EXHIBIT NO. \_\_\_(LEO-10CT)
DOCKET NOS. UE-090704/UG-090705
2009 PSE GENERAL RATE CASE
WITNESS: LOUIS E. ODOM

## BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

Docket No. UE-090704 Docket No. UG-090705

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (CONFIDENTIAL) OF LOUIS E. ODOM ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

REDACTED VERSION

**SEPTEMBER 28, 2009** 

## PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.

## PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY (CONFIDENTIAL) OF LOUIS E. ODOM

## **CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ENCOGEN MAJOR MAINTENANCE	1
III.	MAINTENANCE ESTIMATES	3
IV	CONCLUSION	4

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.** PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY 2 3 (CONFIDENTIAL) OF LOUIS E. ODOM 4 5 I. INTRODUCTION 6 Are you the same Louis E. Odom who provided prefiled direct testimony in Q. 7 these dockets on behalf of Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE")? 8 Yes, I filed prefiled direct testimony, Exhibit No. (LEO-1CT) and eight A. 9 supporting exhibits (Exhibit No. (LEO-2) through Exhibit No. (LEO-9C)). 10 What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony? Q. 11 A. This supplemental testimony updates my prefiled direct testimony for scheduled 12 major maintenance work on PSE's Encogen Generating Facility ("Encogen") in 13 Bellingham, Washington. My supplemental testimony also corrects the rate year 14 expense for maintenance costs less than \$2 million for PSE's thermal facilities. II. 15 **ENCOGEN MAJOR MAINTENANCE** 16 Q. Please describe the update to your prefiled direct testimony for scheduled 17 major maintenance work on Encogen. 18 Encogen's unit 3 major inspection outage, previously scheduled for May 2010, A. 19 has been rescheduled to The Fourth Exhibit to my Prefiled Direct

- Q. Why did PSE change the dates for this major maintenance work at Encogen?
- A. It is possible to schedule \_\_\_\_\_\_. This will reduce the risk of a forced outage during the winter peak season.
- Q. Does this change in timing affect PSE's revenue deficiency in this proceeding?
- A. Yes. Because the maintenance is now scheduled to the calculation of the over recovery of major maintenance that is included as a regulatory liability in this proceeding. All things being equal, this would reduce the liability and the resultant amortization from what was included in the original filing. Accordingly, this change increases PSE's ratebase by \$1.8 million and decreases net operating income by \$0.4 million. Please see the Prefiled Supplemental Direct Testimony of John H. Story, Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JHS-9T), for more information regarding how this change impacts PSE's adjustment.

 Q. Please explain the revision to your Prefiled Direct Testimony regarding projected rate year maintenance costs.

- A. None of the rate year production maintenance estimates for PSE's thermal facilities provided in PSE's initial filing on May 8, 2009 included an allocation of budgeted labor costs, except for the Frederickson/EPCOR facility. Exhibit No. \_\_\_(LEO-12C) corrects for this inadvertent oversight and includes an allocation of budgeted labor costs for PSE's thermal facilities.
- Q. What is the effect of including these budgeted labor costs in the rate year production estimates?
- A. Including PSE's thermal facilities' labor costs in the rate year production estimates increases the rate year total production operations and maintenance ("O&M") costs by \$2,114,206 over the amount originally filed. Please see Exhibit No. (LEO-12C) for corrected production O&M costs for each facility.
- Q. Does this change affect PSE's revenue deficiency in this proceeding?
- A. Yes, the inclusion of budgeted labor costs increases the revenue deficiency by \$2,238,636. Please see the Prefiled Supplemental Direct Testimony of John H. Story, Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JHS-9T), for details regarding updates to PSE's revenue deficiency.

1

2

3

4

5

7