

1
2

**BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY,

Respondent.

**Docket UE-190529
Docket 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**

**Docket UE-190274
Docket UG-190275
(consolidated)**

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

**For an Order Authorizing Deferred
Accounting associated with Federal Tax Act
on Puget Sound Energy's Cost of Service**

**Docket UE-171225
Docket UG-171226
(consolidated)**

In the Matter of the Petition of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

**For an Order Authorizing the Accounting
treatment of Costs of Liquidated Damages**

**Docket UE-190991
Docket UG-190992
(consolidated)**

3
4

**DECLARATION OF JON A. PILIARIS ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND
ENERGY PURSUANT TO WAC 480-07-470(10)**

1 **DECLARATION OF JON A. PILIARIS ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND**
2 **ENERGY PURSUANT TO WAC 480-07-470(10)**

3 I, Jon A. Piliaris, declare and state as follows.

4 1. I am over the age of 21 and am competent to testify herein.

5 2. I am employed by Puget Sound Energy (“PSE”) as Director, Regulatory
6 Affairs.

7 3. On February 6, 2020, in PSE’s general rate case hearing before the
8 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission in the above-captioned
9 dockets, I was cross examined by the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington
10 Attorney General’s Office (“Public Counsel”).

11 4. During that questioning, I was asked by Public Counsel a question
12 “subject to check” and I accepted the information presented in the question
13 “[s]subject to check.”

14 5. On February 19, 2020, the transcript for the hearing on February 6 was
15 distributed to the parties and in accordance with WAC 480-07-470(10)(b), I
16 reviewed the transcript to confirm my “subject to check” response. Attached as
17 Attachment A to my declaration is a true and accurate copy of page 264 of the
18 hearing transcript, which contains the referenced questioning.

19 6. Upon review of the hearing transcript, in accordance with WAC 480-07-
20 470(10)(b), I do not accept the information “subject to check” as transcribed in
21 the hearing transcript because the calculation as presented is not correct.

22 7. Beginning on line 17 of page 264, Public Counsel asked me, “If we divide
23 your residential 6.8 [verbatim] percent increase by the overall system increase of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

7.16, we get 107.3 percent of the system average percent increase; is that correct?
Subject to check.”

8. I do not accept the information presented in this question as transcribed in the hearing transcript because 6.8 divided by 7.16 is 94.9 percent, not 107.3 percent, as presented in the question.

9. However, I believe the intended question should have stated “residential 7.68 percent” instead of “residential 6.8 percent” because as reflected on page 264, lines 9-11, earlier I was asked by Public Counsel “Column F, row 1, shows a proposed revenue increase of 7.68 percent for the residential class; correct.”

10. If 6.8 percent is changed to 7.68 percent and is divided by 7.16, the amount of 107.3 percent is achieved, which is the same percentage as contained in Public Counsel’s question during the hearing.

11. In sum, while I do not accept the information presented in Public Counsel’s question “subject to check” as transcribed in the hearing transcript, if 7.68 percent is used (instead of 6.8 percent) to divide by 7.16, which I believe was the intent of the question, then I would accept the information presented and the math is correct.

1

2

3

4

**I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the
state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.**

DATED this 24th day of February 2020, at Bellevue, Washington.



Jon A. Piliaris
Director, Regulatory Affairs

5

ATTACHMENT A

Jon Piliaris by Ms. Gafken

1 (A recess was taken from 2:00 p.m. to 2:03 p.m.)

2 THE COURT: We'll go back on the record and
3 proceed.

4 BY MS. GAFKEN:

5 **Q. Mr. Piliaris, if you could please refer to**
6 **page 8 of Exhibit JAP-6, which presents your rate spread**
7 **summary.**

8 A. I'm there.

9 **Q. Column F, row 1, shows a proposed revenue**
10 **increase of 7.68 percent for the residential class;**
11 **correct?**

12 A. Proposed revenue increase; correct.

13 **Q. And PSE's proposed system-wide increase is 143**
14 **million or a system-wide increase of 7.16 percent;**
15 **correct?**

16 A. Correct.

17 **Q. If we divide your residential 6.8 [verbatim]**
18 **percent increase by the overall system increase of 7.16,**
19 **we get 107.3 percent of the system average percent**
20 **increase; is that correct? Subject to check.**

21 A. Subject to check.

22 **Q. If you refer to the issues list, the effective**
23 **table -- rate spread table shows 107 -- 107.3 percent**
24 **for the residential class; correct? The effective**
25 **table.**