BEFORE THE

#### WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UG-\_\_\_

#### GENERAL RATE APPLICATION

OF

NORTHWEST NATURAL GAS COMPANY

MARCH 28, 2008

**Direct Testimony of David A. Heintz:** 

Cost of Service Study

#### DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID H. HEINTZ

#### **Cost of Service Study**

#### **Table of Contents**

Page

I.	Introduction and Summary	1
II.	Cost of Service Study	2
III.	Qualifications	18

Rates & Regulatory Affairs NW NATURAL 220 N.W. Second Avenue Portland, Oregon 97209-3991 1-503-226-4211

1		I. Introduction and Summary
2	Q.	Please state your name, occupation, and business address.
3	A.	My name is David A. Heintz. My business address is 293 Boston Post Road
4		West, Suite 500, Marlborough, MA 01752. I am an Assistant Vice President with
5		Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc. ("Concentric"). Concentric is a management
6		consulting and economic advisory firm focused on the North American energy
7		and water industries. Concentric specializes in transaction-related financial
8		advisory services, energy market strategies, market assessments, regulatory and
9		litigation support, energy commodity contracting and procurement, economic
10		feasibility studies, and capital market analyses and negotiations.
11	Q.	On whose behalf are you testifying?
12	A.	I am testifying on behalf of Northwest Natural Gas Company (NW Natural or the
13		Company).
14	Q.	Have you testified before regulatory authorities in the past?
15	A.	Yes. I have testified before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Texas
16		Eastern Transmission Corporation, Docket No. CP81-237, and Panhandle
17		Eastern Pipeline Corporation, Docket No. RP82-58. I have also testified before
18		the New York State Public Service Commission in Empire Pipeline, Case No. 88-
19		T-132, the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy in
20		Boston Gas Company, Docket No. 96-50, the Pennsylvania Public Utility
21		Commission in Peoples Natural Gas Company, Docket No. R-00994600, the
22		New Jersey Board of Public Utilities in South Jersey Gas Company, Docket No.

1		GX99030121 and GO99030124, the State of Rhode Island and Providence
2		Plantation Public Utilities Commission, New England Division Southern Union
3		Company, Docket No. 3401, and the Arkansas Public Service Commission in
4		Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Corporation, Docket No. 05-006.
5	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
6	Α.	The purpose of my testimony is to explain and support the Cost of Service Study
7		("COSS"), and the allocation of the revenue deficiency to the various rate
8		schedules.
9		II. Cost of Service Study
10	Q.	What is the purpose of a COSS?
11	A.	A COSS provides a measure of the cost responsibility of the Company's various
12		rate classes (or schedules) based on cost causation principles. In general, costs
13		are first identified based on the function for which they are incurred, then those
14		costs are classified among customer, demand and commodity classifications,
15		and finally directly assigned or allocated to the various classes (schedules). An
16		allocated cost of service study is necessary in certain instances to arrive at the
17		cost responsibility for individual rate schedules because many of the Company's
18		costs are common and are incurred across all classes of customers.
19		Identification of the costs caused by each rate schedule provides a guide for the
20		allocation of the revenue requirement increase to each rate schedule and for the
21		design of rates to achieve the assigned revenue responsibility.

## Q. What are the guiding principles that should be followed when performing a cost of service study?

A. The concept of *cost causation* is the fundamental and underlying philosophy
applicable to all cost studies performed for the purpose of allocating costs to
customer groups. Cost causation addresses the question: "Which customer or
group of customers causes the utility to incur particular types of costs?" To
answer this question, it is necessary to establish a linkage between a utility's
customers and the particular costs incurred by the utility in serving those
customers.

10 The essential element in the selection and development of a reasonable 11 cost of service study allocation methodology is the establishment of relationships 12 between customer requirements, load profiles, and usage characteristics on the 13 one hand and the costs incurred by the utility in serving those requirements on 14 the other hand. For example, providing a customer with gas service during peak 15 periods can have much different cost implications for the utility than service to a 16 customer who requires off-peak gas service.

