Exhibit No.:

*Issue(s):* Customer Deposits,

Interest on Customer Deposits, Insurance Expense and

Miscellaneous Expense

Witness: Blair Hardin

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Case No.: GR-2024-0106

Date Testimony Prepared: September 18, 2024

### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

# FINANCIAL & BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION AUDITING DEPARTMENT

#### SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

#### **BLAIR HARDIN**

LIBERTY UTILITIES (Midstates Natural Gas) CORP., d/b/a Liberty

**CASE NO. GR-2024-0106** 

Jefferson City, Missouri September 18, 2024

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
2	OF		
3	BLAIR HARDIN		
4		LIBERTY UTILITIES (Midstates Natural Gas) CORP.,	
5		d/b/a Liberty	
6		CASE NO. GR-2024-0106	
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.	
8	A.	My name is Blair Hardin, 111 North 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 105, St. Louis, MO, 63101.	
9	Q.	By whom are you employed?	
10	A.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as	
11	a member of the Auditing Staff ("Staff").		
12	Q.	Are you the same Blair Hardin who filed Direct testimony on July 18, 2024, in	
13	this case?		
14	A.	Yes, I am.	
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal testimony?	
16	A.	My Surrebuttal testimony will address the Rebuttal testimony of	
17	Liberty Midstates witness Charlotte Emery regarding customer deposit balances, the interes		
18	calculated on those customer deposits, as well as insurance and workers compensation expense		
19	CUSTOMER	DEPOSITS & INTREST ON CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	
20	Q.	On page 16, lines 7-13 of Liberty Midstates' witness Charlotte Emery's Rebuttal	
21	testimony, she	discusses her disagreement with Staff's proposed interest on customer deposits	
22	but explains	that a response to Staff's Data Request ("DR") 86 included some	

incorrect information. What data needed to be corrected that impacted the calculation of interest on customer deposits?

A. After reviewing Liberty Midstates' Rebuttal testimony and workpapers and comparing this information to the general ledger data that Staff included in its direct cost of service, Staff noticed that the ending monthly balances for all rate districts (WEMO, SEMO, and NEMO) in May 2023 in Liberty Midstates' rebuttal workpapers, did not tie to Staff's balances. In addition, it was also determined that Staff's customer deposit balances for October, November, and December 2023 for the NEMO district did not tie to Liberty Midstates' balances for these months. Staff met with Liberty Midstates' personnel to determine why the amounts included in Liberty Midstates' Rebuttal testimony did not tie to the general ledger balances that Staff included in its case.

When Liberty Midstates Gas transitioned to its System Applications and Products in Data Processing (SAP)" general ledger beginning in October 2023, it was decided that the profit center for the Kirksville, MO service territory would be delineated separately in the general ledger from the rest of the NEMO profit center. Staff's customer deposit balances for October, November, and December 2023 were missing the balances for Kirksville, MO. Staff did not include the Kirksville customer deposit balances into its NEMO balances in its Direct filing, but included Kirksville in its Surrebuttal. It was also determined that Liberty Midstates utilized a report in its Rebuttal customer deposit balances that was missing some information that Staff had included in its May 2023 balances. Liberty Midstates confirmed that Staff's May 2023 ending balances were correct. Staff then calculated an updated 13-month average of customer deposits ending December 31, 2023, as a reduction to

21

22

rate base and applied the tariffed interest rate to that 13-month average to determine the correct 1 2 amount of interest on customer deposits to include in the cost of service. 3 O. Is Staff and Liberty Midstates in agreement on the correct amount of customer 4 deposits to include in rate base and the annualized amount of interest on customer deposits to 5 include in the cost of service? 6 A. Yes. 7 INSURANCE AND WORKERS COMPENSATION EXPENSE 8 Q. On page 12, lines 21-24 and page 13, lines 1-3, of her Rebuttal testimony, 9 Liberty Midstates witness Emery discusses how the Company reduced its insurance premiums 10 included in its cost of service, based upon a response that was provided to Staff DR 100. 11 Is Staff and Liberty Midstates in agreement on the annualized amount of insurance expense to 12 include in the cost of service? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. On page 17, lines 6-14, of her Rebuttal testimony, Liberty Midstates witness 15 Emery discusses how the Company's previously proposed adjustment for worker's 16 compensation expense contained an incorrect allocation factor in its calculation. Is Staff and 17 Liberty Midstates in agreement on the annualized amount of worker's compensation expense 18 to include in the cost of service? 19 A. Yes. 20 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Q. On page 13, lines 7-15, of her Rebuttal testimony, Liberty Midstates witness Emery discusses her disagreement with Staff's proposed removal of miscellaneous expenses 4

5

6

7

8

9

- due to the overlap of removed charges and other additional items that were proposed for removal. Besides the non-recoverable items for removal that were agreed upon between Liberty Midstates and Staff, what other charges did Staff propose to remove?
  - A. For a discussion of the overlap in the costs of items proposed to be removed for the non-recoverable/miscellaneous expenses, please refer to Staff witness Lisa M. Ferguson's Surrebuttal testimony. As far as the costs for additional items I proposed removing, these charges were related to promotional items that have no benefit to ratepayers, and therefore should not be included in the cost of service.
    - Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
- 10 A. Yes, it does.

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Reque Utilities (Midstates Natura d/b/a Liberty to Implement Increase for Natural Gas S Missouri Service Areas of	al Gas) Corp. t a General Rate service in the	) Case No. GR-2024-0106
	AFFIDAVIT	OF BLAIR HARDIN
STATE OF MISSOURI	) ) ss.	
COUNTY OF ST LOUIS	j	
lawful age; that she contribu	uted to the forego	on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and oing Surrebuttal Testimony of Blair Hardin; and that
the same is true and correct	according to ner	best knowledge and belief.
Further the Affiant saye	th not.	Hair Hardin
		JURAT
Subscribed and sworn b	efore me, a duly	constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for
	State of Missou	uri, at my office in <u>ST. LOUIS</u> , on this
LISA M. FERGUSON Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for St. Louis County My Commission Expires: June 23, 2028 Commission Number: 16631502		Notary Public