

FILE

DEO EXHIBIT 1.4

18

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

2008 AUG 25 AM 10: 52

PUCO

**In the Matter of the Application of The
East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion
East Ohio for Authority to Increase Rates
for its Gas Distribution Service.**

Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR

**In the Matter of the Application of The
East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion
East Ohio for Approval of an Alternative
Rate Plan for its Gas Distribution Service**

Case No. 07-830-GA-ALT

**In the Matter of the Application of The
East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion
East Ohio for Approval to Change
Accounting Methods**

Case No. 07-831-GA-AAM

**In the Matter of the Application of The
East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion
East Ohio for Approval of Tariffs to
Recover Certain Costs Associated with a
Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement
Program Through an Automatic
Adjustment Clause, And for Certain
Accounting Treatment**

Case No. 08-169-GA-ALT

**In the Matter of the Application of The
East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion
East Ohio for Approval of Tariffs to
Recover Certain Costs Associated with
Automated Meter Reading Deployment
Through an Automatic Adjustment Clause,
and for Certain Accounting Treatment**

Case No. 06-1453-GA-UNC

**FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
JEFFREY A. MURPHY
ON BEHALF OF
DOMINION EAST OHIO**

___ Management policies, practice and organization

___ Operating income

**This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file
document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician SM Date Processed 8/25/08**

- ☐ Rate base
- ☐ Allocations
- ☐ Rate of return
- ☐ Rates and tariffs
- ☒ Other (Stipulation and Recommendation)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	1
III. JOINT EXHIBIT 1-A TO THE STIPULATION	7
IV. JOINT EXHIBIT 1-B TO THE STIPULATION	15
V. CONCLUSION.....	15

1 **Fourth Supplemental Direct Testimony of**

2 **Jeffrey A. Murphy**

3 **I. INTRODUCTION**

4 **Q1. Please state your name, occupation and business address.**

5 A1. My name is Jeffrey A. Murphy. I am employed by The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a
6 Dominion East Ohio ("DEO" or "Company") as its Director, Rates and Gas Supply. My
7 business address is 1201 East 55th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44103-1028.

8 **Q2. Are you the same Jeffrey A. Murphy that previously submitted Direct Testimony,**
9 **Supplemental Direct Testimony, Second Supplemental Direct Testimony, and Third**
10 **Supplemental Direct Testimony in Case Nos. 07-829-GA-AIR, 07-830-GA-ALT, 07-**
11 **831-GA-AAM, 08-169-GA-ALT and 06-1453-GA-UNC?**

12 A2. Yes.

13 **Q3. What is the purpose of this supplemental direct testimony?**

14 A3. My testimony supports the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation") filed in these
15 proceedings on August 22, 2008.

16 **II. THE STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION**

17 **Q4. Please describe the Stipulation.**

18 A4. The Stipulation resolves all issues in the case with the exception of rate design in the
19 consolidated cases. Among other things, the Stipulation recommends a net base rate
20 revenue increase of \$40,500,000 and 8.49% as the rate of return on rate base. The
21 Company, the Staff and OOGA have agreed on a proposed rate design, reflected in Joint
22 Exhibit 1-A. I address this proposed rate design in Section III of my testimony below.

Q5. Which parties have signed the Stipulation?

A5. In addition to the Company, the following parties signed the Stipulation: Commission Staff, Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC"), Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy ("OPAE"), City of Cleveland ("Cleveland"), Neighborhood Environmental Coalition, Empowerment Center of Greater Cleveland, Cleveland Housing Network and Consumers for Fair Utility Rates (collectively, the "Citizens' Coalition"), Stand Energy, and The Ohio Oil & Gas Association ("OOGA") (collectively, "Signatory Parties").

Q6. Are there certain parties who are not part of the Stipulation?

A6. Integrys Energy Services, Inc., Interstate Gas Supply, UWUA Local G555, and Dominion Retail have not signed the Stipulation as of the filing of this testimony.

Q7. What were the major issues in this proceeding?

