

1 **expense-per-customer must be maintained to support this ratemaking**

2 **theory?**

3 A. Yes. For total revenues (i.e., customers multiplied by revenue-per-customer) to
4 "match" total expenses (i.e., customers multiplied by cost-per-customer) in the
5 test year and rate year, any increase in expense-per-customer between these two
6 points in time must be accompanied by a similar increase in revenue-per-
7 customer.

8 **Q. Does expense-per-customer change between the test year and rate year?**

9 A. Yes. Table 1 below illustrates how PSE's expense-per-customer has changed
10 over time. Expense-per-customer that is unrelated to energy supply has increased
11 between the test year in PSE's 2004 general rate case and its most recently
12 concluded electric and gas rate cases.¹ As shown below, over this period, PSE's
13 electric expense-per-customer unrelated to power supply has grown at an average
14 annual rate of approximately 2.8 percent, while its gas expense-per-customer
15 unrelated to gas supply has grown at an average annual rate of approximately ~~5.0~~ 3.2
16 percent.

¹ As will be discussed later in this testimony, the Company is primarily concerned with the recovery of costs unrelated to energy supply, since: (a) forward-looking supply costs are used to derive PSE's retail rates; and (b) the effects of energy efficiency on its ability to recover supply-related costs is largely addressed through its energy supply-related cost tracking mechanisms. As such, unless otherwise noted, the discussion of expense-per-customer in this testimony is focused on expenses unrelated to energy supply.

1 A. No. As shown in Table 2, PSE's electric use-per-customer has been essentially
 2 flat since PSE's 2004 general rate case, while gas use-per-customer has declined at
 3 an annual average rate of approximately 1.5 percent. This compares with the
 4 average annual expense-per-customer growth rates of 2.8 percent and ~~5.0~~ 3.2 percent
 5 for PSE's electric and gas systems, respectively, as shown in Table 1. PSE's
 6 growth in use-per-customer is seriously lagging its growth in expense-per-
 7 customer.

8 **Table 2 - PSE's Use Per Customer Growth Since the 2004 GRC Test Year**

	2004 GRC Docket Nos. UE-040640 & UG-040641	2009 GRC Docket No. UE-090704	2010 GTIF Docket No. UG-101644
<u>Electric</u>			
Test Year Retail kWh Sales	21,483,173,826	23,742,572,967	
Test Year Customers	963,672	1,063,953	
Use per Customer	22,293	22,315	
Approx. Annual Average Growth Rate Since 2004 GRC		0.0%	
<u>Gas</u>			
Test Year Retail Therm Sales	1,019,920,884		1,090,182,856
Test Year Customers	628,680		748,628
Use per Customer	1,622		1,456
Approx. Annual Average Growth Rate Since 2004 GRC			-1.5%

9
 10 **Q. Has PSE's energy efficiency program affected its use per customer?**

11 A. Yes, PSE's energy efficiency program has reduced the Company's use-per
 12 customer. One way to reflect this impact is to add the Company's verified
 13 conservation savings to its energy sales over time. Table 3 shows that if PSE's
 14 verified conservation savings since the test year in its 2004 general rate case are
 15 added to its actual weather-normalized energy sales over time, the Company's
 16 electric use-per-customer would have grown at an annual average rate of 0.9
 17 percent, versus the absence of weather-normalized growth it actually experienced.
 18 For PSE's gas system, absent Company-sponsored energy efficiency that occurred