#### COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Application of UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc.:
for expedited review and approval of the:
transfer by sale of a 9.0-mile natural:
gas pipeline, appurtenant facilities and:
right of way, located in Mehoopany, PA,
and a related affiliated interest:
agreement.

Docket Nos.

A-2010-2213893

G-2010-2213894

(Initial Hearing.)

Pages 20 through 75

Hearing Room Four Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Commonwealth Keystone Building 400 North Street Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:12 a.m.

BEFORE:

DENNIS J. BUCKLEY, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

DAVID B. MacGREGOR, Esquire
Post & Schell, PC
Seventeen North Second Street, Twelfth F
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
(For UGI Penn Natural Gas, Incorporate

KENT D. MURPHY, Esquire

UGI Corporation

460 North Gulph Road

King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

(For UGI Penn Natural Gas, Incorporated)

Commonwealth Reporting Company, Inc.

700 Lisburn Road Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

(717) 761-7150

1-800-334-1063

40013

# APPEARANCES (Continued):

CHARLES DANIEL SHIELDS, Esquire Office of Trial Staff Post Office Box 3265 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105 (For the Office of Trial Staff)

JAMES A. MULLINS, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
(For the Office of Consumer Advocate)

SHARON E. WEBB, Esquire
Office of Small Business Advocate
300 North Second Street, Suite 1102
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
(For the Office of Small Business Advocate)

Commonwealth Reporting Company, Inc.

700 Lisburn Road Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

(717) 761-7150 1-800-334-1063

1.4

# 

WITNESSES	DIR	ECT	CROSS	REDIR	<u>ECT</u>	RECROSS
Robert F. Beard, Jr.,	P.E.					
(By Mr. MacGregor)		30				
(By. Mr. Shields)			41			
(Examination by	Judge Bi	uckley	at Pa	ges 38	& 42	.)

# $\underline{\mathtt{E}} \ \underline{\mathtt{X}} \ \underline{\mathtt{H}} \ \underline{\mathtt{I}} \ \underline{\mathtt{B}} \ \underline{\mathtt{I}} \ \underline{\mathtt{T}} \quad \underline{\mathtt{I}} \ \underline{\mathtt{N}} \ \underline{\mathtt{D}} \ \underline{\mathtt{E}} \ \underline{\mathtt{X}}$

<u>NUMBER</u>	FOR IDENTIFICA	TION IN EVI	<u>DENCE</u>		
ALJ's					
Exhibit No. 1	(Map with Mark-ups)	61	61		
Penn Natural Gas'					
Statement No. 1	(Direct Testimony of	31	38		
	Robert F Beard, Jr, PE)				
Statement No. 1-R	(Prepared Rebuttal	31	35		
	Testimony of Robert				
	F Beard, Jr, PE)				
Statement No. 1-RJ	(Prepared Rejoinder	31	38		
	Testimony of Robert				
	F Beard, Jr, PE)				
Office of Trial Staff's					
Statement No. 1	(Direct Testimony	69	69		
	of Michael Gruber)				
Exhibit No. 1	(Exhibit to Accompany	69	69		
	the Direct Testimony				
	of Michael Gruber)				
Statement No. 1-SR	(Surrebuttal Testimony	69	69		
	of Michael Gruber)				

1.0

3	NUMBER	FOR IDENTIFICATION	N IN EVIDENCE			
4	Office of Small Bus	siness Advocate's				
5	Statement No. 1	(Direct Testimony and 7	1 71			
ΰ		Exhibits of Robert D				
7		Knecht)				
â	Statement No. 2	(Surrebuttal Testimony 7	1 71			
9	Non-Proprietary	of Robert D Knecht)				
10	Version					
11	Statement No. 2	(Surrebuttal Testimony 7	1 71			
12	Proprietary	of Robert D Knecht)				
13	Version					
14	Office of Consumer	Advocate's				
15	Statement No. 1	(Direct Testimony of 7	0 70			
16		Jerome D Mierzwa)				
17	Statement No. 1-S	(Surrebuttal Testimony 7	0 70			
18		Of Jerome D Mierzwa)				
19	<u>Joint</u>					
20	PNG-OSBA Ex. No. 1	(Sealed Highly 6	5 67			
21		Confidential Stipulation)				
22	Any reproduction of this transcript					
23	is prob	nibited without authorizatio	n			
24	ру	the certifying reporter.				
25		<b>+                                    </b>				

 $\underline{E} \ \underline{X} \ \underline{H} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{B} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{N} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{X} \ (Continued)$ 

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# PROCEEDINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BUCKLEY: Good morning. This is the date and time and place for the hearing in the matter of the Application of UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc. for expedited review and approval of transfer by sale of a nine-mile natural gas pipeline, appurtenant facilities and right of way, located in Mehoopany, Pennsylvania and a related affiliated interest agreement. And the Docket Numbers on this are A-2010-2213693 and G-2010-20213894.

I am Administrative Law Judge Dennis Buckley. And counsels for the parties are present here today. I would ask that they identify themselves for the record. Why don't we start with you, Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Christopher T. Wright. I am here on behalf of UGI Penn Natural Gas.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Kent Murphy, UGI Corporation on behalf of UGI Penn Natural Gas.

MR. MacGREGOR: David MacGregor, Post and Schell for Penn Natural Gas.

MR. SHIELDS: Yes, good morning, Your Honor. My name is Charles Daniel Shields. My title is senior prosecutor with the Commission's Office of Trial Staff.

MR. MULLINS: Good morning, Your Honor.

:

 James A. Mullins on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.

MS. WEBB: Good morning, Your Honor. Sharon E. Webb on behalf of the Office of Small Business Advocate.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Good morning to all of you. And we also have a witness present today on behalf of UGI, who will be identified on the record. Before we actually proceed to the examination of the witness, Mr. MacGregor, did you have a statement that you wanted to put on the record at this point?

MR. MacGREGOR: Should I summarize the statement regarding the stipulation?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yes.

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes, Your Honor. As we discussed previously off the record, three other parties in this proceeding accompanied the Office of Trial Staff and the Office of Consumer Advocate, have reached a stipulation in settlement of their respective issues in this proceeding. We have not reached a settlement to date with the Office of Small Business Advocate. So, we have proposed, and the parties, I believe, Your Honor, have just agreed that we will proceed on the established litigation schedule of this case.

Mr. Beard will be presented this morning to answer questions posed by Your Honor. The other parties,

1,4

through stipulation and settlement, or separate stipulation, have worked out issues regarding cross examination so that there will be no cross examination of the various witnesses in this case, other than Mr. Beard by Your Honor. And their testimonies will be entered by stipulation of the parties.

