EXHIBIT NO. \_\_(SEF-1T) DOCKET NO. UG-15\_\_\_\_ WITNESS: SUSAN E. FREE

#### BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

for (i) Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc. and (ii) a Declaratory Order Approving the Methodology for Allocating Costs Between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services

DOCKET NO. UG-15\_\_\_\_

### PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF SUSAN E. FREE ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

AUGUST 11, 2015

## PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

# PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF SUSAN E. FREE

I.	INTR	ODUCTION1
II.	FOR '	RVIEW OF THE REQUESTED REGULATORY TREATMENT THE REGULATED AND NON-REGULATED PORTIONS OF TACOMA LNG FACILITY2
III.	PROF	POSED ACCOUNTING AND COST ALLOCATION
	A.	Overview of the Existing, Commission-Approved Cost Allocation Methodology4
	В.	Allocation Factors for the Tacoma LNG Facility6
		1. Tacoma LNG Facility Expenses and Capital Costs to be Directly Assigned
		2. Tacoma LNG Facility Causal Allocation Factors9
		3. Tacoma LNG Facility General Allocation Factors11
	C.	Allowance for Funds Used During Construction13
	D.	Corporate Overheads14
	E.	Working Capital15
IV.	REGU BASE	STRATIVE IMPACTS ON REGULATED AND NON- JLATED OPERATIONS OF THE TACOMA LNG FACILITY, ED ON DIFFERING LEVELS OF SUBSCRIPTION OF NON- JLATED FUEL SALES CAPACITY16
V.	CON	CLUSION

	PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC. PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF SUSAN E. FREE
	I. INTRODUCTION
Q.	Please state your name, business address, and position with Puget Sound
	Energy, Inc.
A.	My name is Susan E. Free. My business address is 10885 NE 4th Street, P.O.
	Box 97034, Bellevue WA 98009-9734. I am employed by Puget Sound Energ
	Inc. ("PSE") as the Manager of Revenue Requirement.
Q.	Have you prepared an exhibit describing your education, relevant
	employment experience, and other professional qualifications?
A.	Yes, I have. It is Exhibit No(SEF-2).
Q.	What are some of your duties as Manager of Revenue Requirement?
A.	My present responsibilities include overseeing general and power cost only rat
	case filings, tariff rate change filings, and accounting petitions. Additionally,
	am responsible for issuing internal accounting instructions that are used to ensu
	adherence to the regulatory approvals obtained through PSE's various filings a
	petitions.
Q.	What is the nature of your prefiled direct testimony in this proceeding?
A.	This prefiled direct testimony describes the proposed accounting and cost flow
	methodology for the treatment being requested for both the regulated and non-
	regulated portion of the Tacoma Liquefied Natural Gas Facility (the "Tacoma

1 LNG Facility"). This prefiled direct testimony is being offered to obtain approval of a defined allocation methodology for the Tacoma LNG Facility that will be 2 3 followed consistently over time. 4 II. **OVERVIEW OF THE REQUESTED REGULATORY** 5 TREATMENT FOR THE REGULATED AND NON-REGULATED PORTIONS OF THE TACOMA LNG FACILITY 6 7 Q. Please provide an overview of the requested regulatory treatment for the 8 regulated and non-regulated portions of the Tacoma LNG Facility. 9 A. Please see the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Mr. Roger Garratt, Exhibit 10 No. (RG-1CT), for a description of the overall structure of the Tacoma LNG 11 Facility. PSE is requesting that its existing, Commission-approved cost allocation 12 methodology be deemed appropriate for accounting for its investment in and 13 operation of the Tacoma LNG Facility that will be divided between regulated and 14 non-regulated operations. The capacity of the Tacoma LNG Facility necessary to serve PSE's natural gas customers ("core customers") as a peaking resource along 15 with the capacity necessary to serve Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc. ("TOTE") 16 17 under the LNG Fuel Supply Agreement, dated October 27, 2014, between PSE 18 and TOTE (the "TOTE Special Contract") would be regulated and the remaining 19 capacity of the facility would be non-regulated. This prefiled direct testimony 20 addresses how the costs of the Tacoma LNG Facility will be allocated between 21 the regulated operations and non-regulated operations.

