Docket Nos.

A-2010-2213893

G-2010-2213894

#### COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

BEFORE THE 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.

Initial Prehearing Conference.

Pages 1 through 19 Hearing Room Three

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

Commonwealth Keystone Building 400 North Street

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Friday, January 7, 2011

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:39 a.m.

BEFORE:

DENNIS J. BUCKLEY, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

CHRISTOPHER T. WRIGHT, Esquire
Post & Schell, PC
Seventeen North Second Street, Twelfth Floor
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101
(For UGI Penn Natural Gas, Incorporated)

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

C3224

### 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

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# WITNESS INDEX WITNESSES DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS (None.) 4 EXHIBIT INDEX NUMBER FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE Office of Trial Staff's (None.) Office of Small Business Advocate's 9 (None.) 10 Office\_of Consumer Advocate's 11 (None.) 12 1.3 UGI's (None.) 14 15 16 17

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying reporter.

\* \* \*

3

 $\frac{A}{2}$ 

E

7

8

9

11

12

13

1.5

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, prehearing conference, in the matter of the application of UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc. for approval of transfer by sale of a nine-mile natural gas pipeline, appurtenant facilities and right of way, Located in Mehoopany, Pennsylvania. That is at Docket Number A-2010-2213893. And the related filing in -- affiliated interest filing of UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc. Docket Number G-2010-2213894.

I am Administrative Law Judge Dennis J.

Buckley. And at this time I would just like to have

counsel identify themselves for the record. Why don't we

start at the end of the table, here, 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, representing UGI
Penn Natural Gas.

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

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Welcome.

1.7

4.3

MR. MULLINS: Good morning, Your Honor.

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

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Good morning.

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

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Well, good morning. Now, if counsel would bear with me one moment, I just want to put a brief procedural history, as I have it up to this time, on the record. On December 1, 2010 UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc. filed an application with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission seeking an expedited review and approval for the transfer by sale of a nine-mile natural gas pipeline, appurtenant facilities and the right of way located between Auburn and Mehoopany, Pennsylvania between an affiliated corporate entity of UGI and UGI Services, Inc.

Notice of the application was published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin and newspapers in general circulation. On December 20, 2010 the Commission's Office of Trial Staff filed a protest in the application from affiliated interests. On December 21, 2010 the Office of Small Business Advocate filed a Notice of Intervention and Protest. Meanwhile, January 3, 2011 the Office of Consumer Advocate filed a Notice of Intervention and a public statement. This case was assigned to me as a presiding

ī 8

officer on December 29, 2010.

I, thereafter, initiated a prehearing order;
I believe that was January 4, 2011. In response to that
prehearing order, counsel filed a prehearing memoranda, and
I thank them for that. We have some procedural issues here
today, including the establishment of the procedural
schedule, the discussion with respect to the certification
of the record without decision.

I also note that there had been a number of letters and comments filed in this matter, which OTS wishes to address.

MR. SHIELDS: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And there is also the matter of public input hearings, potentially, and any other matters that the parties care to raise at this time. Let me just ask first: Mr. Murphy, I understand that you have been discussing the procedural schedule?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Do you want to go ahead with that?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor. Before I do that, I did want to clarify for the record a statement that was made on page four of my prehearing conference memo. With regard to certifying the record to the Commission without the issuance of a recommended decision. I had the

G

intention of contacting the parties yesterday for the purpose of discussing that issue. Unfortunately due to the press of other business, I was unable to do so. And I also recognize a request to certify the record for the purpose of having the Commission directly decide this issue without the issuance of a recommended decision should be in the form of a petition to the Commission.

As far as the schedule is concerned, the parties have discussed and come to an agreement as to the dates of testimony, as well as hearing; and obviously the hearing would be dependent upon your schedule. PNG direct testimony, we would stick to what is in our prehearing memo at January 21, 2011. The next date would be other parties' testimony, which would be February 18, 2011.

MR. SHIELDS: Kent, if I could interrupt?

Your Honor, we would typically style that as OTS direct

testimony so as to distinguish it from the OTS sir rebuttal

testimony to the extent any of us submit it.

MR. MURPHY: So that would be other parties' direct testimony?

MR. SHIELDS: That would be my preference, Judge. Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: And that would be February
18th. All parties' rebuttal testimony would be due on
March 2, 2011. A round of sir rebuttal testimony would be

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

due March 11, 2011. Rejoinder in the form of an outline, or if we are able to turn it around quickly, written testimony, would be March 15th.

MR. SHIELDS: That would be by noon?

MR. MURPHY: By noon on March 15th.

Hearings, the parties contemplate the need for one day and we would ask Your Honor for the day of March 16th. Main briefs, I believe we agree to a two-week turnaround at March 30, 2011. And reply brief on April 7, 2011. With regard to discovery, the parties have agreed to a seven-day turnaround time; and that would be seven calendar days.

