

BEFORE THE  
WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UG-06\_\_\_\_  
GENERAL RATE APPLICATION  
OF



February 14, 2006

**Prepared Direct Testimony of  
David W. Stevens**

**(Policy)**



1  
2 A. I am testifying as the policy witness for the Company. I provide an overview of the  
3 Company and the primary factors driving the Company's need for general rate relief, and  
4 also briefly address some of the current and future challenges that are being faced by the  
5 Company, such as the need to expand and reinforce distribution system infrastructure to  
6 support Cascade's strong customer growth in Washington. I will also discuss the  
7 Company's Conservation Alliance Plan, which includes a decoupling mechanism and is part  
8 of the filing. Finally, I will describe the other witnesses testifying for the Company and the  
9 issues on which they will be testifying.

10  
11 Q. Have you previously testified or sponsored testimony before utility commissions?

12  
13 A. Yes. I have testified before regulatory bodies in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, New  
14 Mexico and Texas.

15  
16 **II. OVERVIEW OF CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION**

17  
18 Q. Please briefly describe Cascade Natural Gas Corporation.

19  
20 A. Cascade provides natural gas service to approximately 235,000 customers in 93  
21 communities in Washington and Oregon. Our diverse service territory covers more than  
22 32,000 square miles. Cascade's Washington customers are served from three of our four  
23 operational regions: Western, which includes the Kitsap Peninsula, the Grays Harbor area,  
24 and Kelso/Longview; Northwest, which includes Bellingham, Mt. Vernon, and Oak  
25 Harbor/Anacortes; and Central, which includes the communities of Sunnyside,  
26 Wenatchee/Moses Lake, Tri-Cities, Walla Walla, and Yakima.

1 Cascade is one of the fastest growing natural gas utilities in the nation. In the last five years,  
2 Cascade's customer base grew at a pace of 3 to 5%, which is significantly more than the  
3 national average. This high level of growth was made possible by the overall population  
4 growth in the Company's service area, and the low level of market saturation for natural gas  
5 in the Northwest.  
6

7 Q. Please describe Cascade's current business focus.  
8

9 A. Cascade's primary focus is providing safe and reliable natural gas distribution and related  
10 services to our customers throughout our service territories. We have worked hard to  
11 continuously improve these services and operate as efficiently as possible while diligently  
12 controlling expenses. We also focus on providing the highest value to all of our  
13 stakeholders, including customers, employees, and shareholders.  
14

15 With the onset of new executive management in the past year, the Company implemented  
16 changes in our corporate culture, emphasizing the feasibility and profitability of our strong  
17 growth. Cascade has enacted measures to manage this strong growth while recognizing the  
18 decline in gas usage per customer due to conservation and more energy-efficient homes.  
19 We improved our analysis of economic feasibility to ensure we are accurately calculating  
20 the impact of adding customers. We also shifted our sales and marketing orientation to  
21 spend dollars only where we can measure results.  
22

23 We have dedicated employees that continue to deliver high customer satisfaction. We  
24 continue to look for ways to realign tasks to make us even more responsive to customers.  
25 With the increase in natural gas prices over the past few years, we believe it is vital to focus  
26 on working with customers to encourage conservation while recognizing our responsibility  
27 to all stakeholders.  
28

1 Q. When did the Company last file for a general rate increase in Washington?  
2

3 A. Cascade has not requested a general rate case increase in Washington since 1995. That rate  
4 case, Docket No. UG-951415, was based upon the twelve months ended December 31, 1994  
5 as the test period. Cascade has been able to avoid seeking rate relief due to an internal  
6 culture of pursuing operating efficiencies prior to seeking regulatory assistance, and  
7 encouraging and facilitating strong customer growth during a period of relatively low  
8 interest rates. In addition, Cascade has implemented several operating efficiencies since the  
9 last rate increase that have helped control costs. Through these cost control efforts, we are  
10 able to serve more customers with fewer employees. Since the 1994 test period in the last  
11 rate case, Cascade's residential customer count has increased 60% and commercial  
12 customers have increased 32%. The number of employees, however, has decreased by 17%  
13 during this same period.  
14

