

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UG 287

In the Matter of)
)
CASCADE NATURAL GAS)
CORPORATION,)
)
Request for a General Rate Revision.)
_____)

**OPENING TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL P. GORMAN
ON BEHALF OF NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL GAS USERS**

July 31, 2015

**TABLE OF CONTENTS TO THE
OPENING TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL P. GORMAN**

	<u>Page</u>
I. REVENUE REQUIREMENT ADJUSTMENTS	6
I.A. PREPAID PENSION ASSET	7
I.B. LABOR ADDITIONS	8
I.C. RATE CASE EXPENSE	9
I.D. PLANNED DEPRECIATION RATE FILING	10
I.E. PLANT ADDITIONS	11
I.F. ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION EXPENSES.....	14
II. CASCADE PROPOSED REVENUE SPREAD	15
III. PIPELINE COST RECOVERY MECHANISM (“CRM”)	22
EXHIBIT NWIGU/101 – QUALIFICATIONS OF MICHAEL P. GORMAN	
EXHIBIT NWIGU/102 - Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study Development of Adjusted Non-Gas Revenue Class Increases	
EXHIBIT NWIGU/103 - Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study Revised Revenue Deficiency Scenario Development of Adjusted Non-Gas Revenue Class Increases	

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 **A.** Michael P. Gorman. My business address is 16690 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 140,
3 Chesterfield, MO 63017. I am employed by the firm of Brubaker & Associates, Inc.
4 (“BAI”), regulatory and economic consultants with corporate headquarters in
5 Chesterfield, Missouri. My qualifications are provided in Exhibit NWIGU/101.

6 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

7 **A.** I am testifying on behalf of the Northwest Industrial Gas Users (“NWIGU”). NWIGU is
8 a non-profit association comprised of more than 40 end users of natural gas with major
9 facilities in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. NWIGU members include diverse industrial
10 and commercial interests, including food processing, pulp and paper, wood products,
11 electric generation, aluminum, steel, chemicals, electronics, aerospace, and health care
12 providers. NWIGU member companies purchase sales and transportation services from
13 Cascade Natural Gas Corporation (“Cascade” or the “Company”).

14 **Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY EXHIBITS IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR**
15 **TESTIMONY?**

16 **A.** Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibits NWIGU/101 through NWIGU/103.

17 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR OPENING TESTIMONY IN THIS**
18 **PROCEEDING?**

19 **A.** I will respond to the Company’s claimed revenue deficiency, class cost of service study,
20 and proposed spread of the revenue deficiency across rate classes in this proceeding.

21 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR REVENUE REQUIREMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AND FINDINGS.**
22

23 **A.** The Company’s claimed revenue deficiency of \$3.6 million, or 12.51%, on non-gas
24 revenues is significantly overstated. As shown in Table 1 below, the Company overstates
25 its claimed revenue deficiency for at least six issues.

TABLE 1		
<u>Revenue Requirement Adjustments</u>		
(\$000)		
<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Source</u>
Claimed Revenue Deficiency	\$3,623 (12.51%)	
<u>Less Adjustments:</u>		
Prepaid Pension Assets	\$ 367.6	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. k
Labor Additions	607.9	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. m
Rate Case Expense	121.8	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. q
Depreciation Rates	487.3	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. s
Plant Additions	524.1	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. o
Environmental Remediation	<u>482.4</u>	CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Col. u
Total	\$2,661.0	
Adjusted Revenue Deficiency	\$961.0 (3.32%)	

1 As shown in Table 1 above , the Com pany’s claim ed revenue deficiency of
2 \$3.6 million should be reduced down to a reven ue deficiency of no m ore than \$961,000.

3 I will describe each of these revenue requirement adjustments below.

4 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARI ZE YOUR PR OPOSAL ON HOW TO SPREAD THE**
5 **REVENUE DEFICIE NCY FO UND JU ST AND REASONABLE B Y THE**
6 **COMMISSION IN THIS PROCEEDING.**

7 **A.** The Com pany’s proposed spread of its reve nue deficiency is unj ust and unreasonable
8 because it does not base this proposed spread on an accurate class cost of service study.
9 My proposed spread will move each rate class closer to cost of service, while recognizing
10 the limitations on rate adjustments and gradualism in recovering the revenue deficiency.

11 Based on prim arily the difference in class co st of service study, I show the Com pany’s

1 proposed spread in Table 2 below, along with my proposed allocation of the revenue
 2 deficiency across classes based on the Company's requested revenue deficiency for
 3 illustrative purposes only.

TABLE 2

Class Cost of Service Spread

<u>Description</u> \$	<u>Company Proposed</u> ¹		<u>Adjusted</u> ²		
	<u>Increase</u> %	<u>Increase</u>	<u>\$ Increase</u> %	<u>Increase</u>	
Residential (101)		\$1,358	8.32%	1,810	11.09%
Commercial Service (104)		1,410	18.77%	1,394	18.55%
Industrial Service (105)		133	28.15%	133	28.15%
Large Volume Service (111)		65	28.15%	65	28.15%
General Distribution (163+164)		646	28.15%	130	5.68%
Interruptible (170)		11	3.13%	19	5.68%
Special Contracts (900)		<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>4.0%*</u>
System Total		\$3,623	12.51%	\$3,623	12.51%

Sources and Note:
¹CNG/501, Amen/Page 2 of 2.
²NWIGU/102, Gorman/Page 1 of 2.
 *Based on two years of Consumer Price Index ("CPI") price adjustments.

4 **Q. IN YOUR TABLE 2 ABOVE, YOU NOTE AN INCREASE FOR SPECIAL**
 5 **CONTRACTS CUSTOMERS OF 4%. IS THAT BASED ON A PROPOSAL TO**
 6 **MOVE THEM CLOSER TO COST OF SERVICE IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

7 **A.** No. As I understand it, the Special Contracts tariffs have specific contract provisions
 8 which allow Cascade to adjust these customers' prices outside of a rate case. Based on
 9 the tariff rates for Special Contracts Schedule No. 201, the contracts generally read as
 10 follows:

1 Beginning October 1, 1996 and each October 1 thereafter for the duration
2 of the contract, the Commodity Rate shall be escalated by the percent age
3 change in the Consumer Price Index for the “All Urban Custom ers – U.S.
4 City Average – All Item s,” for the twelve m onths e nding on the
5 immediately prior July 1.

6 Based on this provision, it is my understanding that Cascade can increase rates to
7 the Special Contracts custom ers each July 1 in an amount equal to the Consum er Price
8 Index (“CPI”). As such, the increase in revenues for the Special Contracts cu stomers
9 listed in Table 2 above is based on this contr act provision. I have pr ojected that the CPI
10 will increas e by 4% fr om the 2014 test year to 2016, the rate-effective year. This
11 assumes that rates in this proceeding will be in effect around year-end 2015 and therefore
12 the revenues collected by these custom ers will increase, and support Cascade’s revenue
13 deficiency claim in this proceeding.

14 Importantly, it is not my position tha t the S pecial Contracts cus tomers’ rates
15 should be increas ed beyond the terms and cond itions specified in the custom ers’ special
16 contracts.

17 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE**
18 **COMPANY’S CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY.**

19 **A.** The Company’s class cost of service study is based on the Long Run Incremental Cost
20 (“LRIC”) methodology that has been used to support rate settlements for both Avista and
21 Northwest Natural Gas Company (“Northwest Natural”) in recent rate proceedings.^{1/}
22 Hence, the general structure of the Company’s cost of service study is reasonable.
23 However, I will propose two correcting adjustments to the Company’s cost study. First, I
24 make adjustments to the LRIC cost of meters for several large custom ers. The
25 Company’s LRIC cost for meters is substantially higher than that used in Avista and

^{1/} UG 284, Avista Utilities and UG 221, Northwest Natural Gas Company.