We have not discussed the need for a public input hearing. But based on our understanding of the lack public opposition, other than the Office of Small Business Advocate and the Office of Trial Staff, that there really is no need for a public input hearing.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. This is the schedule that all parties have agreed upon?

MR. SHIELDS: This is Mr. Shields; that's correct, Your Honor.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. WEBB: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Thank you. All right. Very well, that is what I will put out in the post-hearing order. I have no problem with being here on March 16,

 2011; that is the hearing date. With respect to the request for certification of record without decision, we did have some discussion with that off the record. At this point we doubt that is something that is outside of my purviews as an Administrative Law Judge and presiding officer under 52 PA Code Section 545.31(a), as well as 66 PACS Section 335. The decision with respect to certification without a decision of the presiding officer is left to the Commission, as Mr. Murphy has pointed out. What we will do, is we will go ahead with your procedural schedule as it has been laid out here.

If a petition does go to the Commission and I get a directive, then we will deal with that at the time.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Now, Mr. Shields, you had some comments that you wished to make with respect to the letters and the comments that have been filed with this docket?

MR. SHIELDS: I do, Your Honor; but not necessarily to belabor the point, but simply to indicate our position on the record. Let me first say, as Your Honor indicated, we provided electronically our prehearing conference memo to Your Honor and the parties yesterday. I have this morning provided the court reporter with an original and one copy of that OTS prehearing conference

1.4

memorandum, and I have provided hard copies to Your Honor and other counsel present here this morning.

On page five we have a section, exclusion from record evidence. It's merely to note, Your Honor, and it is not so much directed towards you, but to the -- but to whatever use the Company may consider these letters that were sent to the Secretary. The Secretary is not the one to decide the case, the case is properly in front Your Honor. Just to put the Company on record that to the extent that they intend to use those letters, that that is the OTS' position, unless they are formally offered into the record and accepted into the record. But we would merely want to have clarified for the record what our position is vis-à-vis what weight, if any, those letters should receive within the confines of this formal proceeding. That's all I have on the subject, Your Honor.

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, I would only add that I believe it is premature to address the issue. If the Company does rely upon it, then Your Honor would be able to make a determination at that point if OTS continues its objection. I would just note that the Commission did have a public notice and comment period; I believe those letters were submitted consistent with that purpose. As in many rate cases, applications, where you get hundreds of

1.1

3.4

letters from customers or interested stake holders, those documents typically remain as part of the public record, maybe not part of the evidentiary record in a proceeding.

MR. SHIELDS: Your Honor, may I respond?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yes, please.

MR. SHIELDS: I don't know that the nomenclature, public record, would be appropriate; I think it is more appropriate to say that they are in the file. My concern is not so much that the documents would be misused within the confines of this proceeding before Your Honor, but rather the fact that they would be available to anyone else during the course of whomever in the Commission reviews the -- those submissions. Which my reading of those letters contain unverified factual representations. Again, not to beat it to death, that's all I have on the matter.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Mullins, do you have a position on this?

MR. MULLINS: Your Honor, as the letters in questioned have not been proffered for the record at this point, the OCA has no position at present.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Ms. Webb?

MS. WEBB: I echo Mr. Mullins' sentiment at this point. If the Company goes forward, we will -- we may have a reaction.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. I understand how letters materialize; there was a publication. And I am sensitive, though, to Mr. Shields and I am not going to make a ruling right now. But let me just say, it would be very difficult for me to put any kind of reliance on the letters, themselves, the way that they are procedurally at this time. So, that's what I am going to say and we can go on from there.

Now, with respect to discovery, I understand you established seven calendar days. Apparently there is no need at this time for a public input hearing. interest would be expressed, then I would hope that the public advocates would let me know as soon as possible, so that we could get going with that schedule.

MR. MULLINS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. SHIELDS: Yes, Your Honor. Our office would certainly do so, although at this time we have seen no indication that a public input session is necessary.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Correct me if I am wrong, but is this -- this is in what county of Pennsylvania?

That's a good question, Your MR. MURPHY: Honor. I believe it's part of Susquehanna; I believe that Mehoopany is in Susquehanna. Auburn is in Susquehanna. And whatever is south of Susquehanna, which I don't --

JUDGE BUCKLEY: I'm just trying to get a

bearing of where -- I know it is in northcentral Pennsylvania.

MR. MURPHY: Wyoming County, Your Honor; Wyoming and Susquehanna.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Okay, thank you; I appreciate that. Now, with respect to the timing of receipt of documents, usually what my preference is that when a document is due, that we just go ahead and do eservice with hard copy to follow as soon after is practicable, with an in-hand time of 4:00 p.m. on the date due; does anyone have a problem with that?