15 Q. Please describe these cost control efforts.  
16

17 A. In 2002 the Company began converting from handheld meter reading to automated meter  
18 reading (AMR). The \$16 million dollar investment allowed the Company to reduce its  
19 meter reading staff from 25 positions down to 5, which represents approximately \$1.3  
20 million per year in annual savings over the 2002 meter reading expense levels  
21 (approximately \$1 million in Washington). Additionally, the technology allows the  
22 Company to grow without incurring additional meter reading expenses, which was  
23 estimated at an increase of 1 full-term equivalent (FTE) per year to keep up with the  
24 Company's growth. This increased FTE level would substantially increase meter reading  
25 costs from the 2002 level if the AMR equipment were not installed.  
26

27 In 2003, the Company made significant changes in benefit plans for non-bargaining unit  
28 employees, which included the following:

- 1 • Freezing accruals for salaried employees to the retirement plan (pension);
- 2 • Freezing accruals to the Executive Supplemental Retirement Income Plan (SERP);
- 3 • Increasing contributions to the 401(k) for salaried employees;
- 4 • Reducing benefits provided to salaried employees under the medical plan;
- 5 • Implementing market-level monthly contributions to the medical plan for salaried
- 6 employees;
- 7 • Reducing medical benefits provided to retirees; and
- 8 • Implementing monthly contributions to the medical plan for retirees.

9  
10 These changes resulted in the 2004 benefit expenses being approximately \$5 million less  
11 than the 2003 level, thereby reducing the cost of Washington operations by about \$3.9  
12 million.

13  
14 In January 2005, the Company began centralizing its customer service functions by  
15 removing these functions from its district offices to a centralized call center located in  
16 Bellingham. The consolidation, which was completed by the end of March 2005, is  
17 estimated to produce annual savings of approximately \$800,000 (or approximately \$600,000  
18 for Washington operations).

19  
20 **III. COMPONENTS OF THE RATE REQUEST**

21  
22 Q. Why is it necessary for the Company to seek rate relief in Washington?

23  
24 A. Rate relief is necessary because we have exhausted the readily available internal cost control  
25 remedies. We are currently facing financial pressures from three directions: revenue loss  
26 due to declines in gas usage per customer; costs arising from additional facilities required to  
27 continue to provide reliable and safe service in Washington; and cost increases in other  
28 areas beyond the Company's control. In addition, we are proposing to implement a number

1 of other initiatives in this proceeding, including a “Safety and Reliability Infrastructure  
2 Adjustment Mechanism,” a redesign of our industrial non-core rates, and a decoupling  
3 mechanism, which we call a Conservation Alliance Plan. A general rate filing is necessary  
4 in order to achieve a decoupling mechanism that will be best developed with input from all  
5 stakeholders.

6  
7 Q. What increase is the Company seeking in this filing?

8  
9 A. The Company’s testimony and exhibits support the need for an \$11.7 million annual  
10 revenue increase. This increase is based on a test year ended September 30, 2005; an  
11 average rate base of about \$239 million; and an overall rate of return on rate base of 9.37  
12 percent. The Company’s request in this filing is for a 4.47 percent increase in overall  
13 revenue. By comparison, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 24.4 percent in the last  
14 ten years since the Company’s previous Washington rate case.

15  
16 Q. What are the additional investments in facilities that the Company is making in Washington  
17 in order to continue to provide reliable and safe service?

18  
19 A. Cascade has experienced strong growth in our Washington service areas over the last twenty  
20 years. The result of this growth has created a need to expand the backbone in several of our  
21 service area distribution systems. The Company is projecting that it will need to invest  
22 more than \$19 million in system reinforcement projects in Washington over the next five  
23 years.

24  
25 Also, due to the age and condition of some of the pipe in Longview and Anacortes,  
26 Washington, Cascade will have to replace significant portions of these systems to ensure  
27 continued safe and reliable operations. Together with the replacement of some creek

1 crossings, odorizing facilities and ground beds for cathodic protection, Cascade will need to  
2 invest over \$15 million in replacement projects in Washington.

