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Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A. My name is Thomas Kaufmann. My business address is Elizabethtown Gas, 300 Connell Drive, Suite 3000, Berkeley Heights, NJ 07922.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED, AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. I am currently employed as a Manager of Rates and Tariffs and have responsibilities for Florida City Gas ("City Gas" or "the Company").
Q. BRIEFLY STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE.
A. In June 1977, I graduated from Rutgers University, Newark, N.J., with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration, majoring in accounting and economics. In July 1979, I graduated from Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, N.J., with a Masters of Business Administration, majoring in finance. My professional responsibilities have encompassed financial analysis, accounting, planning, and pricing in manufacturing and energy services companies in both regulated and deregulated industries. In 1977, I was employed by Allied Chemical Corp. as a staff accountant. In

1980, I was employed by Celanese Corp. as a financial analyst. In 1981, I was employed by Suburban Propane as a Strategic Planning Analyst, promoted to Manager of Rates and Pricing in 1986 and to Director of Acquisitions and Business Analysis in 1990. In 1993, I was employed by Concurrent Computer as a Manager, Pricing Administration. In 1996 I joined NUI as a Rate Analyst, was promoted to Manager of Regulatory Support in August, 1997 and Manager of Regulatory Affairs in February, 1998, and named Manager of Rates and Tariffs in July 1998.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to present the revised estimate of the Company's projection of gas costs for the period August 2011 through December 2011 and the Company's projection of gas costs for the period January 2012 through December 2012. In addition I will present the development of the maximum rate to be charged to customers for the period January 2012 through December 2012.
Q. HAS THE COMPANY PREPARED THE FORMS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE COMMISSION FOR THIS PURPOSE?
A. Yes. The forms prescribed by the Commission are being filed at this time. Copies are attached to my testimony as Exhibit $\qquad$ (TK-2).
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## Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE PROJECTION METHODOLOGY?

A. Yes. Under this methodology, which was adopted by Order No. PSC-93-0708-FOF-GU of this Commission on May 10, 1993 and modified in Docket No. 980269-PU on June 10, 1998, gas companies are to project their gas costs each twelve months for the ensuing twelve month period ending in December. A per therm rate is developed for the weighted average cost of gas (WACOG). This rate, based on the average of the winter and summer seasons, would lead to over or under-recoveries of gas costs in the two seasons. This problem is mitigated by establishing a maximum levelized purchased gas factor based on the Company's expected winter cost of gas, thereby eliminating a large under-recovery in that season. The Company is then able to flex downward in the summer in order to match market conditions and eliminate the potential for a large over-recovery for the remainder of the period.
Q. What if the actual cost exceeds the maximum rate AS PROJECTED?
A. If re-projected gas costs for the remaining period exceed projected recoveries by at least $10 \%$ for the twelve month period, a midcourse correction may formally be requested by the Company.
Q. WHAT HAPPENS TO THE DIFFERENCES THAT RESULT FROM MISESTIMATES, THAT IS, THE MISMATCHES BETWEEN ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL COSTS?
A. The forms take this into consideration. Form E-2 calculates the projected differences using estimated figures, and form E-4 calculates the final true-up using actual figures. These differences are flowed back to customers through the true-up factor included in gas costs billed in the subsequent twelve month period.
Q. ARE ANY FLORIDA GAS TRANSMSSION (FGT) RATE CHANGES PROPOSED WHICH ARE REFLECTED IN THIS FILING?
A. No, the FGT rates used in the preparation of this filing are those ineffect on September 1, 2011
Q. CAN YOU SUMMARIZE THE CONTENTS OF THE SCHEDULES SUBMITTED AS PART OF THIS FILING?
A. Yes. Schedule E-1 shows the projected period, January 2012 through December 2012. For 2012, the Company estimates the gas purchases for resale will be $43,156,954$ therms (Line 15) at a total cost of $\$ 32,882,029$ (Line 11) with a resulting WACOG of 76.234 cents per therm (Line 40) before the application of the trueup factor and the regulatory assessment fee. Schedule E-4 shows the difference between the estimated actual and actual true-up for the prior period, January 2010 through December 2010, is an under-recovery of $\$ 6,359$ (Column 3, Line 4). The projected true-up for the current period, January 2011 through December 2011, is an over-recovery of $\$ 104,135$ (Column 4, line 4). The total true-up as
shown on Schedule E-4 is an over-recovery of $\$ 97,776$ for a true-up refund factor of 0.227 cents per therm that would be applied during the projected period (Schedule E-1, Line 41). This true-up factor decreases the gas cost factor during the projected period to 76.007 cents per therm (Line 42) before the regulatory assessment fee. With the regulatory assessment fee added, the PGA factor is 76.389 cents per therm (Line 44) based on the average of the winter and summer seasons.
Q. DOES THE ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECTED PERIOD SUMMARIZED ABOVE PROVIDE A SUFFICIENT BASIS TO SET THE PGA CAP IN 2012?
A. No. As shown on Schedule E-1 (winter), City Gas has chosen to establish a maximum levelized purchased gas factor based on the Company's expected winter cost of gas as follows:

Winter Average, per Therm

| Total Cost (Line 11) | $\$ 19,036,109$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Therm Sales (Line 27) | $23,254,273$ |
| (Line 11/ Line 27) | $\$ 0.81861$ |
| True-up | $(\$ 0.00227)$ |
| Before Regulatory Assessment | $\$ 0.81634$ |
| Revenue Tax Factor | 1.00503 |
| Purchased Gas Factor | $\$ 0.82045$ |

As shown above, the maximum levelized purchased gas factor based on the Company's expected winter cost of gas is 81.634

8 A. Yes, it does.

## EXHIBIT TK-2

(SCHEDULES E-1 WINTER, E-1, E-1/R, E-2,

E-3, E-4, AND E-5)

| COMPANY: <br> FLORIDA CITY GAS |  |  |  |  | SCHEDULE E-1 (REVISED FORM 9/22/00) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ORIGINAL ESTIMATE FOR THE PROJECTED PERIOD: 2012 Winter Months |  | \$0.82045 | PGA CAP w/ assessment |  |  |  |  |
| COST OF GAS PURCHASED | PROJECTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | TOTAL |
| 1 COMMODITY (Pipeline) | \$9,621 | \$10,141 | \$11,014 | \$11,564 | \$10,743 | $\xrightarrow{\$ 10,866}$ | \$63,949 |
| 2 NO NOTICE RESERVATION | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3 SWING SERVICE | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 |
| 4 COMMODITY (Other) | \$2,068,249 | \$2,229,040 | \$2,473,482 | \$2,366,503 | \$2,194,062 | \$2,241,151 | \$13,572,487 |
| 5 DEMAND | \$574,321 | \$910,011 | \$939,170 | \$939,170 | \$880,777 | \$939,170 | \$5,182,619 |
| 6 OTHER | \$33,078 | \$34,110 | \$41,320 | \$38,088 | \$36,353 | \$34,105 | \$217,054 |
| LESS END-USE CONTRACT | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 7 COMMODITY (Pipeline) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8 DEMAND | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | s0 |
| 9 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 10 | so | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 11 TOTAL COST ( $1+2+3+4+5+6)-(7+8+9+10)$ | \$2,685,269 | \$3,183,303 | \$3,464,986 | \$3,355,325 | \$3,121,935 | \$3,225,292 | \$19,036,110 |
| 12 NET UNBILLED | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13 COMPANY USE | (\$1,534) | (\$1,726) | (\$1,729) | $(\$ 1,595)$ | (\$1,598) | (\$1,632) | $(59,813)$ |
| 14 THERM SALES REVENUES | \$2,683,735 | \$3,181,577 | \$3,463,257 | \$3,353,730 | \$3,120,337 | \$3,223,660 | \$19,026,296 |
| THERMS PURCHASED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 COMMODITY (Pipeline) | 3,498,579 | 3,687,691 | 4,005,237 | 4,205,056 | 3,906,372 | 3,951,338 | 23,254,273 |
| 16 NO NOTICE RESERVATION | . | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 17 SWING SERVICE |  | - |  |  | - | - ${ }^{-}$ |  |
| 18 COMMODITY (Other) | 3.462,779 | 3,651,291 | 3,961,437 | 4.162,056 | 3,865,372 | 3,913,238 | 23,016,173 |
| 19 DEMAND | 10,035,320 | 16,244,400 | 16,785,880 | 16,785,880 | 15,702,920 | 16,785,880 | 92,340,280 |
| 20 OTHER | 37,800 | 38,400 | 45,800 | 45,000 | 43,000 | 40,100 | 250,100 |
| LESS END-USE CONTRACT | - | . | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21 COMMODITY (Pipeline) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 DEMAND | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 23 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - ${ }^{-}$ |
| 24 TOTAL PURCHASES ( $+17+18+20)-(21+23)$ | 3,500,579 | 3,689,691 | 4,007,237 | 4,207,056 | 3,908,372 | 3,953,338 | 23,266,273 |
| 25 NET UNBILLED | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 26 COMPANY USE | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(12,000)$ |
| 27 TOTAL THERM SALES (24-26) | 3,498,579 | 3,687,691 | 4,005,237 | 4,205,056 | 3,906,372 | 3,951,338 | 23,254,273 |
| CENTS PER THERM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 COMMODITY (Pipeline) (1/15) | 0.00275 | 0.00275 | 0.00275 | 0.00275 | 0.00275 | 0.00275 | 0.00275 |
| 29 NO NOTICE RESERVATION (2/16) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 30 SWING SERVICE (3/17) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 31 COMMODITY (Other) (4/18) | \$0.59728 | \$0.61048 | \$0.62439 | 0.56859 | 0.56762 | 0.57271 | 0.58969 |