17 Q. Why are the relationships between customer requirements, load profiles

18 and usage characteristics significant to cost causation?

A. The distribution system is designed to meet three primary objectives: (1) to
extend distribution services to all customers entitled to be attached to the
system; (2) to meet the aggregate peak design day capacity requirements of all
customers entitled to service on the peak day; and (3) to deliver volumes of

natural gas to those customers. There are certain costs associated with each of
 these objectives. Also, there is generally a direct link between the manner in
 which such costs are defined and their subsequent allocation.

*Customer*-related costs are incurred to attach a customer to the distribution
 system, meter any gas usage, and maintain the customer's account. Customer
 costs are a function of the number of customers served and continue to be
 incurred whether or not the customer uses any gas. They may include capital
 costs associated with services, meters, regulators, and customer billing and
 accounting expenses.

10 Demand- or capacity- related costs are associated with plant that is 11 designed, installed and operated to meet maximum hourly or daily gas flow 12 requirements, such as transmission and distribution mains, or more localized 13 distribution facilities which are designed to satisfy individual customer maximum 14 demands. Gas supply contracts also can have a capacity-related component of 15 cost relative to the company's requirements for serving daily peak demands and 16 the winter peaking season.

17 *Commodity*-related costs are those costs that vary with the throughput
18 sold to, or transported for, customers. Costs related to gas supply are classified
19 as commodity related to the extent they vary with the amount of gas volumes
20 purchased by the utility for its sales service customers.

21 Q. Please describe the process used in performing the COSS.

1	Α.	As noted above, the cost of service study is a basic three-step analysis process
2		that is facilitated by a computer cost study model. The steps are:
3		Functionalization – Plant investment costs and operating costs are categorized
4		by the operational functions with which they are associated, e.g., production,
5		storage, gas supply, and distribution.
6		Classification – The functional cost elements are classified by the factor of
7		utilization most closely matching the cost causation. These are primarily
8		demand, commodity, and customer classifications.
9		Allocation – The functionalized, classified costs are allocated to the rate
10		schedules by allocation factors. Allocation factors are generally based upon
11		volumetric usage, demand usage, or the number of customers for each rate
12		schedule or special studies to determine cost causation.
13	Q.	What costs have been used to develop the COSS?
14	A.	The COSS in this proceeding is based on the pro forma costs of NW Natural, as
15		presented in the joint testimony of Mr. Kevin S. McVay and Ms. Natasha C.
16		Siores. As explained in Mr. McVay and Ms. Siores' testimony, these costs are
17		based on the twelve months ending September 2007, as adjusted. See, Exhibit
18		No (KSM/NCS-1). The sales, customer and revenue data underlying the
19		adjusted costs were used as the allocation bases for several accounts. The
20		remaining allocation data sources were derived from special studies, based on
21		data supplied by the Company.

1 A. There are six customer rate schedules evaluated in the COSS: T	ney are:
---	----------

Rate Schedule	Description
01	General Sales Service
02	Residential Sales Service
03	Basic Firm Sales Service
27	Residential Heating Dry Out
41	Non-Residential Sales & Transport Service
42	Large Volume Non-Residential Sales & Transport Service

2

3		As part of this filing, NW Natural proposes to eliminate Rate Schedule 21, "Firm
4		Service High Load Factor", and move the customers on Rate Schedule 21 to
5		either Rate Schedule 3 or Rate Schedule 41, whichever is the better economical
6		match for the customer. This migration is more fully discussed later in my
7		testimony. In addition to these rate schedules, the COSS includes the revenues
8		from Special Contracts ("Contracts") as credits to the cost of service. The
9		distribution revenues from these Contracts are treated as credits since the nature
10		of the Contracts do not allow for general rate increases. For purposes of this
11		study, the revenues and volumes related to Rate Schedule 19 have been
12		included with the residential service class.
13	Q.	Once the costs are identified by function, how are the costs classified for
14		the COSS?
15	A.	Costs are classified into the demand, customer, and commodity classifications
16		described earlier in my testimony, on an account-by-account basis consistent

of costs that are classified based on a composite of the foregoing demand,
 customer, and commodity classifications.