A7. The Company, Staff and intervenors had different positions concerning various aspects of date certain rate base, test year operating income, rate of return, certain proposed rate and tariff provisions, the PIR application, AMR application and rate design.

Q8. Does the Stipulation resolve these issues?

A8. Yes. With the exception of rate design, all of these issues have been resolved among the Signatory Parties.

Q9. Were all parties to this case included in the negotiations that resulted in the Stipulation and Recommendation?

A9. Yes. DEO circulated its initial settlement proposal at a meeting at the Commission on July 8, 2008, which was open to all parties. Numerous e-mails, conference calls, and other exchanges involving the parties followed over the next two months, even after

1 depositions and the evidentiary hearing were underway. As new drafts of the settlement
2 terms or Stipulation itself were reached, these were also shared with all parties.

3 **Q10. Is the Stipulation a result of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable**
4 **parties?**

5 A10. Yes. Each party to the Stipulation regularly participates in rate proceedings and other
6 regulatory matters before the Commission, and each party was represented by similarly
7 experienced and competent counsel. As can be seen by reviewing the parties to the
8 Stipulation, a broad range of interests is represented: the Company, the Staff of the
9 Commission, various consumer groups (themselves representing a range of consumer
10 interests), a major natural gas marketer, and natural gas producers. The negotiations
11 involved significant give-and-take, with the parties to the Stipulation compromising on
12 numerous issues which had been actively litigated up to the point agreement was reached.
13 And these negotiations were all premised on a thorough analysis of the Company's
14 applications, by the Commission, its independent auditor, and OCC, among others.

15 As a result of these negotiations, the Company will recover less revenue than it
16 requested in its applications, and the Company has also agreed to terms and conditions of
17 service that it did not request. At the same time, the Stipulation provides revenue greater
18 than that advocated by other parties in these cases. This is further evidence that the
19 bargaining in this case was serious.

20 **Q11. Does the Stipulation violate any important regulatory principle or practice?**

21 A11. No. In fact, the Stipulation advances many such principles and practices. The 8.49% rate
22 of return recommended by the Stipulation is consistent with returns authorized for
23 comparable utilities. The Automated Meter Reading ("AMR") program, which the

1 Stipulation recommends approving, will allow the Company to provide monthly meter
2 reading and thus better match billing for service to the period the service is rendered.
3 The Parties have also agreed to credit certain savings achieved by the AMR program as
4 an offset to the AMR Cost Recovery Charge. Likewise, the Pipeline Infrastructure
5 Replacement ("PIR") program, which the Stipulation recommends approving, provides
6 for annual previews of the PIR program proposed for the coming year as well as an
7 annual Post Audit procedure of the program. The Stipulation also recommends a 5-year
8 initial term for the program, as well as caps on charges, which is consistent with sound
9 regulatory practices and the principle of gradualism. As with the AMR program, the
10 Parties have also agreed to credit certain savings achieved by the PIR program as an
11 offset to the PIR Cost Recovery Charge. And the Stipulation is based in large part on the
12 findings and recommendations of the Staff Reports, which analyzed the Company's
13 applications and made recommendations for the purpose of ensuring the resultant rates,
14 terms, and conditions of service comply with sound regulatory principles and practices.

15 **Q12. Does the Stipulation, as a package, benefit ratepayers and the public interest?**

16 **A12.** Yes. The Stipulation provides for a \$40.5 million net base rate revenue increase, whereas
17 the Company fully supported a net increase of approximately \$72.5 million in its
18 Application. Thus, the Stipulation provides over \$30 million less than requested by the
19 Company.

20 The Stipulation recommends approval of two new initiatives that will enhance
21 both service and safety. It recommends approval of the AMR program, which will
22 provide numerous service and billing benefits to customers and will also enable DEO to
23 achieve new efficiencies. The PIR program will also promote the continued safe and

1 reliable operation of its pipeline system, with DEO taking over ownership and
2 responsibility for newly installed, replaced and repaired curb-to-meter service lines. In
3 addition to recommending approval of the programs themselves (which will benefit
4 customers), the parties agreed to credit certain savings achieved by the programs to offset
5 the amounts recovered by the riders. The parties also agreed to audit procedures and
6 other forms of review that ensure transparency and accountability.