The proposal of the parties to Your Honor, subject to OSBA review, is that we will file the formal stipulation and settlement as soon as possible and that the parties who wish to file briefs will address both the open OSBA issues and the issued addressed in the stipulation and settlement, and their briefs will be filed with Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right, thank you. Do any of the counsel for the other parties have a statement they wish to make at this point?

MR. SHIELDS: Yes.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Shields?

MR. SHIELDS: Thank you, Your Honor. Just to follow-up on Mr. MacGregor's remarks. We -- our office will endeavor to work out all of the language of the three-party stipulation that he referred to and submit it to Your Honor as early as possible. And given the fact that all of issues have been addressed with the substantial terms and conditions in the stipulation that will be presented to Your Honor, we will likely be submitting a statement in

] 4

support of that stipulation, and may not necessarily be briefing the issues that remain between OSBA and the company.

That's all I have, Your Honor. Thank you for you opportunity to make some remarked.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Certainly. Mr. Mullins?

MR. MULLINS: Thank you, Your Honor. The

OCA does not intend to brief this proceeding either. And I

guess, for Your Honor's determination, we would also submit

a statement in support of the final settlement agreed upon

by the company, OCA and at this point the OTS.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Ms. Webb?

MS. WEBB: Good morning, Your Honor. The OSBA has come to an agreement on some stipulated factual issues and going forward with the brief. In terms of the settlement, or stipulation, between the company and the other two parties, I'm happy to let them know, as soon as we get a final document, whether or not we would be briefing any issues.

But I want to make sure that the final document isn't going to be issued on the -- or filed on the 29th. I mean, if the briefs are due on the 30th, I would like a couple of days to be able to work through the final. There wasn't a date -- I didn't hear a date--

MR. MacGREGOR: I did not provide a specific

1.8

2.1

date, but I am hopeful that we will have it by the end of the week or very early next week.

MS. WEBB: Thank you.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Mr. MacGregor, let's start -- I do have a question here now. This is a request for expedited treatment. Can you explain to me why expedited treatment is necessary here? Is there something that's going to happen if you don't get this by a day certain?

MR. MacGREGOR: Your Honor, we would very much like a decision from the Commission in this matter on or before June 1st, if possible. It relates to the financing of the transaction by Citrus Energy and relates to equipment that's been ordered. They are ready to drill wells and ready to frac wells and they would very much like to proceed with that, you know, during the summer construction season and would like to be able to get started on or about June 1st.

And Commission approval is one of the regulatory requirements that is needed in order to finish the financing and to allow things to move forward. I can not say that things are going to fall apart and the deal is going to go away if we don't start by June 1st, but it would be highly desirable for the parties, and particularly for Procter and Gamble and Citrus Energy is the project

JUDGE BUCKLEY: I understand. Thank you. 3 All right. Let's swear in Mr. Beard. Mr. Beard, raise your right hand. MR. BEARD: (Complying.) Whereupon, 6 7 ROBERT F. BEARD, Jr. having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 8 9 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Would vou be seated? THE WITNESS: (Complying.) 10 MR. MacGREGOR: Perhaps I can go ahead and 1.1 voir dire Mr. Beard and move his testimony exhibits into 1.2 the record and then subject to your cross examination? 13 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yes, sir. 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 1.5 BY MR. MacGREGOR: 16 17 Mr. Beard, could you state your full name and business address for the record? Yes. My name is Robert F. Beard. I am vice-19 president of marketing, supply and rates with UGI 20 Utilities. My business address is 2525 North Twelfth 21 Street, Suite 360 in Reading, Pennsylvania 18612. 22 MR. MacGREGOR: Your Honor, we previously 23 distributed to the parties and to Your Honor, and I believe 24

could be started as soon as possible.

to the court reporter or we will distribute to the court

2

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

cover page, is captioned Direct Testimony of Robert F. Beard. It has been pre-marked and I would ask that it be marked for identified as PNG Statement Number 1. JUDGE BUCKLEY: It is so marked. (Whereupon, the document was marked as 6 PNG's Statement No. 1 for identification.) MR. MacGREGOR: And similarly, the second document is captioned Prepared Rebuttal Testimony of Robert F. Beard, Junior. And I would ask that it be marked as PNG 10 Statement Number 1-R. JUDGE BUCKLEY: It is so marked. (Whereupon, the document was marked as PNG's Statement No. 1-R for identification.) MR. MacGREGOR: And then the third document is the Prepared Rejoinder Testimony of Robert F. Beard. 1.6 And I would ask that that be marked as PNG Statement Number 1-RJ. 18 JUDGE BUCKLEY: And it is so marked. 19 (Whereupon, the document was marked as PNG's Statement No. 1-RJ for

identification.)

reporter, copies of three documents. The first, on the

BY MR. MacGREGOR:

Mr. Beard, do you have before you the three documents that have been marked for identification as your direct

testimony, your rebuttal testimony and your rejoinder testimony in this proceeding?

A. I do.

3

1.0

11

17

18

20

21

22

- Q. And in regards to your direct testimony, which consists of nineteen pages of question and answer testimony and then attached to that a copy of the application to the Commission of this proceeding and the exhibits that were attached to that documentation, and then lastly the document in the upper right-hand corner that says PNG Exhibit Number RFB-2, which is a response to this proceeding?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And this, in its entirety, comprised as Statement

  Number 1, was this document prepared by you or under your

  direction?
- 16 A. It was.
  - Q. And is the information contained in this document true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
- 19 A. It is.
  - Q. Thank you. And with respect to your rebuttal testimony that has been marked as PNG Statement Number 1-R, is that your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?
- 23 A. It is.
- Q. And is there attached to it a document in addition to the twenty-one pages of questions and answers, a document

captioned Exhibit RFB-3?

- A. There is.
- Q. And was this information prepared and assembled by you or under your direction?
- A. It was.
- Q. And is the information contained in this document true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
- A. It is.
- Q. And finally with respect to the document that has been marked for identification as PNG Statement Number 1-RJ, is this your rejoinder testimony in this proceeding?
- 12 A. It is.

9

10

11

19

20

21

23

24

25

- Q. And does it consist of eight pages of questions and answers?
  - A. It does.
- Q. And does the information contained in this document true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
- 18 ∦ A. It is.
  - MR. MacGREGOR: Thank you. Your Honor, subject to cross examination, I would move for the admission of the documents marked as PNG Statement 1, 1-R and 1-RJ.
  - JUDGE BUCKLEY: Now, Mr. Shields, correct me if I am wrong, but at the pre-hearing am I correct that you had an issue with respect to RFB-3, this cover letter from

ġ

Attorney Paul Zeigler, and then the rest of this as described and termed as a statement of support for quarterlies signed by Alex P. -- is it Fried?