3 Q. Once the costs are functionalized and classified, how are the costs

- 4 allocated in the COSS?
- A. Costs are allocated to the rate schedules on the basis of each rate schedule's
  responsibility for the costs being incurred. The development of appropriate
  allocation factors is a critical component of the allocation process and is based
- 8 on (1) direct assignment where the cost causation is known; (2) rate schedule
- 9 summary statistics, *e.g.*, number of customers and throughput by rate schedule;
- 10 (3) special studies used to determine cost causation and thus responsibility for
- 11 each schedule; and, (4) allocation factors based on composites of the primary
- 12 allocation results.
- 13 Q. Is the overall allocation approach utilized in this proceeding consistent
- 14 with that utilized by the Company in previous rate proceedings?
- A. Yes. The overall allocation approach is similar to that used in the prior case,UG-031885.
- 17 Q. Does the COSS include purchased gas costs?
- A. Exhibit No.\_\_\_ (DAH-3) provides the summary results of the COSS including gas
  costs; however, this is for informational purposes only as the Company is not
  proposing any changes in either the level of gas costs or the allocation of gas
  costs to customers.
- 22 Q. How are the costs of mains allocated to the respective rate schedules?

- A. Primary mains, those 4 inches and larger, are allocated using a peak and
  average day factor to all rate schedules. The peak and average day factor is a
  composite factor made up of peak day throughput and average day throughput.
  Average daily volume divided by peak day volume provides the system
  average load factor which is 26.16 percent in this case. This share of primary
  main costs is allocated to rate schedules on the basis of annual volumes, while
- 7 the remaining primary main costs are allocated to the rate schedules on the
- 8 basis of peak day volumes.
- 9 Average day is defined as normalized throughput divided by 365. Peak day throughput is based on the higher of a design peak day or the average of the 10 11 rate schedule's peak month consumption. A design day was based on the 12 system design three-day peak calculated based on use per customer factors from NW Natural's draft 2008 Integrated Resource Plan<sup>1</sup> for all classes except 13 14 Rate Schedules 21 and 42. For these schedules, it was necessary to use an 15 average of the schedule's peak month consumption as the design day 16 calculation produced load factors in excess of 1.00. 17 Secondary mains, those up to 4 inches, are allocated in a similar fashion. 18 The difference is that Rate Schedule 42 and Special Contract volumes are 19 excluded from the allocation as these large customers do not use the Company's
- 20 small distribution mains.

<sup>1</sup> NW Natural filed its 2007 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) in Washington in March 2007. An updated IRP will be filed in Washington and Oregon in April 2008. A draft of the revised plan was distributed to Washington staff on February 7, 2008.

1	Q.	Why did the Company use its design day demand rather than its actual
2		peak day demand as a demand allocation factor?
3	Α.	Use of the Company's design day demand is superior to using its actual peak
4		day demand or an historical average of multiple peak day demands over time for
5		purposes of deriving demand allocation factors for a number of reasons. These
6		include:
7		NW Natural's gas system is designed, and consequently costs are
8		incurred, to meet design day demand. In contrast, costs are not incurred
9		on the basis of average of peak demands.
10		Design day demand is more consistent with the level of change in
11		customer demands for gas during peak periods and is more closely
12		related to the change in fixed plant investment over time.
13		Design day demand provides more stable cost allocation results over
14		time.
15	Q.	Please explain why the Company's design day demand best reflects the
16		factors that actually cause costs to be incurred.
17	A.	The Company relies upon design day demand in acquiring upstream gas supply-
18		related resources and in designing its distribution facilities required to service
19		firm service customers. Perhaps more importantly, design day demand directly
20		measures the gas demand requirements of the Company's firm service
21		customers which create the need for the Company to acquire resources, build
22		facilities and incur millions of dollars in fixed costs on an ongoing basis.

