

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UG-06 ____

GENERAL RATE APPLICATION

OF



February 14, 2006

**Prepared Direct Testimony of
Jon T. Stoltz**

Summary of Rate Application
Restate Revenues and Gas Cost at current Rates
Removal of Non-Core Competitive Services Revenues and Cost
Lost and Unaccounted For Restatement
Weather Normalization Adjustment
Pro forma Industrial Contract Changes
Estimated Rate Case Expense
Revenue Requirements and Revenue Under Proposed Rates

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Prepared Testimony of Jon T Stoltz
(Summary Exhibit, Restate Revenues and Gas Cost at Current Rates,
Removal of Non-Core Competitive Services Revenues and Cost
Lost and Unaccounted For Restatement,
Weather Normalization Adjustment, Proforma Industrial Contract Changes,
Estimated Rate Case Expense, and Revenue Requirements)

Q. Please state your name and address for the record.

A. Jon T. Stoltz, 222 Fairview Avenue North, Seattle, Washington.

Q. By whom are you employed and what is your title?

A. I am employed by Cascade Natural Gas Corporation (“Cascade” or the “Company”) as Senior Vice President – Gas Supply and Regulatory.

Q. Would identify your responsibilities with the Company?

A. As Senior Vice President- Gas Supply and Regulatory, I am responsible for the Gas Supply and Regulatory Affairs Departments of Cascade. The Gas Supply Department is responsible for the execution of the Company’s Gas Procurement Strategy, including the negotiation and purchasing of physical gas supplies and the securing of price hedges for appropriate portions of the company’s core gas supply portfolio. The Gas Supply Department is also responsible for the daily, monthly and annual management of the core gas supply portfolios, including coordination of transportation and storage of gas supplies via interstate and Canadian pipelines. Cascade is a firm shipper on two U.S. interstate pipelines and two Canadian pipelines. As such, the Gas Supply Department is also

1 responsible for overseeing long- and short-term pipeline contracts and negotiations before
2 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and Canada's National Energy Board.

3
4 The Regulatory Affairs Department is responsible for the preparation of all rate-related
5 exhibits in "tracking" and general rate relief filings. The Regulatory Affairs Department is
6 also responsible for the preparation of the Integrated Resource Plan or sometimes referred
7 to as the Least Cost Plan. Least Cost Planning involves long-range market forecasts,
8 evaluation of the costs and availabilities of demand-side and supply-side resources to meet
9 such forecasted markets, as well as the development of written Integrated Resource Plans
10 for submittal before the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission and the
11 Public Utility Commission of Oregon.

12
13 Q. Please describe your education background and previous experience.

14
15 A. I am a graduate of the University of Texas at El Paso with a degree in electrical
16 engineering. My post-graduate studies include courses in utility economics, management
17 and accounting.

18
19 Prior to joining Cascade, I was employed by El Paso Electric Company as a Rate Engineer
20 with the title of Special Projects Engineer. My responsibilities while with El Paso Electric
21 were quite similar to those our rate analyst have with Cascade.

22
23 My tenure with El Paso Electric was approximately three years.

24
25 Q. Have your previously sponsored testimony?
26

1 A. Yes, I have sponsored testimony before the Public Utility Commission of Oregon, before
2 the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, before the New Mexico Public
3 Utility Commission, and before FERC.
4

5 **Reasons for Filing**
6

7 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
8

9 A. The primary purpose of my testimony is to summarize the effect of the various restating
10 and proforma adjustments on the test period and to determine the increased revenue
11 requirement. I also will discuss changes in rate spread and rate design, including
12 Cascade's proposed Conservation Alliance Plan decoupling application.
13

14 Q. Do you sponsor exhibits in this filing?
15

16 A. Yes, I sponsor eight exhibits. These exhibits are marked as follows: Exhibit _ (JTS-2),
17 containing the summary schedule of all adjustments contained in this application.
18 Exhibits_ (JTS-3), Restatement of Revenues and Gas Cost at Current Rates; Exhibit _
19 (JTS-4), Removal of Non-Core Competitive Services Revenues and Cost; Exhibit _ (JTS-
20 5), Restatement of Gas Cost For Normal Lost & Unaccounted For; Exhibit (JTS-6),
21 Weather Normalization Adjustment; Exhibit _ (JTS-7), Industrial Plant Closure Proforma
22 Adjustment; Exhibit _(JTS-8), Estimated Rate Case Expense, and Exhibit _ (JTS-9),
23 Revenue Under Proposed Rates, change in rate spread and rate design, and changes in the
24 rates for other services and fees.
25

26 Q. Were all of these exhibits prepared either by you or under your direction?
27

28 A. Yes.

1
2
3 EXHIBIT ____(JTS-2)
4

5 Summary Of Rate Case
6

7 Q. What is the purpose of Exhibit_ (JTS-2)?
8

9 A. This exhibit is a summary of all the adjustments that are included in this rate application. It
10 consists of a four-page schedule. Page 1 begins with book figures for the State of
11 Washington for the test period, which is the twelve months ended September 30, 2005 as
12 displayed in detail in Exhibit_ (KJB-2). Page 1, Column (c) displays the net restating
13 adjustments set forth in this application. Page 1, Column (d), indicates the statement of
14 operations and rate of return as restated and is the result of adding columns (b) and (c).
15 Column (e) displays the net proforma adjustments. Column (f), indicates the statement of
16 operations and rate of return as adjusted and is the result of adding Columns (d) and (e).
17

18 Q. How are the net restating adjustments listed in Column (c) determined?
19

20 A. The amounts appearing in this column are developed on Page 2 of this exhibit. The net
21 restating adjustments testified to by the various witnesses for Cascade are listed in the
22 appropriate columns on Page 2. Whenever an adjustment affected revenue adjustment, the
23 revenue sensitive cost factors as developed in Exhibit _ (KJB-2 Schedule 2) were applied.
24 The appropriate federal income tax computation to each adjustment was also made. Each
25 column was totaled to determine the effect on net operating income. The sum of Columns
26 (b) through (1) on Page 2 is shown in Column (m) and also in Column (c) of Page 1.
27

28 Q. How were the net proforma adjustments listed in Column (e) determined?

1
2 A. The amounts appearing in this column are developed on Pages 3 and 4 of this exhibit. The
3 net proforma adjustments testified to by the various witnesses are listed in the appropriate
4 columns on Pages 3 and 4. As with the restating adjustments that appear on Page 2,
5 whenever the adjustment was a revenue adjustment, the revenue sensitive cost factors were
6 applied. The appropriate federal income tax computation to each adjustment was also
7 made. Each column was totaled to determine the effect on net operating income. The sum
8 of Columns (b) through (q), is shown in Column (r) on Page 4 and also in Column (e) on
9 Page 1.