1	Q.	Does this prefiled direct testimony address the cost flow and allocation
2		methodology of the natural gas distribution upgrades?
3	A.	No. The Prefiled Direct Testimony of Larry E. Anderson, Exhibit No(LEA-
4		1T), provides an overview of the natural gas distribution upgrades and the factors
5		that result in the need for this investment.
6		The non-regulated portion of the Tacoma LNG Facility will utilize distribution
7		service. For non-regulated bundled fuel sales, the non-regulated business will
8		provide distribution revenues back to regulated operations. For non-regulated
9		tolling fuel sales, the tolling customer will take distribution service on a tariffed
10		rate, and that revenue will be recognized by regulated operations. Please see the
11		Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No(RG-1CT), for a
12		discussion of the recognition of natural gas distribution system revenues
13		associated with non-regulated fuel sales from the Tacoma LNG Facility.
14		Additionally, as discussed in the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Larry E. Anderson,
15		Exhibit No. (LEA-1T), the natural gas distribution upgrade is sized to serve
16		the vaporization and return flow of natural gas back to PSE's system during peak
17		events to serve PSE's core customers. Because the natural gas distribution
18		upgrade, as designed, would occur with or without the non-regulated fuel sales, it
19		is 100% assignable to regulated operations and requires no allocation to non-
20		regulated operations.

1		III. PROPOSED ACCOUNTING AND COST ALLOCATION
2 3	<u>A.</u>	Overview of the Existing, Commission-Approved Cost Allocation <u>Methodology</u>
4	Q.	Does PSE currently follow a cost allocation methodology to allocate common
5		costs between electric and gas and non-utility operations?
6	A.	Yes. PSE's existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology was
7		first approved in Docket No. UE-960195 (i.e., the merger between Puget Sound
8		Power & Light Company and Washington Natural Gas Company) and also
9		received approval in Docket No. U-072375 (i.e., the merger into Puget Holdings
10		LLC). This existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology is
11		sufficient for use in allocating costs between the regulated and non-regulated
12		operations of the Tacoma LNG Facility.
13	Q.	Please provide an overview of PSE's existing, Commission-approved cost
14		allocation methodology.
15	A.	Please see Exhibit No(SEF-3) for a copy of PSE's Controller's Training
16		Manual Section CTM-8, which provides background and the detail of PSE's
17		existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology. As an overview,
18		allocations are currently performed using the following three methods shown in
19		the order of preference:
20		1. direct charging;
21		2. allocation using causal relationships; and
22		3. allocation using a general allocation factor.
	Prefi	led Direct Testimony Exhibit No(SEF-1T)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Q.

### Please describe direct charging.

A. Direct charging is the preferred method for assignment of costs. When a cost can be uniquely identified to regulated or non-regulated activities, PSE will charge that cost to an account for that specific business area.

For example, PSE would direct charge an employee's time spent negotiating nonregulated fuel sales contracts to the non-regulated operations of the Tacoma LNG Facility. In such a case, the PSE employee would directly charge his or her time to non-regulated operations, and the total amount charged to non-regulated operations would include appropriate labor and corporate overheads.

10 Similarly, employees dedicated to the Tacoma LNG Facility will directly charge 11 their time to a specific function of the Tacoma LNG Facility, when possible. For 12 example, when employees dedicated to the Tacoma LNG Facility perform maintenance or make repairs to specific areas of the facility, such as vaporization 13 14 or storage equipment, they would charge time and materials to work orders that 15 are allocated based on the vaporization or storage allocators that have been 16 developed. These order charges would, in turn, be loaded with the appropriate 17 labor and corporate overheads. Likewise, for time spent that cannot be attributed 18 to a specific function, PSE will use the total capital allocator, which is a general 19 allocator, to allocate their labor and related labor and corporate overheads.