1		The development of NW Natural's gas planning standard is discussed in
2		its draft 2008 Integrated Resource Plan. With regard to delivery system
3		planning, guidelines are established for installation, maintenance, and operation
4		of the Company's physical plant in order to balance cost, safety, and operational
5		requirements. Because of the Company's reliance on its design day planning
6		standard in the acquisition of upstream supply and capacity resources and in its
7		distribution system planning and design criteria, the true cost causative factors of
8		the Company's operations are captured by utilizing the design peak day
9		requirements within its cost of service studies.
10	Q.	Please explain why use of design day demand provides more stable cost
11		allocation results over time.
12	Α.	By definition, the Company's design day peak is as stable a determinant of
13		planned capacity utilization as can be derived. If it were not a stable demand
14		determinant, the design of NW Natural's gas system and supply portfolio would
15		tend to vary and make the installation of facilities and acquisition of supply
16		resources and capacity a much more difficult task. Therefore, use of design day
17		demands provides a more stable basis than any of the other demand allocation
18		factors available based on either actual peak day demand or the averaging of
19		multiple peak days.
20	Q.	How are meter costs allocated?
21	A.	Meter costs, including encoder receiver transmitters ("ERT") and installation

- Company provided data on meter types and meter counts by rate schedule and
   a listing of replacement costs by meter type. This information was used to
   produce a total cost by rate schedule that was used to allocate meter plant costs.
- 4 Q.

#### How are service costs allocated?

5 Α. The Company provided an average service line cost (*i.e.* the cost of installing the 6 pipe that connects the customer's meter to the distribution main) for residential 7 and small commercial customers. The cost was applied to the number of 8 residential and small commercial customers to obtain the service line costs for 9 these customers. The remaining service line costs are then allocated to the 10 remaining rate schedules using the meter allocator. In the absence of specific 11 cost data on service lines for the larger customer classes, meter costs were used 12 as a proxy for the allocation of the cost of service lines. The Company's 13 experience with the installation of metering facilities and service lines for these 14 larger customers has led to the conclusion that the larger meter installations 15 require correspondingly larger sized service lines to supply the required volume 16 of gas.

17 Q. How are storage costs allocated?

A. Storage provides the system with gas during the heating season. Because of
 the seasonal nature of the service provided, the costs are allocated on the basis
 of seasonal loads. Commodity specific costs, reservoirs and non-recoverable
 gas plant and expenses, are allocated on the basis of seasonal sales load. The

2		seasonal load which is the seasonal load less the average non-seasonal load.
3	Q.	How are distribution expenses allocated?
4	A.	Distribution expenses are, for the most part, allocated on the same basis as the
5		related plant. For example, mains and services expenses are allocated on an
6		internal factor which combines the allocation of the mains and services plant.
7		Overhead expense accounts, such as supervision, engineering, and
8		miscellaneous expense, are allocated on a labor or plant basis as appropriate.
9	Q.	What factors are used for the allocation of customer accounts, meter
10		reading and uncollectibles?
11	A.	Customer records and collection expenses are allocated on a per customer
12		basis. Meter reading costs are allocated on the basis of the number of meters.
13		Uncollectible expenses are allocated on the basis of net write-offs by rate
14		schedule.
15	Q.	How are Administrative and General ("A&G") expenses allocated?
16	Α.	A&G expenses are allocated on the basis of labor, plant or O&M expenses as
17		appropriate to reflect the underlying nature of the administrative cost category. A
18		labor allocator is used for the allocation of outside services, pensions and
19		benefits and injuries and damages. A plant allocator is used for the allocation of
20		property insurance and maintenance of general plant. Regulatory commission
21		expense is allocated on the basis of revenues and the remaining accounts are
22		allocated on the basis of O&M expenses.

