

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

IN RESPONSE TO THE FORMAL
COMPLAINT OF CORY S. OLSEN
AGAINST DOMINION ENERGY UTAH

Docket No. 23-057-24

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF AUSTIN SUMMERS

FOR DOMINION ENERGY UTAH

January 18, 2024

DEU Exhibit 1.0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. NATURAL GAS MARKET OVERVIEW..... 1

III. 191.1 ACCOUNT OVERVIEW..... 4

IV. BUDGET BILLING PROGRAM 6

V. RESPONSE TO MR. OLSEN’S CONCERNS 7

VI. CONCLUSION 9

I. INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. Austin Summers, 333 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by Dominion Energy Utah (“Dominion Energy,” “DEU” or “Company”) as a Manager of Rates and Regulation. I am responsible for work related to cost allocation, rate design, gas cost adjustments, and forecasting.

Q. Were your attached exhibits, DEU Exhibit 1.01 through 1.03, prepared by you or under your direction?

A. Yes, unless otherwise stated, in which case my exhibits are true and correct copies of the documents they purport to be.

Q. What general areas does your testimony address?

A. I discuss several matters including (1) overview of the natural gas (“commodity”) market; (2) explanation of the Company’s 191.1 balancing account; (3) description of the Company’s budget billing process; (4) a response to the concerns of Cory S. Olsen (“Mr. Olsen”).

II. NATURAL GAS MARKET OVERVIEW

Q. Why have natural gas prices risen over the last two years?

A. Since the beginning of 2022, the natural gas markets have seen prices that are remarkably higher than normal. This issue is not isolated within Utah but has affected prices throughout the world. Some reasons for the increased prices worldwide include, world political conflict, dramatic shifts in typical weather patterns, and high demand and low supply.

25 **Q. Have natural gas commodity prices in Utah differed from prices in other parts of**
26 **the United States?**

27 A. Yes. The attached DEU Exhibit 1.01 page 1 is a graph depicting natural gas daily spot
28 prices from three different sources: Kern Opal, White River Hub, and Henry Hub. Both
29 Kern Opal and White River Hub are located in the Western United States (“the West”)
30 and are DEU’s primary metrics when pricing natural gas for daily spot purchases.
31 Henry Hub is located in the Southeastern United States and is typically used as a metric
32 of natural gas commodity prices at a national level. Daily spot prices indicate the cost
33 to purchase 1 dekatherm (“Dth”) of natural gas on a given day. DEU Exhibit 1.01 page
34 1 indicates that from January 2022 to November 2022 natural gas spot prices were
35 consistent and similar to national prices. Following November 2022, natural gas prices
36 in the West increased significantly while national prices decreased.

37 **Q. What specific events caused prices to rise in Utah?**

38 A. During the summer of 2022, the U.S. experienced a large amount of Liquefied Natural
39 Gas (“LNG”) exports. Typically, natural gas is less costly in the summer and many
40 utilities will purchase gas at that time to fill natural gas storage facilities, and call upon
41 those storage facilities in order to utilize the lower-priced gas in the winter when prices
42 rise. However, this unprecedented demand caused prices to remain high. Many
43 utilities throughout the West delayed filling storage facilities.

44 In the fall of 2022, there was a large heatwave, together with a major drought, across
45 the West. Many cities throughout this region rely on hydro-electric generation for
46 electricity, but the drought prevented the use of hydro-electric production. To keep up
47 with demand, electric utilities opted to produce needed electricity by natural gas-fueled
48 power generation, resulting in additional demand and high costs.

49 Finally, during the winter of 2022-2023, the West experienced cold temperatures below
50 normal. These cold temperatures were isolated to the West. The rest of the country
51 experienced a warmer-than-normal winter season. Due to the events previously
52 described, natural gas market prices were up to 10 times higher than normal. This was

53 isolated to just the West. Customers were using large amounts of natural gas to heat
54 their homes at exactly the time that commodity prices were tremendously high.

55 **Q. Have western natural gas markets previously seen prices like those experienced**
56 **in early 2023?**

57 A. Natural gas prices in the West during the 2022-2023 heating season were significantly
58 higher than prices experienced throughout the last decade. DEU Exhibit 1.01 page 2
59 shows first of month (“FOM”) pricing from January 2011 to January 2023. FOM
60 pricing indicates the fixed price of gas for a given month for various contracts held by
61 a utility. These types of contracts are part of standard industry practice. The graph
62 includes information from the Northwest Rockies, SoCal city-gate, and Henry Hub
63 distribution locations. The Northwest Rockies and SoCal city-gates are the primary
64 sources of natural gas for the West.