1 Northwest Natural cases, and substantially higher than a reasonable estimate of the
2 incremental cost of meters for its large customers. Second, for the core main costs that
3 are spread on volume, I propose to allocate those main costs across all rate classes. This
4 will result in a more accurate measurement of each class's cost of service. The Company
5 did not include volume for the Special Contracts class in this core main cost allocation.
6 Therefore, Cascade did not accurately measure its cost of service for each rate class.

7 While I understand there are limitations on adjusting the Company's rates for the
8 Special Contracts customers, that does not justify distorting the class cost of service study
9 when initially measuring and comparing each class's cost of service to the approved
10 rates. This is a critical first step in deciding how to allocate a revenue deficiency, if any,
11 for each rate class, including the Special Contracts class, and the remaining rate classes. I
12 will go into more detail in my revisions to the Company's class cost of service study and
13 development of my adjusted spread of the Company's claimed revenue deficiency later in
14 this testimony.

15 **Q. ARE YOU PROPOSING A SPREAD OF YOUR ADJUSTED REVENUE**
16 **DEFICIENCY FOR CASCADE?**

17 **A.** Yes. Based on my corrections to the Company's claimed revenue deficiency, I propose a
18 revenue spread as outlined in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3

Class Cost of Service Spread

<u>Description</u> \$	<u>Gorman Proposed¹</u>	
	<u>Increase</u> %	<u>Increase</u>
Residential (101)	541	3.3%
Commercial Service (104)	249	3.3%
Industrial Service (105)	35	7.5%
Large Volume Service (111)	17	7.5%
General Distribution (163+164)	40	1.7%
Interruptible (170)	6	1.7%
Special Contracts (900)	<u>71</u>	<u>4.0%</u>
System Total	\$961	3.32%

Source:
¹NWIGU/103, Gorman/Page 1 of 2.

1 This alternative spread consistent with the adjusted spread as shown in Table 3
 2 above, is based on corrections to the Company's class cost of service study and a more
 3 equitable allocation of the claimed revenue deficiency in this proceeding.

4 **I. REVENUE REQUIREMENT ADJUSTMENTS**

5 **Q. WILL YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE**
 6 **COMPANY'S CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY?**

7 **A.** Yes. I will explain each of the six adjustments I propose to the Company's claimed
 8 revenue deficiency. The total of these revenue requirement adjustments will reduce the
 9 Company's claimed revenue deficiency of \$3.622 million by \$2.661 million. This leaves
 10 an adjusted revenue deficiency of \$961,000.

1 **I.A. Prepaid Pension Asset**

2 **Q. WILL YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT TO THE**
3 **COMPANY'S CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY BASED ON A PREPAID**
4 **PENSION ASSET?**

5 **A.** The Company is proposing to include in its rate base a prepaid pension asset of
6 \$2.873 million. The existence of this prepaid pension asset increases the Company's
7 claimed revenue deficiency by \$367.64 thousand (CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 1,
8 Column k).

9 The Company states that it is including this prepaid pension asset net of deferred
10 taxes based on the positions of the Joint Utilities in Docket UM 1633, which Cascade
11 states have not yet been resolved. The Company's inclusion of this prepaid pension asset
12 before the issues in UM 1633 have been resolved is inappropriate, is not just and
13 reasonable, and therefore the cost should be removed. (CNG/300, Parvinen/6, lines
14 18-21).

15 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE A PREPAID PENSION ASSET SHOULD BE USED TO**
16 **INCREASE THE COMPANY'S CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY IN THIS**
17 **PROCEEDING?**

18 **A.** No. The Company's prepaid pension asset is necessary to bring its pension trust fund
19 more in line with its pension obligation. The Company has not shown that the reason the
20 prepaid pension contribution was necessary is because of inadequate pension trust
21 funding from prior periods. Further, the Company has not shown that the pension
22 expense receipts from customers in the past have not been adequate to fully reimburse
23 Cascade for this pension trust contribution.

24 As such, including the prepaid pension asset may essentially be requiring
25 customers to pay a return on Cascade's pension trust contributions which was funded by
26 customers via past payments of Cascade's recovery of pension expense in its retail rates.

1 Therefore, the Company's proposal to include this prepaid pension asset in its cost of
2 service has not been shown to be just and reasonable, and may be punitive to customers
3 to the extent they have already fully compensated the Company for its annual pension
4 costs including its contributions to its pension trust fund.

5 **I.B. Labor Additions**

6 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT FOR THE LABOR**
7 **ADDITIONS.**

8 **A.** The Company is proposing to increase its revenue deficiency by \$607,983 to reflect
9 planned additions to its labor force. (CNG/300, Parvinen/7 and CNG/304, Parvinen/Page
10 2 of 2, Column m). At page 7 of Mr. Parvinen's testimony, he states the Company
11 included an additional labor expense for planned additions to the workforce. He states
12 that the Company plans on adding these new employees before the rate-effective date.

13 **Q. IS THE LABOR ADDITIONS ADJUSTMENT REASONABLE?**

14 **A.** No. The increased labor expense is not known and measurable because the employees
15 have not been hired and are not part of the test year labor cost. Therefore, I propose it be
16 removed from this rate case as a not known and measurable cost of service item.

17 **Q. IS IT KNOWN AND MEASURABLE THAT CASCADE'S LABOR EXPENSE**
18 **WILL INCREASE POST-2014 TEST YEAR?**

19 **A.** No. While it is possible that Cascade may add employees to its payroll after the test year,
20 it is also equally possible that Cascade will lose existing employees either to termination,
21 leaving their positions or retirement. The post-test year additions of labor positions may
22 not increase Cascade's labor cost within the test year. Rather, it may simply replace a
23 reduction to the test year labor expense. The labor additions are simply not a known and
24 measurable increase to Cascade's test year labor expense. Therefore, this labor additions

1 adjustment is not a known and measurable change to Cascade's test year cost of service
2 and should not be allowed.

3 **I.C. Rate Case Expense**

4 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ADJUSTMENT CONCERNING THE COMPANY'S**
5 **RATE CASE EXPENSE.**

6 **A.** Mr. Parvinen states at page 11 of his testimony that the Company is including rate case
7 cost associated with this General Rate Case filing. He states that the net income impact is
8 \$111,877 and revenue impact of \$191,748 (CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Column q).

9 **Q. IS THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED RATE CASE EXPENSE REASONABLE?**

10 **A.** No. The Company has included all of its rate case in the test year. This will allow it to
11 recover this rate case expense in only one year. The Company has not filed a rate case
12 for many years, and Cascade has not indicated that it plans on making annual rate case
13 filings. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to amortize its rate case expense over
14 the period the rates determined in this proceeding are expected to be in effect. For
15 example, if these rates are expected to be in effect for three years, then the rate case
16 expense should be amortized over a three-year period.

17 **Q. HAS CASCADE PROVIDED ANY INFORMATION THAT SUGGESTS IT WILL**
18 **BE MAKING ANNUAL RATE CASE FILINGS?**

19 **A.** Not to my knowledge.

20 **Q. HAS CASCADE OFFERED ANY REGULATORY MECHANISMS THAT**
21 **WOULD ALLOW IT TO DEFER MAKING ANNUAL RATE CASE FILINGS?**

22 **A.** Yes. Cascade is proposing to implement a pipeline cost recovery mechanism ("CRM")
23 that will allow for rate changes in between rate cases. This type of mechanism, if
24 approved, would allow Cascade to defer or lengthen the amount of time in between rate
25 cases.

1 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR PROPOSAL?**

2 **A.** I recommend Cascade's rate case expense be amortized over at least a three-year period.
3 This assumes that Cascade will file rate cases about every three years. This is a
4 conservative estimate recognizing that Cascade has not filed a rate case for approximately
5 20 years, and it is proposing a CRM that, if approved, would allow it to delay rate case
6 filings going forward.

7 **Q. HOW DOES YOUR PROPOSED AMORTIZATION OF THE RATE CASE**
8 **EXPENSE IN THIS PROCEEDING IMPACT CASCADE'S CLAIMED**
9 **REVENUE DEFICIENCY?**

10 **A.** It reduces the revenue deficiency by \$121,832. Amortizing rate case expense over a
11 three-year period will reduce the Company's \$191,748 rate case revenue requirement to
12 \$63,916 and, thus, reduce its claimed revenue deficiency by \$121,832.