3  
4 In addition, based upon the various municipal projects that are planned in our service areas,  
5 Cascade anticipates that we will be required to relocate our infrastructure at a cost of more  
6 than \$1.8 million in Washington.

7  
8 Q. How does the Company propose to recover these investments in rates?

9  
10 A. Given this additional investment of approximately \$37 million in non-revenue producing  
11 safety & reliability projects in Washington over the next five years, the Company would be  
12 compelled to continually file rate cases to keep up with these expenditures. Since rate cases  
13 have an expense which is amortized over some time frame, the ultimate cost to the consumer  
14 would likely be greater utilizing a conventional rate case methodology of recovery. These  
15 system upgrades are installed in the interests of safety and reliability. We believe a  
16 preferable approach for recovering the costs associated with these investments is our Safety  
17 and Reliability Infrastructure Adjustment Mechanism, or SRIAM, which we are proposing  
18 to implement in this proceeding. This mechanism will adjust rates annually to reflect the  
19 known and measurable investment in these non-revenue producing projects. The SRIAM  
20 will align Cascade's interests with its customers and the public. The testimony of Mr. F. Jay  
21 Cummings describes this proposed mechanism in much more detail.

22  
23 Q. What are the Company's anticipated costs for new distribution mains and services?

24  
25 A. In addition to the \$37 million in Safety & Reliability projects in Washington, Cascade's  
26 obligation to serve creates the need to invest approximately \$85 million over the next five  
27 years in new distribution mains and services (approximately \$58 million in Washington).  
28 These investments in mains and services by themselves will strain the Company's ability to



1 raise capital at reasonable costs, thus exposing customers to even higher rates. The  
2 Company must maintain its financial integrity to ensure that the necessary capital for these  
3 new systems can be raised at a reasonable cost. Given the Company's capital requirements  
4 over the next five years, it is essential that the Company be provided a reasonable  
5 opportunity to earn a fair rate of return to enable these investments to be financed on  
6 favorable terms which results in lower rates for customers over the long term.

7  
8 Q. Please describe the Company's Conservation Alliance Plan and decoupling initiative.

9  
10 A. Under current regulation, Cascade's ability to recover our fixed cost has been tied to the  
11 volume of gas sales. Expected gas sales are set in the general rate proceeding based on  
12 consumption per customer during a test period and then adjusted for "normal" weather. The  
13 time lag between the rate case being fully processed and the use-per-customer information is  
14 almost two years. Any conservation measures installed by customers in the intervening  
15 period and any weather that is warmer than the "normal" applied in the rate case causes  
16 Cascade to under-recover our fixed cost.

17 To remedy the under-recovery of the Company's costs and better align ourselves with our  
18 customers in their efforts to conserve, Cascade has developed a rate stabilization mechanism  
19 that will decouple fixed-cost recovery from volume. We will be able to promote  
20 conservation without fear of being unable to provide a fair return to shareholders. Mr. Jon  
21 Stoltz will further explain our proposal, which has been evaluated both during the  
22 Commission's rulemaking on decoupling and Cascade's previous filing of its Conservation  
23 Alliance Plan.

24  
25 Q. Please describe the other issues addressed in the Company's filing.

26  
27 A. Our filing also includes proposals for addressing weather normalization, as well as new  
28 initiatives for low-income assistance and in the calculation of service charges.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Q. Please briefly describe the Company’s proposed approach for calculating the weather normalization adjustment.

A. The selection of “normal” in a weather normalization methodology should create a situation where the utility will have an equal opportunity to gain or to lose from the methodology. The currently accepted selection of “normal” relies on the 30-year arithmetic mean or average to define “normal” for Heating Degree Days (HDDs), using data provided by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). This creates a situation where the utility is much more likely to lose than to gain.

Cascade has retained State Climatologist Dr. Philip Mote to help the parties in the general rate case understand and decide on an improved selection of the appropriate HDDs to be used as “normal” in the weather normalization adjustment. In his testimony, Dr. Mote discusses observed warming in the Pacific Northwest climate, indicating that the currently used NOAA 30-year average is not a plausible expectation for HDDs for the next few years.