65 As seen in the exhibit, FOM gas was up to 10 times higher than the Henry Hub prices
66 Mr. Olsen references. This means that DEU baseload contracts that were around the
67 \$7.00 per Dth in November of 2022 were then being paid at \$50.00 per Dth in January.
68 Baseload contracts require the purchase of the contracted amount of gas every day for
69 a given period. These prices were an outlier, not only in comparison to prices nationally
70 but also in comparison to typical commodity prices. No forecasting agency or utility
71 could have foreseen those prices, and none predicted such pricing in their forecasts.

72 **Q. Did these increased costs impact Mr. Olsen’s natural gas bill?**

73 A. Yes. Mr. Olsen, and all of the Company’s sales customers, unfortunately experienced
74 a significant rate increase in order to pay the costs associated with the gas purchases in
75 the winter of 2022-2023.

76 **Q. Did DEU have any measures in place to mitigate rate shock to customers in these**
77 **events?**

78 A. Yes. The Company has many mechanisms in place to mitigate market pricing risk.
79 These measures include hedging contracts, diverse supply sources, and natural gas

80 production provided by Wexpro Company (“Wexpro”). Unfortunately even those
81 mechanisms were not sufficient to overcome the extraordinary market events of the
82 winter of 2022-2023. Importantly, the Company has since, in coordination with the
83 Utah Division of Public Utilities (“DPU”) and Utah Public Service Commission
84 (“Commission” or “PSC”), modified its hedging practices, looked for opportunities to
85 purchase gas away from the California market, and taken steps to increase Wexpro
86 production. These mechanisms will further aid in avoiding such rate shock should
87 similar market conditions occur in the future.

88 **III. 191.1 ACCOUNT OVERVIEW**

89 **Q. How does the Company collect all commodity costs from customers?**

90 A. Section 2.06 of the DEU’s Utah Natural Gas Tariff No. 600 (“Tariff”) describes how
91 the Company recovers such costs. It permits the Company “to recover, on a dollar-for-
92 dollar basis, purchased gas costs and gas-cost-related expenses.” Each of these
93 purchased gas (“commodity”) costs and gas-cost-related expenses (“SNG”)¹ are
94 tracked in the accounting 191.1 balancing account.

95 **Q. Does the Company earn a profit on the sale of the commodity?**

96 A. No. The Company only charges customers for the purchased gas costs and gas-cost-
97 related expenses on a dollar-for-dollar basis. DEU does not mark up the price of the
98 commodity to earn profit.

99 **Q. Will you please explain the 191.1 balancing account?**

100 A. Yes. The 191.1 balancing account is an accounting mechanism that tracks commodity
101 and SNG expenses against revenues received for these expenses. The account ensures
102 DEU collects revenue for the allowed expenses. This balancing account is reviewed at
103 least twice per year, by both the Company and DPU, to ensure the Company is
104 collecting an appropriate revenue.

¹ Supplier Non-Gas (SNG) costs are for services paid to other companies that are upstream of the DEU system. These include transportation, storage, peak hour, services, etc.

105 **Q. How was the 191.1 balancing account affected by the events of the winter of 2022-**
106 **2023, as you described above?**

107 A. Over the past decade, the 191.1 account has typically been within a range of \$50 million
108 of either an over or under collected state. Due to the unprecedented events described
109 previously, the 191.1 account reached an under-collected state of \$538 million within
110 a three-month period during the winter of 2022-2023. DEU Exhibit 1.02 displays a
111 history of the 191.1 account over the past three years. The grey line shown on DEU
112 Exhibit 1.02 reflects a zero balance in the 191 account. The blue line shows the SNG
113 costs over the described period of time, and it indicates that SNG costs were well within
114 the historic expectations for over/under collection. However, the red line shows the
115 over/under collection of commodity costs. As you can see, beginning in November of
116 2022, the 191 account balance was significantly under-collected.