10
11 Q. How did you determine which adjustments would be listed on the restating adjustment
12 page or the proforma adjustment page?

13
14 A. In general, if the changed condition or level of cost occurred within the twelve months
15 ended September 30, 2005, the adjustment was called a restating adjustment. If the
16 changed condition or level of cost occurred after the end of the test period but is known
17 and measurable, the adjustment was called a proforma adjustment.

18
19 Q. How was the remainder of Page 1 determined?

20
21 A. Column (f) shows the test period as adjusted. Upon computing column (f), Cascade's
22 revenue deficiency and the increased revenue required to produce the requested rate of
23 return were calculated. The revenue requirement and the revenue under proposed rates are
24 developed in Exhibit _ (JTS-9), Schedule 1.

25
26 The \$11,727,515 increased revenue requirement is carried forward to Column (g) of this
27 Schedule 1, Page 1, which also shows the application of revenue sensitive costs and federal
28 income tax factors.

1
2 Column (h), the total of Column (f) and (g), shows a proforma twelve months ended
3 September 30, 2005, statement of operations which produces the Company's requested
4 9.37% overall rate of return.
5

6
7 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-3)**
8

9 **Restatement of Revenues and Gas Cost at Current Rates**
10

11 Q. Please describe the contents of Exhibit _ (JTS-3).
12

13 A. Exhibit _ (JTS-3) shows the restatement of revenues and gas cost at the base rates that
14 became effective with the November 1, 2005 PGA. Restating the test period revenues
15 results in an increase of \$37,836,114. Restated test period gas cost results in an increase of
16 \$35,812,291.
17

18 These adjustments for are shown on Exhibit _ (JTS-3), Schedule 1, line 52, columns (f)
19 and (h). This adjustments amount also appears on the Summary Exhibit _ (JTS-2),
20 Schedule 1, Page 2, Lines 1 and 5, Column (b). The effect that these adjustments have on
21 revenue sensitive taxes and fees, along with Federal Income Tax, is calculated and shown
22 on Summary Exhibit _ (JTS-2), Page 2 in Column (b).
23

24
25 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-4)**
26

27 **Removal of Non-Core Competitive Services Revenues and Gas Cost**
28

1 Q. How does Exhibit _ (JTS-4) pertain to these proceedings?
2

3 A. This adjustment removes the revenues, administrative expense and gas cost from the non-
4 core competitive services Cascade provides under a Blanket Marketing Certificate, as
5 authorized under 18 CFR Part 284.402 of FERC's regulations. FERC Order No. 547 issued
6 on November 30, 1992 authorized jurisdictional gas sales for resale at market rates, with
7 pre-granted abandonment, to all persons who are not interstate pipelines, except marketing
8 affiliates of non-open access pipelines. The certificates are automatically granted (no
9 application need be filed and no document is issued), and the sale is not restricted by term,
10 price or category of gas. The certificates are limited jurisdictional certificates that do not
11 subject the certificate holder to any regulation under the Natural Gas Act jurisdiction of
12 FERC by virtue of transactions under the certificate. The enactment of Order No. 547
13 removed the restrictions on local distribution company (LDC) marketing certificates, and
14 allows LDCs to freely compete in the sale of gas with other marketers. On Exhibit (JTS-4),
15 the \$30,875,879 for revenue and \$28,268,010 of gas costs and \$165,332 of administrative
16 expenses are removed from the test period results. These numbers are also contained in
17 the Summary Exhibit _ (JTS-2), Schedule 1, Page 2, Lines 1, 5 and 11, Column (c). The
18 FIT and revenue sensitive taxes and fees are calculated and shown in Column (c).
19
20

21 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-5)**
22

23 **Restatement of Gas Cost For Normal Lost & Unaccounted For**
24

25 Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (JTS-5) and how it pertains to these proceedings.
26

27 A. Exhibit _ (JTS-5) shows the adjustments necessary to restate the Test Period for the
28 quantity of therms in excess of sales and deliveries of therms to our customers. This

1 adjustment is required to recognize those therms that are lost and unaccounted for during
2 the transportation of the gas through the Company's distribution system. There is some
3 quantity of gas that is lost or unaccounted for during the delivery process. Minor leaks in
4 the distribution system, gas lost through third party damage of the system, and the
5 difference in the calibration of pipeline meters and the Company's meters make up the
6 majority of the gas that is either lost or unaccounted for. Cascade is normalizing the lost
7 and unaccounted for quantity for the test period based upon a rolling 5-year average lost
8 and unaccounted for percentage amount. Exhibit _(JTS-5) Schedule 2, page 2, line 84,
9 Column (g) shows that the rolling 5-year average is 0.41%. The Test Period lost and
10 unaccounted for gas as booked was 0.48% and amounted to 2,128,938 therms.

11
12 On Exhibit _(JTS-5), Schedule 1, I have calculated the normalized lost or unaccounted for
13 gas based upon the 5-year average of 0.41% to be 1,821,090 therms as shown on line 6.
14 The decrease in therms of (307,848) are priced at the current commodity weighted average
15 cost of gas (WACOG) of \$0.77776 per therm to equal an adjustment of \$(239,432), as
16 shown on line 13. This figure is also shown on the summary Exhibit _(JTS-2), page 2,
17 column (d), line 5.

18
19 Q. Why is this adjustment necessary?

20
21 A. Gas lost or unaccounted for during the delivery process is the responsibility of all
22 customers, both sales and transportation customers, that use the distribution system to
23 receive their supplies. As discussed later in my testimony, we are proposing a slightly
24 different approach in the case of transportation customers, since they provide their own
25 supply to be delivered through the system. These transportation customers should not be
26 burdened with the Company's commodity WACOG in supporting their portion of the lost
27 or unaccounted for gas. Cascade is including a provision in its proposed Tariff to require
28 transportation customers to provide "fuel in kind" at the rolling 5-year average is 0.41%.

