Exhibit No.:

Issues:

Service Area Description

Witness:

James A. Gray

Sponsoring Party:

MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit:

Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.:

GM-2001-585

Date Testimony Prepared:

August 13, 2001

#### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

#### REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JAMES A. GRAY

GATEWAY PIPELINE COMPANY, INC., ET AL.

CASE NO. GM-2001-585

Exhibit No. 16 Jefferson City, Missouri Unite 4 OS CA Case No. Case No.

\*\*Denotes Highly Confidential Information \*\*

| 1  | REBUTTAL TESTIMONY  |
|----|---|
| 2  | OF  |
| 3  | JAMES A. GRAY   |
| 4  | GATEWAY PIPELINE COMPANY, INC., ET AL   |
| 5  | CASE NO. GM-2001-585  |
| 6  |   |
| 7  | Q. Please state your name and business address.                                       |
| 8  | A. My name is James A. Gray. My business address is P. O. Box 360                     |
| 9  | Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.   |
| 10 | Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?                                     |
| 11 | A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission                |
| 12 | as a Regulatory Economist in the Tariffs/Rate Design Section of the Commission's      |
| 13 | Energy Department.  |
| 14 | Q. How long have been employed by the Commission?                                     |
| 15 | A. I have been employed with the Commission for approximately twenty-on-              |
| 6  | years.  |
| 17 | Q. Please state your educational background.  |
| 18 | A. I received a degree of Bachelor of Science in Psychology as well as one in         |
| 19 | General Studies from Louisiana State University, and I received a degree of Master of |
| 20 | Science in Special Education from the University of Tennessee. Additionally,          |
| 21 | completed several courses in research and statistics at the University of Missouri    |
| 22 | Columbia.   |
| 23 | Q. Please state your professional qualifications.                                     |

A. Prior to being employed by the Commission, I was a Research Analyst for two and a half years with the Missouri Department of Mental Health where I conducted statistical analyses. In 1980, I began my employment with the Commission as a Statistician in the Depreciation Department where I submitted testimony regarding depreciation rates, trended original cost, and trended original cost less depreciation.

Beginning in 1989 as a member of the Economic Analysis Department, I submitted testimony on weather normalized sales for natural gas, water, and electric utilities. In electric utilities' resource plans, I reviewed their residential electric load forecasts with associated detailed end-use studies and marketing surveys.

Beginning in December of 1997, as a member of the Tariffs/Rate Design Section of the Commission's Gas Department, I reviewed tariffs and applications of natural gas utilities. I submitted testimony on weather normalized sales, certificates of convenience and necessity, and minimum statistical sample sizes to be used in natural gas residential customer billing reviews.

Since July of 2001, I have been in the Tariffs/Rate Design Section of the Commission's Energy Department.

- Q. Please list all the cases in which you have submitted prepared written testimony before this Commission.
- A. The cases in which I have submitted prepared, written testimony are enumerated in Schedule 1, attached to my testimony.
  - Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

| 1  | A. I will describe the natural gas transportation service areas and numbers of        |
|----|---|
| 2  | customers depending upon transportation service provided by Missouri Pipeline         |
| 3  | Company (MPC) and Missouri Gas Company (MGC).   |
| 4  | Q. What type of natural gas service do MGC and MPC provide?                           |
| 5  | A. MPC and MGC have tariffs only to provide intrastate natural gas                    |
| 6  | transportation service.   |
| 7  |   |
| 8  | MISSOURI PIPELINE COMPANY (MPC)   |
| 9  |   |
| 10 | Q. Briefly list the Missouri counties that MPC natural gas pipeline travels           |
| 11 | through.  |
| 12 | A. The northern end of MPC begins in Pike County where MPC                            |
| 13 | interconnects with CMS Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle or PEP).        |
| 14 | Then MPC transports natural gas south through Lincoln County, St Charles County, and  |
| 15 | ends in southern Franklin County at an interconnect with MGC. Schedule 2-1, attached  |
| 16 | to this testimony, shows MPC.   |
| 17 | Q. How does MPC tie-in to the St. Louis natural gas market?                           |
| 18 | A. Yes, MPC receives natural gas through an interconnection with Panhandle            |
| 19 | in Pike County. Then MPC transports the natural gas into the St. Louis market.        |
| 20 | MPC transports natural gas to two Local Distribution Companies (LDCs)                 |
| 21 | in the St. Louis area. Laclede Gas Company (Laclede) has delivery points with MPC in  |
| 22 | St. Charles County in St. Peters, West Alton, and Wentzville. In Franklin County,     |
| 23 | Laclede's delivery point with MPC is near Washington. In the St. Louis market, MPC is |

not the sole provider of natural gas transportation to Laclede. Mississippi River Transportation Corporation (MRT) and Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc. (Williams) also have tie-ins to Laclede's St. Louis market. Staff understands that Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (NGPL) may enter the St. Louis market.