7 The Stipulation also provides for a substantial increase in the funding of programs
8 to assist customers. For example, increased levels of demand-side management ("DSM")
9 spending are recommended—up to \$9.5 million from DEO's current expenditure of \$3.5
10 million per year. To determine how best to allocate and deploy these funds, the parties
11 agreed to convene a joint "DSM Collaborative." The parties also agreed that the
12 Company would provide by year-end 2008 a shareholder-funded \$1.2 million to
13 organizations providing payment assistance to DEO customers as well as education
14 regarding the efficient use of natural gas.

15 The Stipulation also recommends a number of adjustments to the terms and
16 conditions proposed by the Company designed with the interests of consumers in mind.
17 For example, the parties agreed to adjust the proposed Late Payment Charge to credit
18 amounts that would otherwise be recovered through the Company's Uncollectibles
19 Expense Rider and also to reduce the impact of that charge on customers participating in
20 the PIPP program or on short-term and budget billing plans. The Stipulation also
21 modifies the security deposit payment provisions by allowing the payment to be billed in
22 three equal installments, rather than all at once. DEO has also committed to study
23 whether it is feasible (A) to provide adjusted bill due dates (to enable customers to pay at

1 more convenient dates) and (B) to reduce certain fees associated with certain forms of
2 payments.

3 There are additional benefits to those described above, but these should be
4 sufficient to show that the Stipulation provides benefits to ratepayers and is in the public
5 interest.

6 **Q13. Does the Stipulation and Recommendation help protect low-income customers?**

7 A13. Yes, in several ways. The proposed levelized rate design for the GSS Class avoids an
8 outcome in which customers who cannot afford to make energy conservation investments
9 effectively subsidize those customers who make those investments (*see Q&A 20*). In
10 addition, half of the \$6 million annual increase in DSM spending proposed in the
11 Stipulation and Recommendation is targeted toward low-income customers. That results
12 in an 86% increase in low-income DSM-related spending when compared to the \$3.5
13 million currently spent each year in the Company's low-income weatherization program.
14 Finally, the Stipulation and Recommendation also includes the following provision
15 designed to help low-income DEO customers:

16 By December 31, 2008, DEO shall provide \$1,200,000 of
17 shareholder-funded assistance to organizations that will help DEO
18 customers in the areas of payment assistance and education
19 regarding the efficient use of natural gas. Of that amount,
20 \$900,000 shall be directed to the following organizations operating
21 in the Greater Cleveland area: (1) \$125,000 to the Consumer
22 Protection Association to enhance the work they are currently
23 engaged in with DEO in helping set up workable payment
24 arrangements for troubled customers; (2) \$425,000 to the
25 Empowerment Center of Greater Cleveland to assist DEO
26 customers, especially low income families as well as their
27 neighborhoods; and (3) \$350,000 to be used as a fuel fund by the
28 Salvation Army and other community groups. This fund would
29 provide a backup to help families avoid disconnection when all
30 other resources have already been used. The remaining \$300,000

shall be directed to organizations operating elsewhere in DEO's service territory.

(Stip. ¶ 3.D.)

Q14. In light of the matters discussed above, do you believe that the Stipulation satisfies the three-part criteria for Commission approval of the Stipulation?

A14. Yes, I do.

III. JOINT EXHIBIT 1-A TO THE STIPULATION

Q15. What is Joint Exhibit 1-A?

A15. This exhibit represents a proposed rate structure for the General Sales Service and Energy Choice Transportation Service (collectively, "GSS Class") rate schedules.

Q16. Please describe the proposed rate structure for the GSS Class rate schedules.

A16. Joint Exhibit 1-A of the Stipulation and Recommendation sets forth the following rate structure for the GSS Class:

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>
Service Charge:	\$12.50 / month	\$15.40 / month
Volumetric Charge:		
First 50 Mcf:	\$ 0.625 / Mcf	\$ 0.355 / Mcf
Over 50 Mcf:	\$ 1.051 / Mcf	\$ 0.603 / Mcf

The GSS Class rate schedules also will be modified to limit eligibility to customers consuming less than 3,000 Mcf per year.