1 Cascade is further proposing to update the rolling 5-year average each year as part of the
2 Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) application. The resulting “fuel in kind” will remain in
3 effect between PGA applications.
4

5
6 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-6)**
7

8 **Weather Normalization Adjustment**
9

10 Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (JTS-6) and how it pertains to these proceedings.
11

12 A. Exhibit _ (JTS-6) shows the adjustments necessary to restate the Test Period for the
13 quantity of therm sales Cascade would have sold if the weather had been “normal.” The
14 calculation also converts the change in therm sales into the corresponding change in
15 revenue and gas cost. The weather normalization calculation applies to the Residential and
16 Commercial General Service Schedules 503 and 504.
17

18 Q. Is the Company’s Weather Normalization Adjustment included in this application
19 consistent with the Weather Normalization Adjustment approved in the last rate case?
20

21 A. No, not completely.
22

23 Q. Please provide a description of the weather normalization methodology adopted in the last
24 rate case.
25

26 A. In Docket No. UG-951415, Cascade and Staff worked together to revise and adopt a
27 Weather Normalization Adjustment methodology. The methodology adopted was a
28 regression analysis that statistically examined the five-year history of actual therms per

1 customer per month for residential and commercial general service customers and the
2 actual heating degree days (HDDs) per month for each of Cascade’s four weather areas,
3 Bellingham, Bremerton, Walla Walla and Yakima. The model calculates a best fit “y”
4 intercept that defines the “baseload” therms per customer for each weather area and group
5 of customers. The model also calculates the best fit X variable for each month for each
6 weather area on a per customer basis for each customer class. The X variable defines the
7 heat sensitive coefficient that reflects the use per customer per HDD for each month. The
8 resulting “y” intercept and X variable coefficients were then used to calculate total sales by
9 month under “normal” HDDs for each month, weather area and customer group. Cascade
10 and Staff adopted the 20-year minus high and low monthly average HDD as “normal.”
11 This is the Weather Normalization Adjustment methodology Cascade has used in the
12 “Adjusted Statement of Operations and Rate of Return” reports that have been filed with
13 the Commission subsequent to that rate case.

14
15 Q. How does the Weather Normalization Adjustment methodology Cascade is proposing in
16 this application differ from that used in Docket No. UG-951415?

17
18 A. Cascade has revised what is used as “normal” HDDs in the analysis. We have not revised
19 any other portion of the analysis. We have noted that Commission Orders in recent general
20 rate cases have rejected the use of shorter periods, such as the 20-year minus high and low
21 adopted in Docket No. UG-951415, in determining “normal” HDDs. The Commission
22 appears to be relying upon the 30-year average of HDDs as published by NOAA as
23 “normal,” a measure that is updated every decade. This trend in Commission Orders raises
24 concerns for Cascade because NOAA’s 30-year average for the period through 2000 does
25 not reflect the undeniable warming trend that is occurring.

26
27 In an attempt to partially recognize that Washington and the rest of the Northwest have
28 gradually warmed over time, the parties in Cascade’s last general rate case adopted the

1 shorter period than the 30-year history published by NOAA. The mechanics of a weather
2 normalization adjustment should result a situation where the calculated therm sales would
3 likely occur if the actual weather is normal. The selection of what level of HDDs should
4 be considered “normal” is also critical to the regulatory tradition behind the theory of
5 weather normalization adjustments. Since the recovery of most of the utility’s fixed cost
6 has traditionally been assigned to the volumetric rate, the selection of “normal” should
7 reflect the most likely level of weather the utility will encounter during the years that rates
8 are effective. Since weather in the Northwest can vary significantly from year to year, it is
9 important to select a “normal” that, statistically, creates an equal chance that it will be
10 colder than normal as the chance that it will be warmer than normal. Such a selection
11 would create a level playing field in providing the utility an equal opportunity of recovery
12 its fixed cost based upon weather.

13
14 Q. Please describe Cascade’s efforts to determine “normal” temperatures for purposes of a
15 weather normalization adjustment.

16
17 A. Cascade asked the State Climatologist, Dr. Philip Mote, to evaluate the use of the 30-year
18 average as a regulatory basis for establishing consumption under normal weather. Dr. Mote
19 concluded that using the 30-year average ignores the commonly accepted conclusion of
20 climatic warming and, therefore, overstates the expected HDDs. Dr. Mote recommended
21 that Cascade apply a statistical calculation of HDDs as “normal” HDDs. Dr. Mote
22 analyzed the data contained in the Western Regional Climate Center’s database and
23 developed statistical normal HDDs for each month for each of our four weather areas, as
24 displayed in the graphs contained in Exhibit _(PWM-3), Schedule 1, pages 1 through 12
25 and listed by month for each of our weather areas in Exhibit __ (PWM-4), Schedule 1, Page
26 1.

1 Cascade has prepared its weather normalization adjustment consistent with Dr. Mote's
2 recommendations. As a result, Cascade has calculated that residential therm sales under
3 Dr. Mote's determination of "normal" would be 1,804,351 therms higher than the actual
4 sales recorded in the test period and that general service commercial therm sales would be
5 1,653,651 therms higher. These weather normalized therms would result in a margin
6 adjustment of \$730,779 as shown on Exhibit _ (JTS-6), Schedule 1, Line 5, Column (d)
7 and also on the summary exhibit, Exhibit _ (JTS-2), on Page 2, Line 1, Column (k).

8
9
10 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-7)**

11
12 **Industrial Plant Closure Proforma Adjustment**

13
14 Q. Please describe the contents of Exhibit _ (JTS-7).

