1	STATE OF MISSOURI
2	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5	Public Hearing
6	
7	December 17, 2007
8	Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 1
9	
10	In the Matter of Proposed) Amendments to Commission)
11	Rule 4 CSR 240-40, Gas)Case No. GX-2008-0032 Utilities and Gas Safety)
12	=
13	
14	COLLEGE M. DALE. Dared dine
15	COLLEEN M. DALE, Presiding CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
16	
17	REPORTED BY: Monnie S. VanZant, CCR, CSR, RPR
18	Midwest Litigation Services 3432 W. Truman Boulevard, Suite 207
19	Jefferson City, MO 65109 (573) 636-7551
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1					A :	P P 1	E A R	A N	C E S	
2	For S	Staff	of	the	Mis	sour	i Pub	olic	Service	Commission:
3							Klie		mis mission	
4				20	00 M		on St			
5				Je	effe	rson		, MO	65102	
6				(\	575)	731	0720			
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										

	Þ	R	\cap	C	\mathbf{F}	F.	\Box	Т	Ν	C	S
L	Г	Γ	\circ	\sim	ننا	نند	$_{\rm L}$		ΤΛ	G	S

- 2 JUDGE DALE: Good morning. We are here today
- 3 December 17th, 2007, In the Matter of Proposed Amendments
- 4 to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-40, Gas Utilities and Gas
- 5 Safety Standards, Case No. GX-2008-0032.
- At this time, we will take entries of
- 7 appearance.
- 8 MS. KLIETHERMIS: For the Staff of the
- 9 Commission, Sarah Kliethermis, 200 Madison Street, P.O.
- 10 Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- JUDGE DALE: Thank you. Seeing no other
- 12 parties, would you like to bring forward your witness?
- 13 MS. KLIETHERMIS: Staff calls John Kottwitz.
- 14 JUDGE DALE: Thank you.
- JOHN KOTTWITZ,
- 16 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
- 17 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:
- 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MS. KLIETHERMIS:
- JUDGE DALE: Thank you. You may proceed.
- 21 Q (By Ms. Kliethermis) Good morning. Do you have
- 22 any additions or comments to the prepared written comments
- 23 of Staff in this case?
- 24 A No, I do not.
- 25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 1 BY JUDGE DALE:
- 2 Q When did you file your written comments?
- 3 A We haven't filed written comments. It is just
- 4 the proposed rule.
- 5 Q Oh, okay. So you just generally support the
- 6 rule?
- 7 A Correct.
- 8 Q Do you have anything to add?
- 9 A We have copies of the documents that are going
- 10 to be incorporated by reference if they're needed by
- 11 anybody.
- 12 JUDGE DALE: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any
- 13 further questions?
- MS. KLIETHERMIS: No.
- 15 JUDGE DALE: Thank you. In that case, we will
- 16 await the arrival of commissioner Clayton, who is supposed
- 17 to be here shortly. And in the meantime, we'll go off the
- 18 record.
- 19 (Break in proceedings.)
- 20 JUDGE DALE: We're going back on the record, and
- 21 we're ready for Commissioner Clayton's questions.
- 22 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: Thank you, Judge.
- 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 24 BY COMMISSIONER CLAYTON:
- 25 Q Good morning, and welcome to the huge audience

- 1 that we have here today. And I hope we have a large
- 2 audience listening out in the rest of the world.
- 3 Mr. Kottwitz, I wanted to ask just a couple of questions
- 4 about this.
- 5 We've talked about this proposed rule in our
- 6 agenda sessions and its various steps through the process.
- 7 Can you -- can you just very briefly explain just what we
- 8 are doing, why we're doing it and what impact you expect
- 9 this will have in Missouri?
- 10 A Our gas safety standards are based on the
- 11 matching corresponding federal standards. And there's
- 12 three of those that -- and we have three corresponding
- 13 rules. And we are adopting the federal amendments that
- 14 have been made to those standards since the last time that
- 15 we adopted those in 2001.
- 16 Q Okay. So 2001 would have been the last
- 17 amendments to this section?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q What -- what year would you say that this rule
- 20 -- the original outline or frame work for the rule was --
- 21 was created?
- 22 A The federal standards were implemented in 1970.
- 23 Q 1970. So they've been evolving since that time?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q All right. And these changes and the way the