13 **I.D. Planned Depreciation Rate Filing**

14 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE**
15 **COMPANY'S REVENUE DEFICIENCY BASED ON ITS PLANNED**
16 **DEPRECIATION RATE FILING.**

17 **A.** The Company states that it plans to file for new depreciation rates in April 2015
18 (Parvinen/11). He states the new depreciation rates will reduce income by \$284,333,
19 which increases the claimed revenue requirement by \$487,323 (CNG/304, Parvinen/Page
20 2 of 2, Columns). This adjustment has been removed as a not known and measurable
21 expense change. This reduces the claimed revenue deficiency by \$487,323.

22 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIATE TO RECOGNIZE AN INCREASE IN**
23 **DEPRECIATION EXPENSE IF THE COMPANY PLANS TO FILE FOR NEW**
24 **DEPRECIATION RATES?**

25 **A.** No. Depreciation rate filings may show that the existing rates exceed reasonable
26 recovery of the life of the largely new investments being made by Cascade in this

1 proceeding, less salvage adjustments. Indeed, new mains generally have longer expected
2 life than the mains being replaced, and salvage adjustments generally may be the same or
3 less than they have been in existing rates. Hence, if Cascade files for new depreciation
4 rates it is just as likely that its depreciation rates will be reduced, rather than increase, as
5 implied by Cascade's adjustment. Therefore, this proposed adjustment in depreciation
6 expense implies approval of higher depreciation rates, which is not a known and
7 measurable change to Cascade's cost of service. Therefore, this proposed adjustment
8 should be denied.

9 **Q. HOW DOES REJECTION OF THE COMPANY'S ADJUSTMENT FOR NEW
10 DEPRECIATION RATES IMPACT ITS CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY?**

11 **A.** Rejecting the Company's proposed increase in its depreciation expense assuming its
12 proposed depreciation rate filing is approved, will reduce its claimed revenue deficiency
13 by \$487,323.

14 **I.E. Plant Additions**

15 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE CASCADE'S PROPOSAL TO INCREASE ITS COST OF
16 SERVICE FOR 2015 PLANT ADDITIONS.**

17 **A.** Cascade states that it is including \$12.0 million of plant additions in 2015 relative to the
18 base period of 2014. Mr. Parvinen states these plant additions reflect replacement of
19 existing facilities which do not generate additional revenues.

20 Mr. Parvinen's schedules show an increase in rate base of \$11.75 million, and
21 accumulated depreciation expense on the 2015 plant additions of \$568,710 and deferred
22 tax of \$13,364.

23 Mr. Parvinen developed the rate base adjustment by reflecting plant additions of
24 \$12.0 million, reflecting one-half year of the 2015 incremental depreciation expense

1 specific to these plant additions, along with accumulated deferred income taxes related to
2 the timing difference of book depreciation and tax depreciation. (CNG/304,
3 Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Column o).

4 **Q. IS MR. PARVINEN'S 2015 PLANT ADDITIONS TEST YEAR COST OF**
5 **SERVICE ADJUSTMENT REASONABLE?**

6 **A.** No. Mr. Parvinen's proposed 2015 plant additions adjustment is not balanced and does
7 not consider both increases and decreases to Cascade's post-test year net plant in-service.
8 Specifically, rate base will be changed based on increases in plant in-service after the test
9 year, but will also be decreased by an increase in accumulated depreciation after the end
10 of the 2014 test year. Hence, the net change in net plant and rate base after the test year
11 must reflect both 2015 plant additions and the post-2014 increase in accumulated
12 depreciation.

13 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW MR. PARVINEN'S 2015 PLANT ADDITIONS CAN BE**
14 **ADJUSTED TO REFLECT A MORE ACCURATE PROJECTED CHANGE IN**
15 **CASCADE'S NET PLANT IN-SERVICE BASE D ON ALL THE FACTORS**
16 **WHICH WILL CHANGE ITS RATE BASE IN 2015?**

17 **A.** Mr. Parvinen's 2015 plant adjustment increases rate base by \$11.745 million as shown
18 below in my Table 4 outlining Mr. Parvinen's plant additions to rate base. However, as
19 shown under Column 4, I show the necessary adjustment to the Company's proposed test
20 year rate base additions to reflect the build-up of accumulated depreciation in 2015 based
21 on depreciation expense recovered in 2014.

22 Based on this revision to the Company's proposed adjustment to rate base for
23 post-test year 2015 plant additions, I recommend that the Company's post-test year
24 adjustment be reflected to include both increases and decreases to rate base. This results
25 in a \$4.88 million reduction to the Company's claimed change in rate base based on post-
26 test year actions.

TABLE 4
2015 Post-Test Year
Plant Additions Rate Base Adjustment
(000)

<u>Description</u>	<u>Per Cascade</u>			<u>Additional Post-Test Year Adj.</u>	
	<u>2014 Rate Base¹</u> (1)	<u>2015 Plant Additions²</u> (2)	<u>Adj. Rate Base³</u> (3)	<u>Adjustment⁴</u> (4)	<u>2015 Rate Base⁵</u> (5)
Plant in Service	\$180,947	\$12,043	\$192,990		\$192,990
Accumulated Depr.	(85,852)	(284)	(86,136)	(4,880)	(91,016)
CIAC 0					0
Cust. Adv. for Constr.	(538)		(538)		(538)
Def. Acc. Inc. Taxes	(25,740)	(13)	(25,753)		(25,753)
Deferred Debits	0				0
Working Capital Allow.	<u>2,199</u>	<u> </u>	<u>2,199</u>	<u> </u>	<u>2,199</u>
Total Rate Base	\$71,016	\$11,745	\$82,761	\$(4,880)	\$77,881

Sources:

¹CNGC/301, Parvinen/Page 1, Col. 1.

²CNGC/304, Parvinen/Page 2, Col. o.

³Sum Cols 1-2.

⁴CNGC/301, Parvinen/Page 1, Col. 1.

⁵Sum Cols 3-4.

1 Mr. Parvinen’s 2015 plant additions adjust ment to rate base and the claim ed
2 revenue deficiency must be corrected to refl ect increases and decreases in rate bas e for
3 the pos t-test year period. This would require recogn izing the \$1 2 m illion plant
4 investments noted by Mr. Parvinen in this adjustment but also recognized a \$4.88 million
5 increase in accumulated depreciation in 2015, relative to the 2014 test year, caused by the
6 Company’s collection of \$4.88 million of depreciation expense in 2014 from customers.

7 Hence, the net increase in net plant fo r 2015, relative to the 2014 test year, would
8 be to reflect plant additions of \$12 m illion to account for Mr. Parv inen’s increm ental
9 depreciation and deferred tax es, but also recognized an in crease to 2 014 accum ulated
10 depreciation of \$4.88 million funded by depreciation e xpense recovered in 2014. This

1 results in an incremental rate base adjustment of \$6.865 million, rather than Mr.
2 Parvinen's estimated rate base adjustment of \$11.745 million.

3 **Q. WITH YOUR ADJUSTMENT TO MR. PARVINEN'S PROPOSED 2015 PLANT**
4 **IN-SERVICE ADJUSTMENT, HOW DOES THAT IMPACT THE COMPANY'S**
5 **CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY?**

6 **A.** An adjustment to rate base of \$4.88 million will lower Cascade's revenue requirement by
7 \$524,100 based on a reduction of operating income and related income tax expense.

8 **I.F. Environmental Remediation Expenses**

9 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ADJUSTMENT BASED ON ENVIRONMENTAL**
10 **REMEDIATION EXPENSES.**

11 **A.** The Company proposes to increase its revenue requirement by \$482,405 to reflect
12 environmental remediation costs. (CNG/304, Parvinen/Page 2 of 2, Column u).