| 32 DEMAND (5/19) | \$0.05723 | \$0.05602 | \$0.05595 | 0.05595 | 0.05609 | 0.05595 | 0.05613 |
| 33 OTHER (6/20) | \$0.87508 | \$0.88828 | \$0.90219 | 0.84639 | 0.84542 | 0.85051 | 0.86787 |
| LESS END-USE CONTRACT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 COMMODITY Pipeline (7/21) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 35 DEMAND (8/22) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 36 (9/23) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 37 TOTAL COST (11/24) | 0.76709 | 0.86276 | 0.86468 | 0.79755 | 0.79878 | 0.81584 | 0.81818 |
| 38 NET UNBILLED (12/25) | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 39 COMPANY USE (13/26) | 0.76709 | 0.86276 | 0.86468 | 0.79755 | 0.79878 | 0.81584 | 0.81818 |
| 40 TOTAL THERM SALES (11/27) | 0.76753 | 0.86322 | 0.86511 | 0.79793 | 0.79919 | 0.81625 | 0.81861 |
| 41 TRUE-UP (E-2) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) | (0.00227) |
| 42 TOTAL COST OF GAS ( $40+41$ ) | 0.76527 | 0.86096 | 0.86285 | 0.79566 | 0.79692 | 0.81399 | 0.81634 |
| 43 REVENUE TAX FACTOR | 1.00503 | 1.00503 | 1.00503 | 1.00503 | 1.00503 | 1.00503 | 1.00503 |
| 44 PGA FACTOR ADJUSTED FOR TAXES (42x43) | 0.76912 | 0.86529 | 0.86719 | 0.79966 | 0.80093 | 0.81808 | 0.82045 |
| 45 PGA FACTOR ROUNDED TO NEAREST . 001 | 0.769 | 0.865 | 0.867 | 0.800 | 0.801 | 0.818 | 0.820 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| COMPANY: <br> FLORIDA CITY GAS |  | TRANSPORTATION PURCHASES SYSTEM SUPPLY AND END USE |  |  |  |  |  |  | SCHEDULE E-3 <br> (REVISED FORM 9/24/99) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ESTIMATED FOR THE PROJECTED PERIOD OF: |  |  |  |  |  | JANUARY 2012 Through DECEMBER 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PURCHASED FROM | $\begin{gathered} \text { PURCHASED } \\ \text { FOR } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCH } \\ & \text { TYPE } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SYSTEM SUPPLY | END USE | COMMODITY COST |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEMAND } \\ & \text { COST } \end{aligned}$ | OTHER CHARGES ACAGRI/FUEL | TOTĀLCENTS PERTHERM |
| Month |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL PURCHASED | THIRD PARTY | PIPELINE |  |  |  |
| Jan | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 4,162,056 |  | 4,162,056 |  | \$7,367 | \$939,170 | \$4,197 | \#VALUE! |
| Feb | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,865,372 |  | 3,865,372 |  | \$6,842 | \$880,777 | \$3,901 | \#VALUE! |
| Mar | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,913,238 |  | 3,913,238 |  | \$6,926 | \$939,170 | \$3,940 | \#VALUE! |
| Apr | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,421,279 |  | 3,421,279 |  | \$6,056 | \$653,038 | \$3,452 | \#VALUE! |
| May | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,544,768 |  | 3,544,768 |  | \$6,274 | \$534,814 | \$3,560 | \#VALUE! |
| June | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,234,669 |  | 3,234,669 |  | \$5,725 | \$518,629 | \$3,257 | \#VALUE! |
| July | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,209,010 |  | 3,209,010 |  | \$5,680 | \$534,814 | \$3,261 | \#VALUE! |
| Aug | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,276,102 |  | 3,276,102 |  | \$5,799 | \$534,814 | \$3,277 | \#VALUE! |
| SeP | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,019,853 |  | 3,019,853 |  | \$5,345 | \$518,629 | \$3,047 | \#VALUE! |
| Oct | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,462,779 |  | 3,462,779 |  | \$6,129 | \$574,321 | \$3,492 | \#VALUE! |
| Nov | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,651,291 |  | 3,651,291 |  | \$6,463 | \$910,011 | \$3,678 | \#VALUE! |
| Dec | Various | Sys/End-Use | FTS | 3,961,437 |  | 3,961,437 |  | \$7,012 | \$939,170 | \$4,003 | \#VALUE! |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 42,721,854 |  | 42,721,854 |  | \$75,618 | \$8,477,358 | \$43,064 | \#VALUE! |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$

