

EXHIBIT NO. _____ (JB-1T)
DOCKET NO. _____
2001 PSE RATE CASE
WITNESS: JULIUS BREITLING

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

Respondent.

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JULIUS BREITLING
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

NOVEMBER 26, 2001

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.**

2 **DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JULIUS BREITLING**

3
4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 **Q: Please state your name and address.**

6 A: My name is Julius Breitling and my address is 74 Sunny Wood Drive,
7 Centerville, Massachusetts 02632.

8 **Q: What is your occupation?**

9 A: I am a self-employed consultant providing depreciation and valuation services,
10 primarily to utilities.

11 **Q: Prior to being self-employed, how were you employed?**

12 A: Prior to being self-employed, I was employed by Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P.
13 (C&L) in its Financial and Advisory Services Group as Director, Utility
14 Depreciation and Valuation. It is now known as PricewaterhouseCoopers.

15 **Q: What kind of organization was C&L?**

16 A: C&L was an international accounting and consulting firm providing a broad range
17 of services to clients in all the principal areas of the world serving business,
18 government, private institutions, investor-owned utilities, municipal and
19 cooperative utilities and public power agencies. Its services to clients range from
20 accounting and auditing to all facets of management and utility consulting.

21 **Q: What were your duties with C&L?**

22 A: I performed valuations and appraisals of utility properties for ad valorem tax,
23 condemnation, damage and insurance claims, mortgage loans, sales, purchases or
24 leases, cost of service and rate cases; also, mortality and depreciation studies to
25 determine service lives, net salvage and depreciation rates for utility and industry
26

1 property; and, the issuance of Independent Engineer's Certificates as required by
2 mortgage indentures. I assisted in the design and development of C&L's
3 Depreciation/Valuation Software System (DVS).

4 **Q: Will you please summarize your education and experience?**

5 A: I was awarded a Bachelor's Degree in Mechanical Engineering in 1959 from the
6 City College of New York, and in 1968, I was awarded a Master's Degree in
7 Business Administration from Iona College, in New Rochelle, New York.

8 From 1959 until 1967, I was employed by the New York State Public
9 Service Commission and served in several bureaus at various levels.

10 I was promoted to the position of Senior Valuation Engineer in 1963. My
11 responsibilities during my employment with the New York Commission
12 encompassed many phases of utility regulation, including the areas of safety,
13 service, financing, rates, valuation and depreciation. From 1967 through March of
14 1983, I was employed by Ebasco Services Incorporated and was a Vice President
15 of Ebasco Business Consulting Company, with the exception of two brief periods
16 from January 1969 through April 1970 when I was employed by United Engineers
17 and Constructors as a Senior Engineer and from June 1972 through May 1973
18 when I was employed by Commonwealth Management Consultants as an
19 Executive Consultant. I was employed by Coopers & Lybrand from April 1983
20 through April 1994.

21 **Q: What is your professional status?**

22 A: I am a Professional Engineer Licensed in the States of New York, Massachusetts,
23 Texas and Virginia. I also am a Senior Member of the American Society of
24 Appraisers; a Senior Member of the International Real Estate Institute (formerly
25 International Institute of Valuers); a Senior Member of the National Association
26 of Review Appraisers; a Member of the International Right-of-Way Association; a

1 Senior Member of the Society of Depreciation Professionals; a Member of the
2 American Water Works Association; a Member of the American Gas Association;
3 and Technical Associate of the Depreciation Accounting Committee of the
4 American Gas Association; a Member of the American Society of Mechanical
5 Engineers; a Member of the New York Society of Professional Engineers; and a
6 Member of the National Society of Professional Engineers. A detailed resume of
7 my education and professional experience is included herewith as Exhibit JB-2.

8 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony in the current proceeding?**

9 A: The purpose of my testimony is to present my recommendations to Puget Sound
10 Energy ("PSE" or "Company") as to the appropriate depreciation rates which it
11 should utilize to depreciate its depreciable electric, gas and common plant in
12 service.

13 My recommendations as to appropriate depreciation rates are based on
14 studies of the Company's depreciable electric, gas and common plant in service at
15 December 31, 2000.