13 Mr. Parvinen describes these environmental remediation costs at pages 25-28 of
14 his testimony. His testimony demonstrates that these costs largely do not relate to the
15 provision of gas service for Cascade and therefore it is not clear whether or not these
16 costs are appropriate to be recovered from retail customers. The Company's proposal for
17 environmental remediation costs also includes deferred costs from prior periods.

18 **Q. IS THE COMPANY'S PROPOSAL FOR RECOVERING THESE**
19 **ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION COSTS REASONABLE?**

20 **A.** No. Mr. Parvinen has not established why it is reasonable and prudent for the Company
21 to include these environmental remediation costs in its retail cost of service. These costs
22 simply are not related to provisions of gas service to its Oregon retail customers.
23 Therefore, these costs should not be included in its rate structure.

24 Further, the Company's proposal to include deferred costs in this test year rate-
25 setting adjustment is imbalanced and should be denied.

1 The Company has not shown if the Commission has given it authority to defer
2 these environmental remediation expenses, nor has it shown that it needed to define these
3 costs in prior periods in order to recover its cost of service. Mr. Parvinen states that the
4 Company did not experience an earnings surplus during the deferred time period.
5 However, the Company has also not established that expensing these costs, rather than
6 deferring them, would have resulted in an earnings shortfall.

7 For all these reasons, the Company's claimed recovery of environmental
8 remediation expense has not been shown to be appropriate from retail customers, and the
9 Company has inflated the environmental remediation costs to include deferrals of cost
10 incurred prior to the test year when its revenue collection may have already been capable
11 of providing recovery of the costs.

12 **Q. DO YOU RECOMMEND THE COMPANY'S ENVIRONMENTAL**
13 **REMEDATION EXPENSE BE INCLUDED IN ITS COST OF SERVICE?**

14 **A.** No. For the reasons stated above, the Company's proposal for an environmental
15 remediation cost recovery of \$482,405 should be denied.

16 **II. CASCADE PROPOSED REVENUE SPREAD**

17 **Q. HOW IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO SPREAD THE CLAIMED**
18 **REVENUE DEFICIENCY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

19 **A.** The Company's proposed revenue spread is developed by Cascade witness Ronald Amen
20 on his Exhibit CNG/501. As shown on that exhibit, Mr. Amen produces the Company's
21 class cost of service study, and then uses those results to produce a two-step
22 determination of the revenue spread of the Company's revenue requirement in this
23 proceeding. Based on this process, Mr. Amen proposes the revenue spread shown below
24 in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Company Proposed Revenue Spread
(\$000)

<u>Description</u>	<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Revenue Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Residential 101		\$1,358	8.32%
Commercial Service	104	1,410	18.77%
Industrial Service	105	133.1	28.15%
Large Volume Service	111	65.0	28.15%
General Distribution	163/164	646.3	28.15%
Interruptible 170		10.7	3.13%
Special Contracts	900	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total System		\$3,623	12.51%

Source: Amen Exhibit CNG/501.

1 **Q. IS MR. AMEN’S PROPOSED SPREAD OF THE REVENUE DEFICIENCY**
2 **REASONABLE?**

3 **A.** No. There are several deficiencies or errors in Mr. Amen’s cost of service study.
4 Correcting this cost of service study results in the following proposed spread of the
5 revenue deficiency in this proceeding, using the Company’s claimed revenue deficiency
6 for illustrative purposes only.

TABLE 6

Corrected Revenue Spread
(Company Claimed Deficiency)
(\$000)

<u>Description</u>	<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Revenue Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Residential 1	01	\$1,810	11.09%
Commercial Service	104	1,394	18.55%
Industrial Service	105	133	28.15%
Large Volume Service	111	65	28.15%
General Distribution	163/164	130	5.68%
Interruptible 170		19	5.68%
Special Contracts	900	<u>71</u>	<u>4.0%*</u>
Total System	111, 163/164, 170 and 900	\$3,623	12.51%

Source: Exhibit NWIGU/102, Gorman/Page 1 of 2.

*Based on two years of CPI changes.

1 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROPOSED CORRECTIONS TO MR. AMEN'S**
2 **CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY.**

3 **A.** I propose two corrections to Mr. Amen's class cost of service study. These include the
4 following:

- 5 1. His LRIC projected meter costs for large customers are overstated. Using inflated
6 LRIC meter costs inflates his cost of service for Rate Schedules 111, 163/164, 170
7 and 900, and therefore overstates the revenue requirement for these classes.
- 8 2. Mr. Amen does not properly allocate the Company's cost of service across all rate
9 classes based on their load characteristics that cause Cascade to incur cost to serve
10 those classes. Mr. Amen develops his volumetric allocation of core main costs by
11 excluding the volume used for Special Contracts customers. This distorts the
12 allocation of approximately \$11.6 million of the Company's total revenue
13 requirement. Hence, before any recognition is made of limitations in rate
14 adjustments, Mr. Amen has simply not accurately measured Cascade's cost of service
15 for each of the rate classes.

1 **Q. WHY DO YOU BELIEVE CASCADE HAS UNDERSTATED ITS LRIC METER**
2 **COSTS TO ITS LARGE CUSTOMERS?**

3 **A.** Mr. Amen's allocation of LRIC meter costs is on its face highly questionable. For
4 example, for Rate Schedules 163 and 164, Mr. Amen notes that there are 32 customer
5 accounts for the system of 69,254, or about 0.05% of all customer accounts on the
6 system. However, in allocating incremental costs of meters, Mr. Amen has allocated
7 \$2.4 million out of \$23.8 million of total meter and regulator investment cost to this same
8 rate class, or 10.1%. There is an obvious imbalance in his determination of meter costs
9 for this rate class.

10 A more detailed review shows more reasons to question the accuracy of
11 Mr. Amen's LRIC for meters and regulators. The accuracy is highly questionable when
12 you compare his cost relative to other large customer classes served by Cascade, and
13 compared to costs used by other Oregon utilities in conducting LRIC gas cost of service
14 studies. Specifically, I compared Cascade's meter regulator costs to those used by Avista
15 and Northwest Natural in recent gas cost of service studies using an LRIC methodology
16 to gain support by all parties in those rate cases. This comparison is shown in Table 7
17 below.

TABLE 7

Meter Cost Comparison

<u>Description</u>	<u>Rate Class</u>	<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Meter Cost</u>
Cascade: ¹			
Industrial		105	\$5,944
Lg	Volume	111	33,417
Gen.	Distribution	163/164	75,516
Interruptible		170	135,029
Special	Contracts	900	167,448
Avista Oregon ²			\$8,902
Northwest Natural ³			\$5,334

Sources:
¹Amen CNG/502, line 17 ÷ line 3 (for specific rate schedule)
²UG 284, Avista Utilities, Exhibit No. 801; Miller/Avista Incremental Investment Costs.
³UG 221, NWN/1101, Feingold/9, Incremental customer-related distribution costs, meters and regulators.

1 As shown in the table above, Cascade’s LRIC meter costs for its Classes 111,
2 163, 164, 170 and 900 are substantially higher than Cascade’s own meter cost estimate
3 for its Class 105 customers. Cascade’s meter costs for its Class 105 customers is in turn
4 more consistent with the LRIC meter cost estimates used by Avista and Northwest
5 Natural in their LRIC gas cost of service studies. Further, a review of Mr. Amen’s
6 testimony failed to produce any support for his LRIC cost estimates for meters for these
7 rate classes.

8 **Q. HOW DO YOU PROPOSE TO CORRECT MR. AMEN’S LRIC COSTS TO**
9 **REFLECT A MORE REASONABLE LRIC METER COST ESTIMATE?**

10 **A.** Mr. Amen’s meter cost estimates for these rate classes appear to be overstated by a factor
11 of 10. Therefore, I adjusted his LRIC meter cost estimate by a factor of 1/10, to produce

1 LRIC meter costs that are more in line with his estimate for Cascade's Schedule 105, and
2 the meter cost estimates made by Avista and Northwest Natural.

