

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

**Complainant,**

**v.**

**PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,**

**Respondent.**

**DOCKETS UE-090704 and  
UG-090705 (*consolidated*)**

**PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.'S  
PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

1. Pursuant to WAC 480-07-850, Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE") respectfully requests that the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission (the "Commission") reconsider the Commission's Order No. 11, entered April 2, 2010, in these consolidated dockets ("Order No. 11") with respect to the sole issue of low income bill assistance.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

2. These dockets concern PSE's 2009 general rate case. In its initial filing in this proceeding, PSE proposed to increase its low income gas and electric residential bill assistance. Reconsideration of Order No. 11 is necessary because, in an apparent oversight, the Commission failed to address low income assistance in its final order.

3. PSE respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider Order No. 11 to approve PSE's proposal to increase residential and gas low income bill assistance.

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS AND ARGUMENT

4. In its initial filing, PSE requested approval to increase the annual level of low-income electric and natural gas bill assistance funding by the corresponding percentage increase to the residential class that would be approved by this Commission. *See* PSE's Initial Brief at ¶ 146. PSE proposed to add this percentage increase to the low income tariff in its next program year. *See* Markell, Exh. No. EMM-1TC 38:9-11. In Order No. 11, the Commission approved a baseline increase of 5.83 percent for electric residential schedules and 7.4 percent for gas residential schedules but failed to address PSE's low income proposal. *See* Order No. 11 at ¶¶ 308, 313 and 399.

5. No party to this proceeding provided any testimony or exhibits opposing PSE's proposed increase to low income bill assistance, and PSE was the only party to raise the issue in initial briefs.<sup>1</sup> However, in its reply brief, Commission Staff stated that PSE's low income tariff had not been suspended and recommended that the Commission delay consideration of this increase until PSE files its next low income tariff. *See* Commission Staff's Reply Brief at ¶¶ 24-25. This was PSE's first indication of any opposition to its proposal. Commission Staff raised an entirely new argument against PSE's proposal, and because the argument was raised in a reply brief, PSE had no opportunity to respond to Commission's Staff's argument.

---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding involved filing simultaneous initial briefs on February 19, 2010 and reply briefs on March 2, 2010.


6. Chapter 80.28.068 RCW authorizes the Commission to approve the increase in low income bill assistance, specifically referring to proposals such as PSE's in the context of a general rate proceeding. Further, nothing in Chapter 80.28.060 RCW, which governs tariff changes, precludes an order granting PSE's proposal. PSE did not request to increase its current low income tariff; rather, PSE requested that the Commission approve an increase so that PSE could apply such increase to its new low income tariff at the next program year. Accordingly, it is irrelevant whether PSE's low income tariff was suspended during this proceeding. The Commission should reject Commission Staff's untimely objection to PSE's proposal.

### III. CONCLUSION

7. Based upon the foregoing, PSE respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider Order No. 11 and issue an order approving an increase to PSE's electric and gas low income bill assistance program in the manner described above.

Respectfully submitted this 8<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010.

PERKINS COIE LLP

By   
Sheree Strom Carson, WSBA No. 25349  
Jason Kuzma, WSBA No. 31830  
Attorneys for Puget Sound Energy, Inc.