

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

Constellation NewEnergy – Gas Division, LLC,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	File No. GC-2021-0315
)	
Spire Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Spire,)	
Respondent,)	
)	
Symmetry Energy Solutions, LLC,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	File No. GC-2021-0316
)	
Spire Missouri, Inc. and its operating unit)	
Spire Missouri West,)	
Respondent,)	
)	
Clearwater Enterprises, L.L.C.,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	File No. GC-2021-0353
)	
Spire Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Spire and its)	
Operating Unit Spire Missouri West,)	
Respondent,)	

**RESPONDENT SPIRE MISSOURI INC’S RESPONSE TO COMPLAINANT
CLEARWATER ENTERPRISES, LLC’S NOTICE OF VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION**

Pursuant to Missouri Supreme Court Rules 56.01 and 57.03 and 20 CSR 4240-2.090, Respondent Spire Missouri Inc. (“Spire”) submits its response and objections to Complainant Clearwater Enterprises, LLC’s Notice of Videotaped Deposition.

RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

1. **Any analysis Spire engaged in concerning the issuance of the Operational Flow Order (“OFO”) Spire issued on February 10, 2021, including why it was necessary, when it should be issued, and any internal discussions or communications with third parties about this topic.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

2. **The process by which Spire determined to issue an Operational Flow Order (including the curtailment of various customer classes) as outlined in its Commission approved tariffs.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

3. **Any analysis Spire engaged in concerning the lifting the OFO, including why it was lifted on February 20, 2021, why it was not lifted earlier, and any internal discussions or communications with third parties about this topic.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

4. **The extent to which Spire personnel were physically present and working at Spire’s gas control center versus remote work immediately prior to and during the OFO period.**

RESPONSE: Spire objects to this topic as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant as it seeks information concerning “which Spire personnel were physically present . . . versus remote work[ing].” As drafted, this topic improperly seeks to have Spire incur the undue burden of identifying and preparing a corporate representative to testify regarding whether **all** Spire personnel were working at Spire’s control center versus remotely, regardless of whether such personnel were involved with the subject matter of this action. This topic is further irrelevant, overbroad, and unreasonable because whether Spire personnel were working in person or remotely has no bearing on Clearwater’s allegations.

Spire further objects that the phrase “immediately prior to” the OFO period is vague and ambiguous. As such, it is unclear from the request what time frame Clearwater is seeking information.

Subject to its objection, Spire will produce a corporate representative who can testify as to where relevant personnel were working during the OFO period.

5. **Spire’s calculation of the actual cost of gas delivered to Clearwater customers – including the calculated cost, and the way in which it was calculated.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

6. **Communications between employees of Spire Missouri Inc. and Spire Marketing Inc. concerning Winter Storm Uri or Clearwater during February or March 2021.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

7. **The availability and use of storage gas by Spire in February 2021, including any decisions to draw from storage or to sell gas to third parties.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

8. **The process by which Spire engages in month-end balancing with Clearwater regarding monthly invoicing, including but not limited to the process as applied since November 2020.**

RESPONSE: No objection

9. **Spire’s collection and production of documents in this matter in response to Clearwater’s data requests, including a discussion of the factual allegations in or factual basis of the spreadsheets, documents, and reports produced by Spire to Clearwater in this docket.**

RESPONSE: Spire objects to this topic as overbroad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks information concerning the “collection and production” of all the produced documents, as well as information regarding “the factual allegations in or factual basis of” all of those documents. As drafted, this topic improperly seeks to have Spire incur the undue burden of identifying and

preparing a corporate representative on all of the “factual allegations and factual bas[es]” for the hundreds of pages of produced documents which is unreasonable.¹

Spire further objects to this topic to the extent the representative may be called upon to provide legal conclusions or testify on matters that are the subject of expert testimony. Spire objects to the extent this topic seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges.

Subject to its objection, Spire will produce a corporate representative who can testify regarding the collection and production of the documents in this matter and the factual basis for the damages calculation spreadsheets that were produced.

10. The factual basis for each of Spire’s responses to Clearwater’s data requests.

RESPONSE: Spire objects to this topic as overbroad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks information concerning the “factual basis” of all of Spire’s responses to Clearwater’s data requests. As drafted, this topic improperly seeks to have Spire incur the undue burden of identifying and preparing a corporate representative to testify regarding “the factual basis” for every written response to Clearwater’s multiple sets of data requests which is unreasonable.²

Spire further objects to this topic to the extent the representative may be called upon to provide legal conclusions or testify on matters that are the subject of expert testimony. Spire objects to the extent this topic seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges.

¹ Clearwater served its notice on Spire on November 19th, 2021. Clearwater, along with two other complainants in this matter, sought a deposition of Spire’s corporate representative before the December 3, 2021 direct testimony deadline. Spire agreed to accommodate the complainants’ short time frame, even with the interceding holiday. All three complainants noticed topics that would seemingly require Spire’s corporate representative to be ready to testify as to **all** the documents produced to them. Clearwater and Constellation further sought Spire’s corporate representative to be ready to testify to **all** of the written responses to their data requests.

² See *supra* n.1.

Subject to its objection, Spire will produce a corporate representative who can testify regarding the collection and production of the documents in this matter and factual basis for the damages calculation spreadsheets that were produced.

11. Factual allegations in Spire’s pleadings in this docket.

RESPONSE: Spire objects to this topic as vague as to the phrase “this docket”; it is unclear whether Clearwater is requesting information pertaining to Spire’s pleadings in the entire consolidated case or just those pleadings directed at or responding to Clearwater.