3 **Q. DID YOU CORRECT MR. AMEN'S CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY TO**
4 **REFLECT THESE ADJUSTMENTS?**

5 **A.** Yes. This is shown in my Exhibit NW IGU/102, page 2. As shown in this exhibit on
6 lines 19 through 27, I have adjusted the LRIC cost for large meters for larger customers,
7 and to spread pipeline costs based on all volume and demand billing units for each of the
8 rate classes. This produces an undistorted cost of service for each rate class.

9 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU PROPOSE TO SPREAD THE COMPANY'S**
10 **CLAIMED REVENUE DEFICIENCY IN THIS PROCEEDING.**

11 **A.** My proposed spread of the revenue deficiency is very similar to Mr. Amen's. I followed
12 the following steps in producing my proposed revenue spread:

- 13 1. I compared the current revenues to the class cost of service study to determine the
14 amount of rate increase necessary to bring each rate class up to cost of service.
- 15 2. I recognized certain classes that have limits and adjustments to rates and considered
16 these rate limits in allocating additional revenues to those classes. Specifically, the
17 Special Contracts rates have tariff provisions which allow for rate adjustments equal
18 to only the CPI rate. Hence, I made CPI rate adjustments for 2015 and 2016 (the rate-
19 effective year) to reflect increased revenues from this rate class.
- 20 3. I did not propose to reduce rates that are measured to be above cost of service.
- 21 4. Using this methodology as a general guide, and the effort to move each rate class to
22 produce the revenue deficiency, I arrived to what I believe to be a reasonable spread
23 across rate classes. My final spread, however, was tempered by ensuring that no rate
24 class got more than a 2.25x system average increase. This last step was designed in
25 order to ensure that no rate class got an extraordinary increase in this proceeding, and
26 therefore was maintained reasonably close within a range of the system average
27 increase.

1 **Q. BASED ON THIS METHODOLOGY, WHAT IS YOUR PROPOSED SPREAD**
2 **FOR EACH RATE CLASS?**

3 **A.** My proposed rate spread reflecting the Company's claimed revenue deficiency for
4 illustrative purposes only, is shown on my Exhibit NW IGU/103 and summarized in
5 Table 8 below.

TABLE 8			
<u>Class Cost of Service Spread</u>			
<u>Description</u> \$	<u>Gorman Proposed</u> ¹		
	<u>Increase</u> %	<u>Increase</u> Index	
Residential (101)	541	3.32%	1.0
Commercial Service (104)	249	3.32%	1.0
Industrial Service (105)	35	7.47%	2.25
Large Volume Service (111)	17	7.47%	2.25
General Distribution (163+164)	40	1.75%	0.53
Interruptible (170)	6	1.75%	0.53
Special Contracts (900)	<u>71</u>	<u>4.00%</u>	1.21
System Total	\$961.0	3.32%	

Source:
¹NWIGU/103, Gorman/Page 1 of 2.

6 As shown on Exhibit NW IGU/103 and Table 8, no class received more than a
7 2.25x system average increase, and the Special Contracts customers' rates were increased
8 by two years of CPI rate increases.^{2/}

^{2/} Based on *The Blue Chip Financial Forecasts*, July 2, 2015, CPI was assumed to be approximately 2% in 2015 and 2% in 2016. This produced a two-year inflation to the rates under this class of around 4%.

1 As shown on page 1 of that exhibit, I s how the proposed spread of m y estimated
2 revenue deficiency of \$961,000. The sam e steps were used to produce this rate spread
3 along with lim itations on increases to any sp ecific rate class for gradualism , and no rate
4 class would get a rate decrease.

5 **III. PIPELINE COST RECOVERY MECHANISM (“CRM”)**

6 **Q. IS THE COMPANY PROPO SING TO IMPLM ENT A CRM IN THIS**
7 **PROCEEDING?**

8 **A.** Yes. The Company states that the CRM will provide timely recovery of costs incurred to
9 promote safety and relia bility of Cascade’s distribution system. These costs will ref lect
10 incremental revenue requirem ent for pipelin e costs that are not revenue producing
11 investments.^{3/} The Company claim s that a CRM is necessary to provide Cascade full
12 recovery of its co sts of providing sa fe and re liable service, and will d efer the need f or
13 frequent rate filings needed to produce rate support for the Di stribution Integrity
14 Management Plan (“DIMP”).

15 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE CO MPANY PROPOSES TO PRODUCE**
16 **CHARGES UNDER THE CRM.**

17 **A.** As described by Mr. Parvinen at pages 28- 32 of his testimony and as developed on his
18 Exhibit CNG/311, Cascade proposes to develo p a revenue requirem ent for increm ental
19 plant additions categorized as rep lacement projects. Those plant additions then will be
20 adjusted for depreciatio n in the year incurr ed, def erred ta xes rela ted to the reco rded
21 depreciation in the year in curred, to develop a rate base com ponent of the plant
22 investment. The revenue requirement then is based on a rate of return, related income tax
23 expense, and depreciation expense related to those plant investm ents. That revenue

^{3/} CNG/300 at Parvinen/28.

1 requirement then will be spread across rate classes using the main incremental investment
2 allocation of the utility's most recently approved class cost of service study. The class
3 allocated share will then be stated in to a volumetric charge for all customers within each
4 rate class.

5 **Q. IS THE COMPANY'S CRM AS DESCRIBED REASONABLE?**

6 **A.** No. The Company has not established that a CRM is needed in order to provide it an
7 ability to adjust its rates to fully recover its cost of service. Pipeline safety trackers such
8 as the CRM should be reserved for extraordinary investments, and only if the Company
9 can show that the traditional regulatory process is inadequate to recover these costs. No
10 showing has been made here. The Company's claim for a CRM to eliminate the need for
11 more frequent rate cases may benefit the Company by accelerating and simplifying its
12 ability to increase rates. But, simple and accelerated rate change authorization is
13 detrimental to customers' interest because rates can be increased using trackers without a
14 full review of the Company's costs and revenues. As such, these tracker mechanisms
15 represent extraordinary regulatory procedures which tilt the balance in favor of investors
16 by eliminating the utility's need to prove a rate increase is justified. For these reasons the
17 proposed CRM should be rejected.

18 **Q. IF THE COMMISSION APPROVES THE PROPOSED CRM, SHOULD**
19 **MODIFICATIONS BE MADE TO CASCADE'S PROPOSAL?**

20 **A.** Yes. The following modifications should be made to Cascade's proposed CRM if the
21 Commission decides one is appropriate and balanced from both investor and customer
22 perspectives. These modifications include the following:

- 23 1. If the CRM is implemented, Cascade should be obligated to make a base rate filing at
24 least every three years. The annual rate changes produced through the CRM may
25 produce revenues that allow Cascade to more than recover its cost of service. Hence,

1 a regular calibration of its base rates is necessary to ensure that the CRM mechanism
2 does not create unnecessary and unjustified rate burdens on customers.

- 3 2. The CRM should have a sunset provision. Cascade claims the need for an increase
4 right now because it is replacing non-revenue producing investments. Cascade
5 should demonstrate that those capital investment obligations are limiting its ability to
6 timely adjust rates to recover its cost of service. Importantly, Cascade has not
7 provided this proof in this case.

8 Nevertheless, sunset provisions should be imposed on Cascade so it is
9 obligated to come in and prove its current traditional regulatory mechanisms are not
10 adequate to allow it to adjust rates to fully recover its cost of service after the CRM is
11 in effect for a reasonable period. Initially, I propose a sunset provision of three years.
12 If the Commission approves the CRM, it will terminate in three years, unless Cascade
13 proves it is in the public interest to continue the CRM.

- 14 3. The CRM should be limited to only qualifying investments that are non-revenue
15 producing as the Company asserts is the purpose of the CRM. This should require the
16 Company to identify specific Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”)
17 accounts that will be designated as qualifying investments that are non-revenue
18 producing, and should qualify to be recovered in the CRM.

