

**Exh. JTW-2
Dockets UE-190529/UG-190530 and
UE-190274/UG-190275 (*consolidated*)
Witness: James T. Woodward**

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY,

Respondent.

**DOCKETS UE-190529
and UG-190530 (*consolidated*)**

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

**For an Order Authorizing Deferral
Accounting and Ratemaking Treatment
for Short-life UT/Technology Investment**

**DOCKETS UE-190274 and
UG-190275 (*consolidated*)**

EXHIBIT TO CROSS-ANSWERING TESTIMONY OF

James T. Woodward

**STAFF OF
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

NWEC Response to UTC Staff Data Request No. 3

January 15, 2020

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
Dockets UE-190529/UG-190530 and UE-190274/UG-190275
January 3, 2020

UTC STAFF DATA REQUEST NO. 3:

In Exh. WMG-1T at 17:16-18, NWECC witness Gerlitz describes the costs typically included in the tariff amount in a “tariff” OBRP as “a simple annual percentage rate (APR) calculation with three primary variables: cost to install the upgrades and any fees, the cost of capital, and the duration of cost recovery.”

- a. Has NWECC considered how the utility recovers administrative and other program costs, delineated what these costs are, and indicated in which accounts these costs would be recorded?
- b. If so, please provide a reference to NWECC’s testimony on the matter.
- c. If not, what does NWECC believe are relevant costs, how should these costs be recovered and from whom?

RESPONSE TO UTC STAFF DATA REQUEST NO. 3:

- a. No.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. NWECC suggests that these matters are better informed by actual costs and program design, which is something to be discussed and considered by the Company’s Conservation Resources Advisory Group (CRAG). NWECC does not wish to presume answers prior to CRAG conversations on the matter.