1	PLACE: Chamber of Commerce, Durham, North Carolina
2	DATE: Thursday, July 10, 2008
3	DOCKET NO.: G-5, Sub 495
4	TIME IN SESSION: 2:00 p.m 2:24 p.m.
5	BEFORE: Commissioner Lorinzo L. Joyner, Presiding Chairman Edward S. Finley, Jr.
6	Commissioner William T. Culpepper, III
7	
8	IN THE MATTER OF
9	Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., Application for a General Increase in Its Rates and
10	Charges.
11	\cdot
12	
13	APPEARANCES:
14	PUBLIC SERVICE NORTH CAROLINA
15	Mary Lynn Grigg Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Rice
16	150 Fayetteville Street, Suite 2100 Raleigh, North Carolina 27612
17	
18	
19	USING AND CONSUMING PUBLIC
20	Gina Holt 4326 Mail Service Center
21	Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4326
22	
23	
24	
	NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

2 COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Good afternoon. We are 3 going to come on the record. My name is Lorinzo Joyner. 4 I am a Member of the North Carolina Utilities Commission. 5 With me today, to my left, is Chairman Edward S. Finley, 6 Jr.; and William T. Culpepper, III.

1

I now call for hearing Docket No. G-5, Sub 495,
wherein Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc.,
d/b/a as PSNC Energy has Applied for an Adjustment in Its
Retail Rates and Charges. On February 27, 2008, PSNC
filed a letter with the Commission providing Notice of Its
Intent to File an Application for a General Rate Increase.
That Application was filed on March 31, 2008.

14 PSNC has requested approval of various changes 15 to its rates, terms and conditions of service. Generally, 16 the Company is requesting an increase of \$20,441,501 in 17 revenues from its rates and charges for natural gas 18 service; certain changes to the cost allocations and rate 19 designs underlying the existing rates for the Company; 20 certain revisions to its tariff; amortization to certain account balances; approval to implement a customer usage 21 tracker; and approval to implement a cost recovery 22 23 mechanism for customer conservation programs. The 24 increase in annual revenues of \$20,441,501 requested by

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

the Company represents an annual increase of 3 percent
 over present rates.

3	According to testimony filed by PSNC in support
4	of the requested increase, it has greatly expanded natural
5	gas service in its rapidly growing service territory since
6	its last general increase in rates and charges, which was
7	effective November 1, 2006. The Company states that since
8.	the end of the test period in that case, it has installed
9	over 929 miles of transmission and distribution mains;
10	added 31,812 customers; and made approximately \$188
11	million in capital investments in its utility plant.
12	Several parties have intervened in this case:
13	Carolina Utility Customers Association, Inc., filed a
14	Petition to Intervene on March 10, 2008. That Petition
15	was granted by Order of the Commission March 11, 2008.
16	The Attorney General has also filed Notice of Intervention
17	in this matter. That Notice of Intervention is recognized
18	pursuant to statute. Intervention and participation of
19	the Public Staff of the North Carolina Utilities
20	Commission is recognized pursuant to G.S.62-15(d) and
21	Commission Rule R1-19(e).
22	On April 30, 2008, the Commission entered a
23	Procedural Order in this case, which scheduled an
24	investigation and hearing; suspended the rates for 270

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1	4
1	days from the requested implementation date of May 1;
2	established the deadline for filing Petitions to
3	Intervene; establish testimony due dates and discovery
4	guidelines; and required public notice.
5	On June 25, 2008, PSNC caused to be filed
6	Affidavits of Publication indicating that notice had been
7	given in accordance with the Commission's Procedural
8	Order.
9	That brings us up to date on the procedural
10	history of the case. In compliance with the requirements
11	of the State Government Ethics Act, I remind all Members
12	of the Commission of their duty to avoid conflicts of
13	interest, and inquire now whether any member has any known
14	conflict with respect to the matters coming before us at
15	this time?
16	(No response.)
17	I now call for appearances of counsel beginning
18	with the Company.
19	MS. GRIGG: Good afternoon. I am Mary Lynn
20	Grigg with the law firm of Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge and
21	Rice, appearing on behalf of PSNC Energy. Also appearing
22	on behalf of the Company is Mr. Craig Collins, Assistant
23	General Counsel, who has been admitted by this Commission
24	for pro hac vice.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

.

