Exhibit No.: Issue: ** ___

Witness: David M. Sommerer

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Case No.: GR-2004-0273

Date Testimony Prepared: November 30, 2006

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY **OF DAVID M. SOMMERER**

LACLEDE GAS COMPANY **CASE NO. GR-2004-0273**

> Jefferson City, Missouri November 2006

^{**} Denotes Highly Confidential Information **

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the PGA Company.	A filing for Laclede C	Gas))	Case No. GR	k-2004-0273
AFI	FIDAVIT OF DAVID	M. SOMMER	RER	
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss.)			
David M. Sommerer, of preparation of the foregon consisting of <u>j </u> page foregoing Surrebuttal Test matters set forth in such an his knowledge and belief.	oing Surrebuttal Test es to be presented in t timony were given b	imony in que the above case by him; that it natters are true	estion and an se; that the ans he has knowle	nswer form, swers in the edge of the to the best of
Subscribed and sworn to be	efore me thi s 29 day	y of <u>Mole</u>	Mber	_2004
NOTARY ASHLE	Y M. HARRISON mission Expires	V 1, 0,00	, last	Mario

August 31, 2010
Cole County
Commission #06898978

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
3	OF
4	DAVID M. SOMMERER
5	LACLEDE GAS COMPANY
6	CASE NO. GR-2004-0273
7	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1
8	** **
9	RELIABILITY4
10	A FORMAL STUDY5
11	LACLEDE'S RATIONALE BEYOND THE STUDIES6
12	MR. GODAT'S CRITISM OF STAFF'S PROPOSED DISALLOWANCE
13	LACLEDE'S STUDIES, ADDITIONAL FLAWS9
14	LIST OF SCHEDULES:
15	Schedule 1: Highly Confidential Data Request 111
16	Schedule 2: Highly Confidential Staff's calculation of the error

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		DAVID M. SOMMERER
4		LACLEDE GAS COMPANY
5		CASE NO. GR-2004-0273
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	A.	David M. Sommerer, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Mo. 65102.
8	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
9	A.	I am the Manager of the Procurement Analysis Department with the Missouri
10	Public Service	e Commission.
11	Q.	Are you the same David M. Sommerer that filed direct and rebuttal testimony
12	in this case?	
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
15	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of Laclede
16	Gas Company	(Laclede, Company) witness George E. Godat.
17	<u>EXECUTIVI</u>	E SUMMARY
18	Q.	Please provide an executive summary of your testimony.
19	A.	My direct testimony recommends an adjustment because Laclede paid
20	excessive **	
21		** without evaluating the cost of this practice. Laclede should have re-

	Surrebuttal Testimony of David M. Sommerer
1	evaluated this practice when the **
2	**
3	In his rebuttal, Mr. Godat mischaracterizes my direct testimony. Mr. Godat implies
4	that it is quite common for LDCs to price ** ** In point of
5	fact, it would be extremely difficult to identify a reliable breakdown of how **
6	** is priced nationally. Mr. Godat quickly dismisses the practices in Missouri and
7	cites an AGA study from July 2005 for the 2004-2005 winter heating season which simply
8	says that FOM index pricing is a prevailing practice. The AGA study says nothing about
9	whether the FOM pricing is for ** **
10	Additionally, it makes no comments evaluating the cost of the **
11	** ** ** It is these costs, which have become excessive, that
12	are the reason for Staff's adjustment recommendation.
13	Mr. Godat incorrectly characterizes Staff's adjustment as being inconsistent with
14	reliable procurement practices. Apparently, Laclede deems any gas purchasing practices
15	other than those contained in its flawed studies to be improper by its argument of long-
16	standing practice. Laclede fails to consider using its **
17	
18	
19	** it is totally consistent with economically dispatching supply while
20	managing the overall supply portfolio during the winter months to address reliability.
21	Q. Do you agree with Mr. Godat that informal processes may be substituted for
22	actual current studies of its practices?

** It is simply a
factor that should be considered when establishing that there is a valid alternative to Laclede's
practice.
With regard to the 2005 AGA study that Mr. Godat cites, a study that pertains to a
winter after this ACA period, it is plain to see that the quote he uses merely says that
** **
The July 2004 AGA report, LDC Supply Portfolio Management during the 2003-2004 Winter
Heating Season, which is the report that summarizes the winter period in question in this case
states **
**
RELIABILITY
Q. Mr. Godat spends pages 3 through 5, of his testimony discussing variou
constraints on Laclede's system. Is this discussion relevant?

