Exhibit No.: Issue(s): Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.:

General Information and Miscellaneous Natelle Dietrich MoPSC Staff Surrebuttal Testimony GR-2017-0215 and GR-2017-0216 November 21, 2017

Date Testimony Prepared:

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

NATELLE DIETRICH

SPIRE MISSOURI, INC., d/b/a SPIRE

LACLEDE GAS COMPANY and MISSOURI GAS ENERGY GENERAL RATE CASE

CASE NOS. GR-2017-0215 AND GR-2017-0216

Jefferson City, Missouri November 2017

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		NATELLE DIETRICH
4		SPIRE MISSOURI INC. d/b/a SPIRE
5 6		LACLEDE GAS COMPANY and MISSOURI GAS ENERGY GENERAL RATE CASE
7		CASE NOS. GR-2017-0215 & GR-2017-0216
8	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
9	А.	My name is Natelle Dietrich. My business address is 200 Madison Street,
10	Jefferson City	, Missouri 65110.
11	Q.	Are you the same Natelle Dietrich that previously filed Direct Testimony as
12	part of Staff	's Direct Class Cost of Service Report on September 22, 2017, and filed
13	Rebuttal Testi	mony on October 17, 2017?
14	А.	Yes I am.
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
16	А.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the October 27, 2017,
17	rebuttal testim	nonies of LAC/MGE witness Shaylyn Dean; Missouri Department of Economic
18	Development	- Division of Energy ("DE") witness Martin R. Hyman, and National Housing
19	Trust witness	Annika Brink, as those testimonies relate to continuation of Laclede Gas
20	Company ("L	AC")/Missouri Gas Energy ("MGE") energy efficiency programs; funding of
21	the programs	and the energy efficiency collaborative ("EEC").
22	Q.	Mr. Dean, Mr. Hyman, and Ms. Brink generally express concerns with
23	The Office of	the Public Counsel ("OPC") witness, Lena Mantle's, recommendation that the

Surrebuttal Testimony of Natelle Dietrich

1	Commission	suspend funding for all energy efficiency programs except for the Low Income
2	Weatherizatio	on Assistance Program. Do you agree the programs should be suspended?
3	А.	No. Staff recommends the Commission approve the continuation of the
4	programs at th	ne current funding budget.
5	Q.	If the Commission continues the current, overall funding budget for the
6	LAC/MGE en	nergy efficiency programs, does Staff have any recommendations as to how to
7	implement the	e funding of that budget?
8	А.	Yes. Staff recommends the Commission direct LAC/MGE to include the
9	following terr	ns/processes in their energy efficiency tariffs:
10		Program Year:
11		
12		The program year will begin on October 1 and end on September 30 of
13		the following year, except for the first year of each new program, in
14		which case the program year will begin with the Commission-
15		approved effective date of the tariff sheets originally filed to
16		implement such program.
17		
18		Program Cost:
19		
20		Unless otherwise specified in the tariff, the budget for each Program
21		shall be calculated annually by the Company and shared with the
22		members of the EEC prior to implementation. The budget for each
23		Program will provide for incentive payments, marketing costs, and
24		Company Administrative costs. Payments will be provided until the
25		budgeted funds for the total Program are expended.
26		
27		Program Funding:
28		The merile comments there exill he are increased in the Commence in the
29		The parties agree there will be no increase in the Company's overall
30		budget funding for program year 2018, except that the Company will
31		continue to fund energy efficiency programs, on an annual basis,
32		toward the goal of .5% of the Company's gross operating
33 24		revenues. These amounts will be deferred and treated as a regulatory
34 25		asset with a ten-year amortization period. Such amortization will
35 26		begin on the effective date of rates in the Company's next general rate
36 37		case. Amounts spent under these programs will be included in
51		Company's rate base in its next general rate case.

28

29

30

31 32

Each year, at the beginning of a Program Year, Company will prepare 1 2 a budget of program expenditures, and will provide it to the members 3 of the EEC prior to its implementation. The new budget will be used 4 for the ensuing 12 months unless the Company determines there is a 5 need to make changes within a budget year. When there is a variance 6 of twenty percent (20%) or more from the previous year's total budget, 7 or from an individual program's budget, the Company will submit its 8 annual budget to the Commission for approval. 9 10 The Company's expenditures will be subject to a prudence review in 11 any relevant MPSC proceedings. 12 13 Q. Mr. Dean also addresses Staff's recommendation, as discussed in the 14 Class Cost of Service Report, that the Commission change the EEC from a voting 15 collaborative to an advisory collaborative. Mr. Dean states LAC/MGE is willing to be 16 supportive of the request as long as a new structure can be developed that does not create 17 additional administrative burden or unnecessary bureaucratic requirements and can provide 18 necessary and consistent support for decisions made by the EEC, whether voting or advisory. 19 Do you have any additional comments or recommendations? 20 A. Yes. Staff appreciates LAC/MGE's willingness to support Staff's 21 recommendation. The concept of an "advisory" collaborative is not new. All other 22 collaboratives, both electric and natural gas, are "advisory" collaboratives. Based on its 23 knowledge and participation in other advisory collaboratives, Staff offers the following 24 language for inclusion in a Commission order authorizing a LAC/MGE advisory 25 collaborative: 26 EEC Membership and Process. The LAC/MGE Energy Efficiency 27

EEC Membership and Process. The LAC/MGE Energy Efficiency Collaborative (EEC) will function as an advisory group. LAC/MGE shall be responsible for all final decisions regarding its natural gas energy efficiency programs. Participation in the EEC shall not affect a party's right to question the prudency of the planning and/or the implementation of energy efficiency programs in future cases. LAC/MGE may file with the Commission proposed revised tariff

$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \end{array}$	 circumstances warrant changes. Prior to filing any such proposed revised tariff sheets with the Commission, LAC/MGE shall circulate those sheets for review and comment by the EEC. The Charter Members of the EEC include the Company, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, the Office of the Public Counsel, the Division of Energy¹ and other members that may be designated from time to time by agreement of the Charter Members or by order of the Commission. The EEC shall meet on a periodic basis to discuss and provide input on energy efficiency measures that LAC/MGE is proposing to adopt, modify or eliminate. LAC/MGE shall also provide EEC members with information regarding the ongoing performance of the various energy efficiency programs previously approved by the Commission. 				
18	should provide interested parties a process to raise concerns, while also providing LAC/MGE				
19	the assurances it needs to move forward with energy efficiency programs.				
20	Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?				
21	A. Yes it does.				
	¹ Other members could include National Housing Trust. Environmental Defense Fund. Renew Missouri, and				

¹ Other members could include National Housing Trust, Environmental Defense Fund, Renew Missouri, and Consumers Council.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company's Request to Increase Its Revenues for Gas Service))	Case No. GR-2017-0215
In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company d/b/a Missouri Gas Energy's Request to Increase Its Revenues for Gas Service)))	Case No. GR-2017-0216

AFFIDAVIT OF NATELLE DIETRICH

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW NATELLE DIETRICH and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this $20\frac{\text{H}}{\text{L}}$ day of November, 2017.

•
ļ
1
•

Notary Public