STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MIDWEST LITIGATION

USW LOCAL NO. 11-6 vs. LACLEDE GAS COMPANY

Case No. GC-2006-0060

Hearing – Volume 3

May 23, 2006

OFFICES MISSOURI I ILLINOIS KANSAS HEADQUARTERS: 711 NORTH ELEVENTH STREET, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101 800.280.3376 www.midwestlitigation.com

PSC HEARING - Vol. 3 5/23/2006

| | | r - V | 01. 3 5/23/2006 |
|---------|---|------------|--|
| | Page 413 | | Page 4 |
| 1 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Then let's go ahead | 1 | (A BREAK WAS TAKEN.) |
| 2 | | 2 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go ahead and go back |
| 3 | | 3 | on the record. Okay. We're back from our lunch break, |
| 4 | seeing panicked looks on faces, and that's the reason why | 4 | and I believe we're ready to begin with Staff's witness. |
| 5 | I'm hoping that we will wrap up today. But the | 5 | MR. SCHWARZ: Staff would call Mr. Robert |
| 6 | | 6 | Leonberger. |
| 12.0% | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 7 | (Witness sworn.) |
| | The second | | |
| 8 | | - | JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. |
| 1.50 | MR. SCHWARZ: Yes. Yes. | 9 | ROBERT LEONBERGER testified as follows: |
| 10 | | 10 | DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SCHWARZ; |
| 14 | | 11 | Q. Good afternoon. Are you the same Robert |
| 12 | | 12 | Leonberger who caused to be filed in this case some dire |
| 13 | Mr. Elbert, you had something to say? | 13 | testimony which has been marked as Exhibit 11? |
| 14 | MR. ELBERT: Just one question, your Honor. | 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | Yesterday I had offered into evidence the deposition of | 15 | Q. Do you have any corrections to that |
| 16 | Mr. Stewart, and you asked us to go back and try to find | 16 | testimony? |
| 17 | pages that were designated rather than offering the whole | 17 | A. I looked back over my testimony. I would |
| 18 | | 18 | like to clarify a possible misinterpretation. On page 8 |
| 19 | lunch. I just don't want to forget about that. | 19 | of my testimony, on lines 15 and 16, I say that the TFTO |
| 20 | JUDGE DIPPELL: This is a good time. | 20 | inspections involved inspection of customer-owned piping |
| 20 | MR. ELBERT: It turns out to be a | 21 | |
| 1450 | | | equipment, clearly the responsibility of customers. |
| 22 | relatively small portion of the transcript. | 22 | It was not my intention to convey that the |
| 23 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Very good. That makes me | 23 | TFTO inspections only involved customer-owned piping |
| 24 | happy. | 24 | equipment. TFTOs do involve inspections of customer-owned |
| 25 | MR. ELBERT: I thought it might. I don't | 25 | piping equipment that are clearly the responsibility of |
| | Page 414 | | D 41 |
| 1 | know what exhibit number that would be. | 1 | Page 41 the customers; however, the TFTO inspections also involve |
| .2 | JUDGE DIPPELL: It was Exhibit No. 22. I | 2 | inspections of company-owned piping. |
| 3 | originally marked it and it was withdrawn. We'll just go | 3 | Q. Do you have a correction? |
| .4 | ahead and leave those pages marked as 22. | .4 | A. No, I just wanted to clarify that there may |
| 5 | MR. ELBERT: Do you want to read into the | 5 | be some mischara misinterpretation. |
| | - | | |
| 6 | record what pages they are or is that | 6 | Q. Thank you. Well, with that, if I asked you |
| 7 | JUDGE DIPPELL: I think it will be clear, | 7 | the same questions as are in your testimony, would you |
| 8 | isn't it, from your copies there? Why don't you | 8 | answers be the same? |
| -*9 | distribute those? | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Exhibit No. 22 is going to be excerpts from | 10 | Q. Are those answers true and correct to the |
| 11 | the deposition of Kevin Stewart taken on May 10th, 2006. | 11 | best of your information, knowledge and belief? |
| 12 | MS. SCHRODER: And, your Honor, I would | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | just request the right to supplement that when we review | 13 | MR. SCHWARZ: With that, I would move the |
| 14 | what he has put in, if we think there's anything | 14 | admission of Exhibit 11 and tender the witness for cross. |
| 15 | misleading. | 15 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any |
| 16 | JUDGE DIPPELL: We'll just let you all | 16 | objection to Exhibit No. 11? |
| 17 | review this, and we'll actually take objections and stuff | 17 | |
| 18 | | | MS. SCHRODER: No objection from the Union. |
| | later when we get back from our lunch break. | 18 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Then I will admit Exhibit |
| 19 | MS. SCHRODER: All right. Thank you. | 19 | No. 11 into evidence. |
| 20 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other matters | 20 | (EXHIBIT NO. 11 WAS RECEIVED INTO |
| 21 | we need to take up before we adjourn for lunch? | 21 | EVIDENCE.) |
| 22 | All right. Seeing none, then, we'll take a | 22 | JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Is there |
| 23 | break until 1 o'clock. We can go off the record. | 23 | cross-examination from Laclede? |
| 24 | (EXHIBIT NO. 22 WAS MARKED FOR | 24 | MR. ZUCKER: Yes, your Honor. |
| 25 | IDENTIFICATION BY THE REPORTER.) | 25 | CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZUCKER: |
| | LEGATION DT THE REPORTER. | 23 | CRUSS-LANTINATION DT MK, ZUCKEK |
| Million | ana ana amin'ny tanàna mandritra mandritra dia kaominina dia kaominina dia kaominina dia kaominina dia kaominin | 1001 W 107 | na kana kana kana kana kana kana kana k |