Q. Please describe the Company’s proposed customer assistance program.

A. As part of our case, Cascade is proposing to provide \$800,000 to the community service agencies in our service area for low-income bill payment and weatherization programs, as described in the testimony of Ms. Barnard. In connection with this additional assistance, however, we propose to implement new measures to ensure that low-income assistance is provided primarily for the benefit of customers who simply do not have the means to pay. In our experience, some customers who are able to pay choose instead to invoke their rights under the Commission’s “prior obligation” rule. Under this rule, the Company cannot refuse service to a customer due to an outstanding (“prior”) obligation. When the Company disconnects service for non-payment, the balance owing is considered a prior obligation and

1 the Company can no longer withhold service because the applicant's balance remains  
2 unpaid. The Company is obligated to reinstate service with the payment of a deposit  
3 (limited to 2/12 of estimated annual billings) regardless of the customer's financial status  
4 and ability to pay. That deposit may not be applied to the outstanding debt and can only be  
5 applied to future outstanding bills. During the winter months, when combined with the turn-  
6 off notice requirements, the deposit is seldom enough to cover the customer's outstanding  
7 balance.

8  
9 In connection with our additional funding for low-income programs in this case, we are  
10 seeking a waiver of the "prior obligation" rule to ensure that Cascade's proposed low-  
11 income programs provide benefits to those in need.

12  
13 Q. Please briefly describe Cascade's proposed changes to service charges.

14  
15 A. Cascade will propose to modernize rates on a variety of service charges to recognize current  
16 business practices, align fees to expenses incurred, and make the practice fairer to those  
17 customers not needing the services. Some examples are the Company's connect fee,  
18 returned check fee, late fee, seasonal turn-on, etc. Cascade has evaluated both internal  
19 expenses to provide the service as well as other Washington utility fees for these sorts of  
20 services. Mr. Jon Stoltz will explain these fee adjustments in his testimony.

21  
22 **IV. THE COMPANY'S DIRECT CASE**

23  
24 Q. Please identify the witnesses testifying for the Company in its direct case.

25  
26 A. Dr. Roger A. Morin, Professor of Finance at the College of Business, Georgia State  
27 University and Professor of Finance for Regulated Industry at the Center for the Study of  
28 Regulated Industry at Georgia State University, has provided Cost of Capital testimony and

1 exhibits supporting his recommendations for a reasonable ROE and for a proposed equity  
2 ratio.

3  
4 Mr. Philip W. Mote, Washington State Climatologist, has provided testimony and exhibits  
5 supporting his recommendations concerning the establishment of reasonable “normal”  
6 Heating Degree Days (HDDs) for use in the Company’s Weather Normalization  
7 restatement.

8  
9 Mr. Lamar Maxwell Dickey of the consulting firm Threshold Associates, Inc., has provided  
10 testimony and exhibits supporting his Cost of Service allocation study.

11  
12 Mr. F. Jay Cummings of the consulting firm Ruhter & Reynolds has provided testimony and  
13 exhibits supporting his recommendation for the establishment of a Safety and Reliability  
14 Infrastructure Adjustment Mechanism.

15  
16 In addition to myself, Cascade employees Mr. Jon T. Stoltz, Senior Vice President,  
17 Regulatory and Gas Supply has provided testimony and exhibits including a summary  
18 schedule of all adjustments contained in this application; testimony and exhibits supporting  
19 several restating and proforma adjustments, removal of non-core competitive services  
20 revenues and cost, a weather normalization adjustment, estimated rate case expense, revenue  
21 under proposed rates, change in rate spread and rate design, and changes in rates for other  
22 services and fees;

23  
24 Ms. Katherine J. Barnard, Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs has provided testimony and  
25 exhibits supporting several restating and proforma adjustments.

26  
27 Mr. James Haug, Controller has provided testimony and exhibits supporting changes in  
28 Income Tax on Proforma Capitalization; and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

Mr. Matthew D. McArthur, Treasurer has provided testimony and exhibits supporting the Company's Cost of Debt.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.