15
16 A. This exhibit shows the proforma affect of the permanent closure in November 2005 of the
17 Welch plant, account number 2380, which is located in Kennewick, Washington. During
18 the Test Period, Cascade delivered 694,414 therms to this non-core customer served on
19 Rate Schedule 663. This loss of customer will result in a revenue reduction adjustment of
20 \$81,296, as shown on Exhibit_ (JTS-7), Schedule 1 Page 1 Column (b), line 3. Also
21 included in this exhibit is the proforma affect of the conclusion of a ten-year Monthly
22 Facilities Charge contract with account number 0175. Cascade has been collecting a
23 Monthly Facilities Charge of \$6,000 per month plus Gross Revenue Fees, to compensate
24 the Company for the installation of facilities beyond the normal feasibility allowance. The
25 primary term of this ten year facilities reimbursement contract will expire in December
26 2006. The customer will continue to receive service under Rate Schedule 664, but will no
27 longer have to pay the Monthly Facilities Charge. This will result in a revenue reduction
28 adjustment of \$75,336 as shown on Exhibit_ (JTS-7), Schedule 1, Page 1, Column (b), line

1 5. This total change in proforma revenues of (\$156,632) is also shown on the summary
2 exhibit, Exhibit _ (JTS-2), on Page 3, Line 1, Column (d).

3
4 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-8)**

5
6 **Rate Case Expense**

7
8 Q. What does Exhibit _ (JTS-8) show?

9
10 A. This exhibit shows the estimate of rate case-related costs that Cascade has and will have
11 incurred in processing this rate case. At this time, Cascade estimates the current case will
12 involve costs totaling \$500,000. The Company is proposing that one third of this amount,
13 or \$166,667, as a proforma adjustment. The Company will monitor actual rate case
14 expense throughout these proceedings and will change this estimate to actual at its
15 conclusion.

16
17 Q. Have you shown the \$166,667 of rate case expense on Cascade's summary exhibit?

18
19 A. Yes. The \$166,667 appears on the summary exhibit, _Exhibit _ (JTS-2), on Page 3, Line
20 11, Column (e).

21
22
23 **EXHIBIT _ (JTS-9)**

24
25 **Calculation of Revenue Requirements and Revenues**
26 **Under Proposed Rates**

27
28 Q. Please explain the purpose of Exhibit __ (JTS-9).

1
2 A. The purpose of Exhibit ____(JTS-9) is to first determine the Increased Revenue Requirement
3 demonstrated in this application. This Exhibit then explores the various rate spread
4 options that are available to recover the Increased Revenue Requirement and concludes
5 with Cascade's proposed rate spread. Following that, we explored various rate design
6 options before concluding with our proposed changes in rate design. The Exhibit also
7 shows the revenue impact of updating miscellaneous service charges and fees (*e.g.*, fees
8 charged for various services such as reconnection, returned check charges, and after hours
9 service calls). The Exhibit also shows impact of our revenue proposals on the average
10 customer. The remainder of this Exhibit contains the Tariffs that support the Company's
11 request.

12
13 Q. Please describe the contents of Exhibit _ (JTS-9).

14
15 A. This exhibit is comprised of four components, (1) the increased revenue required for
16 Cascade to reach the rate of return of 9.37%, (2) the impact of proposed changes in
17 miscellaneous service charges and fees, (3) rate spread, and (4) rate design. Schedule 1 is
18 the actual calculation of the revenue requirements. Schedule 2 develops the Company's
19 recommendations for miscellaneous service charges and fees. Schedule 3 develops the
20 Company's recommendations for rate spread. Schedule 4 develops the Company's
21 recommendations for rate design. Schedule 5 shows the proposed changes in the monthly
22 Basic Service Charge. Schedule 6 shows the percentage change in revenue resulting from
23 the Company's proposed rates. Schedule 6 also shows the overall impact on the average
24 monthly bills for the various rate schedules. Schedule 7 included the Notice to the Public
25 and the proposed tariffs.

26
27 Q. Please explain Schedule 1.
28

1 A. Exhibit __ (JTS-9), Schedule 1 shows the Test Period rate base on Line 1, along with the
2 requested rate of return on Line 2. When the two items are multiplied, the total net
3 operating income is determined, as shown on Line 3. Line 4 displays the adjusted net
4 operating income which was developed in the summary exhibit, Exhibit _ (JTS-2),
5 Schedule 1, Page 1, Line 19, Column (f). This amount subtracted from Line 3 shows the
6 increase in net operating income required, shown on Line 5. By applying the revenue
7 sensitive costs and FIT conversion factor to line 5, the total amount of the increase revenue
8 requirement was computed and shown on Line 7. This number is carried forward to Page 1
9 of Cascade's summary exhibit, Exhibit _ (JTS-2) on Line 3, Column (g). Exhibit __ (JTS-
10 9), Schedule 1, Line 8, shows the increase in revenue that will occur due to the proposed
11 increase in the miscellaneous service charges and fees. Line 9 is the remaining increased
12 revenue requirement to be spread to the rate schedules. Line 10 shows that the increase
13 margin requirement is 16.57% of the total adjusted margins excluding Special Contract
14 Revenue and B & O Tax revenue. All of the Special Contracts contain an automatic
15 escalation clause, which adjusts the rates annually to the Special Contract customers
16 regardless of whether Cascade seeks a general increase for its other customers. This clause
17 was negotiated so that the rates to these potential bypass customers would not change in a
18 general rate case setting, thereby preserving the benefits these contracts bestow upon the
19 rest of Cascade's customers, particularly as these contracts mature.

20
21 Q. Please describe Schedule 2 of this exhibit.

22
23 A. Schedule 2 provides a comparison of the Company's current rates for disconnection visits,
24 reconnection visits and Returned Check (NSF) fees as specified in the Company's Rule 5
25 and Rule 6 and the costs associated with providing those services. The schedule
26 shows that the current charges for these services do not nearly reflect the actual costs of
27 providing those services. If this inequity continues, other ratepayers will be harmed by

1 subsidizing the portion of these costs not recovered from the select group of customers
2 who require these services.

3
4 Q. What level of fees is appropriate?

5
6 A. The Company proposes to change the fee structure in its Rule 5, Tariff Sheet No. 9, to
7 reflect fees of \$25 for a disconnection visit; \$32 for a reconnection visit during regular
8 business hours; and \$100 for a reconnection visit during non-business hours. This
9 proposed fee structure still does not fully recover the cost of these utility services from the
10 customers that require the services. However, these proposed fees will recover a majority
11 of the costs, thereby making the subsidy by other ratepayers much smaller.

12
13 Q. What type of expenses does the Company incur in providing after hours services?

14
15 A. The major expenses associated with a service reconnection are the labor costs associated
16 with the service mechanics, who are the only company personnel authorized to perform
17 these services. Providing these services after hours requires that the Company incur higher
18 labor costs due to the overtime salary requirements associated with providing labor after
19 normal business hours.