The second LDC that receives natural gas transportation service from MPC is Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE (AmerenUE). AmerenUE's delivery points with MPC are near Troy and in Wentzville. Panhandle also transports natural gas for AmerenUE directly to a delivery point at Curryville. These three delivery points transport natural gas to AmerenUE's Wentzville District.

- Q. Briefly list the cities, outside of the St. Louis market, that only receive natural gas transportation service from MPC.
- A. Outside of the St. Louis market, two LDCs only receive natural gas transportation service at MPC's town border stations. A town border station, also known as a city gate, is a distribution point where gas from the pipeline is measured and sold to an LDC.

MPC has town border stations with Laclede at Washington, St. Clair/Parkway, and in the Union area in Franklin County. MPC also has a town border station with Fidelity Natural Gas, Inc. (Fidelity) at the City of Sullivan in southern Franklin County.

| 20 | Q. | ** | ** |
|----|----|----|----|
| 21 | A. | ** |    |
| 22 |    |    |    |
| 23 |    |    |    |



|    | Rebuttal Testimony of James A. Gray  |
|----|--|
| 1  |  |
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  |  |
| 5  | **   |
| 6  |  |
| 7  | MISSOURI GAS COMPANY (MGC)   |
| 8  |  |
| 9  | Q. What company transports natural gas to MGC?   |
| 0  | A. MPC transports natural gas to MGC. MGC is solely dependent upor                     |
| 1  | MPC to transport natural gas to MGC.   |
| 12 | Q. Briefly list the Missouri counties that MGC natural gas pipeline travels            |
| 13 | through.   |
| ١4 | A. At the northern end, MGC interconnects with MPS in southern Franklin                |
| 15 | County and the pipeline runs southwest through Crawford, Phelps, and Pulaski counties. |
| 16 | Q. What LDC only receives natural gas transportation service from MGC?                 |
| 17 | A. MGC transports natural gas to Missouri Public Service's Eastern System              |
| 18 | through an interconnect with MPC in southern Franklin County. Missouri Public          |
| 19 | Service's Eastern System includes the cities of Rolla in Phelps County, Salem in Den   |
| 20 | County, and Owensville in Gasconnade County. These cities only receive natural ga      |
| 21 | transportation service from MGC, and are captive customers.                            |
| 22 | Q. What municipalities receive natural gas transportation service only from            |
| 73 | MGC2   |



|    | Rebuttal Tes<br>James A. Gr | •  |
|----|-----------------------------|--|
| 1  | A.                          | The municipalities are the City of Cuba in Crawford County, the City of    |
| 2  | St. James in                | Phelps County, and the cities of Richland, St. Robert, and Waynesville in  |
| 3  | Pulaski Cou                 | nty.   |
| 4  | Q.                          | Is Fort Leonard Wood also dependent upon MGC for natural gas               |
| 5  | transportatio               | n service?   |
| 6  | A.                          | Yes, MGC is the only transporter of natural gas to Fort Leonard Wood in    |
| 7  | Pulaski Cou                 | nty.   |
| 8  | Q.                          | Do you have a system map to show the service areas of MPC and MGC?         |
| 9  | A.                          | Yes, I have attached Schedule 2-1 to this testimony to show the intrastate |
| 10 | pipelines of                | both utilities. The MPC and MGC intrastate pipelines are shown in red      |
| 11 | MPS interco                 | nnects with Panhandle in Pike County, and Panhandle's pipeline is shown in |
| 12 | light green.                | Some of the cities that I listed are shown in light blue.                  |
| 13 | Q.                          | ****   |
| 14 | A.                          | **   |
| 15 |                             |  |
| 16 |                             | **   |
| 17 |                             |  |
| 18 |                             | TRANS-MISSISSIPPI PIPELINE COMPANY (TMP)                                   |
| 19 |                             |  |
| 20 | Q.                          | **   |
| 21 |                             |  |
| 22 | A.                          | **   |
| 23 |                             |  |



