BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

Joint Application of Questar Gas Company, : the Division of Public Utilities, and Utah : Clean Energy, for the Approval of the : Conservation Enabling Tariff Adjustment : Option and Accounting Orders : :

Docket No. 05-057-T01 Utah Division of Public Utilities Exhibit No. DPU 4.0

Prefiled Direct Testimony of

David T. Thomson

For the Division of Public Utilities

Department of Commerce

State of Utah

January 23, 2006

- 1 Q. Please state your name and business address for the record.
- 2 A. David T. Thomson. My business address is Heber M. Wells Building 4th Floor,
- 3 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-6751.
- 4 Q. For which party will you be offering testimony in this case?
- 5 A. I will be offering testimony on behalf of the Utah Division of Public Utilities
- 6 (Division).
- 7 Q. Please describe your position and duties with the Division of Public Utilities?
- 8 A. I am a Utility Analyst II. Among other things, I serve as an in-house consultant
- 9 on issues concerning the terms, conditions and prices of utility service; industry
- and utility trends and issues; and regulatory form, compliance and practice
- relating to public utilities. I examine public utility financial data for
- determination of rates; review applications for rate increases; conduct research,
- examine, analyze, organize, document and establish regulatory positions on a
- variety of regulatory matters; review operations reports and ensure compliance
- 15 with laws and regulations, etc.; testify in hearings before the Utah Public Service
- 16 Commission (Commission); assist in analysis of testimony and case preparation;
- and participate in settlement conferences, etc.
- 18 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 19 A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the meetings attended and explain the
- 20 review work performed by the Division in relation to the depreciation study
- 21 referenced in the joint application.
- 22 Q. Please describe the meetings and review work performed by the Division.

The Company has engaged Gannett Fleming, Inc. (Gannett), a consulting firm that specializes in depreciation studies, to conduct a review of its depreciation policies. Gannett reviewed the following three depreciation methods; 1) the current method used by the Company, 2) the Equal Life Group (ELG) method, and 3) the Average Service Life (ASL) method.

The Division was made aware during discussions with the Company regarding the Conservation Enabling Tariff that a rate reduction could be a part of the overall joint application. The Company communicated that one of the main items that would contribute to the rate reduction would be the results of the depreciation study. This information was made known to the Division sometime towards the end of October, 2005. This was also communicated to the Commission during the technical conference on November 9, 2005 as previously discussed in Section 17 of the joint application.

Prior to the filing of the joint application, individuals from the Division, the Company and the Committee of Consumer Services (Committee) attended two informal meetings that directly related to the depreciation study and its results. Those meetings were on December 1, and December 9, 2005. Depreciation was also indirectly discussed among other matters as part of a meeting attended by the Division and Company personnel on December 14, 2005.

During the meetings attended it was represented that a majority of the natural gas utilities in the United States use the ASL method. Company management indicted that based on their analysis of the information and results obtain during the study that this is the method that it would adopt from the three

A.

presented. The Division notes that it appears that the adoption of the EGL method would increase rates. Thus, the majority of the review was done on the ASL method.

Each of the meeting's discussion and review was done on a conceptual basis to gain an understanding of the results of the study with no in-depth analysis or review by the Division. At the meetings there were discussions about the depreciation study, the methodologies of the three depreciation methods in the study and a review of initial summary and detailed depreciation schedules as prepared by the Company based on its understanding of the affects of the study at the time the schedules were presented.

Also in these meetings, questions and concerns were discussed and potential problems or benefits were communicated. Some of the questions and concerns came about after initial review of the material provided by the Company during previous meetings. The ramifications of implementing ASL to certain major dollar asset categories' depreciation expense and depreciation reserve amounts were also discussed.

From December 1 to December 15, 2005 the Company was updating its summary depreciation schedule until it arrived at a final amount that was to be used in the final revenue requirement reduction in the filing. The Company appears to be comfortable with the fact that the ASL, method, if adopted, would overall reduce depreciation rates. Thus this updating appears to be the Company fine tuning its numbers to arrive at its best determination of the amount to be used for the depreciation part of the revenue requirement computation.

Division personnel had one final meeting with Company personnel regarding depreciation on December 15, 2005. In this meeting the Division clarified with the Company that the amortization and adoption of the ASL method would be treated prospectively in the Company's accounting and reviewed how the amortization adjustment would be entered into the accounting records.

The Division has just only recently received a copy of the Gannett depreciation study. It has not performed a detailed review or analysis of the study or its results prior to the issuance of this testimony.

The Division is relying on the good faith effort of the Company in its determination of the results of the adoption of the ASL method to its depreciation expense and its depreciation reserve. It appears that the adoption of the ASL method would cause an overall impact of lengthening of asset category service lives and thus would reduce depreciation and depreciation reserves. The amortization of the affect of the above contributes approximately \$4.8 million to the overall rate reduction of \$10.2 million mentioned in the joint application.

The Division believes that the adoption of the ASL method would require that an Accounting Order be obtained from the Commission. This method is a change from the method currently being used by the Company and thus is a change in accounting method for rate making purposes.

- Q. Is there any thing else you would like to add to your testimony before it is concluded?
- Yes, I would like to emphasize that the Division did not do an in-depth review or investigation of the depreciation study at this time. The Division understands that

the depreciation amounts provided to it were done by a good faith best effort of the Company based on its understanding and comprehension of the affects of adopting the ASL method. However, it does appear at this time to the Division that the adoption of this method will materially reduce the depreciation expense and depreciation reserve of the Company thus contributing to a reduction of the revenue requirement of the Company.

For the purpose of this filing the Division has agreed to the adoption of the ASL methodology. Based on the Division's limited review and discussions with the Company and the Company's consultant, it appears to be an acceptable and reasonable method for determining depreciation and its adoption would now generate a rate reduction for Utah ratepayers. However, the Division also understands that it has reserved the right to have its personnel or its consultants, at any time in the future, do a much more in-depth and complete review and investigation of this methodology and the final report of Gannett. The acceptance of the ASL method and its rates or other methods and their rates is subject to and contingent upon a more detailed examination and review of current and future information if and when it is generated, having to do with depreciation accounting methods.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

20 A. Yes.