- 1 federal state relationship works, are these basically we
- 2 enact what the Feds tell us to enact, or are they approved
- 3 no greater, no stricter standards than what the Feds have
- 4 approved?
- 5 Or may we go beyond that? Can you tell me what
- 6 discretion we have in terms of our own rules as related to
- 7 the federal rules?
- 8 A Okay. I'll try to answer it the best I can.
- 9 That the -- on the one level, on the federal amendments,
- 10 we're required under our certification with the Federal
- 11 Government to adopt regulations that are at least as
- 12 stringent.
- And then we're also able to go adopt state
- 14 regulations that are more stringent. And we have done
- 15 that in the state. Starting in 1989, we adopted numerous
- 16 regulations that are more stringent than the federal
- 17 regulations.
- 18 Q Okay. And these amendments, are these more
- 19 stringent than what the Feds have, I guess, suggested? Is
- 20 that the way that they -- they mandate a certain level and
- 21 then you can go beyond that?
- 22 A Correct.
- 23 Q Do these rules go beyond what they've suggested
- 24 or what they've mandated?
- 25 A For the most part. They're very -- there's

- 1 several amendments that we're adopting. Most of them make
- 2 regulations -- Federal regulations that are more stringent
- 3 than the previous Federal regulations. I believe there
- 4 might be one or two of them that are just kind of
- 5 editorial or a little less stringent.
- 6 Q Okay. Can you highlight for me an example where
- 7 we are -- where we're being more stringent than the
- 8 Federal rule in -- in this proposed amendment?
- 9 A An example is we're continuing to be more
- 10 stringent with our leak surveys. Unprotected steel
- 11 pipelines have to be leak surveyed annually, 15 months.
- 12 And other pipelines every three years not to exceed a
- 13 39-month intervals. And at the federal amendment level,
- 14 that is three years, not to exceed 39 months and five
- 15 years not to exceed, I believe, 62 months or something
- 16 like that.
- 17 Q Okay. But is that subject to this amendment,
- 18 the -- the proposed rule here today, the leak survey
- 19 criteria that you just mentioned?
- 20 A I believe they made a slight editorial
- 21 modification in that area. It's -- I don't -- I'd have to
- 22 check that.
- Q Okay?
- 24 A The -- there is a couple places where they did
- 25 the three years not to exceed 39 months, and we kept --

```
1 kept our version. You're -- basically, the information
```

- 2 range for the leak surveys, that's something that's
- 3 previously been adopted in the rule --
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q -- correct? That's not what's proposed here
- 6 today?
- 7 A True.
- 8 Q Okay. Just here today is just --
- 9 A They've changed some of the time intervals.
- 10 Q Some of the time intervals. Basically, this
- 11 rule just relates to reporting, I believe, for the most
- 12 part?
- A And 40-020 is reporting. 40-030 involves
- 14 numerous subjects relating to the operation and
- 15 maintenance of gas pipelines.
- 16 Q Okay.
- A And then 40-080 is with the drug and alcohol
- 18 testing.
- 19 Q Good. Good. Okay. Okay. Does this rule --
- 20 explain to me -- this is gas safety. Is it -- it's
- 21 pipeline safety. Does it -- does it go from transmission
- 22 systems and to distribution systems?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q Relates to all of them?
- 25 A Correct. Yes.