1	A. No. Mr. Godat misses the point. The Staff is not asserting that the Company
2	could have used ** ** Nor is
3	the Staff suggesting that some other level of **
4	
5	
6	
7	**
0	A DODMAL CTUDY
8	A FORMAL STUDY
9	Q. Do you agree with Mr. Godat's pronouncement on page 6 of his rebuttal
10	testimony that a formal study was neither a necessary nor appropriate prerequisite to
11	continuing ** **
12	A. No. The outdated ** ** are so
13	difficult to support that Laclede merely uses them as an aside or as insurance in case some of
14	the other more intangible rationale fails. In fact the ** **
15	Weather can impact the price of natural gas and since weather changes from year to year, it is
16	not appropriate to consider whether or not ** ** is appropriate
17	given only one year's weather. Notably, footnote references in the **
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

	**	
Furth	nermore, inclusion of **	
***	The method Laclede's studies	s use is to claim "savings" anytime the **
**		
LACLEDE ²	'S RATIONALE BEYOND TH	HE STUDIES
Q.	What do you mean by other "i	'intangible rationale"?
A.	It is apparent that Mr. Godat	is hedging his support of Laclede's studies.
studies were	not provided in his direct or reb	buttal testimony. I provided them. Faced with
flaws in the	ose studies, a laundry list of ra	rationale is provided by Laclede on why it
somehow se	elf-evident that **	** T
rationales ar	re interwoven on pages 6 throu	ugh 8 of his rebuttal testimony. The practic
**	** is referred to	as "long-standing". Yes, Laclede has gene
**		
	,	

	Surrebuttal Testimony of David M. Sommerer
1	Granted, reliability is critical, but references to its importance do not take away from
2	Laclede's obligation to use **
3	**
4	MR. GODAT'S CRITISM OF STAFF'S PROPOSED DISALLOWANCE
5	Q. Has Mr. Godat criticized the Staffs analysis of damages?
6	A. Yes. On page 9, of his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Godat criticizes the damage
7	calculation in three ways. He seems to think that the Staff should use the five years prior to
8	the 2003-2004 period to evaluate damages. The Staff's analysis, by necessity, has to assess
9	whether any damages were actually incurred for the 2003-2004 period. In some instances
10	there can be a faulty decision, for example, **
11	**, there is no disallowance. However, in this case, after the
12	Staff recognized that Laclede's main support was a **
13	
14	
15	** (See
16	Sommerer Direct Schedule 4), Staff's assessment shows that damages occurred in the ACA
17	period.
18	Q. What do you mean by saying the ** ** was offered up as the
19	main support for Laclede's decision?
20	A. In my direct testimony, Schedule 4, I provided the Data Request that asked for
21	Laclede's cost benefit analysis ** ** The question and answer is provided
22	in part as follows from Sommerer Direct Schedule 4-4:

	Surrebuttal Testimony of David M. Sommerer
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	**
8 9 10 11 12	**
13	As time has passed, the Company has added to the support for its decision.
14	Q. Does Mr. Godat raise other rationalizations for why there should not be a
15	disallowance?
16	A. Mr. Godat says that the Staff focused only on the ** ** That
17	is correct. The adjustment is related to **
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	**
25	The final criticism of the Staff's calculation is that it somehow failed to give a credit
26	for net revenues from off-system sales. Such a credit is unsupportable and would be totally
27	speculative. The questions include:

Surrebuttal T David M. So	
1)	Had Laclede chosen a **
	**
2)	**
	**
3)	**
	**
I ACI FDF'	S STUDIES, ADDITIONAL FLAWS
	Mr. Godat continues to extol the virtues of Laclede's studies on page 9,
	Do you have other comments regarding these studies?
	Yes. Laclede was unable to produce the underlying data and source
_	** That meant the key formulas could not be
viewed or ea	sily be tested or verified by the Staff. It was also difficult to construct scenarios
from the stud	dies in that much of the information had to be reentered by the Staff to analyze
Laclede's int	formation.
Based	d upon some higher level review of the studies, it became clear that the 2005
	David M. So 1) 2) LACLEDE' Q. lines 4-14. If A. information viewed or ea from the stuck Laclede's information Based

	**
Q.	Is there an additional flaw in the Laclede studies?
A.	Yes, the way the studies have been constructed, **
	** but some much lesser amount that do
eflect the c	urrent ** **
Q.	Do you see any inconsistency, as Mr. Godat notes on page 11, in
conclusions	about off-system sales?
A.	No. Staff believes that Laclede's use **
	**
Q.	Do you agree with or understand Mr. Godat's consternation abo

	Surrebuttal Testimony of David M. Sommerer	
1	A. No. Mr. Godat explains that LER **	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		**
9	Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?	
10	Λ Vec	

SCHEDULE ONE HAS BEEN DEEMED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL IN ITS ENTIRETY

SCHEDULE TWO HAS BEEN DEEMED HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL IN ITS ENTIRETY