16 II. DEPRECIATION STUDY

17 **Q: Were you engaged by PSE to undertake a depreciation study?**

18 A: Yes, I was. PSE authorized me to undertake a depreciation study of its
19 depreciable electric, gas and common plant in service as of December 31, 2000
20 for presentation and use in this case. The objective of this assignment was to
21 recommend depreciation rates to be utilized by PSE for accounting and
22 ratemaking purposes until another comprehensive study is made.

23 **Q: How did you go about performing this assignment?**

24 A: PSE's predecessor companies previously had depreciation studies made as
25 follows:
26

- 1 (i) Washington Natural Gas Company's last depreciation study was made as
2 of September 30, 1987; and
3 (ii) Puget Sound Power and Light Company's last depreciation study was
4 made as of December 31, 1991.

5 The current study updated these previous studies by including the additional years
6 of plant accounting activity through December 31, 2000.

7 Analyses were made of the Company's historical plant accounting activity
8 which reflected the additions and retirements and plant balances for each account,
9 or subaccount.

10 The analyses method used to ascertain the Company's historical experience
11 of Average Service Life and Mortality Dispersion is known as the Simulated Plant
12 Record Method of Analysis (SPR). The SPR method of analysis was used for
13 both prior studies noted above. This method of life analysis has been accepted by
14 many regulatory bodies, including this Commission, for the analysis of historical
15 plant accounting activity.

16 Analyses were also made of Puget Sound's cost of removal and salvage
17 experience to determine the historical net salvage realized for each account, and
18 subaccount. Due to the limited availability of data as a result of the Company's
19 adoption of a new computer system, these studies were limited to three years of
20 data.

21 Information was obtained from the Company's personnel as to the
22 Company's current plans and programs which could affect my expectations as to
23 appropriate service lives, dispersion patterns, net salvage, and retirement dates for
24 certain properties.

25 This information was used in making recommendations as to appropriate
26 depreciation rates for the Company's depreciable property. A report containing my

1 recommendations as to appropriate depreciation rates, and future variations was
2 submitted to PSE.

3 That report entitled "Puget Sound Energy Depreciation Study of Certain
4 Electric, Gas and Common Plant in Service at December 31, 2000" is included
5 herewith as Exhibit JB-3.

6 **Q: Will you please describe Exhibit JB-3?**

7 A: Yes, I will. Exhibit JB-3 is a report containing my recommendations as to
8 appropriate depreciation rates for certain of the Company's depreciable Electric,
9 Gas and Common Plant in Service at December 31, 2000. The report is
10 comprised of a letter of transmittal, which summarizes the recommendations
11 resulting from the study, and three sections.

12 Section I contains three schedules which address my recommendations
13 relative to certain of PSE's depreciable Electric, Gas and Common Plant in
14 Service at December 31, 2000. The depreciation rates I recommended were
15 developed by the direct remaining life approach. Under this method the surviving
16 original cost of the property in each plant account, or subaccount, as of the study
17 date is adjusted for the expected net salvage to be incurred or realized. From this
18 amount the existing accumulated depreciation is subtracted and the difference is
19 divided by the expected average remaining life.

20 This is the same method used in the prior studies and accepted by this
21 Commission.

22 Schedule IA, presents the development of my recommended depreciation
23 rates for PSE's depreciable Electric Plant in Service studied.

24 Schedule IB, presents the development of my recommended depreciation
25 rates for PSE's depreciable Gas Plant in in Service studied.

26

1 Schedule IC, presents the development of my recommended depreciation
2 rates for PSE's depreciable Common Plant in Service studied.

3 Schedules IIA, IIB and IIC compare my recommended depreciation rates
4 and annual accruals with the Company's current depreciation rates and accruals
5 based on plant in service at December 31, 2000 and displays the difference
6 between the recommended accruals.

7 Section II contains a discussion of the methods and procedures utilized in
8 making this study.

9 The third section contains appendices which include a glossary of terms;
10 examples of the SPR and salvage analyses; examples of the calculations of the
11 depreciation requirements; and examples of the calculations of the average
12 remaining life.