- 1 Q And are there any federal mandates with regard
- 2 to main replacement, copper main replacement, unprotected
- 3 steel main replacement, cast iron main replacement? Are
- 4 there federal rules on that -- on those subjects?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q No. So each state is given the ability to act
- 7 within its own discretion?
- 8 A Right. In 1989, that's when I mentioned the
- 9 more stringent state regulations. That's when we adopted
- 10 our program replacement requirements.
- 11 Q Were you here in 1989?
- 12 A Yes, I was.
- 13 Q Been here a long time. I'm not even going to
- 14 ask Mr. Leonberger. Mr. Leonberger, how long has it been?
- 15 When those more stringent standards were implemented, was
- 16 -- was there a reason behind that? I mean, were there --
- 17 were there occurrences or activities occurring that
- 18 warranted having more stringent rules in place?
- 19 A They were implemented following several
- 20 instances that occurred in the Kansas City area. There
- 21 were also, I believe, some legislative hearings at that
- 22 time and a lot of focus on that at the Commission.
- 23 That was one of the main drivers behind the more
- 24 frequent leak surveys and the replacement programs.
- 25 Q Okay. Do you believe that Missouri needs to act

- 1 in terms of gas safety anywhere else in terms of
- 2 rule-making or any other type of docket? Are we deficient
- 3 anywhere that we need to continue reviewing to improve
- 4 safety?
- 5 A I wouldn't say that we're deficient. But we do
- 6 on a continual basis want to keep reviewing, as you said,
- 7 and monitoring our gas safety regulations and approving
- 8 them. No. 1 is we want to keep our regulations up to date
- 9 with the federal regulations, which is the purpose of
- 10 these rule-makings.
- 11 But we also intend to look over the next year or
- 12 two at doing another rule-making that addresses other
- 13 subjects beyond just the federal -- adopting the federal
- 14 amendments.
- 15 But we wanted to keep that separate from this to
- 16 where this is more of a simple rule-making where we're
- 17 just adopting the federal amendments.
- 18 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: Okay. I don't think I
- 19 have any other questions for this witness. Are there any
- 20 other witnesses, any other attorneys? Public Counsel is
- 21 here. Are you -- are you all in on this game, Mr. Poston?
- 22 MR. POSTON: No. I'm just monitoring it. We
- 23 have no -- no problem with this.
- 24 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: No problem. Any
- 25 position --

- 1 MR. POSTON: No.
- 2 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: -- beyond support?
- 3 MR. POSTON: No.
- 4 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: Or now I guess you're not
- 5 necessarily here to support it.
- 6 MR. POSTON: No. We're -- we support these
- 7 changes. Yes.
- 8 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: Okay. I don't have any
- 9 other questions, Judge.
- 10 JUDGE DALE: Thank you, Mr. Kottwitz. You may
- 11 step down.
- MR. KOTTWITZ: Thank you.
- 13 JUDGE DALE: Mr. Poston, do you want to enter an
- 14 appearance, or do you just --
- MR. POSTON: No. That's okay.
- JUDGE DALE: Okay.
- 17 MR. POSTON: I couldn't hear the audio upstairs.
- 18 That's why I came down.
- JUDGE DALE: Hm-mm. The -- well --
- 20 MR. POSTON: It's probably my -- my fault.
- 21 Probably my computer.
- JUDGE DALE: Is there any other business before
- us before we adjourn? Seeing none, then we are adjourned.
- 24 Off the record.

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF MISSOURI)
4	COUNTY OF OSAGE)
5	
6	I, Monnie S. VanZant, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
7	Certified Court Reporter #0538, and Registered
8	Professional Reporter, and Notary Public, within and for
9	the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that I was
10	personally present at the proceedings as set forth in the
11	caption sheet hereof; that I then and there took down in
12	stenotype the proceedings had at said time and was
13	thereafter transcribed by me, and is fully and accurately
14	set forth in the preceding pages.
15	
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
17	seal on December 29, 2007.
18	
19	
20	
21	Monnie S. VanZant, CSR, CCR #0539
22	Registered Professional Reporter
23	
24	
2.5	

1	I N D E X	
2	WITNESS: JOHN KOTTWITZ	PAGE
3	Direct Examination by Ms. Kliethermis	3
4	Cross-Examination by Judge Dale	3
5	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Clayton	4
6		
7	Reporter's Certificate	12
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		