33 (Pages 413 to 416)

www.midwestlitigation.com

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

- Vol 3 5/23/2006 10

| Vol. 3 5/23/2006 |
|--|
| Page 423 |
| 1 meter reading. |
| 2 Q. And is that the reason, then? They're just |
| a there for a special meter reading? |
| A motor meter reading is one of the |
| |
| 5 exceptions. 6 Q. And why is that an exception? |
| l we shapped the rule to require certain |
| 7 A. We changed the full to require the requirements would be made, and we 8 times that the these requirements would be made, and we |
| 8 times that the these requirements much believe that |
| 9 had a list of exceptions for those, and we believe that 9 had a list of exceptions for those, and we believe that |
| 10 was one of them. It wasn't a customer service call. 11 was one of them. It wasn't a customer service call. |
| 10 Was one of them. It means service call, then we put 11 First the rule said customer service call, then we put |
| 12 exceptions in there for various items. |
| Okay So in your opinion, there's no need |
| the affect what would be similar to a IPIO |
| 14 to do, in effect, what iteration is a second property to read the 15 inspection while on the customer property to read the |
| 16 meter? |
| well not TETO inspection, but the |
| to requirements in 14B-6. |
| MD ZUCKED OKAV. THAT'S all I have, your |
| |
| 20 Honor. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Public Counsel? |
| TO DOCTON: Yesh |
| 22 MR. POSTON. Tean. |
| 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON: 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON: 24 Q. Good afternoon. Mr. Leonberger, it's your |
| 24 Q. Good atternoon. Mr. Leonberger, for |
| 25 position that there's no safety justification for |
| |
| Page 424 |
| 22 1 requiring TFTO inspections or annual inside meter reads; |
| 2 is that correct? |
| a A Correct. |
| And you were here during the Union |
| The second who testified about safety hazards found as a |
| the start start start and TETO inspections, contest. |
| - during the testimony, yes. |
| and the start testimony changed any position |
| to taken in this case? |
| the van similar to what was in the |
| 1. |
| 11 written testimony. 12 Q. And can you please explain where the |
| 12 Q. And can you please explain that is a company-owned equipment stops and the customer-owned is company-owned equipment stops in a complex dynalling with |
| 13 company-owned equipment stops and the customers 14 equipment begins on a typical single-family dwelling with |
| |
| 15 a single meter? |
| a 16 A. It ends at the outlet of the meter. |
| a 16 A. It finds at the bulk of the bulk of the meter from 17 Q. So the piping going out of the meter from |
| 18 that point on is customer what you would can |
| 19 customer-owned equipment? |
| The regulations say it ends at the outlet |
| 20 A. The regulations say it clieb at an a |
| 21 meter |
| 21 meter. |
| 21 meter. 22 Q. Would you agree that where there's a 23 transfer of service due to a new Laclede customer comin |
| er 21 meter. 22 Q. Would you agree that where there's a 23 transfer of service due to a new Laclede customer comin 24 into a home or coming into a rental unit that's already |
| 21 meter. |
| |

35 (Pages 421 to 424)