|    | Rebuttal Tes<br>James A. Gr |  |
|----|-----------------------------|--|
| 1  |                             |  |
| 2  | <del></del>                 | **   |
| 3  | Q.                          | **   |
| 4  | Α.                          | **   |
| 5  | <u> </u>                    |  |
| 6  |                             | **   |
| 7  | Q.                          | **   |
| 8  | A.                          | **   |
| 9  |                             |  |
| 10 |                             |  |
| 11 |                             | **   |
| 12 | Q.                          | **   |
| 13 |                             | ?**  |
| 14 | Α.                          | **   |
| 15 |                             |  |
| 16 |                             | **   |
| 17 |                             |  |
| 18 |                             | MPC AND MGC CUSTOMER INFORMATION                                       |
| 19 |                             |  |
| 20 | Q.                          | How many natural gas customers receive natural gas solely from MPC and |
| 21 | MGC?                        |  |
| 22 | Α.                          | Approximately 13,600 natural gas customers receive natural gas solely  |
| 23 |                             | and MGC. Of that number, approximately 9,000 customers of Laclede,     |
|    |                             | -, - <sub>1</sub>  |



Fidelity, and Missouri Public Service's Eastern System have their rates regulated by the Commission. I have attached Schedule 3 to this testimony showing approximately how many customers and/or services by LDC, municipal system, and Fort Leonard Wood.

- Q. Why did you report numbers of natural gas service lines for most of the municipalities and Fort Leonard Wood?
- A. The best estimate that I have of the number of customers for most of the municipalities and Fort Leonard Wood is the number of natural gas services obtained from a 2000 United States Department of Transportation (DOT) report. Natural gas services do not precisely match numbers of customers since there might be one service to an apartment building containing several customers. Also, in new construction, there may be natural gas service lines for many unsold subdivision lots.
  - Q. What do the numbers of service lines at Fort Leonard Wood represent?
- A. It represents the number of natural gas service lines to supply the various building structures. Military housing units range from barracks, two-story duplexes, and individual homes for some officers. The natural gas usage is paid for by the United States military.
- Q. Please combine your two lists of all the cities relying exclusively upon MPC and MGC for transportation service.
- A. MPC transports natural gas to two LDCs. They are Laclede Gas Company and Fidelity Natural Gas Company. This includes the cities of Washington, Union, St. Clair, Parkway, and Sullivan.

One LDC only receives natural gas transportation service from MGC, it is
Missouri Public Service's Eastern System. This system includes the cities of Salem,
Owensville, and Rolla.

The municipalities of Cuba, St. James, Waynesville, St. Robert, and Richland rely solely on MGC for transportation service. Also Fort Leonard Wood relies solely on MGC for transportation service.

- Q. Do you have any information concerning population growth in the Missouri counties receiving natural gas transportation service from MPC and/or MGC?
- A. Yes, I obtained population growth statistics from the United States Census. I have attached Schedule 4 to this testimony, showing Missouri counties receiving transportation service from MPC and/or MGC pipelines with their 2000 population and percent change from 1990 to 2000.

The data show that the greatest population growth, in counties served by MPC is St. Charles County. The population growth in St. Charles County is thirty-three percent over ten years. This substantially exceeds the statewide population growth of nine percent. St. Charles has a 2000 population of 283,883, so a thirty-three percent gain translates into a larger gain in numbers of persons than a similar percent gain in a county with a smaller, base population.

In the counties receiving only transportation service from MPC and/or MGC, the population growth is more moderate. The data show a decrease in population for Pulaski County.

Q. Why did you not compare the percent growth by city?

1

A. The county growth statistics were readily available. Moreover, county

2 boundaries are stable.

3

Boundaries of cities are not necessarily stable. The cities might have

The data in Schedule 4 is by county. MPC and MGC do not serve entire

Given stable economic conditions and stable, normal winter weather, it

annexed additional land area since the 1990 census.

5

Q. What do you conclude from the 2000 U.S. Census Data?

6

A. Population growth in counties currently receiving natural gas

7

transportation service exclusively from either MPC or MGC does not match the

8

population growth in St. Charles County.

9

10

counties. Therefore, these county statistics exceed the current MPC and/or MGC service

11

areas, but the census data demonstrate the lack of sustained, overall population growth in

12

an entire county, such as Pulaski. The numbers of residential customers in Pulaski

13

County would increase if more municipalities would take natural gas transportation

14

service from MGC or if the current municipalities would annex more land, then increase

15

the numbers of their gas customers.

commercial or industrial businesses.

16

17

seems that an increase in residential natural gas sales in counties such as Pulaski cannot

18

be realized without substantial population growth. I did not analyze growth in

19

Q. Why do you list housing units in Schedule 4?

21

20

A. A population census may not necessarily be the best measure of potential

22

customers. Housing units are available residential housing. Apartments, mobile homes,

23

and groups of rooms are housing units. Housing units are not necessarily occupied.

| Rebuttal | Testimony of | ıf |
|----------|--------------|----|
| James A. | Gray         |    |

- Q. Do you believe that Gateway can expect substantial growth in natural gas sales from the residential customers in the counties served exclusively by either MPC or MGC?
  - A. No, the data does not seem to support increased demand from residential customers in the near future.
    - Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?
    - A. Yes, it does.

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

| IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GATEV |   |             |  |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| PIPELINE COMPANY, INC                     | ,                                       | Case        | No. GM-2001-585  |
| MISSOURI GAS COMPAN                       |   |             |  |
| MISSOURI PIPELINE COM                     | 1PANY                                   |             |  |
|   |   |             |  |
|   | AFFIDAVIT OF                            | IAMES A GE  | PAV  |
| 4   | AITIDAVII OF                            | JANES A. GI | AA1  |
| STATE OF MISSOURI                         | )                                       |             |  |
|   | ) ss                                    |             |  |
| COUNTY OF COLE                            | )                                       |             |  |
|   |   |             |  |
|   | •                                       |             | that he has participated in the  |
| • • •                                     | _                                       | -           | answer form, consisting of //  |
|   |   | •           | e answers in the attached written<br>ters set forth in such answers; and |
| that such matters are true to             | · .                                     |             |  |
|   |   |             | ٨  |
|   |   | Jam         | er a Shou  |
|   |   | 1           | James A. Gray  |
|   |   | - (1-       | •  |
| Subscribed and sworn to bef               | fore me this                            | ) Th day of | August, 2001.  |
| bubblious and sworm to bor                |   | <u> </u>    | )  |
|   |   | iA          |  |
|   | DAWN L. HAK                             | i di nama   | Janua D. Lake  |
|   | Notary Public - State of County of Cole |             | Notary Public  |
| My commission expires                     | County of Con-                          | lan 9, 2005 | _  |
|   |   |             |  |

#### Gateway Pipeline Company, Inc., et al. Case No. GM-2001-585

### Summary of Cases in Which Prepared Testimony Was Submitted by James A. Gray

| Missouri Public Service Company       | GR-81-312   |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Missouri Public Service Company       | ER-82-39    |
| Missouri Public Service Company       | GR-82-194   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-82-200   |
| St. Louis County Water Company        | WR-82-249   |
| Missouri Public Service Company       | ER-83-40    |
| Kansas City Power & Light Company     | ER-83-49    |
| Osage Natural Gas Company             | GR-83-156   |
| Missouri Public Service Company       | GR-83-186   |
| The Gas Service Company               | GR-83-225   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-83-233   |
| Missouri Water Company                | WR-83-352   |
| Missouri Cities Water Company         | WR-84-51    |
| Le-Ru Telephone Company               | TR-84-132   |
| Union Electric Company                | ER-84-168   |
| Union Electric Company                | EO-85-17    |
| Kansas City Power & Light Company     | ER-85-128   |
| Great River Gas Company               | GR-85-136   |
| Missouri Cities Water Company         | WR-85-157   |
| Missouri Cities Water Company         | SR-85-158   |
| United Telephone Company of Missouri  | TR-85-179   |
| Osage Natural Gas Company             | GR-85-183   |
| Kansas City Power & Light Company     | EO-85-185   |
| ALLTEL Missouri, Inc.                 | TR-86-14    |
| Sho-Me Power Corporation              | ER-86-27    |
| Missouri-American Water Company, Inc. | WR-89-265   |
| The Empire District Electric Company  | ER-90-138   |
| Associated Natural Gas Company        | GR-90-152   |
| Missouri-American Water Company, Inc. | WR-91-211   |
| United Cities Gas Company             | GR-91-249   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-92-165   |
| St. Joseph Light & Power Company      | GR-93-42    |
| United Cities Gas Company             | GR-93-47    |
| Missouri Public Service Company       | GR-93-172   |
| Western Resources, Inc.               | GR-93-240   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-94-220   |
| United Cities Gas Company             | GR-95-160   |
| The Empire District Electric Company  | ER-95-279   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-96-193   |
| Missouri Gas Energy                   | GR-96-285   |
| Associated Natural Gas Company        | GR-97-272   |
| Union Electric Company                | GR-97-393   |
| Missouri Gas Energy                   | GR-98-140   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-98-374   |
| AmerenUE                              | GA-99-107   |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GA-99-236   |
| St. Joseph Light & Power Company      | GR-99-42    |
| Laclede Gas Company                   | GR-99-315   |
| AmerenUE                              | GR-2000-512 |
| Missouri Gas Energy                   | GR-2001-292 |
| <del></del>                           |             |

### Gateway Pipeline Company, Inc., et al. Case No. GM-2001-585

## Missouri Gas Company (MGC) and Missouri Pipeline Company (MPC)



# SCHEDULE 2-2 IS DEEMED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL IN ITS ENTIRETY

# SCHEDULE 2-3 IS DEEMED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL IN ITS ENTIRETY

### Gateway Pipeline Company, Inc. et al. Case No. GM-2001-585

#### Numbers of Customers or Services in Missouri Receiving Natural Gas Solely from Missouri Pipeline Company and Missouri Gas Company

|                           | Local Distribution Company                 | Affected              | Number of |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| Pipeline Company          | and/or Municipal System                    | Missouri Counties     | Customers |
|                           | •  |                       |           |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | Laclede Gas Company                        | Franklin County       | 3,549     |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | Fidelity Natural Gas Company               | Franklin County       | 1,191     |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Missouri Public Service - Eastern District | Gasconnade County     |           |
|                           |  | Phelps County         |           |
|                           |  | Dent County           | 4,269     |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Richland, Missouri (Municipal System)      | Pulaski County        | 300       |
|                           |  |                       |           |
|                           |  |                       |           |
|                           | 4"<br>-                                    |                       | Number of |
|                           |  |                       | Services  |
|                           |  |                       |           |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Cuba, Missouri (Municipal System)          | Crawford County       | 1,060     |
| Missouri Gas Company      | St. James, Missouri (Municipal System)     | Phelps County         | 1,035     |
| Missouri Gas Company      | St. Robert, Missouri (Municipal System)    | Pulaski County        | 390       |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Waynesville, Missouri (Municipal System)   | Pulaski County        | 565       |
|                           |  |                       |           |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Fort Leonard Wood (Omega Pipelines)        | Pulaski County        | 1,259     |
|                           |  |                       |           |
|                           | Total numbers of co                        | ustomers and services | 13,618    |

## Gateway Pipeline Company, Inc. et al. Case No. GM-2001-585

## Population Data from the 2000 U.S. Census for Counties served by Missouri Pipeline Company and Missouri Gas Company

| Pipeline Company          | County         | Population | Percent<br>Change | Housing<br>Units |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Missouri Gas Company      | Pulaski        | 41,165     | -0.3%             | 15,408           |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Phelps         | 39,825     | 13.0%             | 17,501           |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Crawford       | 22,804     | 18.9%             | 10,850           |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Dent           | 14,927     | 8.9%              | 6,994            |
| Missouri Gas Company      | Gasconnade     | 15,342     | 9.5%              | 7,813            |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | Franklin       | 93,807     | 16.4%             | 38,295           |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | St. Charles    | 283,883    | 33.4%             | 105,514          |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | St. Louis      | 1,016,315  | 2.3%              | 423,749          |
| Missouri Pipeline Company | St. Louis City | 348,189    | -12.2%            | 176,354          |