MR. MacGREGOR: Fried.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: HSE and Energy Affairs Manager of Procter and Gamble Products.

MR. SHIELDS: I did, indeed, Your Honor, and thank you for raising that issue. Had we not entered into a stipulation, I fully intended to object to the admission of those documents and the reference in the witness' testimony. However in the spirit of settlement, I do not intend to do so today. I am reserving the right to do if similar documents are similarly offered and referenced in subsequent proceedings.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Then there is no person present from Procter and Gamble to authenticate this letter, is that correct?

MR. MacGREGOR: That is correct, Your Honor. It was filed with the Commission and resides in the Commission's public files.

MR. SHIELDS: It is my understanding, Your Honor -- this is Mr. Shields, of course -- that there was, in fact, a signed affidavit attached to that letter. I may stand corrected, but I think there was. Which I don't know if it satisfies Your Honor's concerns for authenticity, but

1.0

1.3

1.9

if one is to accept the sworn affidavit, that ameliorates our concerns to some extent.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Well, hearing no objection, I'm going to admit what has been marked as PNG Statement No. 1-R and its attachment. However, and as the day goes on here, I think you'll -- counsel -- will kind of get your answer to where I am coming from on this. I am surprised, and frankly a bit concerned, that there is no witness from Procter and Gamble in this proceeding.

A lot of the questions that I am going to have for Mr. Beard are intended to fill in some of the gaps of my understanding. I am sure that he can point me to places in his testimony that will clear up my misunderstandings or lack of knowledge on some issues with respect to this application. But it seems to me, having read the record as it stands, that we're here today primarily at the instance [sic] of Procter and Gamble, who want this transaction to take place. Now, if I am wrong about that, somebody can correct me.

(Whereupon, the document marked as PNG's Statement No. 1-R was received in evidence.)

MR. MacGREGOR: Your Honor, I think it is clear Procter and Gamble wants this transaction to go forward. And it does reflect in agreement between Energy

1 i

Services and Procter and Gamble and Citrus and among the parties, subject to various agreements.

Procter and Gamble approached us regarding this transaction and these are the terms and conditions presented to the Commission under which UGI PNG is willing to undertake that transaction, which we believe for the various reasons set forth in Mr. Beard's testimony and exhibits, is in the public interest and advise the important that is to customers. But yes, certainly Procter and Gamble desires this transaction to go forward. And the conversion of the line to gathering services paid primarily at the request of Procter and Gamble as a way to get its Marcellus Shale gas to market.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Thank you. Now with Mr. Shield's potential objection in the offing, I had not read Exhibit RFD-3 and I would just like to take a minute and read that now, if you will all read with me? (Judge perusing document.) All right. This answers some questions. All right. I'll tell you what, Mr. MacGregor, you had moved PNG's Statement Number 1, 1-R and 1-RJ into the record?

MR. MacGREGOR: And the attached exhibits, yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And the attached exhibits. Any objections?

2ŭ

MR. SHIELDS: Only as counsel represented,
Your Honor, subject to cross examination of Your Honor and
at the risk of -- perhaps, will the other parties be
entitled to cross in response to anything that we hear from
the witness in response to Your Honor's cross examination?
There may be a thing or two that raises a flag with us when
he answers in response to your questions.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Well, I think that's a fair question. I want to what Mr. MacGregor has to say on that.

MR. MacGREGOR: We have no objection.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Provided that it is limited to my examination, that would be fine. And I want to make it clear on the record, I am not here to blow up your settlement. My purpose today is to try to anticipate some of the questions that the Commission will have with respect to this matter. And as the Administrative Law Judge, it is my responsibility to make sure that they are attested to as we can possibly have. So with that being said, let's start with this map, which was attached, I believe, to the original application as Attachment A or Exhibit A.

And I have taken the liberty of posting here or trying to blow it up. And what I am going to do, is I am going to ask Mr. Beard to turn to the map, as I have some specific questions. And Counsel, you are free to

gather around.

3

6

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

20

25

(Whereupon, the documents marked as PNG's Statements Nos. 1 and 1-RJ were received in evidence.)

#### EXAMINATION

## BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

- Q. What we are looking at here, I am going to refer to the larger map. This is the Auburn Line; it runs from what, Auburn Four Corners to where?
- A. (Witness perusing document.) It runs the interconnection at the Tennessee Pipeline.
- Q. Okay.
- A. Southward to the Procter and Gamble plant, that's the terminus.
  - Q. All right. Now, these -- I was trying to read the legend here. The triangles represent drilled wells, the circles with apparently a dot in them represent permitted wells that have not yet been drilled, is that correct?
- 19 A. Correct, that's correct.
  - Q. Okay. Now, do you know when this was complied?
- 21 A. I do not.
- Q. Okay. So, it could be that additional wells have been drilled since this was -- this exhibits was complied?

  Or additional wells may have been permitted?
  - A. Yes, that's possible.

- Q. Okay. Now -- and I am correct that you said that the terminus is at the Procter and Gamble plant, and that is right here, if I am correct, where it says W -- it is obscured; it says W, and then MIN?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. And there is a permitted well right at that point?
- 7 A. Correct.

ó

8

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okav. And this runs through or past Mehoopany?
- 9 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, I also understand that there are fourteen other customers who take service?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Do they take service from this line?
- 14 A. They do, from the Auburn Line.
- Q. Ohay. I see. And there -- I assume that they are scattered along the length of the line?
- 17 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. And right now, of course, this is all
  Tennessee gas, that is coming and being piped south through
  the line?
- 21 A. That's correct.
  - Q. Your proposal is that you are going to replace the Tennessee gas with gas -- Marcellus Shale gas? And you are going to reverse the direction of the flow so that it is going from south to north?

- A. Correct. What will happen, is that UGI Energy
  Services will have to establish another interconnect with
  Tennessee Gas Pipeline, because this is not sufficient to
  take the volumes of gas from production back to the
  pipeline.
- A. Oh.
- Q. You are correct. What will happen here, is production gas will come in -- if I may?
- Q. Sure. Well, I'll tell you what. Let me give you a marker, that way we don't have to look for another pen.
- Here, this will work. Why don't you use the blue marker?