	5
1	MS. HOLT: Good afternoon. I am Gina Holt with
2	the Public Staff here on behalf of the Using and Consuming
3	Public.
4	COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Thank you. Are there any
5	preliminary matters we need to address before we inquire
6	as whether or not there are any public witnesses?
7	MS. GRIGG: No, ma'am.
8	MS. HOLT: No.
9	COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Ms. Holt, do we have any
10	public witnesses who wish to testify?
11	MS. HOLT: Yes, we do. Public Staff calls Mr.
12	Richard Leber.
13	RICHARD LEBER; Being first duly sworn,
14	testified as follows:
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. HOLT:
16	Q Please state your name and spell your last name.
17	A Yes. My name is Richard Leber, L-e-b-e-r.
18	Q And what is your address, Mr. Leber?
19	A 103 Cherrywood Circle, Chapel Hill, North
20	Carolina, 27516.
21	Q Go ahead.
22	A As I said, my name is Richard Leber. My wife and
23	I have lived in Chapel Hill for the last 13 years. In the
24	mid 70s, we lived in Fayetteville when I served in the
	NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

Army as an Officer in the Army Engineering Corp. My wife 1 was raised in Sampson County. Her family owned a farm and 2 fuel, oil and kerosene and gasoline supply business in 3 Garland. I was raised in Pennsylvania. My father owned a 4 fuel oil, kerosene, motor oil and gasoline 5 distributorship. In one sense, we were both raised in an 6 energy supply environment. 7 I want to give you my thoughts on three topics 8 this afternoon: The first is a suggestion that the PSNC 9 proprietary project feasibility model used to evaluate new 10 customer profitability be subject to a full and open 11 12 public audit. The second is the level of benefit currently 13 14being given to interruptible customers be reduced. My last comments are related to the decoupling 15 16 request. 17 I hope we all share one interest as Americans: 18 the need to reduce our dependence on foreign energy 19 sources. Although we may debate how this should be done, 20 more drilling, more clean energy, more or less coal and 21 nuclear, more hybrid or all electric or all natural gas 22 cars, I think we would all agree the most immediate way 23 and probably the least expensive way to reduce our energy dependence is conservation by using less of our precious 24

6

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

resources.

1

2	The use of these resources is interrelated.
3	Here's a few examples: If we follow the Governor's
4	suggestion to limit ourselves to a military shower, we use
5	less water and less energy to heat our water. If we are
6	more careful about the frequency of washing our clothes
7	and use predominantly cold water in our washing machines,
8	we use less water and less energy to heat our water. Less
9	energy is also used when we dry some of our clothes air
10	dry some of our clothes.
11	New technologies and such things as duel-fuel
12	heating systems that combine efficient electric heat pump
13	technology with supplemental gas furnace are very
14	efficient. Some attention has also been given to
15	insulating the exterior walls around gas log fireplaces.
16	I mention these items as I think PSNC management
17	would agree that conservation and new technology are some
18	of the reason the residential customers are using less
19	natural gas.
20	After working in our family oil business for
21	years, I spent several years as an operations and cost
22	analyst for a major regulated pipeline company and later

24

23

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

for a large international chemical company. A natural

question of an analyst in a market experiencing lower

customer volumes is: How do you evaluate the 1 profitability of new customers? This is why I think a 2 full audit should be made of the PSNC proprietary 3 projected profitability model. As these new customers 4 using -- Are these new customers using the amount of gas 5 that was projected by this proprietary model? Has the 6 7 model been adjusted for customers taking the recommended short military shower? Using cold-water wash cycles? 8 Setting our house or zone temperatures at lower settings 9 or even installing the efficient duel fuel heating system 10 11 as we've done. 12 My second topic is the amount of benefit being 13 given to large interruptible gas customers. As an 14 operations analyst for one of the largest refined products pipeline companies in the country, my primary 15 16 responsibility was to deal with over two dozen electric 17 utilities. I was tasked with understanding how the 18 pipeline could make use of utility tariff provisions that 19 include time-of-day pricing, simple block, block based on 20 monthly or yearly demands as well as interruptible pricing tariff provisions. 21 22 Here is why I think the credit to large

Here is why I think the credit to large
 interruptible gas customers should be reduced: We agree
 PSNC residential volumes are decreasing. System

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

residential volume, which includes 62,000 new customers since '03 has decreased by over 5 percent. Residential customers now represent a smaller portion of system volumes. In 2007 over 30 percent of PSNC volume was on interruptible rates. The benefit to the interruptible customer may be well over \$8 million per year or about \$20 per residential customer.

8 What's the right amount of financial benefit to 9 these customers? In a perfect world interruptible credit 10 would be put out to auction and the amount of volume that 11 would need to be interrupted may be 10 or 15 percent of 12 the system volume would be auctioned to the lowest bidder.