20
21 Q. Is the Company proposing any new service charges?

22
23 A. Yes, the Company is proposing several new service charges. They are: an Account
24 Activation Charge; a Tampered Meter Charge; an Equipment Service Call Charge, a Short-
25 Notice Underground Locate Service Charge; and a Late Payment Charge on past due
26 accounts.

27
28 Q. Will you please describe the proposed Account Activation Charge?

Testimony of Jon T. Stoltz - 2006 General Rate Case Application

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WA 98109
(206)624-3900

1
2 A. The Company is proposing that an Account Activation Charge of \$32 be charged to all
3 customers at the time service is established. In the Company's view, such an approach is
4 appropriate as it recovers most of the costs from those customers causing the Company to
5 incur the expenses. This approach is similar to that of other utilities that charge a
6 connection fee at the time service is established.

7
8 Q. Will you please describe the proposed Tampered Meter Charge?

9
10 A. Under the current fee structure, the Company is able to charge only a disconnection visit
11 charge when a customer has tampered with the meter. However, the Company incurs
12 significant additional costs in these circumstances, such as multiple site visits, research and
13 investigation costs, and ultimately the meter must be replaced. Therefore, the company is
14 proposing a \$175 charge to cover those costs.

15
16 Q. Please describe the proposed Equipment Service Call Charge.

17
18 A. An equipment service call occurs when a customer contacts the Company requesting
19 Company personnel to troubleshoot the customer's equipment, turn-on or turn-off a pilot
20 light or gas insert, or perform other equipment-related services. Currently the Company
21 does not charge for this type of service call, although it does incur costs to dispatch a
22 service mechanic to complete this work. The Company is proposing a \$32 charge which is
23 intended to ensure that customers responsible for causing such costs pay for most of such
24 costs rather than having these costs be borne by all customers.

25
26 The Company is also proposing a Short Notice Underground Locate Service charge.
27 According to Washington State Law, the Company must provide these services within 2
28 business days following the day of the request. Provided we are given the two day notice,

1 Cascade provides this service at no cost to the customer. However, customers frequently
2 call to request these services immediately and, in some cases, after normal business hours.
3 In order to accommodate their requests, Cascade proposes implementing a Short Notice
4 Underground Locate Charge of \$90 during normal business hours and a \$160 charge after
5 normal business hours.

6
7 Lastly, the Company proposes implementing a Late Payment Charge. The proposed fee is
8 1.5% on balances over \$100, but no less than \$4 on accounts with a past due balance. This
9 is designed to recover the costs associated with the provision of providing two late notices,
10 and the time associated with contacting customers once their account is past due. The
11 Company believes that such a charge is necessary in order to discourage delinquent bill
12 payment practices by customers. In addition, such a charge would reduce the harm
13 currently borne by ratepayers who pay their bill in a timely manner, as they are currently
14 subsidizing these costs not recovered from the select group of customers who require these
15 services.

16
17 Q. Please Explain Schedule 3.

18
19 A. Schedule 3 examines alternative rate spread choices. Page 1 examines the effect of
20 spreading the increased revenue requirement on an Equal Percentage of Margin basis.
21 Page 2 examines the effect of spreading the increased revenue requirement in a manner
22 that would better reflect the cost to serve each rate schedule.

23
24 Schedule 3, page 1 applies the same percentage increase to the margin of each rate
25 schedule other than the Special Contract customer group. In column (e), I have shown the
26 overall rate of return for each rate schedule on a fully adjusted basis. These rates of return
27 were developed in Mr. Dickey's Cost of Service Study. In column (g), I calculated the
28 increase in margin that would result from the application on an equal percentage increase

1 and I show the total margin in Column (h). I have also calculated the resulting rate of
2 return for each rate schedule under an equal percentage of margin basis. As can be seen
3 from the rate of returns shown in column (i), this rate spread methodology would result in
4 the continuation of the large volume rate schedules subsidizing the residential and
5 commercial rate schedules on a Cost of Service basis.

6
7 Schedule 3, page 2 applies the increase in margin necessary to achieve the same rate of
8 return for each rate schedule. This approach was applied to all rates schedules with the
9 exception of the Special Contracts customers. The Special Contracts have automatic
10 escalation clauses built into the rate section of the agreements and should not be adjusted
11 in a general rate case. Column (f) is the dollar increase or decrease by rate schedule.
12 Column (g) shows the percent change in margin necessary to achieve an equal rate of
13 return by each rate schedule. Cascade believes that, based upon the results of Cost of
14 Service Study that is included in the application as Exhibit _ (LMD-2ADJ), it is
15 appropriate to depart from equal percentage approach for this rate application. Column (i)
16 shows that each rate schedule would contribute equally toward the overall cost of service.

- 17
18 Q. Is it the Company's proposal to spread the increased revenue requirement in the manner
19 developed in Schedule 3, page 2?
20
21 A. Yes. We believe that rates generally should be based upon the costs that each rate class
22 imposes upon the system. The primary reason is to advance the rate of return of each rate
23 schedule toward the overall rate of return of 9.37%. The cost of service study included as
24 Exhibit _ (LMD-2ADJ) demonstrates a disturbing degree of inequity in the amounts of
25 margin contributed by the various customer classes when compared to the respective costs
26 those classes impose upon the system. More nearly reflecting true costs in rates will assist
27 in optimizing the effective use of gas by our customers. To the extent some customers are
28 currently being subsidized by others, the economic signals being conveyed fail to

1 encourage the conservation that should be practiced by some while inhibiting economically
2 desirable gas used by others.

3
4 Q. In addition to the rate spread changes you have just described, is Cascade proposing to
5 change the design of the rates in this application?

6
7 A. Yes, we are making adjustments in our rate design. We are introducing a Modified
8 Straight-Fixed Variable rate design for our Non-Core rate schedules as shown in Exhibit
9 ____(JTS-9), Schedule 4. We are also updating the Basic Service Charges in the Core rate
10 schedules as shown on Schedule 5. Additionally, Cascade is proposing a decoupling
11 mechanism for our Residential and Commercial customers.

12
13 Q. Please explain Exhibit ____(JTS-9) Schedule 4.