- 19 4. The revenue requirement of these qualifying CRM investments then should be
20 adjusted to reflect a roll-forward of accumulated depreciation that is recovered in base
21 rates for the specified FERC accounts. This will recognize the incremental capital
22 investment made by Cascade is offset by recovery of embedded plant investment
23 recorded in the designed FERC accounts.

- 24 5. The Company’s proposed intra-class cost recovery of CRM investments on a dollars
25 per volumetric basis should be denied. Instead, the CRM should be a percent of
26 non-gas bill. This will ensure that the proper cost allocation of Cascade’s costs is
27 reasonably allocated to customers within each rate class function.

28 **Q. CAN YOU PROVIDE SOME DETAIL DESCRIBING YOUR PROPOSED**
29 **REVISIONS TO THE COMPANY’S PROPOSED CRM MECHANISM?**

- 30 **A.** Yes. Referring to Mr. Parvinen’s CNG/311, he develops a rate base value of the
31 qualifying CRM investments by considering only depreciation expense applicable to the
32 incremental CRM investment. This is not appropriate and will overstate the Company’s
33 net plant investment over time because it is not recognizing that incremental plant
34 investments are offset by recurring depreciation expense receipts in measuring change to

1 total “net” plant. Hence, it does not properly measure the Company’s net plant
2 investment for these qualifying pipeline replacement costs.

3 To correct this, line 13 of Mr. Parvinen’s CNG/311, should include both one-half
4 year of the depreciation expense associated with the incremental plant investment, plus a
5 full year of the depreciation expense that aligns with the qualifying CRM plant
6 investments recovered by the Company in the prior year, less the amount included in base
7 rates in the Company’s most recent rate case filing.

8 For example, if the Company had accumulated depreciation reserved for CRM
9 qualifying plant accounts of \$1,000 in its last rate case, and at the end of the following
10 year the first year accumulated depreciation on qualifying CRM increased to \$1,100, then
11 the additional \$100 of accumulated depreciation should be recognized in the CRM in
12 order to estimate the incremental “net” plant value of qualifying CRM investments. This
13 will ensure that the Company is allowed to earn a fair return on its net plant investment
14 for CRM qualifying investments, which includes its invested capital recovered in base
15 rates, and its invested capital recovered in the CRM surcharge.

16 Without this important adjustment in developing the revenue requirement in the
17 CRM, customers will be exposed to paying higher rates than necessary to provide the
18 Company the full revenue requirement attributable to its net plant in-service for CRM
19 qualifying investments, which will result in the combination of base rates and CRM
20 surcharges not being just and reasonable.

21 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR OPENING TESTIMONY?**

22 **A.** Yes, it does.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UG 287

In the Matter of)
)
CASCADE NATURAL GAS)
CORPORATION,)
)
Request for a General Rate Revision.)
_____)

EXHIBIT NWIGU/101

QUALIFICATIONS OF MICHAEL P. GORMAN

July 31, 2015

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A Michael P. Gorman. My business address is 16690 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 140,
3 Chesterfield, MO 63017.

4 **Q PLEASE STATE YOUR OCCUPATION.**

5 A I am a consultant in the field of public utility regulation and a Managing Principal with
6 Brubaker & Associates, Inc. (“BAI”), energy, economic and regulatory consultants.

7 **Q PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND WORK**
8 **EXPERIENCE.**

9 A In 1983 I received a Bachelors of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from
10 Southern Illinois University, and in 1986, I received a Masters Degree in Business
11 Administration with a concentration in Finance from the University of Illinois at
12 Springfield. I have also completed several graduate level economics courses.

13 In August of 1983, I accepted an analyst position with the Illinois Commerce
14 Commission (“ICC”). In this position, I performed a variety of analyses for both formal
15 and informal investigations before the ICC, including: marginal cost of energy, central
16 dispatch, avoided cost of energy, annual system production costs, and working capital. In
17 October of 1986, I was promoted to the position of Senior Analyst. In this position, I
18 assumed the additional responsibilities of technical leader on projects, and my areas of
19 responsibility were expanded to include utility financial modeling and financial analyses.

20 In 1987, I was promoted to Director of the Financial Analysis Department. In this
21 position, I was responsible for all financial analyses conducted by the Staff. Among
22 other things, I conducted analyses and sponsored testimony before the ICC on rate of
23 return, financial integrity, financial modeling and related issues. I also supervised the
24 development of all Staff analyses and testimony on these same issues. In addition, I

1 supervised the Staff's review and recommendations to the Commission concerning utility
2 plans to issue debt and equity securities.

3 In August of 1989, I accepted a position with Merrill-Lynch as a financial
4 consultant. After receiving all required securities licenses, I worked with individual
5 investors and small businesses in evaluating and selecting investments suitable to their
6 requirements.

7 In September of 1990, I accepted a position with Drazen-Brubaker & Associates,
8 Inc. ("DBA"). In April 1995, the firm of Brubaker & Associates, Inc. was formed. It
9 includes most of the former DBA principals and Staff. Since 1990, I have performed
10 various analyses and sponsored testimony on cost of capital, cost/benefits of utility
11 mergers and acquisitions, utility reorganizations, level of operating expenses and rate
12 base, cost of service studies, and analyses relating to industrial jobs and economic
13 development. I also participated in a study used to revise the financial policy for the
14 municipal utility in Kansas City, Kansas.

15 At BAI, I also have extensive experience working with large energy users to
16 distribute and critically evaluate responses to requests for proposals ("RFPs") for electric,
17 steam, and gas energy supply from competitive energy suppliers. These analyses include
18 the evaluation of gas supply and delivery charges, cogeneration and/or combined cycle
19 unit feasibility studies, and the evaluation of third-party asset/supply management
20 agreements. I have participated in rate cases on rate design and class cost of service for
21 electric, natural gas, water and wastewater utilities. I have also analyzed commodity
22 pricing indices and forward pricing methods for third party supply agreements, and have
23 also conducted regional electric market price forecasts.

1 In addition to our main office in St. Louis, the firm also has branch offices in
2 Phoenix, Arizona and Corpus Christi, Texas.

3 **Q HAVE YOU EVER TESTIFIED BEFORE A REGULATORY BODY?**

4 A Yes. I have sponsored testimony on cost of capital, revenue requirements, cost of service
5 and other issues before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and numerous state
6 regulatory commissions including: Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware,
7 Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri,
8 Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma,
9 Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West
10 Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and before the provincial regulatory boards in Alberta
11 and Nova Scotia, Canada. I have also sponsored testimony before the Board of Public
12 Utilities in Kansas City, Kansas; presented rate setting position reports to the regulatory
13 board of the municipal utility in Austin, Texas, and Salt River Project, Arizona, on behalf
14 of industrial customers; and negotiated rate disputes for industrial customers of the
15 Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia in the LaGrange, Georgia district.

16 **Q PLEASE DESCRIBE ANY PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATIONS OR**
17 **ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH YOU BELONG.**

18 A I earned the designation of Chartered Financial Analyst (“CFA”) from the CFA Institute.
19 The CFA charter was awarded after successfully completing three examinations which
20 covered the subject areas of financial accounting, economics, fixed income and equity
21 valuation and professional and ethical conduct. I am a member of the CFA Institute’s
22 Financial Analyst Society.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UG 287

In the Matter of)
)
CASCADE NATURAL GAS)
CORPORATION,)
)
Request for a General Rate Revision.)
_____)

EXHIBIT NWIGU/102

**LONG RUN INCREMENTAL COST (LRIC) STUDY
DEVELOPMENT OF ADJUSTED NON-GAS REVENUE CLASS INCREASES**

July 31, 2015

**Cascade Natural Gas Corp.
Oregon Jurisdiction
Docket No. UG 287**

Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study
Development of Adjusted Non-Gas Revenue Class Increases

		Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study Results				Step 1		Step 2				Step 3			
Line	Rate Class	Non-Gas Revenue @ Current Rates (1)	Revenue Requirement (2)	Non-Gas Revenue Increase (3)	Percent Increase (4)	Adjustment to Class Increases (5)	Increase to Current Revenue (6)	Shortfall Spread (7)	New Revenue Increase (8)	Increase (9) (10)		Return Index (11)	Increase (12) (13)		Return Index (14)
1	Residential 101	\$16,312,863	\$16,801,484	\$488,621	3.00%	\$16,801,484	\$488,621	\$953,827	\$17,755,311	\$1,442,448	8.84%	0.71	\$1,809,733	11.09%	0.89
2	Commercial 104	7,513,446	8,257,847	744,401	9.91%	\$8,257,847	\$744,401	\$468,801	\$8,726,648	\$1,213,202	16.15%	1.29	\$1,393,721	18.55%	1.48
3	Industrial 105	472,884	967,044	494,160	104.50%	\$967,044	\$494,160	\$54,899	\$1,021,943	\$549,059	116.11%	9.28	\$133,127	28.15%	2.25
4	Lg Volume 111	230,926	404,828	173,902	75.31%	\$404,828	\$173,902	\$22,982	\$427,810	\$196,884	85.26%	6.81	\$65,011	28.15%	2.25
5	Gen. Distribution 163+164	2,295,862	1,823,890	(471,972)	-20.56%	2,295,862	\$0	\$130,337	\$2,426,199	\$130,337	5.68%	0.45	\$130,337	5.68%	0.45
6	Interruptible 170	340,717	228,266	(112,451)	-33.00%	340,717	\$0	\$19,343	\$360,060	\$19,343	5.68%	0.45	\$19,343	5.68%	0.45
7	Special Contracts 900	1,787,429	4,093,538	2,306,109	129.02%	1,858,926	\$71,497	\$0	\$1,858,926	\$71,497	4.00%	0.32	\$71,497	4.00%	0.32
8	Total	\$28,954,127	\$32,576,897	\$3,622,770	12.51%	\$30,926,708	\$1,972,581	\$1,650,189	\$32,576,897	\$3,622,770	12.51%	1.00	\$3,622,770	12.51%	1.00

Cascade Natural Gas Corp.
Oregon Jurisdiction
Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study
Summary

Line #	Description	Total	101	104	105	111	163+164	170	900
			Residential Service core	Commercial Service core	Industrial Service core	Large Volume Service core	General Distribution non-core	Interruptible core	Special Contracts non-core
1	Billing Determinants								
2	Peak Day Forecast	83,138	46,988	32,086	2,617	1,447	0	0	0
3	Customer Count	69,254	59,252	9,839	111	13	32	4	4
4	Throughput	33,745,469	3,944,203	2,790,590	253,388	157,985	3,478,380	276,803	22,844,121
5									
6	O&M Costs								
7	Gas Supply Related								
8	Gas Planning	\$ 26,165	\$ 11,922	\$ 8,191	\$ 681	\$ 386	\$ 640	\$ 143	\$ 4,201
9	Gas Supply	\$ 44,079	\$ 17,347	\$ 12,273	\$ 1,114	\$ 695	\$ 1,511	\$ 1,217	\$ 9,922
10	Gas Control	\$ 95,077	\$ 37,043	\$ 26,208	\$ 2,380	\$ 1,484	\$ 12,058	\$ 2,600	\$ 13,305
11	Customer Related								
12	Meter Reading	\$ 253,003	\$ 211,393	\$ 35,101	\$ 396	\$ 1,499	\$ 3,691	\$ 461	\$ 461
13	Customer Acct records & collect.	\$ 1,229,953	\$ 1,048,824	\$ 174,154	\$ 1,964	\$ 230	\$ 3,825	\$ 478	\$ 478
14	Billing Postage & Printing	\$ 346,211	\$ 296,208	\$ 49,184	\$ 555	\$ 65	\$ 160	\$ 20	\$ 20
15	Uncollectible	\$ 278,894	\$ 226,650	\$ 52,214	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16	Subtotal: O&M Costs	\$ 2,273,382	\$ 1,849,385	\$ 357,326	\$ 7,120	\$ 4,359	\$ 21,884	\$ 4,920	\$ 28,388
17									
18	Customer Investment Carrying Costs								
19	Meter	\$ 2,935,074	\$ 1,600,768	\$ 1,179,345	\$ 95,899	\$ 6,318	\$ 35,146	\$ 7,856	\$ 9,742
20	Service	\$ 12,417,164	\$ 10,226,363	\$ 1,885,694	\$ 51,727	\$ 16,710	\$ 177,124	\$ 46,631	\$ 12,914
21	Mains	\$ 11,632,431	\$ 4,526,025	\$ 1,085,696	\$ 921,423	\$ 241,753	\$ 2,758,597	\$ 382,489	\$ 1,716,447
22	Subtotal: Customer Investment Costs	\$ 26,984,669	\$ 16,353,156	\$ 4,150,736	\$ 1,069,050	\$ 264,781	\$ 2,970,867	\$ 436,976	\$ 1,739,103
23									
24	System Core Main Carrying Costs								
25	Capacity	\$ 37,706,253	\$ 21,302,440	\$ 14,546,501	\$ 1,186,418	\$ 655,982	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,912
26									
27	Commodity	\$ 12,881,733	\$ 1,675,488	\$ 1,185,436	\$ 107,639	\$ 67,111	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,250,866
28	Subtotal: System Core Main Costs	\$ 50,587,986	\$ 22,977,928	\$ 15,731,937	\$ 1,294,056	\$ 723,094	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,265,778
29									
30	LRIC - Distribution	\$ 79,846,037	\$ 41,180,470	\$ 20,239,999	\$ 2,370,226	\$ 992,234	\$ 4,470,358	\$ 559,481	\$ 10,033,269
31									
32	Fuctional Cost Assignment by LRIC								
33	Scheduling & Planning	\$ 165,321	\$ 66,311	\$ 46,673	\$ 4,176	\$ 2,565	\$ 14,208	\$ 3,960	\$ 27,428
34	Meter Reading, Billing etc.	\$ 2,108,061	\$ 1,783,074	\$ 310,653	\$ 2,944	\$ 1,795	\$ 7,676	\$ 960	\$ 960
35	Meters, Services & Mains extensions	\$ 26,984,669	\$ 16,353,156	\$ 4,150,736	\$ 1,069,050	\$ 264,781	\$ 2,970,867	\$ 436,976	\$ 1,739,103
36	System Core Mains	\$ 50,587,986	\$ 22,977,928	\$ 15,731,937	\$ 1,294,056	\$ 723,094	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,265,778
37	Total	\$ 79,846,037	\$ 41,180,470	\$ 20,239,999	\$ 2,370,226	\$ 992,234	\$ 4,470,358	\$ 559,481	\$ 10,033,269
38									
39	Non-Gas Revenue at Current Rates	\$ 28,954,127	\$ 16,312,863	\$ 7,513,446	\$ 472,884	\$ 230,926	\$ 2,295,862	\$ 340,717	\$ 1,787,429
40	Proposed Increase	\$ 3,622,770							
41	LRIC Based Non-gas Rev Req.	\$ 32,576,897	\$ 16,801,484	\$ 8,257,847	\$ 967,044	\$ 404,828	\$ 1,823,890	\$ 228,266	\$ 4,093,538
42	Revenue to Cost Ratio		0.97	0.91	0.49	0.57	1.26	1.49	0.44
43									
44	Incremental Non-gas Revenue Req.	\$ 3,622,770	\$ 488,621	\$ 744,401	\$ 494,160	\$ 173,902	\$ (471,972)	\$ (112,451)	\$ 2,306,109

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UG 287

In the Matter of)
)
CASCADE NATURAL GAS)
CORPORATION,)
)
Request for a General Rate Revision.)
_____)

EXHIBIT NWIGU/103

**LONG RUN INCREMENTAL COST (LRIC) STUDY
REVISED REVENUE DEFICIENCY SCENARIO
DEVELOPMENT OF ADJUSTED NON-GAS REVENUE CLASS INCREASES**