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

Fax: 314.644.1334

PSC HEARING - Vol. 3 5/23/2006

| | · | | 20 Annual and the colorest is constructed as a subject to a subject |
|------|---|-------------|---|
| | Page 533 | | Page 53: |
| 1 | considerably less than that. It's rare to find anything | 1 | sent to me. I received nothing of significance. No |
| 2 | of substance. | 2 | Class 1 leaks were turned in, you know, nothing like that. |
| 3 | Occasionally, the most common thing is I | 3 | And the number of hazards that were found were relatively |
| 4 | think Mr. Hendricks testified caps missing from ranges. | 4 | small. And I specifically don't know the number, but it |
| 5 | The gas is off, there's no flow, but there's a flex | 5 | was a couple months, and it was just raw numbers, just |
| 6 | connector or a valve that needs a cap put on it. In and | 6 | check off how many hazards came in versus how many TFTOs |
| 7 | of itself, I'm not sure how much of a hazard that | 7 | were done. |
| 8 | constitutes, but we do our procedures do require them | 8 | Q. And when you were doing that, were you |
| 9 | to cap it. | 9 | looking just at the Form 627? |
| 10 | Q. If the cap's off, isn't it isn't it true | 10 | A. I believe we did 626s and 627s, the notice |
| 11 | that that's more likely to develop a leak? | 11 | of code violations. |
| 12 | A. Only if you've had only if the valve is | 12 | Q. So you looked at notice of code violations |
| 13 | bad. You've got to have the cap off and the valve bad. | 13 | and hazard reports? |
| 14 | Q. All right. What is your estimation of the | 14 | A. Correct. |
| 15 | percentage of time percentage of times that a hazard is | 15 | Q. So you didn't look at the CIS forms that |
| 16 | found in a TFTO inspection? | 16 | would show if they fixed it on the spot or the reports of |
| 17 | A. I would suggest something less than 5. | 17 | leak or the referrals to the C&M or street department; is |
| 18 | Q. Than 5 percent? | 18 | that right? |
| 19 | A. That's correct. | 19 | A. The 712s would have been included in there, |
| 20 | Q. And have you reviewed hazard tickets to | 20 | in what they sent me. I didn't receive any, but that |
| 21 | come to that conclusion? | 21 | would have been one of the forms they would have sent me. |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | They wouldn't have sent me the 626 or I'm sorry the |
| 23 | Q. Did you review, for instance, all the | 23 | 686. |
| 24 | hazard tickets for 2005? | 24 | Q. Or the CIS? |
| 25 | A. I don't know specifically the time frame | 25 | A. Or the CIS form. |
| 1 | Page 534 that I reviewed, but we've watched as we're preparing for | 1 | Page 536 Q. Would you agree that hazards that were |
| | contemplating TFTOs going away as part of AMR coming into | 2 | referred to, that hazards from TFTOs could have been |
| 3 | place, we just kind of did a casual, not a sophisticated | 3 | referred to the street department on Form 686s? |
| 4 | survey, you know, just kind of monitored things that were | 4 | A. No, I would not agree with that. The |
| 5 | coming in, hazards and things of that nature, and found it | 5 | 686 form is not necessarily for hazards. Things we refer |
| 6 | to be relatively low and significantly minor. | 6 | to the C&M with regard to hazards would typically be |
| 7 | Q. Because we were told in this case that | 7 | leaks. That would be a 712 form. 686 form is typically |
| 8 | Laclede had approximately 79,000 hazard tickets in 2005 I | 8 | for brackets loose where the meter needs to be refastened |
| 9 | think that resulted from TFTOs. | 9 | to the wall, the riser sunk somewhat and needs to be |
| 10 | MS. SCHRODER: And I will count on Rick. | 10 | raised up, the lock cock, the ear on the lock cock has |
| 11 | Is that correct? | 11 | been sheered off and needs to be replaced. That would be |
| 12 | MR. ZUCKER: The number 79,000 that I | 12 | not necessarily what we would constitute as a hazard per |
| 13 | remember is the number of TFTO orders that we did in 2005. | 13 | se. |
| 14 | MS. SCHRODER: All right. Thank you. | 14 | Q. What do you constitute as a hazard? |
| 15 | BY MS. SCHRODER: | 15 | A. Something that's imminently dangerous or |
| 16 | Q. There were approximately 79,000 TFTOs in | 16 | potentially dangerous. Depending on imminently dangerous |
| 17 | 2005, and that that was too burdensome to produce to the | 17 | requires on the CID side 627, the hazard form, it's a red |
| | Union. Did you look at a smaller sampling? | 18 | tag, potentially dangerous, the 626, the code violation |
| . 19 | A. As to? | 19 | form, or a 712 if it's a leak. |
| 20 | Q. Time period. Did you look at a smaller | . 20 | Q. And those things could also have been |
| 21 | time period or did you just do what you said was a casual | 21 | picked up and fixed on a customer and then reported on a |
| | survey? | 22 | customer information system form; is that correct? |
| 23 | A. For a couple of months, as those came in, | 23 | A. If a repair was made, correct. |
| 24 | we just kind of tracked raw numbers of hazards that were | 24 | Q. Would you agree that in performing a TFTO |
| | | | |
| 25 | coming in, and then anything of significance I asked to be | 25 | that a service person, in addition to the other things |

63 (Pages 533 to 536)

www.midwestlitigation.com

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

Fax: 314.644.1334