See
16
17 Sections 360-369 of Part 101. PSE states that if PSE's proposed classification of
18
19 transmission and distribution was adopted by the Commission, PSE would seek to report its
20
21 transmission and distribution plant to FERC under and in light of such adoption by the
22
23 Commission.

24
25 With regard to its reporting requirements to this Commission, PSE makes its reports
26
27 concerning its transmission and distribution plant to this Commission in its semiannual
28
29 commission basis and annual reports. Pursuant to WAC 480-100-031(5), PSE's annual report
30
31 to this Commission consists of PSE's FERC Form No. 1. PSE proposes that if its proposed
32
33 classification of transmission and distribution facilities was adopted by the Commission, PSE
34
35 would, commencing from the date of Commission's order, report its transmission and
36
37 distribution plant in its annual report (and PSE's semiannual commission basis reports) under
38
39 and in light of such adoption by the Commission.

40
41 The Commission finds that an accounting order authorizing PSE to reflect such
42
43 classifications in its accounts and reports to the Commission is reasonable and in the public
44
45 interest. In addition, as recommended by Staff, we hereby clarify that, until this Commission
46
47 approves a new depreciation study for PSE's facilities, the transmission and distribution

1 facility classifications, and their related accounting treatment, should not result in revised
2 depreciation rates for facilities so classified.
3

4
5 **IV. DECLARATORY ORDER**
6

7 A declaratory order by the Commission adopting PSE's proposed classifications is
8 appropriate in this case. The facilities so classified, however, are unique to PSE and this
9 order should not be construed as setting precedent for any other utility.
10

11 By authority of WAC 480-09-230 and RCW 34.05.240(1), the Commission may enter
12 a declaratory order upon a showing:
13

14 (a) That uncertainty necessitating resolution exists;
15

16 (b) That there is actual controversy arising from the uncertainty such that a
17 declaratory order will not be merely an advisory opinion;
18

19 (c) That the uncertainty adversely affects the petitioner;
20

21 (d) That the adverse effect of uncertainty on the petitioner outweighs any
22 adverse effects on others or on the general public that may likely arise from the order
23 requested; and
24

25 (e) That the petition complies with any additional requirements
26 established by the agency under subsection (2) of this section.
27

28 The declaratory order requested by PSE in its Petition meets these requirements, as set forth
29 below.⁵
30

31 **Uncertainty Necessitating Resolution:** The uncertainty to be resolved by this Order
32 is the precise demarcation between PSE transmission and distribution facilities to be applied
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 ⁵ The Commission has not established additional requirements under RCW 34.05.240(1)(e),
46 but rather requires that petitions for declaratory order comply with the remaining subsections of
47 RCW 34.05.240(1). See RCW 34.05.240(2); WAC 480-09-230.

PERKINS COIE LLP
One Bellevue Center, Suite
1800
411 - 108th Avenue
Northeast
Bellevue, WA 98004-5584
(425) 453-6980

1 in the future to reports to this Commission and to FERC. As to the jurisdictional significance
2 of such distinctions, FERC invites proposals filed by public utilities under the Federal Power
3 Act to classify transmission and distribution facilities, and cost allocations associated
4 therewith. However, this Commission must first speak to the issue. Indeed, FERC
5 recognized that state determination of its jurisdictional boundaries under and in light of the
6 seven-factor test was a necessary prerequisite to federal consideration of such questions:
7
8
9
10
11

12 [A]s a prerequisite to filing transmission/local distribution facility
13 classifications and/or cost allocations with [FERC], utilities *must*
14 consult with their state regulatory authorities.
15
16

17 Order 888-A, at 30,336 (emphasis added).
18

19 **Actual Controversy Arising From the Uncertainty Such That a Declaratory**
20

21 **Order Will Not Be Merely an Advisory Opinion:** The controversy arises from uncertainty
22 as to which of PSE's facilities are transmission facilities and which are distribution facilities
23 under and in light of the seven-factor test promulgated by FERC in Order 888.
24
25

26 **The Uncertainty Adversely Affects the Petitioner:** The uncertainty adversely
27 affects PSE in that, absent resolution thereof, there is uncertainty as to whom PSE owes
28 certain regulatory responsibilities determined under and in light of the seven-factor test
29 promulgated by FERC in Order 888. In this regard, FERC said:
30
31
32

33 We also believe it is important to develop mechanisms to avoid
34 regulatory conflict and to help provide certainty to utilities as to which
35 regulator has jurisdiction over which facilities.
36
37
38

39 Order 888, at 31,783.
40

41 **The Adverse Effect of Uncertainty on the Petitioner Outweighs any Adverse**
42 **Effects on Others or on the General Public That May Likely Arise From the Order**
43

44 **Requested:** Resolution of the questions raised in this petition will not result in any adverse
45
46
47

1 effect on others or the general public. The public interest is served by clarification of
2
3 regulatory jurisdiction of the Commission, and of FERC, under and in light of the seven-
4
5 factor test promulgated by FERC in Order 888.⁶
6

7 **V. FINDINGS OF FACT**

8
9 The Commission finds:

10
11 1. PSE is a public service company furnishing electric and gas service primarily
12
13 in the greater Puget Sound region of the State of Washington and is subject to the regulatory
14
15 authority of the Commission as to its rates, service, facility, and practices.
16

17 2. On January 2, 2001, PSE filed with the Commission a Petition for a
18
19 Declaratory Order and Accounting Order regarding the classification of certain facilities and
20
21 accounting treatment consistent therewith.
22

23 3. PSE's proposed classification of its facilities, as shown in Appendix A of this
24
25 Order, and PSE's proposed accounting procedures consistent with such classification is
26
27 reasonable, in the public interest and should be approved.
28

29 **VI. ORDER**

30
31 The Commission Orders:

32
33 1. **THE COMMISSION DECLARES** that PSE's proposed classifications of its
34
35 facilities as shown in Appendix A are reasonable and in the public interest.
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 ⁶ PSE further states that adoption of PSE's proposed classifications would have no effect on
43 others or the general public during the period of rate stability set forth in the Merger Order. PSE
44 proposes that at the time of PSE's next general rate case, and to the extent such classifications are
45 addressed in such a proceeding, PSE would not propose that the different classes of customers
46 experience any impacts that arise solely from any change in the methodology for classification of
47 facilities resulting from this Petition.

1 2. Authorization is hereby given to PSE to reflect such classifications in its
2
3 accounts and reports to this Commission.

4 3. Such classifications, and the determinations upon which they are based,
5
6 should not be construed to constitute precedent for any other utility.
7

8 4. The Commission retains jurisdiction to effectuate the provisions of this Order.
9

10
11
12 DATED at Olympia, Washington, and effective this _____ day of _____.
13
14

15
16 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47