

WUTC  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

RECEIVED

April 20, 2016

APR 25 2016

WASH. UT. & TP. COMM

John and Ida VanderMolen  
2019 Edwards St.  
Bellingham, Wa 98229  
Cell No. 206-972-7273

To WHOM IT CONCERNS:

This is to register our objection to the proposed general rate request increase filed by Cascade Natural Gas Corporation (Cascade) on December 1, 2015. Our objection is made for the following reasons:

1. The minimal Notice of Proposed Increase that was provided to us and others is totally inadequate. We as consumers and customers of Cascade deserve a much more detailed explanation of the reasons for the proposed increase, especially its decoupling proposal. There is no information in the Notice to us as to why this is necessary or even what it means. There also is nothing provided as to why Cascade's request is based on a proposed 10 per cent return on shareholder equity. We deserve much more than this type of Notice, and the proposed increase should be rejected just on the basis that Cascade is not informing its consumer customers in an adequate manner.

2. We object to the proposed 10 per cent return on shareholder equity as being too high. There is no justification provided to us for this figure. When fixed income persons like ourselves receive no increase at all in our Social Security pensions, and our return on investments with CD's, savings accounts, etc, with banks hover at slightly above 1 per cent, we do not understand why a huge figure of 10 per cent return is justified or necessary. Again, as stated in Paragraph 1, we at least deserve an explanation of what is the rationale for a 10 per cent return.

3. Decoupling would appear to allow Cascade to surcharge us (or rebate us) at

the will of Cascade itself. We do not want Cascade to have this kind of discretion without adequate supervision and/or checks or balances that would prevent them from being biased towards their own interests. Therefore, as we have already noted in Paragraph 1, we object to this specific aspect because it has not been adequately explained to us what this apparent significant change in rate procedures means and how it will impact us or be monitored in future rates.

4. No rationale is given for allocating the rate increase solely to RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS! This is patently unfair on its face, and we hereby strenuously object to such a discriminatory rate increase.

We will be attending the Mt. Vernon public hearing, and plan to vigorously oppose this increase until we are provided adequate information, reasons, and justification for why Cascade is attempting to take this draconian type of action against its residential customers. Cascade only exists only because of its customers, and we deserve better treatment and consideration than what is being given relative to this rate increase request.



John H. VanderMolen

Sincerely yours,



Ida A. VanderMolen

CC: Public Counsel, Attorney General of Washington