Chugach Electric Association, Inc.'s Closing Statement

REGULATORY COMMISSION OF ALASKA
U-16-066

Topics for Closing

- Economy Energy Sales
- Seaboard v. Coincident Peak
- Postage Stamp Rates

ECONOMY ENERGY SALES

- Economy Sales Revenues Should Be Returned To Firm Transmission Customers, Which Include ENSTAR's Retail Customers and the Electric Utilities
- ENSTAR Is Double Recovering
 - ENSTAR excludes economy sales revenues to determine its revenue requirement--but still pockets the funds
 - Under ENSTAR's proposed revenue requirement, it will fully recover for transmission costs through firm contracts
 - Under ENSTAR's approach, economy sales are extra profit
- RECOMMENDATION: Commission should require ENSTAR to return economy energy sales proceeds to its firm transmission customers, and direct ENSTAR to file a tariff advice letter proposing how it will do so

COST ALLOCATION

- Commission Last Decided on Seaboard in 1987
 - At that time, Seaboard was the favored approach nationally
 - It was FERC policy
 - Recommended in 1981 NARUC Manual

- Same Approach Applied Today Would Lead RCA to Adopt Coincident Peak
 - FERC has moved to CP (SFV contract demand is still driven by maximum demand of contracts)
 - NARUC Manual superseded in 1989 (applies to transmission AND distribution)
 - Circumstances in Alaska have changed

- FERC Has Abandoned Seaboard
 - Seaboard is Anti-Competitive
 - FERC realized it distorted gas market pricing (post-1952 FERC cases)
 - "...the use of Seaboard for rate design has serious infirmities." (United Fuel Gas Company, 31 FPC 1342, 1964)
 - Seaboard's 50/50 split is arbitrary and does not follow the cost causation model

- NARUC Manual No Longer Recommends Seaboard
 - Transmission costs are fixed costs
 - Fixed costs are attributed to capacity (peak)

- Cost Allocation Should be Tied to Cost Drivers
 - Peak demand drives cost
 - Transmission is recognized as a fixed, capacityrelated expense

- ENSTAR Approach to Past Settlements is Concerning
 - ENSTAR asks RCA to ignore detailed policy explanation to which they stipulated in 2009
 - ENSTAR claims a black box settlement supports their method
 - Is a detailed stipulation to be treated as meaningless "words on a page?"

- Explanations by ENSTAR and RAPA experts are illogical
 - "Intent" Does Not Change Cost
 - "Gas Supply Concern" Does Not Change Cost

- Gradualism is a Nice Word for Unfairness
 - ENSTAR acknowledges that Seaboard would result in a drastic increase to transmission customers
 - ENSTAR requests adoption of an unfair methodology and then asks to mitigate that unfairness
 - The unfairness would continue until ENSTAR's next rate case

POSTAGE STAMP RATES

- ▶ Titan & HEA Want Special Treatment
 - For 40 years, postage stamp rates have been the policy of this Commission
 - Standard policy for regulatory commissions around the country
 - Good policy: everyone benefits from a strong, integrated system – it's all about reliability

POSTAGE STAMP RATES (cont'd)

- Titan & HEA Benefit from Entire System
 - Gas supplies come from around the inlet
 - Reliability is important to customers emergencies happen
 - Evidence shows that both Titan & HEA have used and relied on the whole system

POSTAGE STAMP RATES (cont'd)

- Slippery Slope
 - Every rate making case will have intervenors asking for special treatment
 - If Titan & HEA are entitled to distance-based rates, why not everyone else – for every utility?
 - New rate case every time Titan & HEA uses new part of system?

SUMMATION

- Economy Energy Sales: Commission should order revenue returned to customers and direct the filing of a tariff advice letter
- Seaboard v. Coincident Peak: Commission should order the adoption of Coincident Peak cost allocation method
- Postage Stamp Rates: Commission should continue with a uniform policy