20

Q. Please describe allocations using causal relationships.

21 22 A. The second method of allocation is using an allocator based on the relationship of the underlying driver of the cost being allocated. An example of an allocation

1 based on the cause of the cost would be the allocation of the costs associated with 2 storage. These costs would be allocated based on the total gallons of storage 3 available to each consumer (PSE and TOTE storage would be allocated to regulated operations, while the remaining storage would be allocated to non-4 5 regulated operations). Please describe allocations using general allocation factors. 6 Q. 7 A. The third type of allocation relates to Tacoma LNG Facility costs that are 8 common to both regulated and nonregulated services but cannot practically be 9 allocated using the first two methods of allocation. This method of allocation will 10 be based on the assumption that PSE incurred the common costs to support both 11 regulated and non-regulated services, and the assignment of these costs would be 12 in relationship to the directly incurred costs. 13 **Allocation Factors for the Tacoma LNG Facility** B. Q. 14 What allocators will PSE use to allocate Tacoma LNG Facility costs and capital? 15 16 A. Please see Exhibit No. (SEF-4) for the allocation factors developed for the 17 Tacoma LNG Facility to allocate Tacoma LNG Facility costs and capital. Please 18 see the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No. \_\_\_(RG-1CT), 19 and supporting materials thereto, for the development and support of the capital 20 allocation factors. Please see the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding, 21 Exhibit No. (CR-1HCT), and supporting materials thereto, for the

1		development and support of the operations and maintenance ("O&M") allocation
2		factors.
3		The allocation factors presented in Exhibit No(SEF-4) were estimated based
4		off of the modeling assumptions used in the first year of operations assuming 19%
5		utilization of non-regulated capacity which is PSE's current base case projection
6		of subscription for that year and is derived from the analyses conducted by
7		Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc. ("Concentric"). Please see the Prefiled Direct
8		Testimony of Melissa F. Bartos, Exhibit No(MFB-1T), and the supporting
9		exhibits thereto, for a discussion of the Concentric analyses.
10 11		1. Tacoma LNG Facility Expenses and Capital Costs to be Directly Assigned
12	Q.	Based on the existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology,
13		what Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense, and capital cost categories will
14		be directly assigned?
15	А.	PSE will directly assign the following Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense,
16		and capital cost categories:
17		• Bunkering O&M and capital;
18		• Vaporization O&M and capital;
19		• Revenue;
20		• Gas Costs;
21 22		• Non-Regulated Fuel Sales Distribution Revenues and Expenses;
23		• Certain Labor, along with Labor and Corporate Overheads;
	(None	ed Direct Testimony confidential) of E. Free Exhibit No. (SEF-1T) Page 7 of 20

1		• Certain Maintenance Expenses;
2		• Depreciation Expense;
3		• Regulated Interest Expense;
4		• Revenue Sensitive Fees & Taxes; and
5		• Federal Income Tax.
6		Please see Exhibit No. (SEF-5) for the Tacoma LNG Facility revenue,
7		expense, and capital cost categories that PSE will directly assign.
8	Q.	Will the capital and O&M costs allocated pursuant to the bunkering
9		allocation factor always be allocated 100% to TOTE fuel sales?
10	A.	Yes. The capital and O&M costs allocated pursuant to the bunkering allocation
10 11	A.	Yes. The capital and O&M costs allocated pursuant to the bunkering allocation factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE
	A.	
11	А.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE
11 12	A.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE makes non-regulated fuel sales to marine customers using bunkering facilities,
11 12 13	A.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE makes non-regulated fuel sales to marine customers using bunkering facilities, PSE will credit TOTE fuel sales on a pro rata basis for such use. For example, if
11 12 13 14	A.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE makes non-regulated fuel sales to marine customers using bunkering facilities, PSE will credit TOTE fuel sales on a pro rata basis for such use. For example, if PSE were to make non-regulated fuel sales utilizing the bunkering facilities in
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> </ol>	A.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE makes non-regulated fuel sales to marine customers using bunkering facilities, PSE will credit TOTE fuel sales on a pro rata basis for such use. For example, if PSE were to make non-regulated fuel sales utilizing the bunkering facilities in amounts that equal the fuel sales volume made to TOTE (such that TOTE's
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> </ol>	A.	factor will be fully assigned to TOTE fuel sales. However, to the extent that PSE makes non-regulated fuel sales to marine customers using bunkering facilities, PSE will credit TOTE fuel sales on a pro rata basis for such use. For example, if PSE were to make non-regulated fuel sales utilizing the bunkering facilities in amounts that equal the fuel sales volume made to TOTE (such that TOTE's utilization of the bunkering facilities equal 50% of the total volumes), then PSE

