

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of the Application of Laclede Gas)
Company to Change its Infrastructure System) **Case No. GO-2016-0196**
Replacement Surcharge in its Laclede Gas Service)
Territory)

In The Matter of the Application of Laclede Gas)
Company to Change its Infrastructure System) **Case No. GO-2016-0197**
Replacement Surcharge in its Missouri Gas Energy)
Service Territory)

**MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF OPC WITNESS CHARLES R. HYNEMAN**

COMES NOW Laclede Gas Company (“Laclede”), on behalf of its two Missouri operating units, Laclede Gas (“Laclede Gas”) and Missouri Gas Energy (“MGE”), and files this motion to strike questions and answers in the rebuttal testimony of OPC witness Charles R. Hyneman (the “Hyneman Rebuttal”) and, in support thereof, states as follows:

1. The Hyneman Rebuttal states that it is responding to the Direct Testimony of Laclede witness Glenn W. Buck (“Buck Direct”). Laclede moves to strike 15 questions and answers in the Hyneman Rebuttal on the grounds that they are not appropriate matters for rebuttal testimony in that they do not rebut the Buck Direct.

2. A timeline of relevant events is as follows:

February 1	Laclede and MGE file ISRS Applications
April 1	Staff files its Recommendation in both cases.
April 11	OPC files motion for an evidentiary hearing on the issue of updating pro forma ISRS costs. OPC acknowledges that the issue and argument is the same or similar to that raised by OPC in the last Laclede and MGE ISRS cases.
April 12	Commission issues Procedural Schedule
April 18	Direct Testimony Filed.
April 21	Issues List and Position Statements filed on updating issue.
April 21	Rebuttal Testimony Filed

3. The Buck Direct filed on April 18 did nothing other than sponsor the Company's February 1 applications and declare Laclede's agreement with the April 1 Staff Recommendations. The Applications have been available since February 1. If OPC sought to question the applications, it should have done so no later than the 60 day recommendation period afforded to Staff in the ISRS statute. Instead, OPC's motion for evidentiary hearing and its direct testimony focused on the only issue it raised in this case, which is the updating process.

4. The Hyneman Rebuttal contains 15 substantive questions and answers beginning with the last question, on line 14 at the bottom of page one. None of these questions and answers delve into topics raised in the Buck Direct. For example, the first question addresses whether ISRS replacements were used and useful, an argument raised by OPC in its direct, but not by Laclede in the Buck Direct. The Hyneman Rebuttal then proceeds to address the following issues: a trend of increasing ISRS costs, an assertion that 60 days is not enough to perform an ISRS audit, and a comparison of Laclede Gas work orders to MGE work orders. None of these matters were raised in the Buck Direct, so they cannot and do not respond to the Buck Direct. Moreover, they were all matters that could have been raised by OPC in direct testimony.

5. As a result, Laclede requests that the Commission strike 15 questions and answers in the Hyneman Rebuttal, beginning with the question at page 1, line 14, and ending with the answer concluding on page 9, line 10.

Respectfully Submitted,

LACLEDE GAS COMPANY

/s/ Rick Zucker

Rick Zucker #49210

Associate General Counsel

720 Olive Street

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

(314) 342-0533 (Phone)

(314) 421-1979 (FAX)

rick.zucker@[thelacledegroup.com](mailto:rick.zucker@thelacledegroup.com)

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that copies of the above and foregoing document were sent by electronic mail on this 22nd day of April, 2016 to counsel of record.

/s/ Rick Zucker