

Service Commission

Exhibit No.: Issues: Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared:

Tariff Thomas M. Imhoff MO PSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony GT-2009-0056 August 19, 2009

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

THOMAS M. IMHOFF

LACLEDE GAS COMPANY

CASE NO. GT-2009-0056

Jefferson City, Missouri August 2009

Exhibit No. GC Case No(s). GT -1.0009 - 0056 Date 10/8/09 Rptr MM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company's) Tariff Revision Designed to Clarify its) Liability for Damages Occuring on) Customer Piping and Equipment Beyond) the Company's Meter)

Case No. GT-2009-0056

AFFIDAVIT OF THOMAS M. IMHOFF

STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss COUNTY OF COLE)

Than M. Sont

Thomas M. Imhoff

Subscribed and sworn to before me this $18^{4/2}$ day of August, 2009.



SUSAN L. SUNDERMEYER My Commission Expires September 21, 2010 Callaway County Commission #06942086

Notary Public

1 2	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
3	OF
4	THOMAS M. IMHOFF
6 7	LACLEDE GAS COMPANY
8 9	CASE NO. GT-2009-0056
10 11	
12	Q. Please state your name and business address.
13	A. Thomas M. Imhoff, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
14	Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
15	A. I am the Rate & Tariff Examination Supervisor in the Energy Department of
16	the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission).
17	Q. Please describe your educational background.
18	A. I attended Southwest Missouri State University in Springfield, Missouri, where
19	I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration, with a major in
20	Accounting, in May 1981. In May 1987, I successfully completed the Uniform Certified
21	Public Accountant (CPA) examination and subsequently received the CPA certificate. I am
22	currently licensed as a CPA in the State of Missouri.
23	Q. What has been the nature of your duties with the Commission?
24	A. From October 1981 to December 1997, I worked in the Accounting
25	Department of the Commission, where my duties consisted of directing and assisting with
26	various audits and examinations of the books and records of public utilities operating within
27	the State of Missouri under the jurisdiction of the Commission. On January 5, 1998, I
28	assumed the position of Regulatory Auditor IV in the Gas Tariffs/Rate Design Department,
29	where my duties consisted of analyzing applications, reviewing tariffs and making

1.

Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas M. Imhoff

- Į

1	recommendations based upon those evaluations. On August 9, 2001, I assumed the position		
2	of Rate & Tariff Examination Supervisor in the Energy Tariffs/Rate Design Department,		
3	where my duties consist of directing Commission Staff within the Department, analyzing		
4	applications, reviewing tariffs, and making recommendations based upon my evaluations and		
5	the evaluations performed by Staff within the Department.		
6	Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission?		
7	A. Yes. A list of cases in which I have filed testimony before this Commission is		
8	attached as Schedule 1 to my Rebuttal Testimony.		
9	Q. What is the nature of your Rebuttal Testimony?		
10	A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to address the Direct Testimony of		
11	Laclede Gas Company (Laclede or Company) witness David P. Abernathy relating to		
12	Lacede's liability tariff language.		
13	Q. On page 4, lines 5 through 14, Mr. Abernathy states that a number of		
14	discussions were held concerning this language. Is he correct?		
15	A. Yes. Staff, Laclede and the Office of the Public Counsel (OPC) held numerous		
16	discussions over a six-month period. Based on those discussions and Laclede's responses to		
17	7 its Data Requests, Staff has analyzed the information provided by Laclede. As a result, Staff		
18	has considered this information and suggested changes to Laclede's liability language during		
19	9 our tariff review process over the last six months. Staff's suggested changes are reflected in		
20	Mr. Abernathy's Schedule 1. Staff agrees that the proposed tariff language in Schedule 1 is		
21	acceptable to Staff.		
22	Staff views this tariff language as reasonable and in the public interest of all Laclede's		
23	customers. The proposed tariff language is designed and intended to protect the rights of all		

2

Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas M. Imhoff

Laclede customers as a whole, as well as the individual customer and Laclede. Staff is of the
 opinion that this language reasonably balances the interests of all concerned parties.

Q. Has Staff received the requested information from Laclede as Mr. Abernathy
alludes to on page 4, lines 16 through 18?

Yes. The requested information was supplied to Staff. That information 5 Α. provided Staff the ability to analyze various unregulated providers' warranties of similar 6 services. The warranty period proposed by Laclede is reasonable based upon the information 7 provided to Staff for the equipment repair/inspection services identified in the tariff. In its 8 response to Staff Data Request No. 1, Laclede provided information that resulted in a claim or 9 case for damages from 2000 to present. The type of information provided by the Company 10 included, but was not limited to, the name of the claimant, date of injury or damage, nature of 11 claim for damages and a description of the resolution of the case by settlement or 12 13 verdict/judgment including amounts paid to the claimant.

