

ROSS RICHARDSON
Henningsen, Vucurovich & Richardson PC
116 W. Granite
Butte, MT 59701
(406) 723-3219
rossrichardson@qwestoffice.net

AL BROGAN
NorthWestern Energy
208 N. Montana, Suite 205
Helena, Montana 59601
Tel. (406) 443-8988
Fax (406) 443-8979
al.brogan@northwestern.com

Attorneys for NorthWestern Energy

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE REGULATION
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

In the Matter of NorthWestern Energy’s Application For) REGULATORY DIVISION
(1) Unreflected Gas Cost Account Balance and Projected)
Cost; and (2) Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause) DOCKET NO. D2013.5.34
Balance)

and

In the Matter of NorthWestern Energy’s Application For)
(1) Unreflected Gas Cost Account Balance and Projected) DOCKET NO. D2014.5.47
Cost; and (2) Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause) (consolidated)
Balance)

NORTHWESTERN ENERGY’S POST-HEARING BRIEF

Pursuant to the Montana Public Service Commission’s (“Commission”) order,
NorthWestern Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy (“NorthWestern”) hereby submits this
Post-Hearing Brief (“Brief”) in the above-captioned consolidated dockets.

I. INTRODUCTION

The evidence in this docket supports NorthWestern’s request to recover unreflected gas
cost account balances for two separate tracker periods that began on July 1, 2012 and ended on

June 30, 2014. Except for three issues contested by the Montana Consumer Counsel (“MCC”), NorthWestern’s costs related to natural gas supply were uncontested. The MCC contested three issues in this docket: (1) NorthWestern’s request to recover Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (“LRAM”) revenues resulting from its Universal System Benefits (“USB”) activities in tracker periods 2012-13 and 2013-14; (2) NorthWestern’s recovery of LRAM revenues resulting from USB activities in future tracker periods¹; and (3) the reasonableness of NorthWestern’s current methodology of cost recovery for its investments in natural gas production assets. See, *Prehearing Memorandum of the Montana Consumer Counsel*, p.1.

Montana law requires NorthWestern to have a USB program. Commission orders require NorthWestern to devote over 50% of its USB expenditure to activities that reduce sales of natural gas. NorthWestern complies with the law and the Commission orders; it loses revenue that it would have received but for the USB activities. The Commission has allowed NorthWestern to recover its lost revenues through an LRAM. The Commission should continue to allow recovery of lost revenues attributable to USB activities.

The Commission approved the inclusion of the Battle Creek natural gas production assets in NorthWestern natural gas utility rate base. The Commission approved fixed-cost unit rates for the Battle Creek assets in a general rate case. The permanent rates set for Battle Creek cannot be changed in a tracker docket; they may only be changed in a subsequent general rate case.

The Commission has approved of NorthWestern’s acquisition of additional natural gas production assets and has approved of bridging concept rates to facilitate those acquisitions. Currently, NorthWestern collects its costs for two natural gas production properties through bridging concept rates. Bridging concept rates are interim rates and subject to refund or

¹ The MCC conflated these two issues into one in his opening statement. See, Transcript (“Tr.”) 13:20 – 15:22.

surcharge when permanent rates are established. There is no reason to change the current bridging concept rates at this time. Elimination of bridging concept rates from future natural gas trackers would preclude acquisition of additional natural gas production resources.

NorthWestern has reduced its calculated lost revenues based on its experts' report. The Commission should not order any further adjustment.

A. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 31, 2013, NorthWestern submitted its Application for approval of (1) Unreflected Gas Cost Account Balance and Projected Gas Cost; and (2) Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause ("2013 Application").

On June 19, 2013, the Commission issued a Notice of Application and Intervention Deadline. The MCC petitioned for and was granted intervention. On July 18, 2013, NorthWestern filed Supplemental Testimony. On September 26, 2013, the Commission issued Procedural Order No. 7282a. After engaging in discovery, on November 27, 2013, the MCC filed the Prefiled Direct Testimony of George L. Donkin. On December 19, 2013, the Commission issued a Notice of Additional Issue ("NAI") that directed NorthWestern "to respond to the recent Commission Findings of Fact ¶ 40-79 in Order No. 7219h involving true-up of lost revenues and the lost revenue adjustment policy that may be applicable to the natural gas tracker application and proceeding" and suspended the procedural schedule. On March 14, 2014, NorthWestern moved the Commission to defer the 2013 Application and consolidate it with the 2014 Natural Gas Supply Tracker.

On May 29, 2014, NorthWestern submitted an Application for approval of (1) Unreflected Gas Cost Account Balance and Projected Gas Cost; and (2) Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause ("2014 Application"). On June 11, 2014, the Commission issued a Notice of

Commission Action indicating that it had consolidated the 2013 Application and the 2014 Application (“Consolidated Dockets”). On June 16, 2014, the Commission issued a Notice of Application and Intervention Deadline. On September 4, 2014, the Commission issued Procedural Order No. 7282c. On October 23, 2014, the Commission, through a Notice of Staff Action, suspended the procedural schedule to allow more time for NorthWestern to respond to data requests. On December 5, 2014, NorthWestern filed Supplemental Testimony in the Consolidated Dockets. In the Supplemental Testimony, NorthWestern updated actual information for the natural gas market, supply, costs, and Demand Side Management (“DSM”) savings and related lost revenues for the months that had been estimated in the 2014 Application; identified and corrected a natural gas production allocation procedure; corrected royalty expense; reduced natural gas rates to reflect a \$1,154,881 over-collection; corrected DSM and USB savings and related lost revenues; and responded to the NAI.

On January 27, 2015, the Commission, through a Notice of Staff Action, modified Procedural Order 7282c and restarted the procedural schedule. After receiving responses to multiple rounds of discovery, on March 18, 2015, the MCC filed the Prefiled Direct Testimony of George L. Donkin. On April 24, 2015, NorthWestern filed Rebuttal Testimony.

As noticed, on May 19, 2015, the Commission held the public hearing in the Consolidated Dockets. NorthWestern presented the following witnesses at the hearing: Mr. Patrick J. DiFronzo, Mr. John M. Smith, Dr. Marjorie McRae, Mr. Michael Baker, Ms. Faith DeBolt, and Mr. Joe Schwartzenberger. Mr. Joe Schwartzenberger adopted and sponsored the prefiled testimony of Mr. William M. Thomas in addition to his own testimony. The MCC called Mr. George L. Donkin. At the close of the hearing, the parties agreed to submit briefing according to the following schedule: NorthWestern’s initial brief due on or before June 26, 2015,

the MCC's response brief, if any, due on or before July 17, 2015, and NorthWestern's reply brief, if any, due on or before July 31, 2015.

B. INTERIM ORDERS

The Commission has issued two interim orders in the Consolidated Dockets. Order No. 7282, issued on June 26, 2013, approved (1) NorthWestern's proposed rates and charges for the Unreflected Gas Cost Account and the Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause on an interim basis, (2) continuance of the Battle Creek recoupment rate until September 2013, and (3) allowing NorthWestern to reflect the costs of its "interest in Bear Paw on an interim basis as part of future tracker filings until such time that a Bear Paw revenue requirement filing is processed before the Commission." Order No. 7282b, issued on June 18, 2014, approved (1) NorthWestern's proposed rates and charges for the Unreflected Gas Cost Account and the Gas Transportation Adjustment Clause on an interim basis and (2) allowing NorthWestern to reflect the costs of its "interest in Bear Paw and Devon on an interim basis as part of future tracker filings until such time that a revenue requirement filing is processed before the Commission."

II. ARGUMENT

A. THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT PENALIZE NORTHWESTERN FOR COMPLYING WITH ITS ORDERS AND MONTANA LAW BY DENYING RECOVERY FOR LOST REVENUES ATTRIBUTABLE TO USB ACTIVITIES.

Section 69-3-1408, MCA (2014), mandates that NorthWestern, as a natural gas utility, have a USB program. USB programs are public purpose programs for cost-effective local energy conservation, low-income energy bill discounts, low-income weatherization, and emergency low-income energy bill assistance. § 69-3-1402(15), MCA (2014). The statute does not prescribe how natural gas USB funds are to be allocated among the multiple functions other than requiring that at least 0.42% of the utility's annual revenue for the previous year be used for

low-income weatherization and low-income bill assistance. § 69-3-1408(2), MCA (2014). However, in Docket Nos. D2004.7.99, D2004.12.192, and D2005.6.106, Order No. 6679e, the Commission ordered NorthWestern to allocate 21.02% of its natural gas USB funds to conservation and 36.55% to low-income weatherization. Order No. 6679e, ¶ 103, Table 3 and ¶ 105. In the calendar years included either in part or in total, in the tracker periods from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014, NorthWestern spent \$2,976,099 of natural gas USB funds for local conservation and \$3,842,150 for free weatherization. See Docket Nos. D2013.3.20, D2014.3.30, and D2015.3.30, *Natural Gas Universal System Benefits Charge, Annual Filings*. The Commission has approved the 2012 and 2013 expenditures in a Final Order. Docket Nos. D2013.3.20 and D2014.3.30, Order No. 7354a. Also, the Commission approved the 2014 budget for natural gas USB expenditures. *Id.*, ¶ 16.

Mr. Schwartzenberger testified that the lost revenue associated with USB programs in the July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014 tracker periods is \$81,547. Exhibit NWE-15, *Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony*, JS-7:14-19. No one questioned Mr. Schwartzenberger's testimony on this point. See, Tr. 79:9 – 106:18.

The lost revenues are a direct result of complying with the Commission's Order No. 6679e and subsequent orders in Natural Gas USB annual dockets. If NorthWestern had directed its natural gas USB funds in another manner, the lost revenues may not have accrued. Although the Commission ordered NorthWestern to implement USB programs that reduce sales of natural gas, the Commission did not account for these reductions when approving rates in NorthWestern's most recent natural gas general rate case (Docket No. D2012.9.94). A regulatory mandate that reduces throughput, which is not accounted for in ratemaking, imposes an unfair financial disadvantage on the utility. The Commission has recognized this in prior

orders and specifically analogized USB activity to other energy efficiency activity. The Commission should not now penalize NorthWestern by reversing its prior determinations and findings. As the Commission has noted in other dockets, programs that reduce sales between rate cases from what they would have been without the programs create a financial disincentive. See, e.g. Docket Nos. D2008.5.45 and D2009.5.62, Order No. 6921c (May 20, 2010). The Commission would be adopting flawed regulatory policy if it imposed a financial disincentive to compliance with its mandate to implement natural gas conservation and low-income weatherization USB programs.

In addition to advocating that the Commission deny NorthWestern's recovery of lost revenues attributable to USB activities in the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 tracker periods, the MCC also advocates that the Commission deny recovery for similar lost revenues in future years. See Exhibit MCC-1, *Pre-Filed Direct Testimony of George L. Donkin*, 15:19 – 16:2; and Exhibit MCC-2, *Pre-Filed Direct Testimony of George L. Donkin*, 16:18 – 17:19. The Commission is considering the policy related to LRAM for both DSM and USB activities in Docket No. D2014.6.53. NorthWestern requested that the Commission reserve this issue for that docket. According to minute entry (147), the Commission voted unanimously to take this request under advisement. See <http://psc.mt.gov/docs/minutes/2015/20150518.pdf>, last accessed on June 25, 2015. The Commission has not provided any guidance to the parties with respect to its consideration of this issue in this docket. NorthWestern renews its request that the Commission reserve this issue, or in the alternative, as advocated by Mr. Schwartzenberger, consider this issue “after an order has been issued in the LRAM Docket.” See Exhibit NWE-15, JS-4:5-12. If the Commission does consider this issue in this docket, NorthWestern asserts that the Commission should allow recovery of lost revenues related to USB activities in future dockets

for the same compelling reasons that it should allow recovery of lost revenues in these Consolidated Dockets.

B. NORTHWESTERN'S METHOD OF RECOVERING ITS COSTS FOR NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION ASSETS IS REASONABLE.

NorthWestern has three distinct natural gas properties referred to as Battle Creek, Bear Paw, and Devon. They are treated differently for ratemaking purposes. Battle Creek is in rate base with Commission-approved permanent rates; Bear Paw and Devon are not yet in rate base and have interim rates subject to true-up.

1. Battle Creek's rates are lawful and may only be changed upon application by NorthWestern or complaint.

The Commission approved Battle Creek's inclusion in NorthWestern's natural gas rate base. Docket No. D2012.3.25, Order No. 7210b. The rates for Battle Creek were approved in a final order, subject to revision upon determination of an authorized return on equity in a separate, pending docket, D2012.9.94. The Commission required NorthWestern to "include Battle Creek in its next full general rate case (Docket D2012.9.94), as a known and measurable adjustment in the applicant's rebuttal testimony." Order No. 7201b, Order ¶ 3.