117 **Q. Why did the 191.1 account become so under-collected?**

118 A. The Company promptly sought adjustment in rates to account for these unprecedented
119 market conditions. For the Company to change any rates, it must follow a specific
120 regulatory process. This process requires significant review by various parties, and it
121 takes time for rates to go into effect. It is important to note that customers ultimately
122 pay only for the gas they use and only at the price paid by the Company for the
123 commodity and SNG related to those volumes.

124 **Q. Did the Commission approve of the rates the Company now charges for**
125 **commodity and SNG costs, as a result of the high prices of gas?**

126 A. In docket No. 23-057-03, the Commission examined and approved the rates the
127 Company charged in order to recover the costs held in the 191 account. That docket
128 was properly noticed, and the DPU and Utah Office of Consumer Services both
129 participated. After reviewing the evidence and hearing the positions of all intervenors,
130 the Commission found that the rates were just, reasonable and in the public interest..

157 like Mr. Olsen, did not experience those increases until August, when the Company re-
158 calculated and updated the budget bill amount for each participating customer.

159 **Q. Is it possible for a customer to be over-billed in the Program?**

160 A. No. When the Company evaluates each budget billing customer’s account each year,
161 the Company accounts for actual usage of commodity and DEU services. That actual
162 usage, netted against payments made, is referred to as the Payoff Balance. When the
163 bill of the program participant is reviewed, if the customer’s payment amounts exceed
164 the Payoff Balance, the over-payment will be credited to the customer “over the next
165 twelve months, interest free, unless a customer requests an immediate refund or credit.”
166 See Section 8.05 of the Tariff. Hence, any payment over the actual usage will be given
167 back to the customer in the form of a credit, refund, or discount to the monthly rate.

168 Furthermore, the estimated monthly equal-pay amount is just that...an estimate. It does
169 not reflect actual usage at then-effective rates. Customers who wish to pay for their
170 actual usage, at then-effective rates, and to have a monthly account balance of zero can
171 simply choose not to participate in the Budget Billing Program and pay their bills on
172 time.

173 **Q. Was Mr. Olsen’s bill calculated the same way as other customers enrolled in the**
174 **Budget Billing program?**

175 A. Yes. The Company uses an algorithm that automatically calculates each participants
176 individual bill. Mr. Olsen’s bill was recalculated and updated at the same time as that
177 for all other Program participants, August of 2023. Mr. Olsen’s bill was calculated at
178 the same time and utilized the same methodology as all other Program participants.

179 **V. RESPONSE TO MR. OLSEN’S CONCERNS**

180 **Q. Mr. Olsen states that DEU “has been increasing rates while cost has been**
181 **decreasing”. What is your response?**

182 A. To make this statement, Mr. Olsen uses gas rates from Henry Hub and compares those
183 values to an average dekatherm charge found on his monthly bills. His comparison does

184 not accurately reflect the costs the Company has already incurred in procuring gas
185 supply for Mr. Olsen and its other customers. First, as Mr. Olsen noted, DEU does
186 not purchase gas from Henry Hub. As I have shown, gas markets in the West can vary
187 greatly from Henry Hub. The fact that Henry Hub prices are *currently* lower than the
188 prices the Company actually paid for gas supply in the winter of 2022-2023 is an apples
189 to oranges comparison. The Company purchased its supplies at hubs in the West during
190 an unprecedented market event. The Company has only included its actual costs in the
191 191 account.

192 Second, as I described above, the 191 balancing account is designed so that the
193 Company collects only the costs it incurred in procuring gas supply. The 191 balancing
194 account is currently under-collected, and the Company's rates are properly designed to
195 collect enough to remedy that under-collection. Put simply, the Company's customers
196 are paying the Company back for the costs of providing natural gas commodity in the
197 winter of 2022-2023.

198 **Q. In addition to the commodity costs that have been discussed, are there other costs**
199 **that are included on a customer bill?**

200 A. Yes. When Mr. Olsen is looking at Henry Hub prices, he is only seeing the cost of the
201 natural gas itself – the commodity costs. Customers also pay SNG costs for services
202 that are upstream from the DEU system, like upstream transportation of the commodity.
203 Finally, DEU rates include the cost of operating the local distribution system, including
204 the pipes that transport natural gas from the FERC-regulated interstate pipeline system
205 to homes and businesses in Utah. We refer to this last category of costs as Distribution
206 Non-Gas (DNG) costs. Costs shown at Henry Hub do not include DNG and SNG costs
207 and those costs are not included in DEU Exhibit 1.01. Mr. Olsen's total bill includes
208 all three categories of costs.