July 31, 2015

**Cascade Natural Gas Corp.
Oregon Jurisdiction
Docket No. UG 287**

Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study
Revised Revenue Deficiency Scenario
Development of Adjusted Non-Gas Revenue Class Increases

Line	Rate Class	Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study Results				Step 1		Step 2				Step 3				
		Non-Gas Revenue @ Current Rates	Revenue Requirement	Non-Gas Revenue Increase	Percent Increase	Adjustment to Class Increases	Increase to Current Revenue	Excess Spread	New Revenue Increase	Increase		Return Index	Increase		Return Index	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Amount	Percent	(11)	Revenue	Percent	(14)	
1	Residential	101	\$16,312,863	\$15,428,680	(\$884,183)	-5.42%	\$16,312,863	\$0	\$154,873	\$16,467,736	\$154,873	0.95%	0.29	\$541,431	3.32%	1.00
2	Commercial	104	7,513,446	7,583,121	69,675	0.93%	\$7,583,121	\$69,675	\$71,993	\$7,655,114	\$141,668	1.89%	0.57	\$249,375	3.32%	1.00
3	Industrial	105	472,884	888,029	415,145	87.79%	\$888,029	\$415,145	\$8,431	\$896,460	\$423,576	89.57%	26.99	\$35,314	7.47%	2.25
4	Lg Volume	111	230,926	371,750	140,825	60.98%	\$371,750	\$140,825	\$3,529	\$375,280	\$144,354	62.51%	18.83	\$17,245	7.47%	2.25
5	Gen. Distribution	163+164	2,295,862	1,674,865	(620,997)	-27.05%	\$2,295,862	\$0	\$21,797	\$2,317,659	\$21,797	0.95%	0.29	\$40,175	1.75%	0.53
6	Interruptible	170	340,717	209,615	(131,102)	-38.48%	\$340,717	\$0	\$3,235	\$343,952	\$3,235	0.95%	0.29	\$5,962	1.75%	0.53
7	Special Contracts	900	1,787,429	\$3,759,066	1,971,637	110.31%	1,858,926	\$71,497	\$0	\$1,858,926	\$71,497	4.00%	1.21	\$71,497	4.00%	1.21
8	Total		\$28,954,127	\$29,915,127	\$961,000	3.32%	\$29,651,269	\$697,142	\$263,858	\$29,915,127	\$961,000	3.32%	1.00	\$961,000	3.32%	1.00

Cascade Natural Gas Corp.
Oregon Jurisdiction
Long Run Incremental Cost (LRIC) Study
Summary

Line #	Description	Total	<u>101</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>163+164</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>900</u>
			Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Large Volume	General	Interruptible	Special
			Service	Service	Service	Service	Distribution		Contracts
			core	core	core	core	non-core	core	non-core
1	Billing Determinants								
2	Peak Day Forecast	83,138	46,988	32,086	2,617	1,447	0	0	0
3	Customer Count	69,254	59,252	9,839	111	13	32	4	4
4	Throughput	33,745,469	3,944,203	2,790,590	253,388	157,985	3,478,380	276,803	22,844,121
5									
6	O&M Costs								
7	Gas Supply Related								
8	Gas Planning	\$ 26,165	\$ 11,922	\$ 8,191	\$ 681	\$ 386	\$ 640	\$ 143	\$ 4,201
9	Gas Supply	\$ 44,079	\$ 17,347	\$ 12,273	\$ 1,114	\$ 695	\$ 1,511	\$ 1,217	\$ 9,922
10	Gas Control	\$ 95,077	\$ 37,043	\$ 26,208	\$ 2,380	\$ 1,484	\$ 12,058	\$ 2,600	\$ 13,305
11	Customer Related								
12	Meter Reading	\$ 253,003	\$ 211,393	\$ 35,101	\$ 396	\$ 1,499	\$ 3,691	\$ 461	\$ 461
13	Customer Acct records & collect.	\$ 1,229,953	\$ 1,048,824	\$ 174,154	\$ 1,964	\$ 230	\$ 3,825	\$ 478	\$ 478
14	Billing Postage & Printing	\$ 346,211	\$ 296,208	\$ 49,184	\$ 555	\$ 65	\$ 160	\$ 20	\$ 20
15	Uncollectible	\$ 278,894	\$ 226,650	\$ 52,214	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
16	Subtotal: O&M Costs	\$ 2,273,382	\$ 1,849,385	\$ 357,326	\$ 7,120	\$ 4,359	\$ 21,884	\$ 4,920	\$ 28,388
17									
18	Customer Investment Carrying Costs								
19	Meter	\$ 2,935,074	\$ 1,600,768	\$ 1,179,345	\$ 95,899	\$ 6,318	\$ 35,146	\$ 7,856	\$ 9,742
20	Service	\$ 12,417,164	\$ 10,226,363	\$ 1,885,694	\$ 51,727	\$ 16,710	\$ 177,124	\$ 46,631	\$ 12,914
21	Mains	\$ 11,632,431	\$ 4,526,025	\$ 1,085,696	\$ 921,423	\$ 241,753	\$ 2,758,597	\$ 382,489	\$ 1,716,447
22	Subtotal: Customer Investment Costs	\$ 26,984,669	\$ 16,353,156	\$ 4,150,736	\$ 1,069,050	\$ 264,781	\$ 2,970,867	\$ 436,976	\$ 1,739,103
23									
24	System Core Main Carrying Costs								
25	Capacity	\$ 37,706,253	\$ 21,302,440	\$ 14,546,501	\$ 1,186,418	\$ 655,982	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,912
26									
27	Commodity	\$ 12,881,733	\$ 1,675,488	\$ 1,185,436	\$ 107,639	\$ 67,111	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,250,866
28	Subtotal: System Core Main Costs	\$ 50,587,986	\$ 22,977,928	\$ 15,731,937	\$ 1,294,056	\$ 723,094	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,265,778
29									
30	LRIC - Distribution	\$ 79,846,037	\$ 41,180,470	\$ 20,239,999	\$ 2,370,226	\$ 992,234	\$ 4,470,358	\$ 559,481	\$ 10,033,269
31									
32	Fuctional Cost Assignment by LRIC								
33	Scheduling & Planning	\$ 165,321	\$ 66,311	\$ 46,673	\$ 4,176	\$ 2,565	\$ 14,208	\$ 3,960	\$ 27,428
34	Meter Reading, Billing etc.	\$ 2,108,061	\$ 1,783,074	\$ 310,653	\$ 2,944	\$ 1,795	\$ 7,676	\$ 960	\$ 960
35	Meters, Services & Mains extensions	\$ 26,984,669	\$ 16,353,156	\$ 4,150,736	\$ 1,069,050	\$ 264,781	\$ 2,970,867	\$ 436,976	\$ 1,739,103
36	Sysctem Core Mains	\$ 50,587,986	\$ 22,977,928	\$ 15,731,937	\$ 1,294,056	\$ 723,094	\$ 1,477,607	\$ 117,585	\$ 8,265,778
37	Total	\$ 79,846,037	\$ 41,180,470	\$ 20,239,999	\$ 2,370,226	\$ 992,234	\$ 4,470,358	\$ 559,481	\$ 10,033,269
38									
39	Non-Gas Revenue at Current Rates	\$ 28,954,127	\$ 16,312,863	\$ 7,513,446	\$ 472,884	\$ 230,926	\$ 2,295,862	\$ 340,717	\$ 1,787,429
40	Proposed Increase	\$ 961,000							
41	LRIC Based Non-gas Rev Req.	\$ 29,915,127	\$ 15,428,680	\$ 7,583,121	\$ 888,029	\$ 371,750	\$ 1,674,865	\$ 209,615	\$ 3,759,066
42	Revenue to Cost Ratio		1.06	0.99	0.53	0.62	1.37	1.63	0.48
43									
44	Incremental Non-gas Revenue Req.	\$ 961,000	\$ (884,183)	\$ 69,675	\$ 415,145	\$ 140,825	\$ (620,997)	\$ (131,102)	\$ 1,971,637