1		2. Tacoma LNG Facility Causal Allocation Factors
2	Q.	Based on the existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology,
3		what causal allocators will PSE use for the Tacoma LNG Facility?
4	A.	PSE will use the following causal allocators for the Tacoma LNG Facility
5		revenues, expenses, and capital costs:
6		• Liquefaction Capacity;
7		• LNG Volumes;
8		Annual Capacity;
9		• Wharfage; and
10		• Storage.
11		Please see Exhibit No. (SEF-6) for further detail on these causal allocators.
12		The allocation factors presented in Exhibit No(SEF-6) were estimated based
13		on the modeling assumptions used in the first year of operations assuming 19%
14		utilization of non-regulated capacity which is PSE's current base case projection
15		of subscription for that year.
	(Non	ed Direct Testimony Exhibit No(SEF-1T) confidential) of Page 9 of 20 n E. Free

- Q. To what Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense, and capital cost categories will PSE apply the causal allocation factors identified in Exhibit
  No. \_\_(SEF-6)?
  A. PSE will apply the causal allocation factors identified in Exhibit No. \_\_(SEF-6) to the following Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense, and capital cost categories:
- 7 8

# Table 1. Tacoma LNG Facility Revenue, Expense, And Capital Cost Categories to be Allocated Using Causal Allocation Factors

Category	Causal Allocation Factors
Fixed Power Costs	Annual Capacity
Variable Power Costs	LNG Volumes
Wharfage	Wharfage
Plant Consumables	LNG Volumes
Liquefaction Capital and O&M	Liquefaction Capacity
Storage Capital	Storage

1		3. Tacoma LNG Facility General Allocation Factors
2	Q.	Based on the existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology,
3		what General Allocators will PSE use for the Tacoma LNG Facility?
4	A.	Certain capital and O&M expenses associated with the Tacoma LNG Facility
5		cannot utilize the first two preferred allocation methodologies of direct and causal
6		allocations. Therefore, PSE will use the following general allocators for the
7		Tacoma LNG Facility:
8		Common Capital;
9		• Truck Loading; and
10		• Total Capital.
11		Please see Exhibit No. (SEF-7C) for additional detail on these general
12		allocation factors. The allocation factors presented in Exhibit No. (SEF-7C)
13		were estimated based off of the modeling assumptions used in the first year of
14		operations assuming 19% utilization of non-regulated capacity which is PSE's
15		current base case projection of subscription for that year.
	(Non	ed Direct TestimonyExhibit No. (SEF-1T)confidential) ofPage 11 of 20n E. FreePage 11 of 20

 Q. To what Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense, and capital cost categories
 will PSE apply the general allocation factors identified in Exhibit
 No. \_\_(SEF-7C)?
 A. PSE will apply the general allocation factors identified in Exhibit No. \_\_(SEF-7C) to the following Tacoma LNG Facility revenue, expense, and capital cost

categories:

7 8

Table 2. Tacoma LNG Facility Revenue, Expense, And Capital Co	st
Categories to be Allocated Using General Allocation Factors	

Category	General Allocation Factors
Capital Costs common to all Tacoma LNG Facility functions	Common Capital
Staff Expenses, Labor and Labor Overheads that cannot be directly assigned or causally allocated	Total Capital
Maintenance Expenses that cannot be directly assigned or causally allocated	Total Capital
Incremental Insurance Expense	Total Capital
Lease Expense	Total Capital
Property Tax Expense <sup>1</sup>	Total Capital
Truck Loading O&M and Capital	Truck Loading

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  The total capital allocator will be applied to the actual and estimated tax bills received from Pierce County where the parcels or tax code areas for which the Tacoma LNG Facility assets reside.

1	<u>C.</u>	Allowance for Funds Used During Construction
2	Q.	How will PSE allocate Allowance for Funds Used During Construction
3		associated with the Tacoma LNG Facility?
4	А.	The portions of the Tacoma LNG Facility capital expenditures for the regulated
5		operations will receive Allowance for Funds Used During Construction
6		("AFUDC") based on PSE's full authorized cost of capital of 7.77%.
7		For purposes of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), however,
8		the portion of the Tacoma LNG Facility recorded to non-utility plant will receive
9		capitalized interest based on the cost of debt only and not the full weighted
10		average cost of capital which includes equity. PSE's currently authorized cost of
11		debt is 5.90%.
12		In order to achieve the GAAP level of capitalized interest on non-utility property,
13		PSE will first apply AFUDC based on the full 7.77% cost of capital to all LNG
14		capital orders. This full AFUDC will be allocated between regulated and non-
15		regulated operations following the allocation methods previously discussed.
16		Then, PSE will record the GAAP-required offsetting reduction to the non-
17		regulated capital expenditures on a separate capital order that will be directly
18		assigned to non-regulated fuel sales operations and will be calculated to reduce
19		the AFUDC on non-utility plant to a level that equals the 5.90% cost of debt.

# 1 D. Corporate Overheads

2	Q.	Will PSE apply corporate overheads to the Tacoma LNG Facility? If so, how		
3		will PSE allocate corporate overheads between regulated and non-regulated		
4		operations?		
5	A.	Yes. PSE will apply corporate overheads to the Tacoma LNG Facility. PSE's		
6		existing, Commission-approved cost allocation methodology provides for		
7		appropriate allocation of corporate overheads between regulated and non-		
8		regulated operations.		
9		Along with labor overheads discussed earlier in this prefiled direct testimony,		
10		PSE's corporate overheads applicable to service from the Tacoma LNG Facility		
11		will include an allocation for corporate support services that are applied to all		
12		labor associated with non-regulated fuel sales operations. Therefore, any labor		
13		and costs directly charged or allocated to non-regulated fuel sales operations will		
14		be loaded with these corporate overheads.		
15		Under PSE's existing, Commission-approved costs allocation methodology, the		
16		labor associated with corporate employees receives a corporate overhead rate that		
17		includes the costs of supporting employees in PSE's corporate location.		
18		Alternatively, the labor associated with employees directly located at a subsidiary		
19		or non-utility location receives a corporate overhead rate that does not include		
20		certain of the corporate costs that do not apply to remotely located employees.		
21		Please see Exhibit No. (SEF-8) for an example of the current corporate		
22		overhead rates for PSE's non-regulated subsidiary and holding company.		