13 My last topic is decoupling. Mr. Chairman, you 14 asked me about my thoughts on decoupling at the June 30 15 meeting, public hearing. As most of my working career was 16 spent in marketing product management and this business 17 development for large international chemical company, I 18 tend to look at the differences in product life cycles. Ι 19 think it is noteworthy that the natural gas industry has seen more conservation and volume decreases than our 20 21 electric utilities. There's a large part of the natural 22 gas conservation due to the fact that natural gas prices 23 have risen much faster than electric utility prices. What 24 will happen with electric utility demand when a doubling

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1	of coal prices is passed on to residential consumers?
2	What should be done when a utility asks for some type of
3	decoupling? First, I think the return on equity should be
4	reduced for a utility asking for decoupling. I think a
5	good case could actually be made to equate the return on
6	equity to cost of debt. In a perfect world, I would
7	suggest that a utility that is concerned about return on
8	decreasing or flat volumes would want to evaluate its
9	strategies such as selling these assets to a non-profit
10	utility authority and redeploying equity capital to a more
11	useful purpose.
12	I also recommend implementation of my first two
13	suggestions: A full and open-to-the-public audit of the
14	Public Service NC proprietary new customer model and a
15	reduction to the interruptible rate credit.
16	If PSNC has actually invested capital in
17	low-return new customers because the proprietary model
18	does not reflect current customer volumes, I think a
19	portion of this low-return invested capital should be
20	excluded from this rate case. If PSNC is not required to
21	fully disclose the interworkings of this model, aren't we
22	giving PSNC an open checkbook to invest capital that will
23	have a guaranteed retum?
24	In closing I also recommend that increasing
	NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

block structures be considered in future utility rate 1 increases as a way of promoting even more conservation of 2 our precious resources. Thank you for your time. 3 COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Any questions for 4 Mr. Leber? 5 MS. GRIGG: May I have one moment, please? 6 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. GRIGG: Good afternoon, Mr. Leber. Again, I'm Mary Lynn 8 0 9 Grigg, counsel for PSNC. I understand that over the past 10 few months you have had several phone calls with Angie 11 Townsend of PSNC's Public Affairs, and y'all have 12 exchanged --Yes. She has been extremely helpful. 13 I'm really А 14 happy to have a resource like Angie. It helps us to be 15 educated. 16 Thank you. I understand that you read the Q 17 Company's Application and testimony in this proceeding? 18 I have gone through it. I wouldn't say that I Α 19 know it by heart. But I think I have a conceptual 20 understanding; but not the details to the specific case. I was trying to talk more in general case today and not 21 specific. 22 Certainly. I was going the thank you because we 23 0 24 put a lot of time and effort in that, and not many people

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1	read it. Thank you for your time and attention. I just
2	have one general question. You were talking about
3	A Ask any question, we have the time.
4	Q Thank you. This is just for clarification: You
5	were raising questions and concerns about the Company's
6	project feasibility model.
7	A Yes.
8	Q Were you aware, Mr. Leber, that when a customer
9	inquires with the Public Staff about a contribution on
10	construction, the Company looks into the the Public
11	Staff looks into the Company's calculation to assure the
12	reasonableness of the contribution that the Company is
13	asking from the customer?
14	A Yes. I have been in communication with the Staff,
15	Jan Lawson, and he told me that Here's my concern:
16	Industry standards are used for the amount of consumption
17	that comes off. I was talking to another church member
18	Sunday who was offered a \$7,000 connection fee and was
19	told he would have to hook up his hot water heater or some
20	appliance, either heating or hot water, as one of the
21	variables used to connect.
22	A few years ago, I was volunteering for Habitat
23	for Humanity, and I refused to join any committee because
24	I was tired of committees. And within a year and a half,

12

I

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

I was elected President of the Orange County Habitat 1 Affiliate. But in that process, I was also Chair of the 2 Construction Committee. And one of the things that I 3 really pushed as Chair of the Construction Committee is to 4 evaluate gas use in Habitat Homes. Now counter-to-gas use 5 in Habitat Homes is that an organization in Raleigh, a б 7 non-profit called Advanced Energy -- I am sure you are familiar with them -- has a program for low-income home 8 constructions for Habitat. They go in and really analyze 9 10 the structure of a house. The Habitat homes are typically 11 about a thousand square feet to 1200 square feet; three to 12 four bedrooms. And I have to share with you when I worked in my 13 14 family business, I was actually in hundreds of homes. At 15 one time I was a qualified oil service technician and was 16 involved in installing heating equipment in homes. 17 Here's my concern: The amount of gas that is 18 consumed in these models -- I think on the Public Service 19 website an assumption is made that a water -- gas hot water heater will consume about 20 therms a month. 20 Т 21 don't think it relates to reality. 22 Getting back to the Habitat situation, Advanced 23 Energy through insulating and designing a well-constructed 24 electric heat pump with backed-up resistence electric

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

guarantees the Habitat customers that they won't consume more than \$28 a month for the heating and cooling expense. When you have the \$10 a month monthly service fee, which is requested to go to 12, to install gas into a house, even if it's within a hundred feet, you have to overcome that 10 to \$12 monthly service fee.