13 **Q: What are the definitions of the key terms you used in your report containing**
14 **your depreciation rate recommendations to PSE?**

15 A: The definitions are as follows:

16 Depreciation – As applied to depreciable utility plant, means the loss in
17 service value not restored by current maintenance, incurred in the connection with
18 the consumption or prospective retirement of utility plant in the course of service
19 from causes which are known to be in current operation and against which the
20 utility is not protected by insurance. Among the causes to be given consideration
21 are wear and tear, decay, action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence,
22 changes in the art, changes in demand and requirements of public authorities.

23 Service Value – The difference between original cost and net salvage of
24 utility plant.

25 Net Salvage – The salvage value of property retired less the cost of
26 removal.

1 Salvage Value – The amount received for property retired, less any
2 expense incurred in connection with the sale or in preparing the property for sale;
3 or, if retained, the amount at which the material recoverable is chargeable to
4 materials and supplies, or other appropriate account.

5 Cost of Removal – The cost of demolishing, dismantling, tearing down or
6 otherwise removing utility plant, including the cost of transportation and handling
7 incidental thereto.

8 Service Life – The time between the date utility plant is includible in
9 utility plant in service or utility plant leased to others, and the date of its
10 retirement. If depreciation is accounted for on a production basis rather than on a
11 time basis, then service life should be measured in terms of the appropriate unit of
12 production.

13 **Q: Can you explain these terms in a more simplified manner?**

14 A: Yes. Basically what all these terms boil down to is that the cost of capital assets,
15 adjusted for the net salvage expected at the end of the life of the assets, should be
16 allocated to each accounting period (year) over their lives. The allocation method
17 most commonly used is the Straight Line method. Under this method an equal
18 amount is allocated to each accounting period. When the direct remaining life
19 method is used, then the unrecovered cost of assets, adjusted for the expected net
20 salvage, less the amount previously recovered through depreciation, is allocated
21 over the expected average remaining lives of the assets in each plant account, or
22 subaccount.

23 **Q: Would you please summarize the results of your recommendations?**

24 A: When compared with the depreciation rates currently used by PSE, applied to the
25 depreciable plant in service at December 31, 2000, my recommendations result in
26 the following changes in depreciation accruals.

- 1 (i) For Electric Plant: A decrease of \$7,227,207; or 0.20% of the
2 \$3,695,703,280 plant in service studied.
- 3 (ii) For Gas Plant: An increase of \$794,419; or 0.06% of the \$1,332,153,745
4 plant in service studied.
- 5 (iii) For Common Plant: An increase of \$1,089,521; or 1.06% of the
6 \$102,992,999 plant in service studied.

7 **Q: Are there any variations in your recommendations that you would like to**
8 **bring to the attention of the WUTC?**

9 A: Yes, there are two.

10 **Q: What are those variations?**

11 A: The variations relate to two Gas Plant accounts.

12 (i) Account 376.1 Mains – Cast Iron and

13 (ii) Account 376.3 Mains – Bare Steel

14 **Q: Will you please explain those variations?**

15 A: Yes, I will. For those accounts PSE was required to establish a plan to retire and
16 replace those Mains. PSE's plan was to replace the Cast Iron Mains in Account
17 376.1 by the year 2007, in accordance with the Settlement and Operating
18 Agreement Order in Docket No. UG-92087. It was also required to submit a plan
19 for the Bare Steel Mains in Account 376.3.

20 I have been advised that PSE has proposed to retire and replace the Bare
21 Steel Mains in Account 376.3 by 2017. Therefore, I recommend that each year
22 PSE recompute the depreciation rates for these sub-accounts over a declining
23 remaining life, using the methodology in my report. That is, for Account 376.1
24 the depreciation rate for 2002 should be based on a 6-year remaining life; for 2003
25 the depreciation rate should be calculated based on a 5-year remaining life; and so
26 on. For account 376.3 the depreciation rate for 2002 should be based on a 16-year

1 remaining life; for 2003 the depreciation rate should be calculated based on a
2 15-year remaining life; and so on.

3 **Q: Why have you made that recommendation?**

4 A: I have made that recommendation to assure that the original cost of the property in
5 these accounts, adjusted for the net salvage, is fully recovered, no more, no less,
6 by the end of the planned period for the retirement and replacement of those
7 mains.

8 **Q: Does this conclude your prepared testimony?**

9 A: Yes, it does.

10

11 [BA013240085]

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

EXHIBIT NO. _____ (JB-2)
DOCKET NO. _____
2001 PSE RATE CASE
WITNESS: JULIUS BREITLING

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

Respondent.

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF JULIUS BREITLING
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.**

2 **PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF JULIUS BREITLING**

3
4 **EXPERIENCE**

5 1994-PRESENT Self Employed Consultant.

6 Providing: (1) Valuations and appraisals of utility property for various purposes,
7 including property tax, condemnation, sales, purchases or leases, damage and insurance
8 claims, mortgage loans, fair value for cost of service and rates cases. (2) Depreciation
9 studies. (3) Expert testimony. Also, the Licensing of Depreciation/Valuation-Projection
PC System Software through "Depreciation Valuation Services International Inc." a
wholly owned company.

10 1983-1994 Coopers & Lybrand (C&L): Director Utility Depreciation and
11 Valuation.

12 Responsibilities included direction and supervision of valuations and appraisals of utility
13 properties for property taxes, condemnation, damage and insurance claims, mortgage
14 loans, sales, purchases or leases, cost of service and rate cases; establishment of property
15 record systems; issuance of Independent Engineer's Certificates; conduct and review of
16 mortality and net salvage analyses for depreciation studies to determine service lives and
17 net salvage rates and recommend appropriate depreciation rates for utility property
including electric, gas and telephone companies in the United States and Canada;
18 assistance with preparation for formal litigation and providing testimony as an expert
19 witness.

20 Additional responsibilities included; specification for the design and enhancements to
21 C&L's personal computer Depreciation/Valuation Software System (DVS) and user
22 manual; negotiations with Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) for C&L's
23 exclusive right to market AECL's nuclear generating decommissioning and fossil fueled
24 generating plant demolition cost estimating software programs, as well as nuclear plant
25 decommissioning and fossil plant demolition cost estimating services throughout the
26 United States; the preparation of educational materials and the presentation of seminars
on the subjects of plant accounting, depreciation, valuation, nuclear plant
decommissioning and fossil plant demolition cost estimating, nationally and
internationally.

1 1973-1983 Ebasco Business Consulting Company: Successively as Senior
2 Consultant,
3 1970-1972 Principal Consultant, Director, and Vice President.
4 1967-1968

5 Responsibilities included depreciation studies for electric, gas and railroad companies;
6 valuations and appraisals of industrial and utility properties for various purposes,
7 including property tax, condemnation, sales, purchases or leases, damage and insurance
8 claims, mortgage loans, cost of service and rate cases; establishment of property record
9 systems; issuance of Independent Engineer's Certificates; and, providing expert
10 testimony, nationally and internationally.

11 Additional responsibilities included direction and supervision of financial feasibility
12 studies, rate of return studies, publication of "Analysis of Public Utility Financing"
13 (APUF), strategic planning, tax accounting services, investment tax credit analysis;
14 preparation, review and audit of utilities' federal and state income tax returns and other
15 related tax matters.

16 1972-1973 Commonwealth Management Consultants: Executive Consultant.

17 Responsible for all utility property valuations and appraisals for insurance claims, sales or
18 purchases, cost of service and rate cases; utility depreciation studies to determine service
19 lives, net salvage and depreciation rates.

20 1969-1970 Jackson & Moreland Division-United Engineers & Constructors:
21 Senior Engineer and Project Manager.

22 Responsible for valuations and appraisals of utility property for sales, purchase, cost of
23 service and rate cases; depreciation studies to determine service lives and net salvage for
24 utility property; engineering economic studies; financial feasibility studies; issuance of
25 Independent Engineer's Certificates of maintenance and condition as required by
26 Mortgage Indentures of Trust.

1959-1967 New York State Public Service Commission: Successively as Junior
Engineer, Assistant Valuation Engineer, Senior Valuation Engineer.