In Docket No. D2012.9.94, NorthWestern included Battle Creek in its natural gas utility rate base. See Docket No. D2012.9.94, *Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony of Brian B. Bird*, BBB-2:1-9:

In addition, I have updated the adjusted rate base used for capitalization presented in Exhibit__(BBB-3), as well as the rate of return and total debt that was included in Exhibit__(BBB-1), both attached to my prefiled direct testimony in this docket. The purpose of these updates is to reflect the inclusion of the Battle Creek Natural Gas Production Properties ("Battle Creek") in this filing in accordance with Order No. 7210b in Docket No. D2012.3.25. The update to the adjusted rate base used for capitalization is included with this rebuttal testimony as Exhibit__(BBB-4) and the updates to the rate of return and cost of debt as Exhibit__(BBB-5).

The rates were found to be just and reasonable. The Commission ordered that “NorthWestern reflect in its June 2013 natural gas monthly tracker the new fixed-cost unit rate for the Battle Creek assets based on the 9.8 percent ROE approved in this Final Order.” Docket No. D2012.9.94, Order No. 7249e, Order ¶ 60. In addition to the Commission’s order finding that the Battle Creek rates are just and reasonable, the rates are prima facie lawful. § 69-3-110(2), MCA (2014). The prima facie standard creates a statutory presumption that they are just and reasonable.

The Battle Creek rates were approved in a full general rate case. The assets are part of NorthWestern’s natural gas utility. While the Battle Creek fixed-cost unit rates are part of natural gas supply rates, they may not be adjusted in a tracker proceeding. Long-standing Commission practice and precedent regarding ratemaking preclude changing permanent rates in a tracker docket. The Commission has adopted minimum filing requirements that must be met by anyone seeking to change permanent rates. See ARM 38.5.101 – 38.5.195. Anyone seeking a change in permanent rates, whether it is a utility, a complainant, or the Commission, must comply with these administrative rules. Montana statutes provide process for a complainant to seek a rate change. The MCC has not followed that process.

Even though it has no evidence that NorthWestern’s natural gas utility is earning more than its authorized rate of return and contrary to its long-standing advocacy against single-issue ratemaking, the MCC is advocating that the Commission revise fixed-cost unit rates for a single, discreet set of assets, Battle Creek, rather than seeking a review of the full natural gas utility rates. See Tr. 124:20 – 127:12. The MCC’s witness has not reviewed NorthWestern’s natural

gas annual reports since the last general rate case² and does not know if NorthWestern's natural gas utility is overearning. Tr. 125:25 – 126:15. The MCC is going even further and advocating ratemaking based on an analysis used to evaluate the acquisition of Battle Creek, not on its actual normalized test period costs. Tr. 126:24 – 127:12.

There is no statutory basis to request a change to approved permanent rates in a tracker. The Commission should reject the MCC's over-reaching request for single-issue ratemaking based on analysis prepared years ago rather than on actual costs.

2. *There is no necessity to revise the interim rates for Bear Paw and Devon at this time.*

The MCC advocates that the interim rates for Bear Paw and Devon be changed to reflect the acquisition analysis of these properties. While the MCC argues that the rates should be lower, it does not show that there is any risk or harm to NorthWestern's customers of maintaining the current rates. These interim rates will be trued-up based on a final order in a future filing. The Commission has ordered that NorthWestern may use these rates "until such time that a revenue requirement filing is processed before the Commission." Order No. 7282b, ¶ 11. If in a subsequent revenue requirement proceeding, the Commission authorizes different rates for Bear Paw or Devon, there will be a true-up. See Exhibit NWE-3, *Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony of Patrick J. DiFronzo*, PJD-3:19 – PJD-4:2; and Tr. 24:12 – 26:23. Consequently, customers are neither harmed nor at risk. The current interim rates should remain in effect.

3. *If the Commission eliminates bridging concept rates in the natural gas tracker, NorthWestern will be unable to acquire new natural gas production assets.*

² On May 19, 2015, Mr. Donkin believed that NorthWestern's annual report for 2014 was not available; he was wrong. In fact, the report was filed by its statutory due date of April 30, 2015.

Mr. Donkin advocated that “the Commission should direct NWE to make a filing, to be effective July 1, 2015, that removes ‘bridging concept’ rates from the gas tracker.” Exhibit MCC-2, 31:10-13. If by this, Mr. Donkin means that the Commission should prohibit bridging concept rates from future natural gas trackers, the Commission should reject Mr. Donkin’s proposal. The Commission has recognized that utility-owned natural gas production assets are an important and beneficial part of a portfolio of natural gas resources. “The Commission supports the volumes of owned natural gas production assets within the parameters outlined in this Plan. Further, NorthWestern’s proposal to use a pro-rata allocation of natural gas production resource acquisitions that will serve both its retail natural gas customers and Electric Utility natural gas-fired generation seems reasonable.” See Docket N2012.12.125, *Public Service Commission Comments on NorthWestern Energy’s December 2012 Natural Gas Biennial Procurement Plan*, ¶ 33.

