

**EXHIBIT NO. ___(JAP-26)
DOCKET NOS. UE-111048/UG-111049
2011 PSE GENERAL RATE CASE
WITNESS: JON A. PILIARIS**

**BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

**Docket No. UE-111048
Docket No. UG-111049**

**SECOND EXHIBIT (NONCONFIDENTIAL) TO THE
PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
JON A. PILIARIS
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.**

JANUARY 17, 2012

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STAFF
RESPONSE TO DATA REQUEST

DATE PREPARED: December 21, 2011 WITNESS: Deborah J. Reynolds
DOCKETS: UE-111048/UG-111049 RESPONDER: Deborah J. Reynolds
REQUESTER: Puget Sound Energy TELEPHONE: (360) 664-1255

PSE Data Request No. 027 to WUTC Staff:

RE: Deborah J. Reynolds, Exhibit No. ____ (DJR-1T), page 32, line 17-19

Please provide the basis upon which Commission Staff determined that PSE's proposed CSA mechanisms are "annualizing adjustments." As part of this response, please provide the specific definition or criteria for an "annualizing adjustment" relied upon to form this opinion.

RESPONSE:

Staff did not conclude that the CSA was an "annualizing adjustment." Staff's testimony refers to existing annualizing adjustments, and goes on to point out that even if such an adjustment were needed, the calculated changes in revenue do not appear to be significant. Staff's testimony should more accurately state at Exhibit No. ____ (DJR-1T), page 32, line 18:

- A. No. Annualizing adjustments already in place should capture significant changes in use patterns of existing customers. The calculated changes in use patterns from energy efficiency only changed the electric revenue requirement 0.21 percent, or \$4.5 million, and the gas revenue requirement 0.09 percent, or \$0.9 million.