7 So my point is that I think the model concept is goods, but I don't think it really reflects, as I was 8 saying in my testimony, the amount of consumption that is 9 10 actually used in a home. In reality, if you look back over the last 5 years, composite volume has gone from 720 11 12 something therms to 580 therms for an average customer. 13 I'm not sure what the model shows for heating and water 14 use. And that's my concern as a public advocate.

15 I don't know why it has to be proprietary. Ι 16 think it should be open and people should understand that 17 if they hook up to a house with gas, their expectation is 18 that they are going to use 20 therms of water. If they 19 are taking a military shower and using cold water like we do to wash clothes, we use about 2 therms a month, which 20 21 is 4 or \$5 a month. I know I shared that with Angie, and 22 she looked up in my records that for years -- we have a 23 gas hot water heater and gas dryer -- and we are using as 24 low as 2 therms.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

If you have a -- If you go back to the situation 1 of latter part of 2006 when Public Service enacted the 2 minimum use during the Summer times, there was a letter, 3 after letter that highlighted they were using hot water 4 and gas dryer and they weren't meeting the minimum. 5 I think Angie gave me the credit of writing the 6 first letter to the editor on that case, which was then 7 picked up by Allen Corey (phonetic) in the editorial. So I 8 don't know if I answered your question. But there is a 9 lot of background to it that my concern is the amount of 10 consumption that is in that model. I have no idea what it 11 12 is. I was glad to see you were going to charge one of my 13 friends \$7,000 to connect. Of course, he wasn't 14 interested in it because he wanted to know what gas oven 15 -- he is a gourmet cook and he liked to control the gas. 16 But \$7,000, I think he was going to get propane gas grill 17 for the back deck. 18 MS. GRIGG: Thank you. No further questions. 19 COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Ouestions from the Commission? 20 21 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN FINLEY: 22 Q What is your impression, Mr. Leber, of Advanced 23 Energy based on your contact with this? 24 Α I think they are an under-utilized resource. Ι

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

think you may have seen one of my letters to the Editor.
 I have been published several times in Talk Back pieces.
 My mother always said you need to speak out on those
 issues that are important, otherwise the world doesn't get
 changed. I carry that every day.

I never pictured myself as a writer; in school, 6 7 English was always my worst subject. I've been published several times in the paper. And one of the things that I 8 called for was an independent agency in North Carolina 9 that would have a website that would maintain unbiased 10 11 information on the efficiency of appliances. I think -- I 12 apologized to Angie one day when she was guoted in the 13 paper as saying gas heat is always more efficient than 14 electric. And there's the duel-fuel heating systems that are very popular today that would question that 15 16 assumption.

17 Is gas hot water heating always more efficient? 18 Yes. But is it worth the additional capital? Probably 19 not if you are using 2 therms a month. So I think 20 Advanced Energy has a tremendous role to play in this 21 state if we are really interested in educating and 22 empowering consumers to make the decisions, and taking 23 that decision away from our utilities.

24

As another example, I agree with Public Service

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

when they attacked the electric utilities in offering 1 2 incentives for energy conservation projects. How do you entice someone to put in a duel-fuel heating system which 3 is probably an ideal system when somebody already has gas 4 and is replacing a gas furnace? Who gives the credit to 5 customers and who gets the credit for conservation? 6 Insulation and windows, the same way. A gas utility may 7 not see the full benefit of insulation or windows because 8 the benefit is going to be in both heating and cooling. I 9 10 think Advanced Energy is a tremendous resource that we 11 have that should strengthened as we move forward if we are serious about conservation. Sorry for my long-winded 12 13 comments. 14 I do remember you saying you were going to be 0 studying decoupling the other night and, obviously, you 15 16 have. I appreciate that. We are studying it, too. Thank 17 you very much. 18 COMMISSIONER JOYNER: Thank you so much for 19 coming, Mr. Leber. Ms. Holt? 20 MS. HOLT: We have no further witnesses. 21 COMMISSIONER JOYNER: There appears to be no 22 other public witnesses. Anything else we need to deal 23 with before we recess and reconvene in Raleigh? MS. GRIGG: No, ma'am. 24 NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

	18
1	MS. HOLT: No.
2	COMMISSIONER JOYNER: If there is nothing else,
3	thank you so much, Mr. Leber, for coming. We are
4	adjourned.
5	
6	Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
	NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

		19
1		
2	CERTIFICATE	
3		
4	The undersigned Court Reporter certifies that	
5	this is the transcription of notes taken by her during	
6	this proceeding and that the same is true, accurate and	
7	correct.	
8		
9	1 (00	
10	Sandi Mayer	
11	Court Reporter II	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION	