BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company's Proposed Rebate Tariff Sheet Filing <u>Case No. GT-2017-</u> Tariff No. JG-2017-0151

MOTION TO SUSPEND OR REJECT TARIFF AND MOTION FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission and for its *Motion to Suspend or Reject Tariff and Motion for Expedited Treatment* ("Motion") respectfully states as follows:

1. On January 23, 2017, Laclede Gas Company ("Laclede" or "Company") filed <u>P.S.C. MO. No. 5 Consolidated, Second Revised Sheet No. R-46-b</u>, with a proposed effective date of February 22, 2017. This filing was assigned Tariff Tracking No. JG-2017-0151. Laclede filed a substitute tariff sheet in the JG-2017-0151 file on February 8, 2017, a copy of which is attached hereto.

2. Laclede's tariff sheet filing constitutes a "promotional practice" as that term is defined by 4 CSR 240-14.010(6). Pursuant to the Commission's requirements for promotional practices, no gas utility shall offer a promotional practice until a tariff filing has been made with the Commission.

3. The Commission's rules governing gas utility promotional practices also require the utility demonstrate that promotional practices such as the proposed tariff sheet are cost-effective. See 4 CSR 240-3.255(2)(B) and 4 CSR 240-14.010.

4. Laclede has not demonstrated that all of the new or revised rebate provisions on its proposed revised tariff sheet are cost-effective demand side resources. More specifically, the proposed new rebate in the commercial portfolio for "Gas storage

water heater greater than or equal to 20 gallons and less than or equal to 55 gallons" does not appear to have been analyzed using the cost-effectiveness tests.

5. Since the Company has not demonstrated that all of the new or revised rebates on its proposed revised tariff sheet are cost-effective, the tariff sheet should either be rejected or suspended for the maximum suspension period in order to allow the Company to demonstrate that all of the proposed new rebates are cost-effective.

Motion for Expedited Treatment

6. Because the tariff sheet at issue has a proposed effective date of February 22, 2017, pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.080(14) Staff requests the Commission act to either reject or suspend the tariff sheet effective no later than February 21, 2017. This will prevent a potentially non-cost-effective promotional practice from going into effect, and should have no negative effect since currently approved practices will remain in effect. This pleading was filed as soon as it could have been given the number of other cases currently on Staff's schedule.

WHEREFORE Staff respectfully requests that the Commission issue an order with an effective date no later than February 21, 2017, rejecting or suspending Laclede's tariff filing <u>P.S.C. MO. No. 5 Consolidated, Second Revised Sheet No. R-46-b</u>, Tariff Tracking No. JG-2017-0151, for the maximum suspension period.

2

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey A. Keevil

Jeffrey A. Keevil #33825 Deputy Counsel Attorney for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 526-4887 (Telephone) (573) 751-9285 (Fax) Email: jeff.keevil@psc.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed, hand-delivered, or transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail to counsel of record this 14th day of February, 2017.

<u>/s/ Jeffrey A. Keevil</u>

P.S.C. MO. No. 5 Consolidated Second Revised Sheet No. R-46-b CANCELLING P.S.C. MO. No. 5 Consolidated, First Revised Sheet R-46-b Schedules

Laclede Gas Company

For

Community, Town or City

.....

Refer to Sheet No. R-1

Name of Issuing Corporation or Municipality

.....

RULES AND REGULATIONS

.....

35. Conservation and Energy Efficiency Programs (continued)

| eater than or equal to and less than 92% AFUE* eater than or equal to and less than 92% TE** eater than or equal to and less than 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 92% AFUE* eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** eater than or equal to 82% TE** | \$2.50 per MBH \$3.00 per MBH \$1.75 per MBH 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to \$100 per steam trap | |
|---|---|--|
| and less than 92% TE** eater than or equal to and less than 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 92% AFUE* eater than or equal to 92% TE** eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | \$3.00 per MBH \$1.75 per MBH 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| and less than 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 92% AFUE* eater than or equal to 92% TE** eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | \$1.75 per MBH 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| 92% AFUE* eater than or equal to 92% TE** eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | \$1.75 per MBH 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| 92% TE** eater than or equal to 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | \$1.75 per MBH 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| 92% CE*** eater than or equal to 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| 82% AFUE* eater than or equal to 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| 82% TE** rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| trap considered efficiency improvement | replacement or rebuild kit, up to | |
| ron ronlocoment or rehald | | |
| rap replacement or rebuild trap considered efficiency improvement | 50% of the equipment cost for trap replacement or rebuild kit, up to \$200 per steam trap | |
| er installation considered iciency improvement | 50% of equipment cost or \$500 cap per boiler, whichever is lower | |
| er installation considered iciency improvement. | 50% of equipment cost or \$500 cap per boiler, whichever is lower | |
| eater than or equal to 0.82 EF**** | \$300 | |
| eater than or equal to 0.67 EF**** | \$200 | |
| eater than or equal to 90% TE** | \$450 | |
| | er installation considered iciency improvement er installation considered iciency improvement. eater than or equal to 0.82 EF**** eater than or equal to 0.67 EF**** | |

| DATE OF ISSUE | January 23, 2017 | | | DATE EFFECTIVE | February 22, 2017 | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|---|
| | Month | Day | Year | | Month | Day | Year | |
| ISSUED BY | | | - Regulatory an | nd Governmental Affairs | , 700 Marl | ket, St. Lo | uis, Mo. 6310 | 1 |
| | Name of (| | Title | | Address | | | |