Spire further objects to the topic as overbroad and unduly burdensome in that it seeks information concerning the “factual allegations” of all of Spire’s pleadings. As drafted, this topic improperly seeks to have Spire incur the undue burden of identifying and preparing a corporate representative to testify regarding “the factual allegations” for every pleading in this matter which is unreasonable.³

Spire further objects to this topic to the extent the representative may be called upon to provide legal conclusions or testify on matters that are the subject of expert testimony. Spire objects to the extent this topic seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges.

Subject to its objection, Spire will produce a corporate representative who can testify regarding the process by which the pleadings in this “docket” were prepared.

12. The factual bases for Spire’s produced files titled “GC-2021-0353 CONFIDENTIAL MOW Invoices.pdf”, “Clearwater OFO Report GD 12 through GD 18 CONFIDENTIAL.pdf”, “Confidential Actual Cover Costs Spire MOWEST Daily purchases Feb 12 through Feb 19.xls”, and “Clearwater OFO Report Confidential.xlsx”

RESPONSE: No objection.

³ See *supra* n.1.

- 13. The identities of the persons who provided the factual information supporting the responses to Clearwater’s data requests.**

RESPONSE: No objection.

- 14. Spire Missouri West gas distribution system’s integrity and operating parameters for the period February 1, 2021 through March 10, 2021, including: (a) Details of line pack management; (b) Storage withdraws and injections on the Spire and Southern Star systems; (c) Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP) by segment; (d) Actual operating pressures by segment by hour; (e) Actual daily average operating pressures by delivery point, by receipt point; (f) Actual total receipt volumes into the Spire Missouri West gas distribution system; (g) Actual deliveries out of the Spire Missouri West gas distribution system; and (h) Daily balance/imbalance tracking on the Spire Missouri West gas distribution system.**

RESPONSE: Spire objects to this topic as overbroad and irrelevant in that the topic seeks information concerning the “[d]etails of line pack management” and for “(MAOP) by segment,” even though Spire does not have line segments. The topic is further overbroad and irrelevant to the subject matter of this action in that it seeks operational information concerning the pressure that Spire experienced on its system, even though Spire has previously offered to stipulate that it did not lose pressure on any part of its system during Winter Storm Uri because Spire sourced the necessary cover gas.

Spire further objects to this topic to the extent the representative may be called upon to provide legal conclusions or testify on matters that are the subject of expert testimony. Spire objects to the extent this topic seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges.

Subject to its objection, Spire will produce a corporate representative to testify.

- 15. Spire’s evaluation and related decisions for issuing or implementing, maintaining, and terminating each/all of the following actions with regard to any/all Spire Customers, affiliates, shippers, pool managers, aggregators and other parties affecting the Spire Missouri West gas distribution system, by segment, during the month of February 2021:**

(a) Requests for voluntary actions; (b) Unauthorized overrun notices; (c) Contract Demand delivered volumes and notices by Customer; (d) OBA notices to any/all parties for any action; (e) Advance notice of any OFO or curtailments; (f) Notice of OFOs and curtailment orders or requests; (g) Notice of any Emergency OFOs, and if none, details of the evaluation supporting the decision not to issue same; and (h) Emergency Gas Sales and if none, details of the evaluation supporting the decision not to implement same.

RESPONSE: Spire objects that this topic is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in that it seeks “evaluation and related decisions for issuing or implementing, maintaining, and terminating each/all” of the listed actions during the month of February 2021, regardless of whether such information is relevant to the subject matter of this lawsuit. For example, Clearwater seeks information regarding “Contract demand delivered volumes and notices by Customer,” regardless if such delivered volumes have any impact or relevance to Clearwater’s complaint.

Spire further objects that the phrases “[r]equests for voluntary actions” and “[u]nauthorized overrun notices” are vague.

Spire objects to this topic to the extent the representative may be called upon to provide legal conclusions or testify on matters that are the subject of expert testimony. Spire also objects to the extent this topic seeks information protected by the attorney client privilege, work product doctrine, or other applicable privileges.

Spire will need additional clarification in order to even attempt to undertake to prepare a corporate representative on this topic.

16. All gas sales and/or deliveries by Spire of gas supplied directly by Spire, to any party on its system who was a customer of a third party.

RESPONSE: No objection.

17. All gas purchases and all gas sales made by Spire on its system, and for volumes on, into and out of the Southern Star system, including: (a) Affiliated transactions, including transactions with Spire Marketing, Inc.; (b) Upstream and downstream pipelines; and (c) Storage

injections, withdraws, and intra-storage purchases, sales and exchanges.

RESPONSE: No objection.

18. Spire's communications issued to end users and to Clearwater regarding permitted gas usage and/or curtailment obligations.

RESPONSE: No objection.

19. What, if any, steps Spire took with regard to curtailment.

RESPONSE: No objection.

Dated: November 26, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Dean Cooper
Dean L. Cooper MBE#36592
BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND
P.C.
312 E. Capitol Avenue
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 635-7166
dcooper@brydonlaw.com

Matthew Aplington MoBar #58565
General Counsel
Spire Missouri Inc.
700 Market Street, 6th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 342-0785 (Office)
Email: matt.aplington@spireenergy.com

Goldie T. Bockstruck MoBar #58759
Director, Associate General Counsel
Spire Missouri Inc.
700 Market Street, 6th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-342-0533 Office
314-421-1979 Fax
Email: Goldie.Bockstruck@spireenergy.com

Rachel Lewis Niemeier MoBar #56073

Regulatory Counsel
Spire Missouri Inc.
700 Market Street, 6th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-390-2623 Office
Email: rachel.niemeier@spireenergy.com

Gabriel E. Gore #45416
Rebecca McLaughlin #71969
DOWD BENNETT LLP
7733 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 1900
St. Louis, MO 63105
Telephone: (314) 889-7300
Facsimile: (314)863-2111
ggore@dowdbennett.com
rmclaughlin@dowdbennett.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR SPIRE MISSOURI
INC.**