EXHIBIT NO. ___(KJB-8T) DOCKET NO. UE-130617 2013 PSE PCORC WITNESS: KATHERINE J. BARNARD

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

Docket No. UE-130617

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF KATHERINE J. BARNARD ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

JULY 2, 2013

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF KATHERINE J. BARNARD

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	UPDATE TO REVENUE REQUIREMENT	2
III.	CONCLUSION	13

1			PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.
2 3			REFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY ONCONFIDENTIAL) OF KATHERINE J. BARNARD
4			I. INTRODUCTION
5	Q.	Are you	the same Katherine J. Barnard who provided prefiled direct
6		testimon	y in this docket on behalf of Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE")?
7	А.	Yes, I file	ed prefiled direct testimony, Exhibit No(KJB-1T), and six
8		supportin	g exhibits, Exhibit No(KJB-2) through Exhibit No(KJB-7).
9	Q.	What top	pics are you covering in your prefiled supplemental direct
10		testimon	y?
11	А.	This pref	iled supplemental direct testimony presents:
12 13 14 15		1.	the update to the power cost pro forma adjustment for the new power cost projections discussed by Mr. David E. Mills in his prefiled supplemental direct testimony, Exhibit No(DEM-5CT);
16 17		2.	a correction to the original filing to include property insurance premiums for the Colstrip facility;
18 19 20		3.	an increase to transmission revenues for a change to PSE's Open Access Transmission ("OATT") tariff that became effective June 1, 2013;
21 22 23 24 25		4.	the transfer of a portion of transmission credits that were made under a Large Generator Interconnection Agreement ("LGIA") with the Bonneville Power Authority ("BPA") associated with the sale of the Lower Snake River ("LSR") Phase 2 development rights, which is addressed in the prefiled

1 2		supplemental direct testimony of Mr. Michael Mullally, Exhibit No. (MM-8T); and
3 4 5 6 7 8		5. the update for the after-tax weighted average cost of capital that became effective July 1, 2013 as a result of PSE's Expedited Rate Filing that was approved in Order 07 in Docket Nos. UE-130137 and UG-130138 (consolidated). The after-tax weighted average cost of capital changed from 6.71% to 6.69%.
9		I will also provide updated exhibits that are impacted as a result of these changes.
10		These changes to the pro forma and restating adjustments result in a revenue
11		deficiency of \$491,934, as compared to the revenue surplus of \$618,683 set forth
12		in PSE's April 25, 2013, filing. The increase requested in this supplemental filing
13		is an average 0.02 percent increase in the PCA-related rates that became effective
14		May 14, 2012 in Docket UE-111048.
15		II. UPDATE TO REVENUE REQUIREMENT
15 16	Q.	II. UPDATE TO REVENUE REQUIREMENT Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9).
	Q. A.	
16		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9).
16 17		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4)
16 17 18		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4) in this proceeding, after being updated for the revisions described later in my
16 17 18 19		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4) in this proceeding, after being updated for the revisions described later in my prefiled supplemental direct testimony. The first column in this exhibit provides
16 17 18 19 20		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4) in this proceeding, after being updated for the revisions described later in my prefiled supplemental direct testimony. The first column in this exhibit provides the rate base and production costs from the test year that will be considered in
16 17 18 19 20 21		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4) in this proceeding, after being updated for the revisions described later in my prefiled supplemental direct testimony. The first column in this exhibit provides the rate base and production costs from the test year that will be considered in setting the Power Cost Baseline Rate. The column titled, "Test Year Actual 12
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 		Please explain Exhibit No(KJB-9). Exhibit No(KJB-9) presents similar information as Exhibit No(KJB-4) in this proceeding, after being updated for the revisions described later in my prefiled supplemental direct testimony. The first column in this exhibit provides the rate base and production costs from the test year that will be considered in setting the Power Cost Baseline Rate. The column titled, "Test Year Actual 12 months ended September 30, 2012", sets forth the rate base and actual production

1	adjustments PSE is proposing for the pro forma rate year. For the adjustments
2	that have changed since the April 25, 2013 filing, the columns have been marked
3	as " REVISED ".
4	Each adjustment is presented in more detail on the succeeding pages referenced in
5	the title of a particular column. The total of the test year amounts plus the pro
6	forma and restating adjustments is shown in the column titled "Adjusted 12
7	months ended September 30, 2012", on page three of Exhibit No. (KJB-9).
8	This column represents the costs included in determining the Power Cost Baseline
9	Rate, which is then used to calculate the required rate increase. These are the
10	same amounts shown in the first column of Exhibit No(KJB-10), "Exhibit A-
11	1 Power Cost Baseline Rate".
12	The work papers supporting the April 25, 2013 adjustments were provided to
13	Commission Staff and intervenors on April 25, 2013. For each adjustment that is
14	marked " REVISED " in Exhibit No(KJB-9), a new set of hard copy work
15	papers has been prepared. A full set of electronic work papers for all adjustments,
16	regardless of whether or not they are different from the original filing, will be
17	provided to Commission Staff and intervenors. The numbers that changed on
18	each work paper lead sheet as a result of this supplemental filing have been
19	identified within the work papers.

