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I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name, business address, and present position.

A. My name is Pamela J. Archer and my business address is 8113 W. Grandridge Blvd., Kennewick, WA 99336. My present position is Senior Regulatory Analyst for Cascade Natural Gas Corporation ("Cascade" or "Company"), a wholly owned subsidiary of MDU Resources Group, Inc. ("MDU Resources").

Q. Would you briefly describe your duties?

A. Yes. I prepare regulatory reports and rate/tariff filings for regulatory approval, as well as provide regulatory and tariff advice and knowledge to others within the Company.

Q. Please briefly describe your educational background and professional experience.

A. I am a 1992 graduate of The Ohio State University with a B.S. in Chemical Engineering. In 1996, I graduated from Ashland University with a Master of Business Administration Degree. Prior to joining Cascade in September 2010, I was employed as an Energy Specialist at the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel for fifteen years. I have received additional training at the Annual Regulatory Studies Program sponsored by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") at Michigan State University in 1992 as well as at multiple NARUC sponsored events. I have also taken post-graduate courses in Managerial Accounting, Corporate Finance, and Business Law at The Ohio State University.

Q. Have you previously testified?

A. Yes. I have testified before the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission ("Commission") in Cascade’s 2015 general rate case in Docket UG-152286 and its 2019
general rate case in Docket UG-190210. I have also testified before the Public Utility Commission of Oregon in Dockets UG 287, UG 305, UG 347, and UG 390 on behalf of Cascade. I have also testified before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel in Docket Numbers 93-2006-GA-AIR, 94-996-EL-AIR, 94-1918-EL-AIR, 95-656-GA-AIR, 01-1228-GA-AIR, 04-571-GA-AIR, and 05-0059-EL-AIR.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to introduce all proposed changes to Cascade’s current rate schedules. The proposed tariff and the proposed tariff with all revisions shown in legislative format are included in this filing as attachments A and B to the cover letter accompanying Cascade’s general rate case filing, respectively. The proposed tariff is also introduced into the record under my testimony as Exhibit No. __ (PJA-2).

II. PROPOSED TARIFF

Q. Would you please explain what is contained in Exhibit No. __ (PJA-2)?

A. Yes. Exhibit No. __ (PJA-2) contains a copy of the Company’s proposed tariff sheets that are being presented in this case.

Q. Did you rely on data or information provided by other witnesses to prepare the tariff sheets?

A. Yes. As I discuss in greater detail below, I relied on testimony and exhibits provided by Mr. Isaac D. Myhrum and Ms. Maryalice C. Peters.

Q. What substantive changes is the Company making to its Tariff?

A. The Company is filing the following revised Sheets:
Q. Please explain the changes that are non-housekeeping in nature.

A. Cascade proposes revising Schedule Nos. 503, 504, 505, 511, 570, and 663 to include changes to rates, as discussed in the testimony of Company witnesses Mr. Myhrum and Ms. Peters. In addition, the Company proposes to update Rule 21, Decoupling Mechanism, which is also discussed in Mr. Myhrum’s testimony.
Q. Is the Company proposing any other revisions to the rates or values reflected in the Tariff?

A. Yes. The Company proposes that the Gross Revenue Fee in Rate Schedule 663 increase from 4.362 percent to 4.454 percent, consistent with the changes to the percentage applied to bills to cover the costs for uncollectibles, state Business and Operating ("B&O") tax and Commission fees, as shown in Ms. Peters’ Exhibit No. ___ (MCP-4).

Q. Are there any other Tariff changes?

A. Yes. There are some housekeeping changes to the Tariff language in Rate Schedule 663 and Rule 2 to align the language with standard industry terminology and to better reflect the Company’s actual operations. For example, customer requirements from both the credit and nomination processes have been eliminated to reflect the Company’s current practices.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.