

[Service Date February 11, 2008]

February 11, 2008

NOTICE OF BENCH REQUESTS
(Due by Friday, February 22, 2008, at 3:00 p.m.)

RE: *Cost Management Services, Inc. v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation,*
Docket UG-061256

UTC v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation/In re Notification of Contract and Agreement between Cascade Natural Gas Corporation and its subsidiary CGC Energy, Inc., Dockets UG-070332 & UG-070639 (consolidated)

UTC v. Cascade Natural Gas Corporation, Docket UG-072337

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) seeks information from the parties to the proposed settlement agreement filed in the above dockets on February 7, 2008, in the form of the following bench requests:

TO: ALL PARTIES:

BENCH REQUEST NO. 1:

Please explain why paragraph 20 of the settlement agreement is necessary, as paragraph 17 of the settlement agreement indicates that Cascade Natural Gas Corporation (Cascade) will transfer “any existing CGC Energy, Inc., contracts for Unbundled Retail Sales to Cascade” upon Commission approval of the settlement. Is paragraph 20 intended to address the possibility that CGC Energy, Inc. will assign contracts for Unbundled Retail Sales to a party other than Cascade prior to Commission approval of the settlement agreement?

BENCH REQUEST NO. 2:

In reference to paragraph 22 (a) of the settlement, please define the meaning of the terms “release of capacity” and “reservation release of pipeline primary capacity” in the settlement agreement. Please also describe the process by which these releases are accomplished through the pipeline’s Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB).

BENCH REQUEST NO. 3:

In reference to paragraph 22 (b) of the settlement, would any other interested person or company be harmed by Cascade providing 48 hour advance notice solely to Cost Management Services, Inc. (CMS), of capacity releases to be posted on the pipeline's EBB? If so, please identify and describe the justification for this advanced notice. Would CMS have an unreasonable preference or advantage under the proposed arrangement?

BENCH REQUEST NO. 4:

In reference to paragraph 22 (d) of the settlement:

- (a) Please provide copies of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) regulations or citations to cases governing notification regarding releases of pipeline capacity, including any pending regulations governing this activity.
- (b) Cascade and CMS state that they "reasonably believe" that the proposed arrangement "is not inconsistent with and FERC requirements." On what do the companies base this belief? Does Commission Staff share this belief?

Please respond to these Bench Requests no later than **3:00 p.m., Friday, February 22, 2008**, with an original and nine (9) copies. If you have any questions concerning these requests, please contact Administrative Law Judge Ann Rendahl at 360-664-1144, or via e-mail at arendahl@utc.wa.gov.

To the extent it is applicable to the above requests, please provide your response to each request on a separate sheet of paper and repeat the bench request at the top of the page on which the response begins. Also, please indicate on the response the date the response was prepared, the individual who prepared the response, and the telephone number of the preparer. Please send your responses via U.S. Mail to: Carole Washburn, Executive Secretary, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504, and send an electronic response to the Records Center at records@utc.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

ANN E. RENDAHL
Administrative Law Judge