Prefiled Supplemental Direct Testimony (Nonconfidential) of Katherine J. Barnard

Q. Have you prepared a reconciliation between the revenue surplus filed in April 2013 and the current revenue deficiency?

1

2

3

4

A. Yes. The following table shows the impact of each of the pro forma and restating adjustments on the April 2013 revenue surplus.

Description	Adjustment(s)	(Surplus) Deficiency (thousands)
Surplus filed April 25, 2013		\$(618.7)
Power Costs	9.01, 9.02	4,295.8
Transmission Revenues	9.01	(953.3)
LSR BPA LGIA Credits	9.21	(2,246.9)
Rate of Return Change	Adjustments w/ rate base	(894.4)
Property Insurance - Colstrip	Test Year & 9.14	909.4
Deficiency filed July 2, 2013		\$491.9

5Q.Please explain the changes for each of the pro forma and restating

adjustments. 6 7 **Test Year**, Certain amounts on page one of Exhibit No. ___(KJB-9) have been A. 8 changed since the original filing. The amounts shown on line 15b for property 9 insurance have been revised to include the test year amount of property insurance 10 associated with the Colstrip facility, which was inadvertently excluded from the 11 original filing. Additionally, amounts shown on lines 10 through 12 have been 12 changed to reflect the reduction in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital. Baseline Power costs for the test year, shown on row 29 labeled "Subtotal and 13 Baseline Rate," are now \$1,328,596,008. 14

1	Adjustment 9.01, Power Costs, was updated to reflect the power cost changes
2	discussed in the prefiled supplemental direct testimony of David E. Mills, Exhibit
3	No. (DEM-5CT). Additionally, variable transmission income was increased
4	to reflect the new formula driven OATT rates, which were reset for the June 2013
5	to May 2014 rate year. These rates, filed in May, were approved by FERC and
6	went into effect on June 1, 2013. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount
7	reflected on page one of Exhibit No. (KJB-9) is now decreased by
8	\$134,381,664 for this adjustment.
9	Adjustment 9.02, Montana Energy Tax, has been changed as a result of the
10	change to the rate year generation from the Colstrip facility as supported by Mr.
11	Mills. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page one of Exhibit
12	No. (KJB-9) is now increased by \$918,448 for this adjustment.
13	Adjustment 9.03, Lower Snake River Project, The adjustment to rate base and
14	expenses remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the Subtotal
15	and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page one of Exhibit No(KJB-9)
16	results from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital. The
17	Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$35,452,003 for this
18	adjustment.
19	Adjustment 9.04, Snoqualmie License Upgrade, The adjustment to rate base
20	and expenses remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the
21	Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page one of Exhibit
22	No. (KJB-9) results from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of
	Prefiled Supplemental Direct Testimony (Nonconfidential) of Katherine J. BarnardExhibit No(KJB-8T) Page 5 of 13

capital. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$36,083,888 for this adjustment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Adjustment 9.05, Snoqualmie Deferral: The rate base balance and amortizationexpense have been updated to adjust the deferred carrying charges for the changein the after-tax weighted average cost of capital effective July 1, 2013.Additionally, the change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected onpage one of Exhibit No. ___(KJB-9) includes the impact from the change in theafter-tax weighted average cost of capital applied to the revised rate base balance.The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$3,070,359 for thisadjustment.

 11
 Adjustment 9.06, Baker License Upgrade, The adjustment to rate base and

 12
 expenses remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the Baseline

 13
 Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page one of Exhibit

 14
 No. ___(KJB-9) results from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of

 15
 capital. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$17,371,936

 16
 for this adjustment.

Adjustment 9.07, Baker Deferral, The rate base balance and amortization
expense have been updated to adjust the deferred carrying charges for the change
in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital effective July 1, 2013.
Additionally, the change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on
page one of Exhibit No. (KJB-9) includes the impact from the change in the
after-tax weighted average cost of capital applied to the revised rate base balance.

The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$1,000,611 for this adjustment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Adjustment 9.08, Ferndale Plant, The adjustment to rate base and expenses remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page one of Exhibit No. ___(KJB-9) results from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$10,739,289 for this adjustment.

