EXHIBIT NO. ___(JHS-9T) DOCKET NO. UE-070565 2007 PSE PCORC WITNESS: JOHN H. STORY

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

Docket No. UE-070565

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF JOHN H. STORY ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF JOHN H. STORY

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	UPDATE TO REVENUE REQUIREMENT	2
ш	CONCLUSION	9

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF JOHN H. STORY

I. INTRODUCTION

- Q. Are you the same John H. Story who provided prefiled direct testimony in this Docket on behalf of Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE" or "the Company")?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What topics are you covering in your supplemental direct testimony?
- A. I present the update to power cost projections discussed by Mr. David E. Mills in his prefiled supplemental direct testimony, Exhibit No. (DEM-7T), as well as an update to several proforma and restating adjustments for new information that has become available to the Company since its original filing of March 20, 2007.

These changes to the proforma and restating adjustments result in an adjustment to the Company's revenue deficiency from the \$64,680,804 set forth in PSE's March 20, 2007, filing to \$77,837,215. This is an average 4.43% increase over rates in effect as of January 13, 2007.

Q.

A.

Please explain Exhibit No. ___(JHS-10)?

Exhibit No. ___(JHS-10) presents similar information as Exhibit No. ___(JHS-5) in this Docket, after being updated for the revisions described later in my prefiled supplemental direct testimony. The first column in this exhibit provides the ratebase and production costs from the test year that will be considered in setting the Power Cost Rate. The column, titled "Test Year Actual 12 months ended December 31, 2006", sets forth the ratebase and actual production costs for the test year ended December 2006. The columns to the right of this first column show the impact of the pro forma and restating power cost adjustments PSE is proposing for the pro forma rate year. For the adjustments that have changed since the March 20, 2007 filing, we have marked the columns as "Revised".

Each adjustment is presented in more detail on the succeeding pages referenced in the title of a particular column. The total of the test year amounts plus the pro forma and restating adjustments is shown in the column titled "Adjusted 12 months ended December 31, 2006" on page 2 of Exhibit No. ___(JHS-10). This column represents the costs included in determining the Power Cost Rate which is then used to calculate the required rate increase. These are the same amounts shown in the first column of Exhibit No. ___(JHS-11C), "Exhibit A-1 Power Cost Rate".

The work papers supporting the March 20, 2007 adjustments have been

7

8

previously provided to Commission Staff and intervenors. For each adjustment that is marked "REVISED," new workpapers supporting the adjustment have been provided and the individual workpapers have been identified as to whether they have changed from the original filing. The numbers that changed in each adjustment as a result of this supplemental filing have also been presented in bold and italic font.

- Q. Have you prepared a reconciliation between the revenue deficiency filed in March 2007 and the current revenue deficiency?
- A. Yes. The following table shows the impact of each of the proforma and restating adjustments on the March 2007 revenue deficiency.

Description	Adjustment	Revenue Deficiency (million)
As filed March 20, 2007		\$64.7
Test Year Actual		(.3)
Power Cost	10.01	11.6
Sales for Resale	10.02	2.4
Goldendale	10.04	(.4)
Property Taxes	10.05	(.3)
Montana Energy Tax	10.06	.0
Property Insurance	10.07	(.3)
Wild Horse	10.08	.2
Baker Lake Relicensing	10.09	.2

3

1

Q.

A.

4

5

- 6
- 7
- 9

8

- 10 11
- 12

13

- 14
- 15
- 17

16

18

financial adjustment for Financial Accounting Standards Board Pronouncement No. 143, Asset Retirement Obligations, had been inadvertently picked up in the

After the March 20, 2007 filing we found three accounts associated with the

- historical ratebase calculation. We have removed these account balances which
- lowered historical ratebase by \$2,367,064. In addition, test year actuals reflect a
- change in property taxes as described in the property taxes section below.
- Q. Please explain the changes for each of the proforma and restating
- A. Adjustment 10.01, Power Costs, reflects the natural gas prices and power cost
 - changes discussed in the prefiled supplemental direct testimony of David E. Mills,
 - Exhibit No. (DEM-7T). Operating expense is now decreased by \$37,567,567.
 - Adjustment 10.02, Sales for Resale, reflects the changes discussed in the
 - prefiled supplemental direct testimony of Mr. David E. Mills and is a result of the
 - AURORA model run reflecting those changes. Net operating income is increased
 - by \$82,582,873 after this update.

adjustments.

- Adjustment 10.03, Transmission Income, has not changed since the original
- filing. Net operating income is increased by \$545,355.