Responsible for utility property valuation studies to determine original cost, depreciation,
use, usefulness and adequacy of plant; engineering economic studies; weather
normalization studies; cost-of-service studies; mortality and net salvage studies; and other
technical analyses relating to utility property construction costs, operating costs and
expenses and their classification in accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts.
Responding to customer complaints filed with the Commission and meter testing. Field
observations and examinations of construction work in progress and analyses of
contracts. Investigation into various phases of utility operations such as rate matters,

1 utility financing, mergers, consolidations and property transfers. Examination and
2 analyses of exhibits submitted by utilities and preparation of exhibits submitted by the
3 Commission staff at formal hearings relating to the above matters for electric, gas and
water companies.

4 **EDUCATION**

5 City College of New York, BSME (Mechanical Engineering)
6 Iona College, New Rochelle, MBA (Management Science)

7 **LICENSES**

8 Professional Engineer – Licensed in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Texas and
9 Virginia.

10 **HONORS**

11 Listed in "Who's Who in Finance and Industry" – 22nd Edition, 1981/1982.
12 Listed in "Who's Who in the World" – 6th Edition, 1982/1983.

13 **PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

14 Senior Member – American Society of Appraisers – ASA
15 Senior Member – Society of Depreciation Professionals
16 Senior Member – International Real Estate Institute – SCV
17 Senior Member – National Association of Review Appraisers – CRA
18 Member – American Gas Association – Depreciation Committee
19 Member – National Society of Professional Engineers
20 Member – New York Society of Professional Engineers
21 Member – International Right-of-Way Association (Retired)
22 Member – American Water Works Association

23 **PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

24 "The Substitute Plant Method of Valuation: An Economic Approach to Fair Value
25 Determination" – PUBLIC UTILITIES FORTNIGHTLY, May 20, 1976.

26 "Inflation Accounting" Presented at Ebasco's Forty-Seventh Annual Executive
Conference, October 1976.

"Rate Base and Depreciation" Presented at Ebasco's Texas Rate Regulatory Workshop,
January 1977.

"Cash-flow Improvement Through More Equitable Depreciation Methods" – PUBLIC
UTILITIES FORTNIGHTLY, September 1, 1977.

1 "Capital Recovery – A Consultant's Comments"-Texas Telephone Association, Capital
2 Recovery Seminar, June 1981.

3 Presentations to regional utility associations, 1987-Present:

4 Missouri Valley Electric Association
5 Southern Gas Association
6 Electric Council of New England

7 Various technical reports and papers presented to the joint AGA-EEI Depreciation
8 Accounting Committee and the AGA Depreciation Committee, 1977-Present.

9 **TESTIMONY**

10 **Courts:**

11 Superior Court of Marion County, Indiana
12 Supreme Court of the State of New York, Albany County
13 Supreme Court of the State of New York, Rockland County
14 Supreme Court of the State of New York, Suffolk County
15 Supreme Court of the State of New York, Chautauqua County

16 **Regulatory Commissions:**

17 Alberta Public Utilities Board, Canada
18 Arkansas Public Service Commission
19 Dallas Public Utilities Department, Dallas, Texas
20 District of Columbia Public Service Commission
21 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
22 Kansas State Corporation Commission
23 Kentucky Public Service Commission
24 Maine Public Utilities Commission
25 Maryland Public Service Commission
26 Michigan Public Service Commission
Nevada Public Service Commission
New Jersey Board of Regulatory Commissioners
New Mexico Public Service Commission
New York Public Service Commission
North Carolina Utilities Commission
Ohio Public Utilities Commission
Oklahoma Corporation Commission
Ontario Energy Board, Canada
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission

1 Texas Public Utility Commission
2 Virginia State Corporation Commission
3 Virgin Islands Public Service Commission

4 **Other Agencies:**

5 Indiana State Board of Tax Commissioners
6 Floyd County, Indiana Board of Review
7 Jefferson County, Indiana Board of Review
8 Town of Tonawanda, Erie County, New York Board of Assessment Review

9 [BA013240085]

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

EXHIBIT NO. _____ (JB-3)
DOCKET NO. _____
2001 PSE RATE CASE
WITNESS: JULIUS BREITLING

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

Respondent.

EXHIBIT TO DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JULIUS BREITLING
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.