14
15 A. Schedule 4 shows the change in the rate design of our Non-Core rate schedules 663 and
16 664 to a modified straight fixed variable design. This results in a two-part rate: a monthly
17 Demand charge and a Commodity charge. This rate design allows our non-core customers
18 the opportunity to select the level of “firm” distribution service and the level of service
19 subject to interruptions that best fits their individual needs. Cascade’s core customers have
20 also had the opportunity to have part of the natural gas service protected with service under
21 a firm rate schedule and the remainder of their needs served under the interruptible rate
22 schedule. However, the Non-Core customers have not had such a choice. This new rate
23 design will ensure that the Non-Core customers are paying for the quantity of firm service
24 they require.

25
26 Q. Please explain what is meant by the phrase; Modified Straight-Fixed Variable rate design.
27

1 A. A Straight-Fixed Variable rate design assigns all of the fixed cost identified in the Cost of
2 Service study to the Demand component and only the true variable cost are assigned to the
3 commodity component of rates. A Modified Straight-Fixed Variable rate design does not
4 assign of 100% of the fixed cost to Demand component, but “modifies” the assignment in
5 some manner. That portion of the cost of service that is not assigned to the Demand
6 charge is recovered through the commodity rates.

7
8 Q. How was the Company’s Modified Straight-Fixed Variable rate design developed?
9

10 A. The Cost of Service Study developed by Mr. Dickey assigns a portion of the Company’s
11 investment in Plant in Service based upon peak days and a portion based upon annual
12 throughput. Peak days relate to the “demand” placed upon the Company to have adequate
13 facilities in place to meet the needs of our customers. Annual throughput relates to the
14 volume of gas used or the annual commodity. In Schedule 4, I listed the annual revenue
15 requirement under proposed rates that was developed in Schedule 3 page 2 for each of the
16 Non-Core rate schedules on line 1. I then allocated 55% of the annual revenue requirement
17 to the demand component based upon peak days and the remainder of the annual revenue
18 requirement was assigned to the commodity component. This allocation is shown on lines
19 2 and 3. On line 4, the current sum of the contract demands, as identified in our
20 distribution system contracts, is listed. On line 5, I have assumed that, given the
21 opportunity to refine their firm service level, our Non-Core customers will relinquish on
22 average 1/3rd of their firm contract demand (CD). On line 6, I calculated the demand rate
23 per unit of CD. This calculation resulted in demand rates of \$0.32 for Rate Schedule 663
24 and \$0.25 for Rate Schedule 664. On line 7, I selected \$0.25 as the appropriate demand
25 rate. On line 8, I calculated the portion of the total revenue requirement that will be
26 recovered through this \$0.25 Demand rate and show the remaining revenue requirement on
27 line 9. This amount divided by the annual volume calculated the average Commodity cost
28 per therm, as shown on line 11.

1
2 This design also helps the Company better plan for system infrastructure needs. We will
3 provide customers with the opportunity to retain the existing distribution system CD or
4 reduce the CD to the level they prefer. Those seeking to increase their CD will be
5 considered on an economic feasibility basis. As discussed, Cascade has assumed that 1/3rd
6 of the current distribution system contract demands will be turned back during the
7 customer election process through an “open season.” The Company will adjust the final
8 demand and commodity rates of these rate schedules based upon the tally of the customer
9 elections at the close of the “open season.”

10
11 Q. Is Cascade also proposing changes in how it charges transportation customers for lost and
12 unaccounted for gas?

13
14 A. Yes. Cascade is also implementing a “Distribution System Fuel Reimbursement Clause”
15 for all transportation customers. As discussed during my testimony on Exhibits __ (JTS-6),
16 the five year average lost and unaccounted for gas on the distribution system is 0.41%.
17 This means that Cascade has to receive 0.41% more gas at the city gate than will be
18 delivered to customers. We have to buy 0.41% more gas than our core customers will be
19 metered. Rather than assigning the current cost of supply to the transportation customers,
20 we will require each transportation customer to provide 0.41% of additional customer-
21 owned gas as fuel-in-kind. This approach is similar to the Fuel Reimbursement Clause
22 used by Northwest Pipeline, GTN, TransCanada and most other pipelines. Cascade will
23 update its five year average lost and unaccounted for calculation in each subsequent PGA
24 application.

25
26 Q. What are the proposed changes in the monthly Basic Service Charges for the various core
27 rate schedules?
28

1 A. Since most of the Company's cost to serve customers does not vary from month-to-month
2 nor vary with the amount of gas purchased, Cascade charges a monthly basic service
3 charge in our rate schedules. These charges are currently inadequate and are being
4 increased.

5
6 As shown in Exhibit __ (JTS-9) Schedule 5, The Company is proposing to double current
7 basic service charge of each core rate schedule with the exception of the Residential
8 General Service rate schedule 503. The basic service charge in General Residential
9 Service Rate Schedule 503 is proposed to increase to \$10.00 per month for the six heating
10 season months of October through March, while for the six remaining months, April
11 through September, the basic service charge would remain at \$4.00. Retaining the \$4.00
12 basic service charge during the non-heating portion of the year, along with the proposed
13 increase in reconnect fees, should diminish the economic reasons for customers to seek
14 summer turn offs and fall turn ons. At the same time, this combination of \$10.00 winter
15 and \$4.00 summer basic service charges should not unduly discourage single appliance
16 customers. These changes result in an annual basic charge for residential of \$84.00 while
17 the total fixed cost is \$269.13 per year. Traditional rate design methods would assign the
18 recovery of the remaining \$185 to the per-therm rate or commodity rate. Even with these
19 higher Basic Service Charges, 68% of our fixed cost recovery would be tied to volume of
20 sales. Traditional rate design methods would continue to discouraged Cascade from
21 promoting conservation. As part of this filing, the Company proposes to create a new
22 regulatory tradition that eliminates the disincentive for utilities to promote and pursue
23 conservation and Demand Side Management opportunities through our proposed
24 decoupling mechanism.

25
26 Q. As an alternative to a decoupling mechanism, did you consider simply increasing the Basic
27 Service Charge to a level that would allow the Company to recover its fixed cost entirely
28 through the Basic Service Charge?

