

BEFORE THE  
WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UG-06 \_\_\_\_  
GENERAL RATE APPLICATION  
OF



February 14, 2006

**Prepared Direct Testimony of  
Philip W. Mote**

**The Effect of Climatic Change on Heating Degree Day Normals**



1 A. No. In the presence of a strong warming trend, the 1971-2000 average substantially  
2 underestimates the actual temperature (and overestimates heating degree days) in the 2001-  
3 2010 time period. In fact, that average was even a poor estimate of the mean in the 1990s.  
4 Cascade's rates established in this rate case are likely to be in effect in 2007 through  
5 perhaps 2010 or 2011. The 1971-2000 average as published by NOAA will increasingly  
6 overestimate HDDs each year going forward.

7  
8 Q. NOAA publishes this information as "normal". Is it your testimony that NOAA's use of  
9 normal should not be interpreted as the expected or most likely HDDs to occur in future  
10 years?

11  
12 A. That is correct. The information published by NOAA as normal is merely the arithmetic  
13 mean or average of the 30-year history the report covers. These published normals do not  
14 take into account the existence of a warming trend in globally averaged surface air  
15 temperatures. This warming trend is no longer disputed within the scientific community  
16 and scarcely disputed beyond.

17  
18 Q. What is meant by NOAA by the term normal or climate normal?

19  
20 A. As the NOAA web site (<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/normal/usnormals.html> )  
21 explains in the Frequently Asked Questions section, the term climatic "normal" has faced a  
22 dilemma since its introduction a century and a half ago. A climate normal is defined, by  
23 convention, as the arithmetic mean of a climatological element computed over three  
24 consecutive decades. The casual user, however, tends to (erroneously) perceive the normal  
25 as what they should expect. Dr. Helmut E. Landsberg, who became Director of  
26 Climatology of the U.S. Weather Bureau in 1954 and, later, Director of the Environmental  
27 Data Service, summarized the dilemma quite well over four decades ago (Landsberg,  
28 1955): "The layman is often misled by the word. In his every-day language the word

1 normal means something ordinary or frequent. ...When (the meteorologist) talks about  
2 'normal', it has nothing to do with a common event..... For the meteorologist the 'normal' is  
3 simply a point of departure or index which is convenient for keeping track of weather  
4 statistics..... We never expect to experience 'normal' weather." This is especially true with  
5 precipitation in dry climates, such as the desert southwestern region of the United States,  
6 where the average daily rainfall is near zero but the average rainfall on rainy days can be  
7 rather high because few days have any rain. Likewise with temperature at continental  
8 locations which frequently experience large swings from cold air masses to warm air  
9 masses.

10  
11 It might be "normal" for the weather to swing radically between extremes from day to day  
12 and year to year, but the "climatic normal" is simply an arithmetic average of what has  
13 happened at such a "swinging" place. This is why it's important to use a measure of the  
14 variability of climate (such as the standard deviation and extremes) in conjunction with the  
15 climatic normal when studying the climate of a location (Guttman, 1989).

16  
17 In accordance with national and international convention, the official climate normals  
18 computed for U.S. stations by NCDC consist of the arithmetic average of a meteorological  
19 element over 30 years. The "official" normals are provided solely by National Climate  
20 Data Center (NCDC), which should be noted in light of other non-official means  
21 computations from a myriad of sources.

22  
23 Q. How can we be sure that the Northwest is really warming?

24  
25 A. In addition to the instrumental records discussed earlier, there is ample evidence from  
26 Nature that warming is occurring. Virtually every glacier in the Northwest has been  
27 receding in most of the 20th century, a trend consistent with warming but not with the

1 observed fluctuations in precipitation. Mountain snowpack has been declining in the past  
2 50 years and peak spring snowmelt-driven streamflow has been occurring earlier. Various  
3 plants and animals have tended to reach milestones in their springtime development earlier  
4 as well. Measurements of sea surface temperature at Race Rocks Lighthouse, near Victoria  
5 BC, show warming very similar to the measured warming of air temperatures in the Puget  
6 Sound region.

7  
8 Evidence for a warming trend globally includes direct temperature measurements from  
9 both land- and ship-based surface thermometers, soil temperature profiles in boreholes,  
10 changes in the timing of spring snowmelt in the western US, and recession of nearly every  
11 glacier in the world (Folland et al. 2001, and refs. therein). Assessment efforts by the  
12 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and by the US National Academy of Sciences,  
13 as well as policy statements from all the major scientific societies, underscore the  
14 confidence of the finding that Earth is warming.

15  
16 Commonly cited causes for doubt about this warming, for example the effects of  
17 urbanization or the measurements of tropospheric temperatures from satellites, have been  
18 addressed in dozens of peer-reviewed papers and do not refute the basic conclusion that  
19 Earth is warming.

20  
21 Q. Could this be a natural cycle that will eventually reverse?

22  
23 A. Although there are unquestionably natural cycles in climate, the human-induced forcing of  
24 the climate is growing in strength and its importance as a factor in determining global  
25 climate now rivals that of El Niño: the biggest El Niño on record (1997-98) appears to  
26 have raised global average temperature by at most 0.2°C for one year, whereas greenhouse  
27 gases appear to be changing the mean temperature irreversibly by almost that amount each  
28 decade since 1970.