1		Corporate employee labor is charged 14.7% corporate overheads, and site-specific		
2		labor is charged 3% corporate overheads. The work papers supporting the		
3		Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No(RG-1CT), and the		
4		Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding, Exhibit No(CR-1HCT), assume a		
5		corporate overhead rate of 10%. The 10% corporate overhead rate was used for		
6		modeling purposes to simulate the impact of the use of two corporate overhead		
7		rates that depend on the type of employees charging or allocating time to LNG		
8		functions.		
9		Additionally, the total capital costs assigned to the non-fuel sales operations will		
10		contain standard capital overheads, such as construction support, materials, and		
11		fleet overheads. These methods for applying corporate overheads to capital and		
12		O&M costs ensure that the non-regulated fuel sales operations are being		
13		appropriately burdened with a fair share of support services and are not being		
14		subsidized by regulated operations.		
15	<u>E.</u>	Working Capital		
16	Q.	Will PSE allocate working capital to the non-regulated fuel sales operations?		
17	А.	Yes. PSE will allocate working capital to the non-regulated fuel sales operations.		
18		The Commission-approved calculation of combined working capital employed by		
19		PSE assigns a portion of working capital to non-utility, which is excluded from		
20		PSE's rate base. The amount of working capital that is assigned to non-utility is		
21		based on the balances in non-operating accounts, such as non-utility plant and		
22		construction work in progress. Accordingly, no change needs to be made to the		

1		method for allocating working capital because the increased balances in non-
2		utility plant will serve to increase the portion of working capital that is allocated
3		to non-utility.
4		The Commission-approved calculation is a highly detailed calculation. PSE did
5		not model the impact of the non-regulated fuel sales operations of the Tacoma
6		LNG Facility to the non-operating working capital at the same level of detail. In
7		the interest of simplicity, PSE's model assumes working capital allocated to non-
8		regulated fuel sales operations is equal to one month's expense of non-regulated
9		fuel sales expenses.
10 11 12 13 14		IV. ILLUSTRATIVE IMPACTS ON REGULATED AND NON- REGULATED OPERATIONS OF THE TACOMA LNG FACILITY, BASED ON DIFFERING LEVELS OF SUBSCRIPTION OF NON-REGULATED FUEL SALES CAPACITY
15	Q.	Will the allocation of the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to
15 16	Q.	Will the allocation of the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations change?
	<b>Q.</b> A.	
16		non-regulated fuel sales operations change?
16 17		<b>non-regulated fuel sales operations change?</b> Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the
16 17 18		non-regulated fuel sales operations change? Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations will not change , the
16 17 18 19		non-regulated fuel sales operations change? Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations will not change , the value of the allocation factors may not be the same as the estimates included in
16 17 18 19 20		non-regulated fuel sales operations change? Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations will not change , the value of the allocation factors may not be the same as the estimates included in this prefiled direct testimony. As discussed in the Prefiled Direct Testimony of
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>		non-regulated fuel sales operations change? Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations will not change , the value of the allocation factors may not be the same as the estimates included in this prefiled direct testimony. As discussed in the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No(RG-1CT), the Tacoma LNG Facility investment
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>		non-regulated fuel sales operations change? Although the allocation methodology for allocating the initial investment of the Tacoma LNG Facility to non-regulated fuel sales operations will not change , the value of the allocation factors may not be the same as the estimates included in this prefiled direct testimony. As discussed in the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No(RG-1CT), the Tacoma LNG Facility investment allocated to non-regulated fuel sales operations will remain assigned to non-

1		LNG Facility in service that PSE will determine the actual value of the capital
2		allocation factors because all costs in all capital categories will then be known.
3	Q.	Will the value of the allocation factors change depending on the level of
4		subscription of the non-regulated service?
5	A.	Yes, depending on the allocator. The LNG Volumes, Annual Capacity and
6		Wharfage causal allocators in Exhibit No(SEF-6) will have different values
7		depending on the level of non-regulated sales over time and will be recalculated
8		on a periodic basis. The exhibits referenced below present illustrative impacts on
9		regulated and non-regulated operations of the Tacoma LNG Facility, based on
10		differing levels of subscription of non-regulated fuel sales capacity. Changes in
11		the value of these specific allocation factors can be seen under each of the
12		different scenarios. The support for the calculation of these factors is included in
13		the work papers supporting the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt,
14		Exhibit No. (RG-1CT), and the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding,
15		Exhibit No(CR-1HCT):
16 17		(i) non-regulated fuel sales capacity is 0% subscribed in the first year of operations (see Exhibit No(SEF-9C);
18 19		(ii) non-regulated fuel sales capacity is 19% subscribed in the first year of operations (see Exhibit No(SEF-10C); and
20 21		(iii) non-regulated fuel sales capacity is 100% subscribed in the first year of operations (see Exhibit No(SEF-11C).
22	Q.	Please provide an overview of the examples presented in your exhibits.
23	A.	Using Exhibit No. (SEF-10C) as an example, all amounts shown on page 1 in
24		column G represent an example of the revenues, expenses, rate base, and net
	(Non	ed Direct Testimony confidential) of E. Free Exhibit No. (SEF-1T) Page 17 of 20