$\qquad$


| COMPANY: FLORIDA CITY GAS | THERM SALES AND CUSTOMER DATA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SChedule e-s (REVSED FORM 903) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ESTIMATED FOR THE PROJECTED PERIOD: |  |  | JANUARY 2012 |  | through | DECEMBER 2012 |  |  | Page 2 of 2 |  |  |  |
|  | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | jun | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | TOTAL |
| THERM USE PER CUSTOMER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 RESIDENTIAL | 20 | 18 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 183 |
| 40 GAS LIGHTS | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 116 |
| 41 COMMERCIAL | 444 | 428 | 454 | 420 | 430 | 397 | 405 | 401 | 370 | 413 | 423 | 438 | 5,024 |
| 42 LARGE COMMERCIAL | 6.481 | 6.758 | 6.665 | 6,846 | 6,308 | 6,423 | 5,338 | 5,500. | 7,877 | 6,185 | 7,485 | 6,669 | 78,535 |
| 43 Natural gas venicles | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| 44 INTERRUPTIBLE PREFERRED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 INTERRUPTIBLE LARGE VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46 COMMERCIAL TRANSP. | 7.335 | 6,875 | 7,523 | $\begin{array}{r}6,745 \\ \hline 1,359\end{array}$ | 6,486 |  | 6.581 |  |  |  | 5,347 | 5,221 | 75,094 |
| 47 SMALL COMMERCIAL TRANSP FIRM | 1.630 | 1,522 | 1.507 | 1,359 | 1,332 | 1,230 | 1,276 | 1,311 | 1.234 | 1,383 | 1,498 | 1.589 | 16,872 |
| 48 SMALL COMMERCLAL TR - INTER. | -. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - |
| 49 SMALL COMMERCIAL TRANSP - NGV | 333 | 333 | 333 | 333 | 333 | 333 | 333 | 333 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 333 | 4,500 |
| 50 INTERRUPTIBLE TRANSP. | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 51 CONTRACT INTERRUPT. TRANSP. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 52 INTERRUPT. LG. VOL. TRANSP. | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 53 CONTR. INTERR LG. VOL. TRANSP. | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 54 SPECIAL CONTRACT | 5,986 | 6,700 | 5,180 | 2.737 | 1.329 | 1.843 | 1,680 | 2,953 | 2,484 | 3,044 | 3,691 | 12,653 | 50,124 |