Q17. How would you describe the rate design indicated in Joint Exhibit 1-A?

A17. The rates contained in that exhibit are based on a modified straight fixed variable ("SFV") rate design. I use the term "modified" to indicate that, unlike more conventional

1 SFV rates, the rates proposed in the Stipulation and Recommendation do not recover all
2 fixed cost in the fixed monthly customer charge. In year 1, for example, only 71% of
3 annual base rate revenues will be provided by the \$12.50 fixed monthly charge for the
4 average residential customer using 99.1 Mcf per year. In year 2, that percentage rises to
5 84% with the \$15.40 monthly charge. Because DEO's costs to provide distribution
6 service are almost entirely fixed, the proposed rate design marks only an initial step
7 toward full SFV rates.

8 **Q18. Why is the Company willing to adopt such a rate design in lieu of the more**
9 **traditional rate design and decoupling mechanism proposed in its Application?**

10 **A18.** As explained on page 42 of my Direct Testimony, DEO prefers SFV to the combination
11 of traditional rate design and decoupling. There are at least five reasons why.

12 First, as noted in the Alt. Reg. Exhibit B included in the Application, moving to a
13 straight fixed variable rate design would address the problem of declining use per
14 customer ("UPC") more effectively by permitting much greater recovery of fixed charges
15 in a demand rate rather than a usage charge. However, that rate design was inconsistent
16 with the Commission's historical approach to calculating customer-related cost, which
17 significantly understates the amount of costs that do not vary with usage. Under the
18 circumstances, the Sales Reconciliation Rider ("SRR") represents an acceptable means to
19 achieve an outcome consistent with traditional rate of return regulation within the
20 historical rate design approach utilized by the Commission.

21 Second, as with the revenue decoupling proposed in DEO's Application, the
22 proposed rate design also advances state energy policy as modified by Amended
23 Substitute Senate Bill No. 221 ("S.B. 221"), which was signed into law earlier this year.
24 S.B. 221 defined a revenue decoupling mechanism as "a rate design or other cost

1 recovery mechanism that provides recovery of the fixed costs of service and a fair and
2 reasonable rate of return, irrespective of system throughput or volumetric sales,” R.C.
3 4929.01(O), and modified the state energy policy so as to “promote an alignment of
4 natural gas company interests with consumer interest in energy efficiency and energy
5 conservation,” R.C. 4929.02(A)(12). By providing for the recovery of a greater portion
6 of fixed cost, the proposed rate design significantly reduces the adverse revenue impact
7 that the Company would otherwise experience from energy conservation by end use
8 customers.

9 Third, the proposed rate design is supported by cost of service studies.¹

10 Fourth, the proposed rate design is preferred because it sends better price signals
11 to customers.²

12 Fifth, the rate design recommended by certain parties in the Stipulation and
13 Recommendation is consistent with the levelized rate design approved by the
14 Commission in its May 28, 2008 Opinion and Order in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, et al.³

15 **Q19. How is the rate design set forth on Joint Exhibit 1-A supported by the cost of service**
16 **information submitted in this proceeding?**

17 A19. The major rate design issue being contested in this proceeding is the extent to which the
18 Company’s cost of service should be recovered from customers through fixed versus
19 volumetric charges. The operation and maintenance expenses set forth in Schedule C-2.1
20 of the Company’s Application are predominantly fixed in nature and do not vary with
21 usage. The same can be said of the other major elements of the cost of service set forth

¹ See Question & Answer No. 19.

² See Question & Answer No. 20.

³ See Question & Answer No. 21.

1 on other Standard Filing Requirements schedules, including depreciation, taxes not
2 otherwise collected in riders and return on rate base. Thus, a rate design that recovers a
3 greater portion of the cost of service through fixed rather than volumetric charges is
4 consistent with the nature of the Company's cost of service as set forth in its Application.