1
2 A. Yes I did. The Company could recover its fixed cost entirely through the Basic Service
3 Charge if we were to raise the charge to just over \$22 per month for the residential and to
4 slightly more than \$74 per month for the commercial customers. There is certainly some
5 attraction to the Basic Service Charge approach in that it is easy for customers to
6 understand and easy to implement. Greater reliance on Basic Service Charges is becoming
7 much more commonplace with cable service, telephone service and even internet service,
8 all of which offer rather large Basic Service Charges for the interconnection of the home or
9 business to the service provider. On demand services like pay-per-view movies or long
10 distance calls are similar to the “commodity” portion of the service. Full recovery of the
11 Company’s delivery cost through the Basic Service Charge would also simplify the
12 customer’s bill. There would be only one charge for the delivery portion of the bill and a
13 commodity charge for the actual gas the customer used. Having a stable amount
14 established for the delivery component of the gas bill during this time of very high gas
15 costs would be attractive.

16
17 Full recovery of the Company’s delivery cost through the Basic Service Charge would also
18 eliminate the current disincentive for Cascade to promote conservation and pursue DSM.
19 The biggest drawback to the Basic Service Charge approach to decoupling is the
20 perception that resulting lower commodity rate may diminish the customer’s incentive to
21 pursue conservation. Another drawback concerns the impact on small users. Percentage-
22 wise, small users would have a very large increase, while the very large users may have a
23 rate decrease, depending on their annual usage.

24
25 For these reasons, Cascade is not recommending the full recovery of our fixed cost through
26 the basic service charge for our residential and commercial customers. Many of our low
27 income and elderly try very hard to use as little natural gas as possible. With the high
28 wholesale cost of natural gas, Cascade would rather try to help these customers than

1 unduly increase their rates. Cascade's Conservation Alliance Plan accomplishes the same
2 effect as that of the high Basic Service Charge without excessively shifting cost
3 responsibilities from the larger customers to the smaller customers on the same rate
4 schedule. Some movement in that direction is appropriate, but we have tempered our
5 recommendations to avoid unacceptable customer impacts.

6
7 Q. Please describe the basis for the Company's proposed decoupling mechanism.

8
9 A. Cascade is proposing a decoupling mechanism for the Residential and Commercial
10 customers served on Rate Schedule 503 and 504. The cost of energy continues to rise.
11 During the past four years, the wholesale cost of natural gas has gone from the lowest in
12 the industrialized world to the highest. In July 2005, the US Congress passed the Energy
13 Policy Act of 2005, which develops a comprehensive, aggressive strategy to lower the cost
14 of natural gas by increasing supply and by managing demand. Energy efficiency and
15 conservation are the most viable near-term tactics for getting natural gas prices under
16 control. It's also a vital strategy for stabilizing the cost of gas over the long term.

17
18 In September, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita caused extensive damage to the oil and natural
19 gas infrastructure in the Gulf of Mexico resulting in 60% of the natural gas production
20 from the Gulf being shut in for an extensive period of time. The loss of production has
21 increased the futures price for natural gas for the November 2005 through March 2006
22 period by 47%. On August 1, 2005 the forward strip at Sumas for Nov-Mar was \$8.45 per
23 MMBtu. On October 14, 2005 the same Sumas Nov-Mar strip was \$12.45. The high
24 wholesale cost of natural gas is reflected in Cascade's Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA),
25 effective November 1, 2005, which includes a 26% increase in residential rates. As a
26 result, conservation and energy efficiency will have increased importance to our customers.
27 Cascade should be able to assist our customers with the promotion of conservation and the

1 investment in cost effective Demand Side Management (DSM) programs without the fear
2 of failing to recover our fixed cost.

3
4 Cascade participated in the Commission's proceedings in Docket No. UG-050369 -
5 Rulemaking to Review Natural Gas Decoupling. As part of that review, Cascade
6 developed a decoupling concept, which was the primary subject of the May 12, 2005
7 rulemaking workshop. Stakeholders from throughout the state submitted comments and
8 recommendations on Cascade's decoupling concept and other decoupling mechanisms on
9 June 10, 2005. However, on October 17, 2005 the Commission terminated its statewide
10 investigation of the potential benefits of alternative decoupling rate designs that could
11 remove the financial disincentives for utilities to promote conservation. The Commission
12 suggested that utilities could offer decoupling proposals for the Commission's
13 consideration as part of general rate filings. This rate proceeding provides the Commission
14 with an opportunity to evaluate and implement Cascade's proposed decoupling
15 mechanism.

16
17 Q. What are the essential features of a decoupling mechanism?

18
19 A. Cascade continues to believe that it is our responsibility to pursue changes that will better
20 align our interest with those of our customers. We have examined the comments
21 submitted in the Decoupling Rulemaking docket and we made changes in our proposed
22 mechanism to alleviate some of the concerns raised by the written comments.

23
24 Cascade believes it is appropriate to propose a simpler mechanism that would have the
25 following attributes:

- 26
27
- Requires no changes to its current billing system,

- 1 • Compares actual usage and weather normalized actual usage and margin to the
- 2 weather normalized usage and margin reflected in this general rate case,
- 3 • Records monthly deferral amount to a conservation balancing account and a
- 4 weather variation balancing account,
- 5 • Results in as few as a single annual rate change based on the prior year's deferral
- 6 balances that could be implemented coincident with the PGA rate change.
- 7

8 Q. Please describe the decoupling mechanism that Cascade is proposing in this case.

9

10 A. Cascade's Conservation Alliance Plan (CAP) is a deferred accounting type decoupling

11 mechanism that will capture changes in margin due to the conservation efforts of our

12 customers and changes in margin due to weather that varies from normal. Cascade will

13 employ separate deferral accounts for conservation induced margin changes and weather

14 induced changes.

15

16 With the exception for the proposed modest increase in the basic service charge, Cascade's

17 mechanism also preserves the current rate design and therefore will continue to send strong

18 price signals to customers even during colder than normal weather.