other plant and expense items are allocated on the basis of incremental

1

# Q. Please explain how the high load factor sales service, Rate Schedule 21, was treated in the cost of service study? A. The settlement of NW Natural's prior Washington general rate case, WUTC

Docket UG-031885, resulted in the closing of Rate Schedule 21 to new
customers. It was the intent of the Company to migrate the existing Rate
Schedule 21 customers to Rate Schedule 3 or Rate Schedule 41 over time.
However, there has been little, if any, rate schedule migration due to the higher
rates on Rate Schedules 3 and 41. In this filing, the Company proposes to
complete the customer migration from Rate Schedule 21, terminate that Rate
Schedule, and transfer the customers to Rate Schedules 3 or 41.

## 11 Q. Please explain how Rate Schedule 21 customers were moved to Rate 12 Schedules 3 or 41?

13 Α. This was a two-step process. First, all Rate Schedule 21 customers were 14 included in the Rate Schedule 41 and an initial cost of service and rate allocation was made. Next, the Rate Schedule 21 customers were priced at the resulting 15 16 Rate Schedule 3 and Rate Schedule 41 rates to determine which rate schedule 17 was more favorable for the customer from a distribution margin perspective. Based on this analysis, 83 Rate Schedule 21 customers with annual usage less 18 19 than 21,000 therms were found to be better off, *i.e.* have lower distribution bills, 20 under Rate Schedule 3 than under Rate Schedule 41. The rate schedules were 21 then reconfigured for this migration, the allocators were recalculated, and a 22 second cost of service analysis and rate design was performed.

#### 1 Q. What changes in the rate schedule structures resulted from the proposed

#### 2 migration?

A. Table 1 below summarizes the rate schedule characteristics before migration
and Table 2 summarizes the rate schedule characteristics after the proposed
migration.

#### 6

#### No. Customer Rate Annual Rate of Avg. Class Customer Use (Dt) **Use/Customer** Costs Return S 3 4,850 1,429,955 295 8.95% \$39.75 21 173 481,301 2,782 8.65% \$273.03 41 2 10,347 5,174 \$404.97 11.85%

### 7

#### 8

## Table 2 – Post-Migration

Table 1 – Pre-Migration

Rate Class	No. Customers	Annual Use (Dt)	Avg. Use/Customer	Rate of Return	Customer Costs
3	4,933	1,602,081	325	8.81%	\$42.74
21					
41	92	382,522	4,158	10.28%	\$274.41

#### 9

10 The returns of all three rate schedule were above the system average, 6.58 11 percent, before migration and remained so after migration. The lower returns in 12 each case indicate the dilutive effect of adding customers. Rate Schedule 3 unit 13 customer cost rose slightly while the Rate Schedule 41 unit costs dropped to the level of Rate Schedule 21 before migration. This indicates that the customers 14 transferred to Rate Schedule 3 have somewhat larger meter and service line 15 16 costs than the schedule average, as indicated by the usage per customer. The 17 drop in the Rate Schedule 41 customer costs is a reflection of the small number

1		of customers (i.e., two) in that schedule prior to migration. Overall, it appears
2		that the customers transferring to Rate Schedule 3 are slightly larger, on
3		average, than the existing customers while those transferring to Rate Schedule
4		41 are somewhat smaller than the existing two customers.
5	Q.	What total gas revenue requirement is the company utilizing in its
6		proposal?
7	A.	The Company has used a total revenue requirement of \$95.8 million as shown
8		on Exhibit No (DAH-3, page 1, line 21), including gas costs. The
9		distribution revenue requirement is \$35.9 million exclusive of gas costs as shown
10		on Exhibit No (DAH-2, page 1, line 21). Net of miscellaneous other revenue
11		of \$0.6 million the total Rate Schedule Revenue Requirement is \$95.2 million
12		(Exhibit No (DAH-3, page 1, line 23) and the non-gas Rate Schedule
13		Revenue Requirement is \$35.2 million (Exhibit No (DAH-2, page 1, line
14		23).
15	Q.	Have the results of the COSS been used in establishing the schedule-by-
16		schedule revenue responsibility levels?
17		A. Yes. The schedule-by-schedule revenue responsibility levels at the
18		Company's proposed revenue requirement and at equalized rates of return are
19		shown on page 1, lines 34 and 21, respectively of Exhibits No (DAH-2) and
20		(DAH-3).
21	Q.	Please describe the results of your COSS with respect to rate of return by

rate schedule.