assets that have been directly assigned or allocated above the line to peak shaving and TOTE fuel sales operations. Amounts shown in column I represent an example of the revenues, costs, and net non-utility plant directly assigned or allocated below the line to the non-regulated fuel sales operations.

#### Revenue

1

2

3

4

5

6 Line 5 represents the revenue to be received from the TOTE Special Contract (but 7 does not include revenue collected from TOTE for service across PSE's 8 distribution system). Line 3 represents the revenue received from PSE core 9 customers to cover the cost of service associated with peak shaving operations. 10 Please see the work papers supporting the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger 11 Garratt, Exhibit No. (RG-1CT), and the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding, Exhibit No. (CR-1HCT), for the determination of the amount of 12 13 revenue assigned to TOTE and PSE core customers. Neither of these amounts 14 include the revenue to recover the natural gas distribution upgrades. These 15 amounts are considered to be directly assigned because they will be the result of 16 PSE customer bills from base rates or special contracts.

Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_(SEF-10C) assumes that the non-regulated fuel sales capacity is 18 19% subscribed during the first year of operations, which is PSE's current base 19 case projection of subscription for that year. Included on line 4 is the amount of 20 distribution revenues received from non-regulated fuel sales operations. The 21 determination of this amount is supported in the work papers supporting the 22 Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No. \_\_\_(RG-1CT), and the

1		Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding, Exhibit No. (CR-1HCT). This
2		amount is considered to be directly assigned because it will be based on revenues
3		received by PSE from non-regulated fuel sales operations pursuant to or based on
4		distribution service tariffed rate.
5		The offsetting distribution expense recorded for amounts paid for natural gas
6		distribution service and charged to non-regulated operations is reflected on line
7		23. Line 6 represents the contracted, directly assignable revenue received by PSE
8		from non-regulated fuel sales operations.
9		Expenses, Rate Base, and Net Assets
10		The remaining expense, rate base and net assets have been directly assigned or
11		allocated as discussed throughout this testimony and are supported by the work
12		papers supporting the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit
13		No(RG-1CT), and the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Clay Riding, Exhibit
14		No(CR-1HCT).
15	Q.	How do Exhibit No(SEF-9C) and Exhibit No(SEF-11C) compare to
16		Exhibit No(SEF-10C)?
17	A.	When the subscribed amount of non-regulated fuel sales capacity changes, the
18		total variable project costs, certain fixed costs, and revenues and expenses from
19		non-regulated fuel sales operations change. Exhibit No. (SEF-9C) and Exhibit
20		No. (SEF-11C) reflect the resulting revenue, costs, and rate base that would be
21		recognized by the regulated and non-regulated operations assuming 0% and 100%
22		non-regulated sales, respectively in the first year of operations based on the
		ed Direct Testimony Exhibit No(SEF-1T) confidential) of Page 19 of 20

Prefi	led Direct Testimony Exhibit No.	(SEF-1)
A.	Yes, it does.	
Q.	Does this conclude your prefiled direct testimony?	
	V. CONCLUSION	
	No(RG-1CT).	
	workpapers supporting the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Roger Garra	tt, Exhibit