209 **Q. Does the Company anticipate its rates to decrease in the near future?**

210 A. The commodity rates Mr. Olsen, and other customers are currently paying remain
211 higher than usual in order to collect the under-collected commodity-related expenses

212 through the 191.1 account. As seen in DEU Exhibit 1.02, the Company has effectively
213 collected a significant amount this winter. However, there is still much more to collect.
214 The Company anticipates once the 191.1 account comes closer to a zero balance, it will
215 seek the Commission's approval to decrease rates.

216 Notably, the Company has, historically, both increased and decreased rates to address
217 over-collection and under-collection in its 191 balancing account. DEU Exhibit 1.03
218 is a chart that shows Winter rates for GS customers over a 10-year period. As seen in
219 the chart, DEU's rates have been fairly constant between March 2015 and March 2022.
220 It was not until the Winter of 2022-2023 that rates significantly increased. When
221 market prices warrant a rate increase, the cost to customers increases. When the market
222 prices have warranted a rate decrease, customers have enjoyed reduced rates. The
223 Company is not "gouging" its customers, as Mr. Olsen contends. It is lawfully
224 collecting the cost of commodity it incurred in serving those customers. When the
225 under-collected 191 balancing account balance is reduced, and those costs go down, so
226 too will customer's rates.

227 **VI. CONCLUSION**

228 **Q. Has DEU acted properly in billing Mr. Olsen and in recalculating his budget-**
229 **billing amount?**

230 A. Yes. The Company has at all times complied with all applicable statutes, rules,
231 regulations, Tariff provisions, and Commission orders in recovering commodity costs,
232 in setting rates, and in establishing monthly payment amounts for budget billing
233 Program customers.

234 **Q. Has Mr. Olsen benefited from the Program?**

235 A. Yes. Mr. Olsen has enjoyed having a consistent bill every month since enrollment.
236 Mr. Olsen has also benefited from carrying an interest-free balance on his account for
237 10 of 12 months in 2023.

238 **Q. What solutions can the Company offer Mr. Olsen?**


239 A. Upon the request of Mr. Olsen, the Customer Relations department at Dominion
240 Energy coordinated a call with Mr. Olsen and the Manager of DEU Rates and
241 Regulation department. This manager and Mr. Olsen spoke through his concerns to
242 help him understand the situation. Additionally, the Company notes that enrollment in
243 the budget billing Program is voluntary. Mr. Olsen has voluntarily unenrolled from the
244 Budget Billing Program. The Company believes that the concerns he has raised related
245 to his own account have been resolved.

246 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

247 A. Yes.

State of Utah)
) ss.
County of Salt Lake)

I, Austin Summers, being first duly sworn on oath, state that the answers in the foregoing written testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. The exhibits attached to the testimony were prepared by me or under my direction and supervision, except where otherwise stated, in which case they are true and correct copies of what they purport to be, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Any exhibits not prepared by me or under my direction and supervision are true and correct copies of the documents they purport to be.


Austin Summers

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO this 18th day of January, 2024.


Notary Public



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the Direct Testimony of Austin Summers
was served upon the following persons by e-mail on January 18, 2024:

Patricia E. Schmid
Patrick Grecu
Assistant Attorneys General
160 East 300 South
P.O. Box 140857
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0857
pschmid@ugutah.gov
pgrecu@agutah.gov

Counsel for the Division of Public Utilities

Madison Galt
Utah Division of Public Utilities
160 East 300 South
P.O. Box 146751
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6751
mgalt@utah.gov

Robert J. Moore
Assistant Attorney General
160 East 300 South
P.O. Box 140857
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0857
rmoore@agutah.gov

Counsel for the Office of Consumer Services

Michele Beck
Director
Alyson Anderson
Bela Vastag
Alex Ware
Jacob Zachary
Office of Consumer Services
160 East 300 South
P.O. Box 146782
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6782
mbeck@utah.gov
akanderson@utah.gov
bvastag@utah.gov
aware@utah.gov
jzachary@utah.gov
(ocs@utah.gov)

Cory S. Olsen
10249 Dimple View Ln.
Sandy, Utah 84092
corysolsen@comcast.net