  (Item handed to witness.)
- A. Thank you. Sure. Approximately a half-mile from the Procter and Gamble plant, there is a regulator station that will cut the pressure. All of the production will come in upstream relative to Procter and Gamble.
- Q. Okay. That plant is current there? (Indicating.)
- A. It is, let's say here. (Indicating.) Right.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- A. And the regulator station is here, also.
- Q. The regulator station is there right now?
- 22 A. It is.
- 23 | Q. Okay.
- A. All production will come in upstream relative to the location of Procter and Gamble. And some gas will go

south, will have the pressure reduced and will go south to the Procter and Gamble plant. And the remainder of the gas will go northward, back onto the Tennessee Pipeline and to a new interconnect that will have to be established with the Tennessee Pipeline.

- Q. All right. That was my understanding, but I just wanted to make absolutely sure that I was understanding this correctly. Now, that line that is current in place, that's a twelve-inch line?
- 10 A. It is.

8

G

11

12

L 3

14

15

, 6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Do you know when that was put in?
- A. I don't specifically. Service to the plant, I believe, began in 1966, so somewhere around 1966.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: I see, all right. Does anyone -- does counsel -- do any of you have any questions with respect to the map?

MR. SHIELDS: Just one follow-up question, Your Honor, just to clarify his last statement.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Sure.

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHIELDS:

- Q. Am I correct that the line will go, for all intents and purposes, to provide service to Procter and Gamble?
- A. That's correct.

MR. SHIELDS: That's all I have, Judge,

thanks.

8

1.0

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay.

#### FURTHER EXAMINATION

## BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

- Q. You may not be qualified to answer this, but, do you know the extent of Procter and Gamble's property? Do you know how many wells we are talking about there?
- A. I do not. I know that they are a significant landowner, but I don't know the exact acreage or the number of permits that they have received or even applied for.
- Q. Okay, all right.
- A. But they do have a substantial land holding.
- Q. All right. I think that those are the only questions that I have about the map.
  - A. Okay, thank you.
  - Q. All right. So let me also clarify what we are talking about here is, again, we are replacing the Tennessee Gas with Marcellus Shale gas, correct?
  - A. Correct. But I want to be clear that the interconnection that exists that feeds Tennessee gas will stay in place. So, we're not retiring, we're still maintaining the ability to take Tennessee gas.
  - Q. Right, understood. Does reversing the flow on this line -- obviously I am not an engineer. But does this raise any kind of operational or safety considerations? I

1.8

クミ

mean the line has been in place for, what, fifty years or so and it has always in one direction. Can you conceive of any potential problem when you are suddenly -- well not suddenly -- but you are going to change the configuration of the line, you are going to reverse the flow. Could that potentially lead to any issues?

- A. That should have no effect.
- Q. All right. So there should be no safety issues?
- A. No safety issues whatsoever. And the history of the line, and I checked, it is a line with a good operating history and it doesn't cause any pause, whatsoever, as far as its condition.
- Q. Okay, thank you. Give me a moment here; I just want to take a look at some of my notes. (Pause.) All right. I am looking at your direct testimony, Mr. Beard, page eight. Now, the question is, once the transfer occurred, how will PNG be assured that natural gas will be available for customers that are currently served from the Auburn Line? Are you with me?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. And you say, "Under this," -- line seventeen -- "Under this agreement, UGIES has undertaken the obligation to deliver gas to PNG each day on an instantaneous, no-notice basis in an amount that is equal to the demand on the Auburn Line." When you referred to

this agreement, you were referring to the agreement that was filed with the Commission; is that correct?

A. Yes.

1.0

1 i

Q. Okay. All right. Because I am going to have some questions about that agreement. You say, "However, in the unlikely event that that local production becomes inadequate," -- I'm on line twenty, going into twenty-one -- "PNG has the right to require UGIES to take gas through PNG's Auburn Station I on an emergency basis to assure service to PNG's customers." Flipping over to page nine, going on lines four through six. "I would note that UGIES currently undertakes similar obligations for providing supply services to both UGI and PNG under existing, Commission-approved peak supply agreements."

Now, let's assume that this goes through and the Commission approves what we have asked for. My understanding is that there is a contractual obligation on the part of UGIES to furnish that supply; is that contractual obligation that is enforceable in the Court of Common Pleas, or would that be jurisdictional to the Commission?

A. (No response.)

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And this might be a bit of a question for your attorney in this situation.

MR. MacGREGOR: I wouldn't want to give a

definitive answer; it could be both or either. It would certainly be enforceable in the Court of Common Pleas. The Commission might have jurisdiction over that, as well. We can address that in a brief, if you wish.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yeah, I would. In fact, on one hand I am comforted by the fact that you are not giving me a definitive answer, because you know, I'm sitting up here and I'm not as slow as I thought I was.

# (Laughter.)

JUDGE BUCKLEY: But on the other hand, it is not a comfort to me because we're in a new territory here, and I would like that addressed.

MR. MacGREGOR: We will address it, Your Honor. And I note that one of the remedies under the agreement, and it will be further detailed in the stipulation and settlement, is what happens if for any reason UGIES fails to live up to its obligations under the agreement, including the obligation to provide service. Then PNG, as the utility, has the right to automatically take back ownership of the line.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: We are going to talk about that, too.

### BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

Q. All right. Some of my questions might already been considered and might be under discussion with respect to

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

nineteen, you say, "In addition," -- are you with me? Α. I am. "In addition, even if some hypothetical additional value were attributed to the line, customers should not share in that value because that value is clearly associated with operating the Line as the gathering line." Gathering is underlined. "Importantly, the use of the Auburn Line as a distribution line is not being transferred to UGIES. It is being retained by PNG and its customers through the Interconnection, Operating And Emergency Service Agreement." JUDGE BUCKLEY: Which again, Mr. MacGregor, am I correct that that's the agreement with UGI which is--MR. MacGREGOR: That's right, Your Honor. JUDGE BUCKLEY: So what is this line, is it a distribution line or is it a gathering line or can you enlighten me a little bit; is it both, is it dependant upon a particular use? MR. MacGREGOR: Just a minute. JUDGE BUCKLEY: Sure, take your time. MR. MacGREGOR: I'm sorry. JUDGE BUCKLEY: That's okay. THE WITNESS: Your Honor, it will be

the stipulation, and I understand that. Okay, let's go to

your rebuttal testimony. At the bottom of page four, line

i

<u>1</u> 1

classified on the sale as a gathering line.

The function of distribution will still be retained by PNG. And that really is one of the nuances of this situation that's interesting, in that we will retain -- PNG will retain all of the commercial benefit of the distribution customers that are connected with that line. And those customers will still be guaranteed service under PNG's rate schedule.

So while the line, itself, will be classified on the Federal definition as a gathering line, we will have distribution service offered from it.