0.

Adjustment 10.04, Goldendale, actual capital costs through April 30, 2007 plus updated forecast capital expenditures have been used to update the investment for ratebase and the depreciation calculation. Mr. Roger Garratt discusses the capital cost updates in his prefiled supplemental direct testimony, Exhibit No. ___(RG-20CT). Mr. Garratt also discusses the updated estimates for operating expenses that have been used in calculating the cost for Goldendale. Ratebase has been reduced by \$3,113,597 to \$122,666,901 and operating expenses have been reduced by \$141,469 from the March filing and now increase operating expense by \$29,991,365.

Adjustment 10.05, Property Taxes, are being updated for the rate year to current levy rates and assessed values instead of the estimated amounts used in the March filing. Test year amounts have decreased by \$50,090 because the revised allocation percentages used to allocate rate year property taxes to production and transmission property are based on updated allocations for the test year. Net operating income is increased \$34,863 by this adjustment after reflecting the new levy rates.

Adjustment 10.06, Montana Energy Tax, is updated based on the new kilowatt hours being generated at Colstrip using the updated AURORA model. Operating expense is now decreased by \$2,924.

Adjustment 10.07, Property Insurance, updates estimated property insurance premium amounts to actual since the March filing. The total adjustment now

Adjustment 10.08, Wild Horse: reflects actual capital costs through April 30, 2007 plus updated forecast capital expenditures, as discussed by Mr. Roger Garratt in his prefiled supplemental direct testimony, Exhibit No. ___(RG-20CT), used to update the investment for ratebase and to calculate depreciation.

Depreciation expense changed from the March 20, 2007 filing due to the capital investment change and property insurance is corrected for an update to the rate year estimated expense. The increase to ratebase has been increased by \$1,554,183 to \$294,496,074 and operating expenses have been increased by \$42,519 from the March filing and now the total increase to operating expense is \$15,406,975.

Adjustment 10.09, Baker Lake Relicensing, has the costs associated with the relicensing updated through April 30, 2007 and reflects the expected FERC approval of the new license in the fourth quarter of 2007. Rate base is increased \$29,083,389 and operating expense is increased \$658,492.

Adjustment 10.10, Regulatory Assets and Liabilities, has not changed from the March 2007 filing. This adjustment reduces ratebase by \$44,993,019 and increases operating expense by \$6,673,724.

Adjustment 10.11, Production Adjustment, is being corrected to reflect the update on the adjustments discussed above. In addition, three Excel cell references in the revenue model have been corrected so that the appropriate

of Exhibit No. ___(JHS-11C), the costs have been allocated in the same manner as discussed in the PCA Settlement Agreement, between fixed and variable costs. Following the same methodology set forth in Exhibit A to the PCA Settlement, this result is then divided by the test year delivered load to calculate the new Power Cost Rate of \$60.204 per MWh, before the adjustment for the Tenaska flow through taxes. This would be the Power Cost Rate used in tracking the PCA periods following this proceeding.

- Q. Please explain the remaining pages included in Exhibit No. ___(JHS-11C).
- A. The remaining pages of Exhibit No. ___(JHS-11C) are equivalent to the exhibits

 A-2 through D included in the PCA Settlement and have been updated to reflect
 the changes in power costs presented by the Company. In the upper left hand
 corner of each of these pages is the reference to the exhibit being replaced in the
 PCA.
- Q. Please explain how the Company calculated the rate increase required after taking into consideration the pro forma and restating adjustments.
- A. As the Company is only requesting that a portion of its rates be adjusted using the power cost only rate filing, we have calculated the required change in rates using the difference between the Power Cost Rate currently being used and the proposed Power Cost Rate after the Adjustment of Power Cost Rate discussed in my prefiled direct testimony, Exhibit No. ___(JHS-01T), page 19 and the adjustments discussed in my prefiled supplemental testimony. This calculation is shown in

9

10

11

12

Exhibit No. (JHS-12) and, as shown on line 16 of that exhibit, the new rate is \$63.262 per MWh, after the adjustment for flow though taxes on Tenaska, versus the current rate of \$59.583. 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 change in revenue deficiency of \$77,837,215 after revenue sensitive items. This change in rates results in an average increase of approximately 4.43%. Mr. Hoff discusses how this revenue deficiency impacts each of the customer classes in his prefiled supplemental testimony.

III. **CONCLUSION**

- Q. Does that conclude your prefiled supplemental direct testimony?
- A. Yes, it does.