Adjustment 9.09, Ferndale Deferral, The rate base balance and amortization 8 9 expense have been updated to adjust the deferred carrying charges for the change 10 in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital effective July 1, 2013. 11 Additionally, the change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on 12 page two of Exhibit No. (KJB-9) includes the impact from the change in the 13 after-tax weighted average cost of capital applied to the revised rate base balance. 14 The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now increased by \$5,731,748 for this 15 adjustment.

16Adjustment 9.10, Wild Horse Solar, The adjustment to rate base and expenses17remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the Subtotal and18Baseline Rate amount reflected on page two of Exhibit No. ___(KJB-9) results19from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital. The Subtotal20and Baseline Rate amount is now decreased by \$492,352 for this adjustment.

Prefiled Supplemental Direct Testimony (Nonconfidential) of Katherine J. Barnard

1 Adjustment 9.11, Remove Tenaska Regulatory Asset, The adjustment to rate 2 base and expenses remains unchanged from the original filing. The change to the 3 Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page two of Exhibit 4 No. (KJB-9) results from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of 5 capital. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount is now decreased by \$10,281,888 for this adjustment. 6 7 Adjustment 9.12, Sale of Electron, The assumed closing date of this transaction 8 has been changed from July 1, 2013, as stated in PSE's original filing, to 9 September 1, 2013. The new closing date is more realistic based on the status of 10 PSE's pending application for authorization to sell water rights and associated 11 assets, filed in Docket UE-131099. Such authorization must occur prior to the 12 transaction's closing date. This change has no impact on overall rate base or 13 amortization expense. The change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount 14 reflected on page two of Exhibit No. (KJB-9) results from the change in the 15 after-tax weighted average cost of capital. The Subtotal and Baseline Rate 16 amount is now decreased by \$5,230,347 for this adjustment. 17 Adjustment 9.13, Property Taxes, has not changed from the April 25, 1013 filing. 18 19 Adjustment 9.14 Property Insurance, has been corrected to include property 20 insurance for Colstrip Units 1-4 for the test year and rate year. The Colstrip 21 insurance costs were inadvertently excluded from the April 25, 2013 filing. The

total adjustment now increases the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount reflected on page two of Exhibit No. ____(KJB-9) by \$41,621.

Adjustments 9.15 through 9.20 Various Regulatory Asset and Liability

adjustments, The change to the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amounts reflected on pages two through three of Exhibit No. ___(KJB-9) for these adjustments result from the change in the after-tax weighted average cost of capital.

Adjustment 9.21 Lower Snake River Prepaid Transmission and Deferred

Carrying Charges, The rate base and amortization expense for this regulatory asset have been changed to reflect the regulatory treatment for a transfer of BPA LGIA credits to Portland General Electric ("Portland General"). Such regulatory treatment has been requested in Docket UE-131230 filed on June 28, 2013. The background and overview of the transaction with Portland General is further discussed in this proceeding in the prefiled supplemental direct testimony of Mr. Michael Mullally, Exhibit No. (MM-8T). Under the terms of the contract, Portland General will, after closing and within two business days after BPA's notice to Portland General that BPA has completed its processing of PSE's assignment to Portland General of the BPA Transferred Transmission Credits, pay PSE an amount equal to \$20,500,000 in consideration of such assignment. PSE proposes to record this \$20,500,000 payment as a regulatory liability and accrue interest on it at PSE's authorized net of tax rate of return grossed up for federal income tax from the date of receipt through the date rates become effective in this proceeding. PSE anticipates that BPA will notify Portland General that the BPA

1	Transferred Transmission Credits have been completed two months after close.
2	Therefore, if the transaction closes as expected on August 1, 2013, PSE expects to
3	be in receipt of the payment from Portland General on or about October 1, 2013.
4	The monthly interest accrual is expected to be \$175,000. For purposes of this
5	adjustment, I have assumed the rates effective date of November 1, 2013, which
6	aligns with all other adjustments currently reflected in my exhibits based on
7	assumptions included in the original filing. Such timing assumptions result in the
8	regulatory liability for accrued interest to be equal to one month of interest, or
9	\$175,000. In lieu of tracking a regulatory liability separately for this minimal
10	amount, PSE proposes that the \$175,000 be offset against a related regulatory
11	asset. PSE has an existing regulatory asset currently being recovered in the PCA
12	for the original accrued carrying charges on the full balance of the transmission
13	credits. This regulatory asset was approved in Dockets UE-111048 and UE-
14	100882 and is included in this same adjustment, as is reflected on line three of
15	page 25 of Exhibit No. (KJB-9). Accordingly, the changes reflected on lines
16	three and eight of this adjustment relate to the offsetting of the \$175,000 of
17	accrued interest payable against the existing regulatory asset balance. These
18	changes to rate base discussed above and the commensurate changes to
19	amortization expense along with the change resulting from the decrease in the
20	after-tax weighted average cost of capital make up the difference in this
21	adjustment between the original and supplemental filings. The Subtotal and
22	Baseline Rate amount shown on page three of Exhibit No(KJB-9) is now
23	increased by \$1,048,880 for this adjustment.