MR. MacGREGOR: And frankly, Your Honor, that's probably a better way to state it than it is stated here in the testimony. I can understand the confusion with this. The line will be a gathering line, but there are caps, the farm taps and the Procter and Gamble tap, off of the line will remain in place and be owned by the utility, who will continue to provide distribution service through those taps from the Auburn Line.

And it is the agreement that maintains that additional use of the line, not only to gather gas, but to distribute gas into the interconnection taps to serve the fifteen customers.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: So then, is it a
distribution line?

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE WITNESS: The lines that come off of this line will be distribution line. Similar to, if you look at the Tennessee Pipeline, that is a transmission line.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Right.

THE WITNESS: Downstream of that is the distribution line.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Right.

THE WITNESS: This will be a gathering line, but at the custody transfer point at the tap from the gathering lien, the utility will retain ownership of those pipes and those will be distribution pipes.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. So let's go back to the map a bit to make sure that I completely understand this.

#### BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

- Q. All right. So what you are telling me is, let's take an example here. Here we have the line, the Auburn Line, that's a gathering line. Are you telling me, let's say, I am going to mark with an X here, this is one of the fourteen customers, okay? (Indicating.)
- A. Mm-hmm. Okay.
- Q. And are you telling, then, that there is a line that comes off of the Auburn Line and goes down?
  - A. That's correct.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And that's a distribution line? 0. Α. Correct. I see. So the distribution line starts where the 3 4 connection line is with the Auburn Line, and it stops when the gas gets to, I would assume, the meter of whoever is taking it? That's correct. Α. I see. Okay. All right. Thank you, that clears that up. I'm not necessarily acreeing to this, but I do ğ understand and that's extremely important. All right. I'm 10 11 looking at pages eight through ten of your testimony, Mr. Beard. This is where you are talking about Citrus. And Citrus -- maybe Mr. MacGregor is going to have to answer this. JUDGE BUCKLEY: Citrus is a natural gas supplier? MR. MacGREGOR: No, they are just a producer, local producer. JUDGE BUCKLEY: They are just a producer?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes.

- BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:
- Okay. I see. And part of your argument for approval of this application is that there are identified risks associated with Marcellus Shale exploration. In that UGI is essentially shifting those risks away from itself and

putting it on Citrus, which is having to take it, or am I mistaken?

- A. At present, UGI has no risk associated with Marcellus.
- O. Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.5

17

18

19

20

21

20

23

24

25

- A. The risk that would be undertaken would be by Citrus, as the producer, driller and producer, and by Energy Services, who would run the risk of success or failure of the wells and the drilling program in general.
- Q. All right. Here is where I am going with this. I was reading along until I got to page eight and then I look at line seventeen, "Gathering has the same risk profile as producing since it is entirely dependant upon the drilling of wells."

After that, we get into the full page of statements, which have been provided from a variety of sources that make Marcellus drilling look a bit problematic, which I understand. Where I am going to this is, when you get to the point in your agreement that essentially says that if something goes wrong, and goes badly, then UGI has the option to take all of this back and to continue to serve the customers, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. But it is an option; it is not an obligation?
- A. Well, we have an obligation to serve the customers

1.0

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that are presently served from the Auburn Line. And in the event the production gas was not available, we would have obligation to continue to take gas from Tennessee and continue to service to those customers.

Q. Where is the authority for that? I mean why are saying -- what does that encompass?

MR. MacGREGOR: Well, I mean I think, Your Honor, we are not -- we would have to file for abandonment of service to the customers to cease providing. So, we would undoubtedly exercise the option to take the distribution line -- to take the line back in order to fulfill our obligation to provide distribution services to those customers. Unless we are going to abandon them, I think we have an obligation to supply them.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: So, by virtue of the fact that you still have this distribution lien that runs from Auburn to the end user, the obligation to serve continues, is that your position?

MR. MacGREGOR: Tes.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Shields?

MR. SHIELDS: Yeah, that would be my understanding, Your Honor. And I think you would be comforted by some of the terms and conditions you are going to see in the stipulation. As you summarized earlier in the discussion, you may have anticipated some of the

3

3

10

11

13

14 15

16 17

18

Honor.

19

20

21

23

24

25

questions. But yes, from our perspective, we wouldn't expect that the UGI or PNG would do anything but continue under Commission jurisdiction to provide service. And that the Commission, were they to fail to do that, fail to exercise the terms and conditions of the settlement that embodied an agreement, I think the Commission would be entirely within its jurisdiction to ensure that they did live up to their obligation to pursue whatever legal avenues they have.

And I think as I said, that will be more specifically identified in the stipulation that we intend to present to Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Counsel, do other counsel have any other questions on the basis of what I have asked so far?

MR. SHIELDS: I have nothing, Your Honor.

MR. MULLINS: Nothing. Thank you, Your

MS. WEBB: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Give me another moment here, if you would, please. (Pause.) Okay. Now, I'm looking at one of your exhibits, Mr. Shields, of the testimony of Michael Gruber for the Office of Trial Staff.

MR. SHIELDS: I have it here.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: That's where the questions

originated from and I may be taking some of what he said out of context in preparing my own question. But at page nine of Mr. Gruber's testimony--

MR. SHIELDS: We will be offering his testimony later today, also, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Understood.

MR. MacGREGOR: I'm sorry, Your Honor,

where?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: On page nine on the exhibit.

BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

Mr. Gruber is stating, "Approval of the present application will have the gas flowing from the customers locations to the interstate pipeline, but not from the interstate pipeline to the customers. Under these circumstances, it is logistically unclear how the customers would be able to acquire gas from anyone other than the local Marcellus Shale producers." And I think that, Mr. Beard, your retort to that, is that this is the displaced gas?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Could you explain that a little bit further, please?
- A. Sure. These customers would still be able to shop and choose the natural gas provider that suits them. Those volumes would be delivered to the gate Station, at the Auburn Interconnect.

And through our gas control gate, through

the displacement, basically, and the paper transaction, that's how that will take place. The actual molecules of gas to these customers would likely still come from what we are producing, there's no other way for it to get there. But there will be a paper displacement for the volumes, so that customers will have the appropriate shop.

- Q. All right. So, if you make an analogy to the electric side of the house, what we are doing here, is we're dealing dollars, not necessarily gas molecules?
- A. Correct.

10

7.7

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And your position is that the ability of the customers to shop is unimpaired and unaffected by this?
- A. That's correct, Your Honor.
- Q. Okay, thank you. On page twelve Mr. Gruber has a question posed, "Will the Commission have the same authority to regulate the operation and safety of the line if the proposed transfer of ownership from PNG to UGIES is approved?" And he answered it no and went on to elaborate. What is your response to the question?

MR. MacGREGOR: Do you mind as if I answer to the legal question?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: No, go anead.