19

20 Under the mechanism, following the initial year, the Company will annually calculate the

21 per therm rate required to recover the authorized margin per customer on a weather

22 normalized basis. This will be accomplished by normalizing the twelve months ended

23 June 30 consumption for residential and commercial customers served on General Service

24 Rate Schedules 503 and 504. This analysis will provide monthly detail of expected

25 weather normalized therms. Our proposed tariff reflects using the weather normalization

26 methodology utilized in the Company's in this general rate case. The mechanism will also

27 calculate the total margin required for both rate schedules by multiplying the weather

1 normalized baseline margin per customer by the average number of customers served on
2 Rate Schedules 503 and 504 for the most recent twelve months ended June 30. The
3 amount deferred under the balancing account would be added to or subtracted from the
4 calculated margin to determine the Total Commodity Margin Requirement. This Total
5 Commodity Margin Requirement would then be divided by weather-normalized
6 consumption to determine the new per therm margin rate. This analysis would be prepared
7 and filed at the same time the annual PGA application is filed with the same effective date
8 so as to minimize the number of rate changes for our customers.

9
10 Each month the Company will weather normalize actual therms consumed by our
11 customers on Rate Schedules 503 and 504 and compare the weather normalized actual
12 consumption to the weather normalized consumption anticipated in the calculation of the
13 margin commodity rate. This will be accomplished by first weather normalizing actual
14 consumption and then calculating weather normalized total margin by rate schedule. The
15 actual weather normalized margin is then compared to the expected margin. The expected
16 margin is calculated by multiplying the baseline margin per customer by the current
17 months actual customer count. The difference between actual weather normalized margin
18 and expected margin is deferred in the Conservation Variance deferral account as
19 Regulatory Asset or Liability. Since the Company is utilizing the same customer count for
20 both the actual and the expected margin calculations, the Company will still have an
21 incentive to invest in new customers. Additionally, each month the Company will
22 compare actual margin generated by our customers on Rate Schedules 503 and 504 with
23 the expected margin to determine the total change in margin. The amount recorded in the
24 Conservation Variance deferral account is then subtracted from this total change in margin
25 and the remainder is recorded in the Weather Variance deferral account. Exhibit _(JTS-
26 9), Schedule 7, includes the tariff entitled Rule 22 – Conservation Alliance Plan Mechanism
27 that describes the mechanics.
28

1 Q. How does Cascade propose to address concerns regarding large deferral balances that may
2 accrue during a warmer than normal winter?

3
4 A. The most frequent criticism of this type of mechanism is that it is possible to create large
5 deferral balances during a warmer than normal winter that would have to be recovered
6 from customers during the next year. If the next year happens to be colder than normal, the
7 customers would not only be paying for more actual gas use, but also paying a higher rate
8 due to the amortization of the previous year's large deferral balance. This possibility can
9 be mitigated with a couple of different approaches. One mitigation approach could be the
10 adoption of a warmer than normal weather scenario in the forecasting model. In this way,
11 the deferral balance is almost always in the customer's favor. It is usually more palatable
12 to the customer to amortize credits than it is to have a large surcharge. A second
13 mitigation approach would involve the amortization of the deferral account on a more
14 frequent basis. For example, Cascade could calculate a monthly or a quarterly
15 amortization rate. This approach would prevent or minimize the possibility of building a
16 large deferral account balance. There would be a two-month time delay in establishing the
17 amortization rates but the amortization would occur in much closer proximity to the
18 causation than the annual calculation of the amortization rate contained in Cascade's
19 proposed tariff. Cascade is reflecting the adoption of a warmer than normal weather
20 scenario in the forecasting model in its proposed tariff.

21
22
23 Q. Is the Company proposing other changes that will assist in the promotion of conservation?

24
25 A. Yes. Cascade proposes to implement its Conservation Alliance Plan in conjunction with
26 the rate case. We have also proposed to provide \$800,000 to the community service
27 agencies in our service area for low-income bill payment and weatherization programs, as
28 described in Exhibit __ (KJB-20). Cascade has also reflected a "Conservation Promotions"

1 budget of \$150,000 to actively promote conservation in our service areas, Exhibit __ (KJB-
2 19). We expect to increase the amount we invest in DSM through the programs identified
3 in our current IRP. As described above, we will also begin deferring changes in margin due
4 to conservation and due to variances from normal weather based upon the weather
5 normalization analysis.

6
7 Under Cascade's proposal, we will assess the conservation potential of our Washington
8 service areas. We also plan to work with the community action agencies to help identify
9 DSM opportunities with our low income customers. As the Conservation Alliance Plan
10 matures, Cascade hopes that most of the funds will be targeted toward conservation.
11 Ultimately we would like to help the low income community action agencies develop a
12 definitive dispersal program, perhaps in the range of 75% low income conservation
13 opportunities and 25% bill payment assistance. However, during the first year, we do not
14 think the agencies should be restricted as how to best meet the needs of our low income
15 customers with the available funds.

16
17 Q. Please explain how the deferrals work in the Conservation Alliance Plan.

18
19 A. The baseline margins per customer for each month will be used for the calculations of the
20 deferral amounts each month for the Conservation Variance and Weather Variance deferral
21 accounts until new values are calculated in the annual September 30 Conservation Alliance
22 Plan (CAP) filings. We propose to wait until the first November following the approval of
23 final rate case rates before we begin to amortize the balance in the deferral accounts.

24 The total average commodity margin per customer will continue to be the baseline annual
25 margin per customer throughout the trial period of Cascade's Conservation Alliance Plan.
26 These totals will be used in the calculation of revenue requirements each year in the
27 preparation of the CAP filing. That calculation will multiply the commodity margin of
28 \$185.13 times the most recent period ending June 30 residential average customer count

1 and multiplying \$721.80 times the commercial average customer count. That new
2 Commodity Revenue Requirement plus the balance from the deferred accounts will be
3 divided by the weather normalized total therm sales for that period. This will result in a
4 new commodity margin per therm rate to become effective on the same November 1st date
5 that the PGA becomes effective.
6

7 Q. Please describe the rest of Exhibit _ (JTS-9).
8

9 A. Schedule 6 page 1 shows the percentage change in total revenue by rate schedule that
10 results from the Company's proposed rate spread and rate design changes. Schedule 6 page
11 2 shows the impact on the average monthly bill. Schedule 7 is a copy of the Notice to the
12 Public, which has been posted in each of the Company's offices and pay stations in the
13 State of Washington. Schedule 7 contains all of the revisions to various rules and rate
14 schedules required to implement Cascade's proposed rate spread and rate design changes,
15 as described above.
16

17 Q. Does this complete your testimony?
18

19 A. Yes.
20