Laclede's response to Staff Data Request No. 2 provided a definition of the term 14 distribution equipment and support for the difference in winter period for the proposed 15 liability tariff as compared to the winter period for rates. Laclede represented to Staff that the 16 Company agrees that the winter period should be the same for both tariff sheets. Laclede's 17 response to Staff Data Request No. 3 provided support for the length of time guarantees for 18 workmanship and parts that included information from non-regulated HVAC companies. 19 Laclede also provided a checklist used for real estate inspections, and for reconnecting gas 20 21 service.

22

Q.

What is your recommendation concerning Mr. Abernathy's Schedule 1?

Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas M. Imhoff

- A. Staff recommends the Commission approve the proposed liability tariff
 language identified in Mr. Abernathy's Schedule 1 to his Direct Testimony.
- Q. Does Staff have further recommendations concerning this proposed tariff
 language or concerns relating to the cost-benefit support of this proposed tariff?

5 Yes. Staff would recommend the Commission permit Laclede to implement Α. 6 this tariff on an experimental basis to sunset three years from the effective date of the tariff. 7 Staff further recommends the Commission direct Laclede to perform certain reporting 8 requirements prior to the end of the three-year period. Those reporting requirements should 9 include but not be limited to, a list and description of the lawsuits and the amount of avoided 10 costs resulting from the implementation of the proposed tariff. This would allow an 11: appropriate length of time for the Company to evaluate whether the proposed liability 12 language achieves its intended purpose of reducing legal and related settlement costs that are 13 paid by all of Laclede's customers. This report is intended to help the Commission determine 14 whether the proposed tariff should continue or expire.

15

Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?

16 A. Yes it does.

LACLEDE GAS COMPANY CASE NO. GT-2009-0056

2

i

÷

Summary of Cases in which prepared testimony was presented by: THOMAS M. IMHOFF

Company Name	<u>Case No.</u>
Terre-Du-Lac Utilities	SR-82-69
Terre-Du-Lac Utilities	WR-82-70
Bowling Green Gas Company	GR-82-104
Atlas Mobilfone Inc.	TR-82-123
Missouri Edison Company	GR-82-197
Missouri Edison Company	ER-82-198
Great River Gas Company	GR-82-235
Citizens Electric Company	ER-83-61
General Telephone Company of the Midwest	TR-83-164
Missouri Telephone Company	TR-83-334
Mobilpage Inc.	TR-83-350
Union Electric Company	ER-84-168
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-85-16
Great River Gas Company	GR-85-136
Grand River Mutual Telephone Company	TR-85-242
ALLTEL Missouri, Inc.	TR-86-14
Continental Telephone Company	TR-86-55
General Telephone Company of the Midwest	TC-87-57
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	GR-88-115
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	HR-88-116
Camelot Utilities, Inc.	WA-89-1
GTE North Incorporated	TR-89-182
The Empire District Electric Company	ER-90-138
Capital Utilities, Inc.	SA-90-224
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	EA-90-252
Kansas City Power & Light Company	EA-90-252
Sho-Me Power Corporation	ER-91-298
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	EC-92-214
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	ER-93-41
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	GR-93-42
Citizens Telephone Company	TR-93-268
The Empire District Electric Company	ER-94-174
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-95-205
Missouri-American Water Company	SR-95-206
Union Electric Company	EM-96-149
The Empire District Electric Company	ER-97-81
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-98-140
Laclede Gas Company	GR-98-374
Laclede Gas Company	GR-99-315
Atmos Energy Corporation	GM-2000-312
Ameren UE	GR-2000-512
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-2001-292
Laclede Gas Company	GT-2001-329
Lutitue Ous Company	Scher
	Sched

Laclede Gas Company	GR-2001-629
Missouri Gas Energy	GT-2003-0033
Aquila Networks – L&P	GT-2003-0038
Aquila Networks – MPS	GT-2003-0039
Southern Missouri Gas Company, L.P.	GT-2003-0031
Fidelity Natural Gas, Inc.	GT-2003-0036
Atmos Energy Corporation	GT-2003-0037
Laclede Gas Company	GT-2003-0032
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren UE	GT-2003-0034
Laclede Gas Company	GT-2003-0117
Aquila Nerworks MPS & L&P	GR-2004-0072
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-2004-0209
Missouri Pipeline Company & Missouri Gas Company	GC-2006-0491
Atmos Energy Corporation	GR-2006-0387
Laclede Gas Company	GR-2007-0208
Missouri Gas Utility Company	GR-2008-0060
TriGen-Kansas City Energy Group	HR-2008-0300

··· – ·

, " |

Т

1

Т

Т

;
