- 2 question.
- 3 MR. SHEPHERD: Well, you did this to choose who was
- 4 like Enbridge, right?
- 5 MR. COYNE: To choose the states where we would find
- 6 utilities like Enbridge, yes.
- 7 MR. SHEPHERD: That's right. And so has anybody done
- 8 any work on this? Is there empirical research around that
- 9 says, you know, this is how you make climatological
- 10 groupings for gas purposes?
- MR. COYNE: Well, we do a lot of work, statistical
- 12 work, on heating degree days pertaining to our demand
- 13 forecast utilities. So it's really based on our resident
- 14 knowledge of utilities and how weather impacts their
- 15 operations.
- 16 MR. SHEPHERD: But I'm asking --
- 17 MR. COYNE: We relied on no other source for that
- 18 purpose other than our own industry knowledge.
- MR. SHEPHERD: Thank you. In Staff 14 you were asked
- 20 about the data that was provided to you, Mr. Coyne, with
- 21 respect to, in this case, capital revenue requirement. And
- 22 we've asked the question in SEC No. 6, TC No. 6, did you
- 23 add any judgment or opinion to the revenue requirements
- 24 information that Enbridge provided to you? They provided
- 25 to you their -- what they thought they were going to spend
- 26 for the five years, right? Did you look and make an
- 27 assessment, are these numbers reasonable in and of
- 28 themselves, on a cost-of-service basis, or did you only do

- 1 then benchmarking tests?
- 2 MR. COYNE: We did two things. We did two things. We
- 3 made -- well, first of all, maybe to your point, most
- 4 specifically, we made no independent analysis of the
- 5 revenue requirements on a bottom-up kind of basis. That
- 6 would not have been within our capacity.
- 7 What we did do is we examined them from a top-down
- 8 evaluation of the O&M level in an I-minus-X framework test
- 9 in our evidence, and we also looked at total revenue
- 10 requirements on an I-minus-X test basis. That was the top-
- 11 down analysis. We did no bottom-up analysis, nor
- 12 independent verification of the O&M or cap-ex numbers.
- 13 We also ran scenarios of alternative capital recovery
- 14 mechanisms to see what impact they would have vis-a-vis
- 15 Enbridge's projected revenue requirements.
- 16 MR. SHEPHERD: So if I understand it correctly, you
- 17 assumed that they had to spend that much money, and so the
- 18 result, that is, that a particular percentage increase
- 19 would be required, was after that just math, right?
- 20 Because in an I-minus-X, if you need X dollars, there's
- 21 already a formula that will tell you that, right?
- MR. COYNE: Yeah, I was aware of what the company --
- 23 generally aware of what the company's budgeting process was
- 24 for O&M. I saw the iterations they went through in
- 25 developing their forecast. But we made no independent
- 26 investigation of the veracity of those forecasts. That was
- 27 not our scope.
- 28 MR. SHEPHERD: So when you say -- I think you said

- 1 that they would need 3.4 percent per year or something like
- 2 that?
- 3 MR. COYNE: I believe that was Enbridge's calculation
- 4 based on the I-minus-X revenue-requirement differential.
- 5 I'm aware of the 3.4 percent you're talking --
- 6 MR. SHEPHERD: But you came to a number for what they
- 7 would need to get or what the shortfall would be in a
- 8 normal I-minus-X.
- 9 MR. COYNE: We did.
- 10 MR. SHEPHERD: Yeah, and so that number that you came
- 11 to, that was a mathematical calculation. That was not
- 12 anything to do with what a reasonable amount was for them
- 13 to spend.
- MR. COYNE: Right. We provided the I and the X for
- 15 that analysis; that was our job. Enbridge projected
- 16 revenue requirements using their O&M and capital budgeting
- 17 process.
- 18 MR. SHEPHERD: So if Enbridge had proposed a lower
- 19 level of budget, then you might have concluded differently
- 20 that I-minus-X would work for them?
- 21 MR. COYNE: We might have.
- MR. SHEPHERD: Okay. My next question is in Staff 16.
- 23 It's not in my written questions.
- 24 And this is -- what you've provided is the data points
- 25 that you used for your benchmark analysis, and a lot of
- 26 them were re-evaluated. "Re-evaluated" means that you took
- 27 the data that was available and you changed it, right?
- MR. COYNE: The -- it's described in footnote 4, what