1  
2 More rigorous evidence that the recent warming is likely of human origin comes from  
3 several lines of analysis. Some groups have developed techniques for comparing the  
4 observed pattern of warming with that expected to occur with rising greenhouse gases, and  
5 they generally find that the observed warming is increasingly consistent with expected  
6 warming. Other groups simulate 20th century climate with climate models, including both  
7 natural and human forcing factors of climate; they all find that it is impossible to simulate  
8 observed recent warming without including the increases in greenhouse gases. When all  
9 forces are included, all of the modeling groups find that the models simulate observed 20th  
10 century global average temperature fairly well, including the rise in temperature since the  
11 1970's.

12  
13 The current warming trend will not reverse for many years. This warming trend will  
14 continue during the 3 to 5 years that Cascade's rates from this rate case are in effect.

15  
16 Q. How does the warming trend affect Cascade's attempt to establish gas consumption under  
17 normal weather?

18  
19 A. Unfortunately, the current practice that purports to set revenue-neutral targets for Cascade  
20 uses the 1971-2000 "normals" (i.e., arithmetic averages) for four locations in Washington.  
21 Such an assumption would be valid if the time series of temperature at these locations were  
22 stationary, but they are not. As shown in Exhibit \_\_ (PWM-2), most stations in the  
23 Northwest warmed during the 20th century, with a regionally averaged warming of 1.5°F,  
24 typical of global land areas. Table 1 lists some annually averaged warming trends for high-  
25 quality climate stations in the CNGC service areas. In seasonal breakdowns (see Exhibit  
26 \_\_ (PWM-2)), warming has been largest in winter, when demand for natural gas is highest,  
27 and trends in autumn have been near zero at many locations.

CNGC service area	station	trend	starting year	
			monthly	daily
Northwest	Blaine	1.7	1893	1948
	Clearbrook	2.4	1904	1931
	Bellingham	1.6	1891	--
	Olga	1.1	1890	1891
	Sedro Woolley	0.7	1896	1931
	<b>average</b>	<b>1.5</b>		
West	Grapeview	1.9	1907	1948
	Aberdeen	2.5	1891	1931
	Longview	1.2	1924	1931
	<b>average</b>	<b>1.9</b>		
Central	Wenatchee	2.9	1912	1931
	Cle Elum	1.8	1899	1931
	Ellensburg	1.4	1892	--
	Sunnyside	2.9	1894	1948
	Kennewick	2.6	1897	1948
	Walla Walla	1.4	1872	
	<b>average</b>	<b>2.2</b>		

**Table 1.** Trends in annually averaged temperature at USHCN stations in the CNGC service areas in Washington. Trends are linear fits to the data from 1920-1997 and are expressed as degrees Fahrenheit per century. Source: Exhibit \_\_ (PWM-2) Mote (2003). The third and fourth data columns also indicate the starting year for monthly and daily data.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

1 What is needed is a better way to estimate future HDDs, taking account of the fact that the  
2 statistics of climate are not stationary. In particular, some combination of past trends and  
3 future projections in monthly temperatures at each of the four locations would provide a  
4 more accurate estimate of future HDDs. This could be done in several ways, but the two  
5 primary approaches would be (1) statistical analysis of observed data and (2) numerical  
6 modeling using state-of-the-art climate models. Owing to the difficulty of accessing and  
7 applying the results of climate models, I have selected a statistical approach.

8  
9 Q. Please describe your statistical analysis.

10  
11 A. I have calculated the linear trends of the past observations in the HDD data and simply  
12 extrapolated forward to the year 2007 to establish the expected HDDs. Calculation of  
13 HDDs in this manner is a vast improvement over the use of 1971-2000 averages as  
14 normals. As with any linear analysis, the question arises as to what time period to use, and  
15 the extent to which the results depend on the period of analysis. The scientific consensus  
16 that human influence on climate has emerged in the past 50 years suggests that earlier data  
17 be used only to estimate natural variability, and more recent data be used for trends  
18 analysis. With the restriction that daily USHCN data are available only to 1948 at many  
19 stations, linear trends over that period of record would be sensible. However, this may lead  
20 to an excessively large upward trend in temperature (or downward trend in HDDs) because  
21 there were two very cold winters around the middle of the century, and January 1950 was  
22 the coldest month on record for the state. I selected data from 1951 through 2005 for my  
23 analysis to provide a more conservative estimate of the trends.

24  
25 Exhibit \_\_ (PWM-3), pages 1 – 12 show the monthly graphs of the four weather stations  
26 Cascade uses to observe actual weather in its Washington service areas. All 50+ observed  
27 HDDs for each month is plotted on the graphs. I also calculated the linear equation  
28 associated with this data and extrapolated the HDD value for the corresponding month in



1 2007. I have also shown the arithmetic average of the 1971 – 2000 period. Exhibit  
2 \_\_ (PWM-4) lists the HDD values Cascade should use as normals in determining the  
3 amount of gas that would be required of its customers under normal weather.  
4

5 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?  
6

7 A. Yes.  
8  
9