MR. MacGREGOR: Our response in the testimony was that the pipeline would be subject to perhaps the federal regulations, rather than the state regulation

1.2

after the transfer. We also noted that there are bills pending in the Legislature to expand the Commission's jurisdiction over safety. However, this issue is specifically addressed in the stipulation. Do the parties care if I inform him of the outcome in the stipulation?

MR. SHIELDS: I think counsel has made a sufficient representation. I can confirm that the factor will be a provision in the stipulation that provides for continued inspection by Commission gas personnel.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right.

THE WITNESS: And Your Honor, just to clarify, the distribution piping served from this piping will still be operated and maintained by the utility.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. All right, let's take a look at Exhibit E. All right. Exhibit E is the Interconnection Agreement Between UGI Energy Services, Inc. and UGI Penn Natural Gas. And that has been submitted statements?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Now, just as a point of information for me, I assume that this is a stand-alone document. But I also assume that this was drafted in conformity with Tennessee Gas Pipeline provisions?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Referring to page seven, gas

quality, those criteria are PNG's criteria, the utility's criteria, which essentially mirror the requirements of Tennessee.

## BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

- Q. Okay, that's Article III, paragraph eight, gas quality?
- A. Correct.

5

6

8

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. All right. In Article IV, page ten, is the Interconnection Fee, which I think was the genesis of some of the complaints or concerns in this proceeding. I take it that any issues will be addressed in the stipulation?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  MacGREGOR: This specific issue is directly addressed in the stipulation.

## BY JUDGE BUCKLEY:

- Q. All right. Very good. The -- Article VI, force majeure, which starts on page thirteen. And again, I'm going to ask, is this related in some way to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline force majeure provisions?
- A. I think force majeure provisions are generally varied, consistent throughout the industry.
- Q. The reason I'm asking, because I'm wondering if Tennessee declares force majeure on its pipelines, is that going to be is that going to have kind of a prospective effect with respect to the operation of this gathering line the way it does with distribution lines?

1.3

i5

A. As I envision a force majeure event, Your Honor, the customer -- actually, this project would be beneficial in that regard. In the event of a force majeure on a pipeline, where normally service would be curtailed, customers along this line would continue to have service. From an operating standpoint, service to these customers would be transparent and the integrity of the service would not change but for the fact that we are establishing another point of delivery, which is, from an operating standpoint, always a good thing.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Thank you. This question is really for counsel, and I'm going to throw it out as a concern for all of the counsel to consider and I don't need your answer right now. Again, this is with respect to larger jurisdictional issues.

I think the gathering of minds have somewhat a checkered history, and I'm not talking about a liability, I am talking just in terms of jurisdictional issues, frankly I can remember back in -- somewhere in the mid-'90s sitting in front of Betsy Moler down in FERC and arguing why Pennsylvania should -- well, actually, why FERC should not assume jurisdiction over gathering lines. From a policy standpoint, in going back to something that Mr. -- Ms. Webb is it Knecht?

MS. WEBB: Knecht.

1.8

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Knecht said in his direct, that this case has the potential to set a precedent for Pennsylvania natural gas distribution companies. Our we, and again this is a rhetorical, are we looking at creating a situation here were FERC is going to come back to us and say, what you are doing is, you is you are vulcanizing the gas deals. We have a hodgepodge of regulation, half-in and half-out of federal and state. That is going to open us up to preemption.

I just want you to think about that; you don't have to reply right now. What I do want you to address, though, is in talking about your stipulation, have you made any provisions with respect to the presidential effect of this case?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes, we have.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: You have?

MR. SHIELDS: And Your Honor, interesting that you should say that. First of all, you are absolutely correct in the somewhat nebulous status of some of these lines is going to require some creativity. But those very concerns that you have just expressed and underlined have been part and parcel of the discussions, in not only this case, but certainly in some other cases.

But yes, in fact, we have -- there is a provision agreed to in the stipulation that seeks to limit

3 4 5

7

9

8

10

11

12

14

15

i7

18

19

20

21

23

22

24 25 cite-ability the application and it points out the particular nature of this particular proposal. So yes, hopefully with an eye towards not contributing further to the confusion of the nebulous nature of the status of these types of lines. I don't think there is some way to address the inquiry.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Mullins, do you have anything to say with respect to this?

MR. MULLINS: Nothing beyond what Mr. Shields has stated.

MS. WEBB: I have to look at the stipulation, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. MacGregor?

MR. MacGREGOR: I have nothing further right now, Your Honor. Except--

JUDGE BUCKLEY: With respect to this issue.

MR. MacGREGOR: I agree with Mr. Shields. Yes, the stipulation deals with limiting the precedential value and -- of this proceeding, and particularly with any jurisdictional determination of this proceeding. We will address it on the brief. There are specific facts about this gathering line that make it clear, at least to us, that the service being provided through our gathering service, is not to be for the public.

So apart from the general jurisdiction or not of

2

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

the gathering lines, the jurisdiction of the Commission over any pipeline is still limited to a line that is providing service to the public for compensation. It is clear to us, at least on these facts, which we will bring out in our brief, that this line is not providing service to the general public as the other lines are.

And that's why it may not be of a concern, at least on our part; we just have to undergo the proceedings

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. If it is clear that that's made in the settlement, then I won't question on it.

MR. SHIELDS: We appreciate your quidance on that, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Those are my questions. Thank you, Mr. Beard, for answering mine. I appreciate your being here today and taking the time to answer those questions.

THE WITNESS: You are welcome.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: I think that what I am going to do is, I am going to have what we have been marking on with pen identified as ALJ-1. And I will see that copies are distributed to the parties and that the court reporter gets copies. I would like to enter that into the record so that the Commission -- well, I should say when the

FORM 2

3

8

10

I 1

1.2

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commission reviews this, they can see exactly what we were talking about here. Does anyone have any objection to that?

(Witness excused.)

(Whereupon, the document was marked as ALJ's Exhibit No. 1 for identification, and was received in evidence.)

MR. SHIELDS: How would those documents be identified, Your Honor?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: The document on the left would be disregarded, because we didn't use that. The blow-up on the right that Mr. Beard and I marked on, I'm going to mark as ALJ-1.

MR. SHIELDS: Understood.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Any objection?

MR. SHIELDS: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: So, let's sum-up here procedurally. What we're going to do is, you are going to go ahead and -- the parties are going to go ahead and you are going to refine the stipulation, refine the settlement. Tentatively, we will expect the file in seven -- did you say this week?

MR. MacGREGOR: Well, I'm an eternal optimist, Your Honor. It is going to most likely going to be next week.

1.8

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right.