5 The proposed rates are also consistent with the class cost of service study
6 included as Schedule E-3.2. As explained by Mr. Andrews during his August 1, 2008,
7 cross-examination by OCC, "the cost of service study that Dominion submitted in its
8 filing would support any rate design that with the combination of charges that were
9 included produce that revenue requirement." (Transcript of August 1, 2008 proceedings,
10 Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR (consol.), page 225.) Because the allocation of the revenue
11 increase adopted in the Stipulation and Recommendation apportions less revenue to the
12 GSS Class than that proposed by the Company in its Application, the class cost of service
13 study would support an even higher revenue requirement from the GSS Class.

14 **Q20. In what way does the proposed rate design send better price signals than the**
15 **combination of a more traditional rate design and decoupling rider?**

16 **A20.** There are several reasons that the proposed rate design sends better price signals. Under
17 the proposed levelized rate design:

18 — Customers have greater certainty with respect to the impact of the conservation
19 decisions they make. Under decoupling, conservation decisions impact future base
20 rates in a largely unknown manner. When customers reduce their consumption of
21 natural gas, the decoupling rider is increased in a subsequent period to offset the
22 impact on base rate revenues. As a result, individual customers cannot readily project
23 how much they will save on base rates by engaging in conservation measures under

1 decoupling. In fact, if everyone conserved at the same rate, there would be no
2 reduction at all in the base rate revenues eventually paid by customers, other things
3 being equal.

4 — There is a more accurate indication of avoided cost. When customers conserve, the
5 one cost they truly avoid is the cost of the commodity itself. They do not contribute
6 to any meaningful reduction in the cost of distribution service. There is no change
7 whatsoever in the cost of the physical plant used to serve the customer, meter reading
8 expenses, billing and remittance processing, or other predominantly fixed cost aspects
9 of providing gas distribution service. A rate that incorrectly implies that the cost of
10 service is reduced when usage declines does not send an accurate price signal to
11 customers.

12 — There is a more equitable distribution of cost. While decoupling provides an
13 opportunity to recover fixed cost in the aggregate, it results in non-conservers
14 subsidizing new conservers. If my neighbor conserves more than I do, my costs go
15 up when the decoupling rider is subsequently adjusted to reflect his reduced UPC.
16 While making conservation investments may be a conscious choice for some
17 customers, there are many customers who would like to make conservation
18 investments but cannot afford to do so. Decoupling disproportionately affects the
19 latter group.

20 — There is a better reflection of cost. No one in this proceeding has argued that the cost
21 of distribution service varies directly with usage. OCC's Mr. Radigan conceded in

his July 23, 2008 deposition that most gas utility costs are fixed as indicated in the following exchange:

Page 47

1 thing. Essential equipment that you
2 need to serve the customer.

3 Q. Hold on a minute.

4 In your review of the Dominion
5 cost-of-service studies and other
6 materials, which DEO costs vary with
7 usage?

8 A. There may be -- you'd have
9 to do a study, but the size of the main
10 may increase with usage, the size of
11 service may increase with usage, the
12 size of the meter may increase with
13 usage.

14 There may be a slight increase in
15 O&M. But generally for a gas utility,
16 most of the costs are fixed.

A price signal that suggests that costs vary with usage is not as accurate as one that properly recognizes the nature of the costs incurred in providing service. While much has been made of the fact that low-usage customers will bear more revenue responsibility under the levelized rate design, that rate design basically corrects inequities from the traditional approach by having all GSS Class customers bear a more appropriate share of the cost to serve.

Q21. Do the same factors considered by the Commission in its May 28, 2008 Opinion and Order in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR et al apply to the rates proposed in this case as well?