MR. SHIELDS: Your Honor, that's terrific; that's the -- I certainly prefer that and I know my office prefers that. If we could clarify it further to say a follow-up copy by first class mail, that might save a ton of money for all parties involved, if that's acceptable to Your Honor?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: If that's acceptable to the parties, it's certainly acceptable to me.

MR. MURPHY: That's acceptable here, Your Honor.

MR. MULLINS: That's acceptable, Your Honor.
MS. WEBB: Yes, sir.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. And if a filing is due on a Saturday or a holiday, then in fact it is due

the next business day.

MR. SHI

2

3

5

7

3

11

1.2

. 3

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHIELDS: Understood, Your Honor.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. All right.

MS. WEBB: Your Honor?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yes?

MS. WEBB: I just want to make sure -- you said that the rejoinder outlines was the acceptance of the time, and that would be due at noon on the 15th; is that what we are using?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: I believe you are right, Ms. Webb.

MS. WEBB: Okay.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. What I would like to do is, if you will bear with me, let me just be absolutely sure I have the schedule correct. So, we have the company's direct testimony on January 21st, correct?

MR. MURPHY: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: And then we have the direct testimony of the other parties, will be due on the 18th of February, correct?

MR. MURPHY: 18th of February, yes.

MR. SHIELDS: That's our understanding;

that's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Then any rebuttal

MR. MURPHY: Correct. JUDGE BUCKLEY: Sir rebuttal, March 11th? MR. MURPHY: Correct. JUDGE BUCKLEY: The Company's rejoinder, 5 March 15th by noon. 6 MR. MURPHY: Correct. MR. SHIELDS: And we'll accept an outline 8 for that, Your Honor. JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. And then we will have 16 11 the hearing on March 16th. Now, that is a--MS. WEBB: Wednesday. 12 JUDGE BUCKLEY: --Wednesday. 13 MR. MURPHY: All right. 14 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Would the parties -- I know 15 you said we would only need one day; would the parties ĺή prefer having a two-day schedule, just in case? 17 MR. MURPHY: Well, Your Honor, I would be 18 open to that, Your Honor. 19 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Or do you think you can do 20 that in one day? 21 MR. MULLINS: I already have a conflict that 22 entire week, so the 16th is do-able. But if we have it on 23 two days, I am going to have to juggle a thing or two make 24

testimony will be due on March 2nd?

sure I am in attendance, if we go that long.

4

5

8

Ģ

10

11

13

14

15

1.5

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JUDGE BUCKLEY: The only reason I was suggesting it was, sometimes I get a little bit concerned with just one hearing day; if we go long or matter come up that need to be fleshed out. Why don't we keep the 16th and see how it goes and if necessary, we will schedule an additional date later on?

MR. SHIELDS: That's fine with us, Your Honor, thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Very good, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Main briefs due March 30th, reply briefs due April 7th. And I believe that that is all that I have. Let me go around the room here and make sure that all of our concerns have been addressed. Mr. Murphy, do you have anything further today?

> MR. MURPHY: Nothing further, Your Honor. JUDGE BUCKLEY: Mr. Shields?

MR. SHIELDS: Your Honor, I think you might have mentioned this in your prehearing order, but can I presume that you would like the briefs in Microsoft Word format?

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Yeah, thank you. I would really prefer any document that you will send to me in Microsoft Word. And as long as I am making clarifications, I think everybody knows my e-mail address is not dbuckley, it is debuckley@state.pa.us. Anything else, Mr. Shields?

thank you. 3 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okav. Ms. Mullins? 4 MR. MULLINS: Nothing, Your Honor; thank 5 you. JUDGE BUCKLEY: And Ms. Webb? MS. WEBB: Nothing; thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE BUCKLEY: All right. Very well, then 8 9 I think that we have done all that we can do today. I wish all of you a happy New Year and I look forward to seeing 10 11 you in this case. MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 MR. SHIELDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 JUDGE BUCKLEY: Oh, wait, one more. I'm 14 sorry, let me go back. What date did the parties contemplate a close of the record by? 1.6 MR. SHIELDS: That's an interesting 17 question, Judge. Every judge seems to have a different 18 opinion on the subject; I'm open to suggestions. 19 close it at the reply brief, some close it at the close of 20 the hearing, so -- do you have a preference, Judge? I have 21 no preference. 22 JUDGE BUCKLEY: I don't have a preference. 23

MR. SHIELDS: Nothing further, Your Honor;

I -- my preference is to leave your fates in your hands as

much as possible. So, if you have a date that you would

ì

2

3

like to suggest, then I certainly would be receptive to that.

MR. SHIELDS: All right. Well, then, I will propose April 7th, the date of the submission of the reply briefs.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Is that agreeable to everybody?

MR. MULLINS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. MURPHY: I believe so; yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE BUCKLEY: Okay. Very well. With

that, this hearing is adjourned and we are off the record. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

\* \* \*

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.