MR. MacGREGOR: We will do it as soon as possible, because OSBA wants to have a chance to see it to try to respond. But the terms and conditions are known today and have been given -- I mean the OSBA has the draft and the basic terms and conditions are not going to change. It is really something boilerplate and precedential language and that's not going to change. The basic terms and conditions are in place and known to the parties.

MR. SHIELDS: And further, Your Honor, the OSBA was provided -- it is my understanding that most of the negotiations were conducted by e-mail. The OSBA was provided with most, if not all of those e-mails as they ensued in the last week.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: what does the OSBA have to say about that?

MS. WEBB: I can't speak to the e-mail traffic that went back and forth from the company to all of the parties. I know what I received. I understand that there were discussions that we were initially involved; I do not want to speak to our ability to respond to the final document until I see the final document.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Understood.

MS. WEBB: I hope to be able to do it based on Mr. MacGregor's representations in brief, but if it is

5

1 Ú

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

served at the eleventh hour, I may need to request an opportunity to respond in a separate document.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And assuming that your issue is not resolved, then I can expect to see a brief on March 30th?

MS. WEBB: Yes, sir. The issues that we are going forward with will be in main brief. My only concern about not being able to include anything in the main brief is dependant on when the settlement from the other parties is resolved. But our -- the OSBA's issues going forward, I will file a main brief on the 30th.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: UGI will also file a brief?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And then reply briefs, again, are April 7th?

MS. WEBB: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Now, housekeeping. I assume you all have exhibits and testimony that you would like to move into the record?

MR. MacGREGOR: I have one, Your Honor, to finish up some things.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Sure, please.

MR. MacGREGOR: Well, it is a stipulation between OSBA and the company. As I mentioned earlier off the record, I believe, that this stipulation involves the

1.1

1.8

<u>1</u>9

stipulation between Procter and Gamble and UGI PNG that we referenced in our testimony. The OSBA had certain questions about the contract for Mr. Beard, Procter and Gamble, in particular, and PNG. The agreement has confidentiality provisions in it and competitive information.

So, we have worked out an agreement and I appreciate the cooperation of the OSBA in doing this, where they essentially pre-served their questions and answers and we refined those and agreed on a stipulation that essentially answered the questions that the OSBA would have asked Mr. Beard. We put that into a confidential stipulation that we would like to move into the record under seal.

And I guess it remains to be seen whether that would need to be referred to in briefs and whether there will have to be proprietary and non-proprietary portions of the briefs. To the extent that we can avoid that, we will, but if we can't, we can't and we would go forward with that.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Ms. Webb?

MS. WEBB: I agree with Mr. MacGregor. We will likely need to refer to things in briefs if it gets to the point -- if I can't do it in such a generic way that I need to refer to things that are in the stipulation, it is

JUDGE BUCKLEY: This is a time confidential 2 stipulation. It is a stipulation that remains confidential 3 for--That's correct. MR. MacGREGOR: JUDGE BUCKLEY: It is not the contract, itself? MR. MacGREGOR: No. JUDGE BUCKLEY: That is not part of the 9 record; it is not being put in under a protective order. 10 11 It is not going to be put into the record, correct? MR. MacGREGOR: No. 12 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. 13 MR. MacGREGOR: It is not marked, I didn't 14 mark it for identification as a PNG exhibit -- hearing 1.5 exhibit 1, if that's the case. 16 MS. WEBB: PNG-OSBA stipulation. 17 MR. MacGREGOR: Yes, PNG-OSBA Exhibit Number 16 1, or stipulation exhibit; however is easiest for Your 19 Honor. 20 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Why don't we just mark it as 21 PNG-OSBA 1? 22 (Whereupon, the document was marked as 23 PNG-OSBA Exhibit No. 1 for identification.) 24 MR. MacGREGOR: Okay. Great. 25

likely that we will file a proprietary brief.

onto this sealed copy. MR. MacGREGOR: I -- do we -- if you know, do we provide -- should I provide copies to the court reporter, Your Honor? 6 JUDGE BUCKLEY: I believe that you must, but 7 provided as you provided it to me under seal. MR. MacGREGOR: Okav. JUDGE BUCKLEY: The secretary can put that () 3.0 exhibit under a confidential file in the docket, I am sure. 11 MR. MacGREGOR: Would it be better if I leave this with the secretary under seal or--1.2 13 JUDGE BUCKLEY: This document is prospective, correct? It is if you can come to an 14 agreement or -- this is an agreement that you have already 15 reached? 16 MR. MacGREGOR: Yes. 17 JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. I really think 18 that it needs to be a record. 19 MR. MacGREGOR: It should. 20 JUDGE BUCKLEY: It should be part of the 21 record. But what I am going to do, is I will make sure 22 that the secretary understands that there is a portion of 23 this record that is highly confidential and access is to be 24

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And I'm just going to hold

restricted and in conformity with confidentiality

requirements. Obviously it will received by the Commissions in reviewing this, is that satisfactory?

MR. MacGREGOR: Yes, that is correct, Your Honor. Thank you.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Mr. Shields?

(Whereupon, the document marked as

PNG-OSBA's Exhibit No. 1 was received in
evidence.)

MR. SHIELDS: Your Honor, just on the question of it being offered for the record. Our office will accept Mr. MacGregor's representation as to what the document represents. It is our understanding that it is a separate -- as he indicated, it is a separate stipulation on a particular finite set of issues between UGI PNG and OSBA. And perhaps counsel for UGI PNG could indicate what, if any effect, this document being offered may have upon the stipulation entered into by the three parties?

MR. MacGREGOR: I do not believe that it has any effect and it does not address or deal with any issues that are covered in the final stipulation.

MR. SHIELDS: With that representation, I have no objection to its admission, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Do you agree with that representation, Ms. Webb?

MS. WEBB: I -- it was not intended to cover

1.8

the issues that were -- that would be discussed in terms of settlement. But having not reviewed the final stipulation, I can't speak to that.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Mr. Shields, do you want to go ahead.

MR. SHIELDS: I do, indeed, Your Honor. As previously indicated, as I think by counsel for the company on the record and in our off the record discussions before we convened -- Your Honor convened the hearing this morning, during the course of the proceeding we identified the OTS witness Michael Gruber and distributed his direct testimony and an exhibit and a surrebuttal testimony which I will now proceed to ask be marked for identification. As OTS Statement Number 1, the direct testimony of Michael Gruber. As OTS Exhibit Number 1, the exhibit which accompanied the direct testimony at the time that it was distributed; a document entitled Exhibit to Accompany the Direct testimony of Michael Gruber.