A21. Yes. As in that case, the evidence of record demonstrates a significant decline in use-per-customer ("UPC") at DEO for some time. (Staff Report at page 45.) Since 1990, residential UPC has declined from over 130 Mcf per year to under 100 Mcf. Although

1 the UPC was fairly stable for the past two years, DEO's forecasts project a continuation
2 of the one to two percent decline in UPC per year as older, less efficient gas appliances
3 are replaced and gas prices continue to rise, resulting in price-induced conservation.
4 DEO's 24% decrease in residential UPC since 1990 has not been offset by the 9%
5 increase in DEO's residential customer base over that same time frame. In fact, as noted
6 in the Staff Report, DEO's residential customer base has actually declined over the last
7 two years by nearly 9,000 customers. Because residential customers comprise 78% of
8 GSS Class volumes and 93% of customers, they exert tremendous influence on the
9 Company's ability to recover its revenue requirement from that class.

10 Another factor considered by the Commission in its decision in Duke is the
11 commitment to conservation measures. That commitment has been significantly
12 increased in DEO's case from the current funding level of \$3.5 million to \$9.5 million, of
13 which \$6.5 million is devoted to low-income customers. The Stipulation and
14 Recommendation also provides an opportunity to increase ratepayer funded spending
15 through the DSM collaborative process and subsequent applications requesting
16 Commission approval of such funding.

17 As the Commission noted, there are some similarities between the levelized rate
18 design approach and a decoupling rider. The advantages of a levelized rate design cited
19 by the Commission in its May 28, 2008 Opinion and Order apply to the rate design
20 proposed in this case as well. Those advantages include more stable customer bills
21 throughout the year, a less complicated approach to establishing rates and more accurate
22 price signals being sent to consumers.

1 **Q22. Please explain the derivation of the rates included in Joint Exhibit 1-A.**

2 A22. The year 1 and year 2 rates are designed to generate the appropriate base rate revenue for
3 the GSS Class. Using the revenue increase allocation set forth in Table 1 on page 30 of
4 the Staff Report, DEO assigned the appropriate portion of the \$40.5 million total
5 Company revenue increase to the GSS Class. The Company then worked with
6 Commission Staff to devise rates that would move in the direction of an SFV rate design
7 over two years. The resulting proposed rates mitigate the impact of that rate design
8 approach by maintaining a volumetric component to the rates and phasing it in over a
9 two-year period.

10 The existence of a rate block for consumption over 50 Mcf per month is another
11 concession to the principle of gradualism in that it results in larger customers paying a
12 larger share of the revenue requirement than their volumes would otherwise dictate. Of
13 the GSS Class's test year usage of 143.3 Bcf, approximately 18.8 Bcf or 13% falls into
14 the over 50 Mcf per month block. Over 15.8 Bcf or 84% of the usage in that block is
15 comprised of the non-residential class. In total, 50% of non-residential GSS Class
16 volumes will be priced at the higher commodity rate, while less than 3% of the residential
17 volumes will be priced at that rate. Because smaller non-residential customers have a
18 load factor that is very similar to that of residential customers, the resulting rate design
19 provides more homogeneity among those customers consuming less than 50 Mcf per
20 month.

21 The 3,000 Mcf cap on the annual usage of customers eligible to receive service
22 under the GSS and ECTS rate schedules reflects the need to limit larger customer access
23 to a rate schedule designed for much lower levels of usage. The 3,000 Mcf figure reflects
24 the point at which customers under current rates would, on average, begin to receive less

1 expensive service under the large volume ("LV") rate schedules, LVGSS and LVECTS.
2 In order to avoid unwarranted migration from their larger volume, more expensive
3 counterparts, DEO has to limit access to the SFV-based GSS and ECTS rate schedules
4 that would be considerably less expensive at any usage level than their LVGSS and
5 LVECTS versions.

6 **IV. JOINT EXHIBIT 1-B TO THE STIPULATION**

7 **Q23. Please describe Joint Exhibit 1-B to the Stipulation.**

8 A23. Joint Exhibit 1-B is a letter containing commitments made by DEO to OOGA. The letter
9 explains DEO's perspective regarding certain tariff provisions of interest to OOGA.

10 Paragraph 4 of the Stipulation requires that the Company file tariff sheets consistent with
11 those commitments after the execution of the Stipulation.

12 **V. CONCLUSION**

13 **Q24. Does this conclude your testimony?**

14 A24. Yes.