1		Adjustment 9.22, Hedging Line of Credit, has not changed from the April 25,
2		2013 filing, and continues to decrease the Subtotal and Baseline Rate amount
3		reflected on page three of Exhibit No. (KJB-9) by \$52,144.
4		Adjustment 9.23, Production Adjustment, is being updated to reflect the
5		changes to the production related adjustments discussed above. The Subtotal and
6		Baseline Rate amount shown on page three of Exhibit No(KJB-9) is now
7		decreased by \$7,734,880.
8		Adjustment 9.24, Temperature Normalization, has not changed from the
9		original filing.
10		Adjustment 9.25, Conversion Factor, has not changed from the original filing.
11	Q.	Have you prepared a new exhibit that calculates the Power Cost Baseline
12		Rate for the PCA in light of the changes to the fixed and variable power costs
13		described earlier?
14	A.	Yes. Exhibit No. (KJB-10) is similar to Exhibit No. (KJB-5) but reflects
15		the updates discussed above, which are prepared in the same manner as Exhibit A
16		to the PCA Settlement. See Exhibit No. (KJB-3) at page 15. On the first page
17		of Exhibit No. (KJB-10), the costs included in the Power Cost Baseline Rate
18		have been allocated between fixed and variable costs in the same manner as
19		discussed in the PCA Settlement Agreement. Following the same methodology
20		set forth in Exhibit A to the PCA Settlement, this result is then divided by the test
21		year delivered load to calculate the new Power Cost Baseline Rate of \$61.237 per
		ed Supplemental Direct Testimony Exhibit No(KJB-8T) confidential) of Katherine J. Barnard Page 11 of 13

1		MWh. Once approved by the Commission, this would be the Power Cost
2		Baseline Rate used in tracking the PCA periods following this proceeding.
3	Q.	Please explain the remaining pages included in Exhibit No(KJB-10).
4	A.	The remaining pages of Exhibit No. (KJB-10) are equivalent to Exhibits A-2
5		through D included in the PCA Settlement and have been updated to reflect the
6		changes in power and production related costs as well as the authorized change to
7		after-tax weighted average cost of capital presented by PSE. In the upper left
8		hand corner of each of these pages is the reference to the exhibit being replaced in
9		the PCA.
10	0.	Please explain how PSE calculated the rate increase required after taking
10 11	Q.	Please explain how PSE calculated the rate increase required after taking into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments.
	Q.	Please explain how PSE calculated the rate increase required after taking into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments.
	Q. A.	
11		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments.
11 12		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This
11 12 13		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This calculation is shown in Exhibit No(KJB-11), which is similar to my Exhibit
11 12 13 14		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This calculation is shown in Exhibit No(KJB-11), which is similar to my Exhibit No(KJB-6). As shown on line 16 of Exhibit No(KJB-11), the new rate
 11 12 13 14 15 		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This calculation is shown in Exhibit No(KJB-11), which is similar to my Exhibit No(KJB-6). As shown on line 16 of Exhibit No(KJB-11), the new rate is \$64.122 per MWh, versus the rate currently in effect of \$64.099. The
 11 12 13 14 15 16 		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This calculation is shown in Exhibit No(KJB-11), which is similar to my Exhibit No(KJB-6). As shown on line 16 of Exhibit No(KJB-11), the new rate is \$64.122 per MWh, versus the rate currently in effect of \$64.099. The difference between these two rates is multiplied by the normalized delivered load
 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 		into consideration the revised pro forma and restating adjustments. The rate increase was calculated in the same manner as the original filing. This calculation is shown in Exhibit No(KJB-11), which is similar to my Exhibit No(KJB-6). As shown on line 16 of Exhibit No(KJB-11), the new rate is \$64.122 per MWh, versus the rate currently in effect of \$64.099. The difference between these two rates is multiplied by the normalized delivered load for the test period. The result of this calculation is the requested revenue

L	Q.	Have new rate spread and rate design exhibits been prepared for this revised
2		revenue requirement deficiency?
3	A.	No. PSE will update the tariff pages and the exhibits that were supported by Mr.
1		Jon A. Piliaris in the original filing during the compliance filing in this
5		proceeding.
6		III. CONCLUSION
7	Q.	Does that conclude your prefiled supplemental direct testimony?
8	A.	Yes, it does.
		ed Supplemental Direct Testimony Exhibit No(KJB-8T) confidential) of Katherine J. Barnard Page 13 of 13