And finally, and subsequently distributed, the surrebuttal of Michael Gruber that we ask, along with the other documents, be marked for identification. This particular document, we ask be marked as OTS Statement Number 1-SR. And may those three documents be so marked, Your Honor?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: They will be so marked.

They are so marked. Are there any objections to the exhibits?

(Whereupon, the documents were marked as Office of Trial Staff's Statements Nos. 1 and 1-SR and Office of Trial Staff's Exhibit No. 1 for identification.)

MR. MacGREGOR: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Hearing none, they are admitted into the record.

(Whereupon, the documents marked as Office of Trial Staff's Statements Nos.

1 and 1-SR and Office of Trial Staff's Exhibit No. 1 were received in evidence.)

MR. SHIELDS: I have nothing further, Your

Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Mr. Mullins?

MR. MULLINS: Thank you, Your Honor. The

OCA would like to identify for the record OCA Statement

Number 1, the Direct Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa, M-i-er-z-w-a, OCA Statement Number 1 consists of six pages of

question and answer testimony.

The OCA would also like to identify for the record, OCA Statement Number 1-S, the surrebuttal testimony of Mr. Mierzwa. OCA Statement Number 1-S consists of two pages of question and answer testimony. Both OCA Statement

Ç)

10

13

12

13

14

i 5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Number 1 and OCA Statement Number 1-S have been provided to Your Honor and the parties. To the court reporter, copies will be provided prior to the conclusion of this hearing.

Based on previously agreement of the parties, the OCA would move for the admission of OCA Statement Number 1 and OCA Statement Number 1-S.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: They are so marked. there any objection to their admission?

> (Whereupon, the documents were marked as OCA's Statements Nos. 1 and 1-S for identification.)

MR. MacGREGOR: No objections.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: They are admitted into the

record. Ms. Webb?

(Whereupon, the documents marked as OCA's Statements Nos. 1 and 1-S were received in evidence.)

MS. WEBB: Thank you, Your Honor. I have previously distributed to the parties copies of the direct and surrebuttal testimony of the OSBA's witness Robert D. Knecht, K-n-e-c-h-t. I would like to identify for the record OSBA Statement Number 1, which consists of twelve pages of question and answer, and Exhibit IEC-1 and IEC-2. And the surrebuttal testimony, which is eight pages of question and answer testimony; the surrebuttal, I have also

5

G

i 0

11

12

⊥3

14

3.5

16

1.7

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

distributed proprietary versions. So, I will be giving the court reporter four pieces of testimony for surrebuttal.

And I understand that no one has cross examination for Mr. Knecht and that the statements can be entered by stipulation. And I would request that they be identified and moved into the record.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. They will be so marked. Any objection?

(Whereupon, the documents were marked as OSBA's Statements Nos. 1, 2 Non-Proprietary Version and 2 Proprietary Version for identification.)

MR. MacGREGOR: No objection, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. They are

admitted. Now, I'm not going to close the record. At the prehearing we had agreed that the record was going to stay open until the date of filing of reply briefs, which I believe is April 6th?

(Whereupon, the documents marked as OSBA's Statements Nos. 1, 2 Non-Proprietary Version and 2 Proprietary Version were received in evidence.)

MR. MacGREGOR: Seventh.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Seventh, okay. Is there anything further today? Mr. Shields?

1 C

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHIELDS: Your Honor, I neglected to indicate for the record that I provided the court reporter with two copies of the documents from OTS that were offered and admitted into the record this morning.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. So noted. Mr. MacGregor?

MR. MacGREGOR: I guess I move my documents subject to cross. I can't remember if you admitted them or not.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: They are in.

MR. MacGREGOR: Thank you.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Anything else?

(No response.)

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Two things. First of all, when we get to the point where we file the settlement, I can't stress enough how important the supporting statements are going to be in this case. And I think I have given you an indication, sort of, of the issues that I believe — well, I know that I am going to be examining, and I think the Commission, as well.

So, I encourage you to go back over the transcript and to file supporting statements. Of course, also recognizing that OSBA still have an issue outstanding. Mr. MacGregor?

MR. MacGREGOR: Just to keep the procedural

10

11

<u>i</u> 2

13

14

1.5

16

17

19

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

on track, what I propose to do, in order to get the stipulation filed as soon as possible, go ahead and get that filed and then have the statement in support filed simultaneously with the briefs. I mean, we have to wait for parties to get statements in support together before we file the stipulation; that might take substantially more time. I just wanted to make sure that that was okay, that the statement in support of the stipulation are filed concurrently with the initial briefs.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Is that all right with you Mr. Shields and Mr. Mullins?

MR. MULLINS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. SHIELDS: Yes, absolutely, Your Honor. That gives us more time to allow us to focus in on whatever we need to produce and submit the stipulation to Your Honor. That facilitates that; it gives us an opportunity to subsequently have better phrased statements in support than I think the records allows.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Ms. Webb?

MS. WEBB: I'm hoping that the stipulation will speak for itself and that the statements in support won't change how the OSBA understands what is proposed. I am concerned that I won't have an opportunity to respond, although the statements in support shouldn't modify the document.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

<u> 1</u>4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WEBB: Right, they can't modify the document. MR. MacGREGOR: So, I would suggest that -and I certainly wouldn't object, if there is any concerns about the statements of support. MS. WEBB: Okay. MR. MacGREGOR: You can do that and reply at the time of the reply brief, either in the reply brief or separate. Is that okay, Your Honor? MS. WEBB: I will say that most communication with the parties, Your Honor, if the concern is raised, we will address it. JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Now, Ms. Webb, I understand your concern and I'm not seeking to minimize it. I am hoping that it will not come down to that, but I also agree with Mr. MacGregor; you will be given an opportunity, if you feel you need to address something that is raised in the statement -- in any statement of support, that you will have that opportunity. MS. WEBB: Thank you.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Anything else?

MR. MacGREGOR: Well, they can't modify it.

(No response.)

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Finally, I want to thank Mr. Beard for being here today. I want to thank

e

1.4

counsel for your professionalism. For me, this has been a very productive and informative hearing. I am happy that we have had the opportunity to go over these issues. I think it is going to make for a much better grasp of the issues. Having said that, it is 11:28 and we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:28 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

**\* \* \*** 

## $\underline{C}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{R}$ $\underline{T}$ $\underline{I}$ $\underline{F}$ $\underline{I}$ $\underline{C}$ $\underline{A}$ $\underline{T}$ $\underline{E}$

I hereby certify, as the stenographic reporter, that the foregoing proceedings were taken stenographically by me, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; and that this transcript is a true and accurate record to the best of my ability.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

By: Ryan Metcalf

SECRETARY SPIDE ST

A TO THE VIEW