1	Α.	Exhibit No (DAH-2, page 1), presents the summary results of the COSS
2		at present and proposed rates. As shown on line 15 of this exhibit, at present
3		rates the COSS shows a wide variation in the rates of return by rate schedule.
4		The General and Residential Dry-Out services are well below NW Natural's
5		overall rate of return of 6.58 percent and are in fact negative. The Residential
6		Sales service shows a return of 5.4 percent while the returns of the other rate
7		schedules are above the system average rate of return.

Q. Please describe the approach followed to apportion the proposed revenue
 deficiency of \$4,342,062 to the Company's various rate schedules.

- As described in Mr. Amen's Testimony, the allocation of revenues among rate 10 Α. 11 schedules consists of deriving a reasonable balance between various guidelines 12 and criteria that relate to the design of utility rates. See, Exhibit No. (RJA-1). 13 The following criteria were considered in this process: (1) cost of service results, 14 (2) class contribution to present revenue levels, (3) customer impacts, and (4) 15 the Company's belief that all rate schedules should participate in the recovery of 16 the overall revenue deficiency. After evaluating these criteria for each of the 17 Company's rate schedules, adjustments were made to revenue levels so as to 18 reduce the variation in the level of returns by schedule and move closer to 19 uniform returns by schedule. 20 Q. How does NW Natural propose to distribute the revenue increase among
- 21 the rate schedules?

1 Α. Exhibit No. (DAH-4) shows the proposed distribution of the revenue increase 2 among the rate schedules. Overall the Company is proposing to increase 3 distribution revenues \$4.3 million, or 14.1 percent. The returns for Rate 4 Schedules 41, 42, and 3 are currently above the system average return of 5 6.58%, and have therefore been assigned less than the average increase. Rate 6 Schedule 41 and 42 have been assigned the lowest level of increase, 6.7 7 percent, as these schedules currently have the highest returns. Rate Schedules 8 3 has been assigned an increases of 7.7 percent in recognition of its higher than 9 average return. The 5.4 percent return on Rate Schedule 2, Residential Sales 10 Service, is below the system average and has been assigned 125 percent of the 11 system average increase. Rate Schedules 1 and 27 returns are well below the 12 system average and have been assigned higher than average increases. Rate 13 Schedule1 has been assigned 150 percent of the system average increase, and 14 Rate Schedule 27 has been assigned 170 percent of the system average 15 increase. Rate Schedule 19, Gas Light Service, was assigned the system 16 average increase of 14.1 percent. As shown on Exhibit No. (DAH-2 page 1, line 37), these proposed 17 18 increases have improved the revenue to cost ratio for all schedules, *i.e.* all rate 19 schedules have been brought closer to the cost levels indicated in the cost of 20 service study.

21 Q. Please describe the results of your COSS with respect to classified costs.

1	Α.	The COSS summarized the costs allocated to the rate schedules on a classified
2		basis, <i>i.e.</i> by demand, customer and commodity basis. Of particular interest are
3		the customer-related costs. Exhibit No (DAH-2, page 3) provides a
4		summary of the classified costs and page 4 shows these on a unit rate basis.
5		These results were used by Company witness Amen as a guide in developing
6		the customer charges for each rate schedule.
7		V. Qualifications
8	Q.	Please describe your educational and professional background.
9	Α.	Please see Exhibit No (DAH-5).
10	Q.	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
11	Α.	Yes, it does.