

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a
AVISTA UTILITIES,

Respondent.

DOCKET NO. UG-021584

INITIAL BRIEF ON BEHALF OF COMMISSION STAFF

DONALD T. TROTTER
Senior Counsel
Counsel for Commission Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY	1
II.	BURDEN OF PROOF	3
	A. Avista Bears the Burden of Proof	3
	B. Other Parties Do Not Have to Provide “Compelling Reasons” In Order for the Mechanism to End	3
III.	FACTS	3
	A. Historical Context of the Benchmark Mechanism	3
	B. The Proposed Benchmark Mechanism	5
	1. Commodity Component	5
	2. Storage Component	6
	3. Transportation Component	7
	4. Basin Optimization Component	8
IV.	DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES	8
	A. The Benchmark Mechanism Should Not Be Approved Because Avista Has Not Passed the Cross-Subsidy Test For These Affiliated Interest Transactions	8
	1. Background	8
	2. Avista Energy is an Affiliated Interest of Avista Utilities	9
	3. The Commission Uses the “Lower of Cost or Market” Standard to Protect Ratepayers	10

4.	Avista Energy Cannot Provide Either the Cost or the Market Price of the Gas and Services It Sells to Avista Utilities Under the Benchmark Mechanism	13
5.	Conclusions on Affiliated Interest Issues	16
B.	The Benchmark Mechanism is Structurally Unsound. It Rewards Avista Energy For Average, and Even Sub-Par Performance, in Circumstances Which Avista Energy Does Not Control	17
1.	Background	17
2.	Commodity Component	18
3.	Storage Component	20
4.	Transportation Component	21
5.	Basin Optimization Component	23
6.	Conclusions on the Structure of the Proposed Mechanism	24
C.	Avista Energy Chose to Use the Benchmark Mechanism for Its Sole Benefit, When it Could Have Chosen to Benefit Ratepayers, Too. Avista Utilities Did Nothing to Prevent It	25
1.	Background	25
2.	How Basin Optimization Benefits Arise	25
3.	How Avista Energy Exploited Basin Optimization Benefits	26
4.	The Facts Do Not Support Avista’s Attempts to Excuse Avista Energy’s Sole Use of Basin Optimization Benefits.....	28

5.	Conclusions on Avista Energy’s Use of the Mechanism to Reap Unilateral Basin Optimization Benefits	30
D.	The Benchmark Mechanism is Inconsistent With the Commission’s Policy Statement on Gas Incentive Mechanisms	31
1.	Background	31
2.	The Proposed Benchmark Mechanism Fails to Satisfy Most of the Principles Enunciated in the Policy Statement	32
E.	Avista Failed to Prove Ratepayers are Getting a Good Deal With the Benchmark Mechanism	34
1.	Background.....	34
2.	Avista Cannot Prove Ratepayers Are Getting a Good Deal Because Avista Has Not Proved Avista Energy’s Cost to Serve the Utility	34
3.	The Table on Page 3 of Exhibit 53-T is Unreliable Because it Does Not Reflect all Relevant Costs and Benefits.....	35
4.	Even Ignoring the Foregoing Deficiencies in Avista’s Analysis, the Record Shows Ratepayers Are Not Getting A Good Deal With the Benchmark Mechanism	37
a.	Currency Risk	38
b.	“Load Volatility”	39

(1)	The Return of the Gas Procurement Function to the Utility Means Benefits That Would Have Accrued to Avista Energy Would Accrue to Avista Utilities	39
(2)	Avista Utility’s Ability to Use Storage on a Daily Basis to Manage Loads Provides Benefits That More than Offset “Load Volatility”	40
(3)	Staff Did Not “Double Count” Storage Benefits	43
c.	Transportation Benefits	44
(1)	Avista’s Calculation is Improper Because it Considered Abnormal Results	44
(2)	Avista’s Late Exhibit Does Not Rescue Its Failed Argument	47
d.	Conclusions	48
V.	OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Commission Decisions

<i>Utilities & Transp. Comm’n v. US WEST Communications, Inc.,</i> Docket No. UT-950200 (April 11, 1996)	11
<i>Utilities & Transp. Comm’n v. Washington Natural Gas Co.,</i> Docket Nos. UG-911236/UG-911270 (Sept. 28, 1992)	11
<i>Utilities & Transp. Comm’n v. The Washington Water Power Co.,</i> Cause Nos. U-82-10/U-82-11 (Dec. 29, 1982)	11

Court Cases

<i>Western Distributing Co. v. Public Service Comm’n of Kansas,</i> 285 U.S. 119, 52 S. Ct. 283, 76 L. Ed. 655 (1932)	11
--	----

Statutes

RCW 34.05.230(1)	31
RCW 80.04.130(2)	3
RCW 80.16	10, 16, 49
RCW 80.16.010	10
RCW 80.16.030	3, 11

Other Authorities

Webster’s New World Dictionary (2 nd College Ed. 1976)	17
---	----