NorthWestern cannot supply natural gas to its customers without receiving timely cost recovery. The natural gas industry will not accommodate the long period required for preapproval of rate-basing natural gas production assets. The bridging concept rates are necessary for NorthWestern to acquire additional natural gas production assets and achieve the level that the Commission has said that it supports. Implementing Mr. Donkin’s recommendation would preclude this.

C. CALCULATION OF LOST REVENUE

This is the first natural gas tracker proceeding subsequent to SBW Consulting Inc.’s (“SBW”) evaluation of NorthWestern’s energy efficiency programs. NorthWestern calculated its lost revenues based on SBW’s recommendations. See Exhibit NWE-14, *Prefiled Supplemental Testimony of Joe Schwartzenberger*. No party disputed NorthWestern’s calculations or SBW’s

recommendations. NorthWestern called Dr. Marjorie R MacRae, Michael H. Baker, and Faith DeBolt (collectively “SBW Witnesses”) to support SBW’s recommendations. No party cross-examined the SBW Witnesses.

However, the Commission introduced evidence regarding SBW’s recommendation. The Commission Staff Attorney, who is a decision maker in this docket,³ produced a portion of the transcript from the hearing in Docket No. D2012.5.49 (“Exhibit PSC-1”), asked Dr. McRae if her former testimony would apply in this docket, and moved that Exhibit PSC-1 be admitted. Exhibit PSC-1 is consistent with and supports Dr. McRae’s recommendations in this case. The MCC appeared and actively contested the issues in this docket. “Evidence may be introduced by the commission on an issue that has not been adequately addressed by any party if the commission first requests counsel of record to address such issue and such counsel fails to introduce sufficient or adequate evidence.” § 69-2-102, MCA (2014). The Commission did not request any counsel of record to address any issue related to Dr. McRae’s testimony prior to the Staff Attorney moving the introduction of evidence. The Commission did not suggest, in any manner, that Dr. McRae’s testimony was not sufficient or adequate.

In this docket, NorthWestern provided the second independent evaluation of its DSM activities. The independent consultant, SBW, conducted both a process evaluation of NorthWestern’s means of soliciting interest in its programs, recruiting participation, delivering program services, and acquiring energy savings and an impact program evaluation or the energy

³ The Commission appointed the Staff Attorney as an examiner to dispose of discovery disputes and motions for protective order. *Notice of Staff Action* (March 19, 2015). In this capacity, the Staff Attorney acted as a gate-keeper regarding the evidence that could and would be presented in this docket.

savings produced by NorthWestern's DSM and USB programs, including an assessment of the costs and benefits⁴. As reported in the *SBW Report*:

NWE offers a large portfolio of residential and non-residential programs, including audits, prescriptive rebates, custom incentives, and education and training. It offers this portfolio with an extremely low staff to budget ratio, as compared with program administrators around the country. NWE's efforts are firmly grounded in efficiency program best practices. It follows over 50 best practices in program planning and design, management and administration, marketing and outreach, quality control, tracking and reporting, and evaluation. NWE clearly adopted recommendations offered in the process evaluation conducted for the 2004-2006 program cycle.⁵

Dr. McRae conclusively established that the proper net to gross ratio is 1.0. SBW stated, "We recommend that NWE (1) use a NTG value of 1.0 to estimate program net benefits and cost-effectiveness."⁶ SBW supported its recommendation in a lengthy analysis⁷ and summarized by reporting:

We present our estimated values of free ridership and spillover for NWE programs and find the free ridership estimates to be comparable to those estimated for other program administrators. (Comparison spillover estimates are not readily available.) We find the self-report free ridership estimator, despite its well established use in impact evaluations, to satisfy only the weakest of validity constructs – face validity and internal consistency – and find that numerous empirically demonstrated behavioral phenomena cast doubt on the estimator's face validity and strongly suggest overestimation occurs. We find indicators that spillover is substantially underestimated by current commonly used methods, including our own, and find reasons to believe that the spillover generated by yesterday's programs are likely observed in the free ridership estimate of today's programs.

We thus conclude that our free ridership estimator – while yielding values comparable to those found by other program administrators – overestimates free ridership and our spillover estimator underestimates spillover, creating a problem of asymmetric information about the two effects. Numerous respected evaluators

⁴ *Exhibit NWE-9, Prefiled Supplemental Testimony of Michael H. Baker, MHB-3.*

⁵ *Exhibit NWE-9, Exhibit___(MBH-1a), pp. 6-7 of 965 ("SBW Report").*

⁶ *SBW Report, p. 874 of 965.*

⁷ *SBW Report, pp. 873-895 of 965.*

believe spillover effects are likely to be comparable, or possibly exceed, free ridership effects.⁸

At the hearing in Docket No. D2012.5.49, in response to a series of questions about free ridership effects, spillover effects, and net to gross ratio, Dr. McRae defined the terms and explained that her profession continues to evolve and professionals are coming forth agreeing that the current measurement methods are inadequate. She also explained the difference between reliability and validity, that the current measurements are not valid, that her firm calculated the current measurements because the scope of work required it, and that the current measurements should not be used to assess the performance of a portfolio even though they are the only methods currently available.

Commissioner Kavulla questioned Dr. McRae at length about free ridership and spillover effects. She explained to him that the correct null hypothesis that one would want to reject is that the net to gross ratio is 1.0 and that there was no basis for rejecting such a null hypothesis. Dr. McRae also explained that the majority of jurisdictions use a net to gross ratio of 1.0. Commissioner Kavulla also questioned Dr. McRae about the net to gross ratio applied in the first evaluation of NorthWestern's DSM programs. In the previous evaluation, Nexant calculated the net to gross ratio as 92.5%. However, even in that evaluation, Nexant believed that self-reported free ridership probably overstated the actual free ridership that would have occurred without the program.

There is no evidence in this docket that supports any net to gross ratio other than 1.0. Based on the uncontroverted evidence of the *SBW Report* and Dr. McRae's uncontroverted testimony, the Commission must find that the correct net to gross ratio is 1.0.⁹

⁸ *Id.* p. 873-874 of 965.

III. RELIEF REQUESTED

Based on the foregoing and the record evidence presented in this docket, NorthWestern requests that the Commission issue an order that:

1. Approves the rates proposed by NorthWestern in this docket for its natural gas supply costs;
2. Allows NorthWestern to recover lost revenues for the tracker period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014 and to continue to recover lost revenues for its USB activities through its natural gas supply trackers;
3. Finds that NorthWestern incurred recoverable lost revenues as presented herein during tracker years 2006-2007 through 2011-2012; and
4. Finds that the current natural gas rates for NorthWestern's production assets are reasonable as presented herein.

IV. CONCLUSION

NorthWestern has shown that the costs incurred for natural gas supply during the tracker period of July 2012 to June 2014 were prudently incurred and thus, rates should be adjusted as proposed by NorthWestern. Wherefore, based on the foregoing, NorthWestern respectfully requests that the Commission grant the relief requested in Section III of this Brief.

⁹ If the Commission were to order a net-to-gross adjustment, then the amount of lost revenues attributable to USB would need to be reduced also.

Respectfully submitted this the 26th day of June 2015.

NORTHWESTERN ENERGY

By: 

Al Brogan
NorthWestern Energy

Ross Richardson
Henningesen, Vucurovich & Richardson PC

Attorneys for NorthWestern Energy

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of NorthWestern's Post-Hearing Brief in Docket Nos. D2013.5.34/D2014.5.47 has been hand delivered to the Montana Public Service Commission and Montana Consumer Counsel and also e-filed with the Montana Public Service Commission. It has also been served upon the following persons by postage prepaid via first class mail as follows:

Robert Nelson
Montana Consumer Counsel
Po Box 201703
Helena Mt 59620-1703

Connie Moran
NorthWestern Energy
40 East Broadway
Butte MT 59701

Joe Schwarzenberger
NorthWestern Energy
40 East Broadway
Butte MT 59701

Ross Richardson
116 W Granite St
Butte MT 59703

John W Wilson
JW Wilson and Associates
1601 N Kent Street Suite 1104
Arlington VA 22209

Kate Whitney
Public Service Commission
1701 Prospect Ave
Po Box 202601
Helena MT 59620-2601

Al Brogan
NorthWestern Energy
208 N Montana Ave Suite 205
Helena MT 59601

Sarah Norcott
NorthWestern Energy
208 N Montana Ave Suite 205
Helena MT 59601

George Donkin
JW Wilson and Associates
1601 N Kent Street Suite 1104
Arlington VA 22209

DATED this 26th day of June 2015.


