

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

John Logue	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3053181
	:	
Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC	:	

FOURTH POST HEARING ORDER

Reopen Hearing Record to
Correct Transcript from
Evidentiary Hearing

Before
Katrina L. Dunderdale
Administrative Law Judge

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On January 30, 2025, John Logue (Complainant or Mr. Logue) filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC (Respondent or Peoples) alleging Peoples provided poor customer service when it applied the Weather Normalization Adjustment (WNA) to his billing statements for natural gas service provided to his residence, and when it used an incorrect formula to determine the adjustment.

On February 20, 2025, Respondent filed an Answer, in which Peoples admitted it provided natural gas service to Complainant at the service address but generally denied the allegations.

On April 23, 2025, the presiding officer convened the initial hearing, at which Complainant and Respondent appeared. Both parties presented testimonial and documentary evidence, which was admitted into the hearing record.

On May 15, 2025, the court reporter filed a transcript (May 15, 2025 transcript) from the initial hearing on April 23, 2025, but the exhibits admitted at the hearing were not included. On May 16, 2025, the presiding officer inquired about the missing exhibits.

Thereafter, on May 19, 2025, the court reporter filed a second transcript (official transcript), from the initial hearing on April 23, 2025, with the Commission's Secretary's Bureau, in addition to filing the exhibits which had been admitted into the hearing record during the initial hearing.

On May 20, 2025, the presiding officer issued the Interim Order Closing the Hearing Record.

On May 27, 2025, Respondent filed a Petition to Reopen the Record (Petition), pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.571. Respondent requested the presiding officer reopen the hearing record for the limited purpose of correcting certain typographical errors in the transcript.

On June 4, 2025, the May 15, 2025 transcript was removed from the Commission's docket because the court reporter filed the official transcript on May 19, 2025, including the missing exhibits.

On June 5, 2025, the presiding officer issued the First Post Hearing Order which granted the request to reopen the hearing record. Respondent was given until June 18, 2025, in which to file a request to correct the transcript which complied with the provisions at 52 Pa. Code § 5.253.

On June 17, 2025, Respondent contacted the presiding officer via email on behalf of both parties and informed the presiding officer that the parties were attempting to reach a consensus on the corrections that should be made to the transcript. The parties requested additional time – to July 3, 2025 – and the request was granted by the presiding officer via email.

On July 1, 2025, Respondent filed the Joint Proposed Corrections to the Hearing Transcript (Proposed Corrections) containing three pages of changes the parties agreed should be ordered. Those three pages included 47 instances in the transcript which the parties agreed were incorrect and needed to be corrected in the official transcript.

On August 6, 2025, the presiding officer issued the Second Post Hearing Order which corrected the transcript and closed the hearing record. However, the presiding officer noticed there was a discrepancy in the page/line references used in the parties' list versus the official transcript. Further inquiry revealed the court reporter had provided the parties with the wrong transcript, instead of the official transcript. Accordingly, the presiding officer offered the parties a second opportunity to obtain the correct transcript (i.e., the official transcript) and re-submit the Proposed Corrections using the correct page/line references in the official transcript. On August 18, 2025, the parties indicated there was a new list of corrections they wanted to have admitted into the hearing record.

Thereafter, on August 21, 2025, Respondent filed the Corrected Joint Proposed Corrections to Hearing Transcript (Corrected Joint Proposal). The Corrected Joint Proposal contains a list of 47 suggested corrections. Respondent provided a "clean" list as well as a "red-lined" list, which reflected the page/line references which had to be corrected.

On September 4, 2025, Respondent emailed a correction to the presiding officer and Complainant which corrected the as-filed corrected transcript corrections that were e-filed on August 21, 2025.

DISCUSSION

The parties, who participated in the April 23, 2025 hearing, have jointly presented proposed corrections to the transcript for the purpose of ensuring the transcript accurately depicts the testimony and statements made during the initial hearing, pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.253(b). Those proposed corrections are listed in full in Appendix A, attached hereto. In addition, the parties provided a "red-line" list of proposed corrections which reflect the proposed corrections

with the incorrect page/line references. The red-lined list is provided in full in Appendix B, attached hereto.

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.253, the presiding officer may correct a transcript but only if the correction is necessary to ensure the evidence in the hearing record accurately reflects the evidence presented at the hearing. Specifically, provisions at 52 Pa. Code § 5.253(b) state: “Proposed corrections of a transcript may be submitted by either of the following means: (1) by written stipulation by the parties of record who were present when the transcription was taken; or (2) upon written request of one or more parties of record present when the transcription was taken.”

Respondent and Complainant reached an agreement on how the transcript should be corrected for the purpose of ensuring the transcript accurately reflected the testimonies and statements offered at the initial hearing. This agreement resulted in the list of proposed corrections reflected in Appendix A, which chart is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

The parties’ request to correct the transcript is reasonable and will be granted in the Ordering Paragraphs below. As noted previously, both parties were present at the April 23, 2025 hearing; both parties agree the proposed corrections are necessary; the requests (to correct the transcript) were made in a timely manner after the filing of the transcript; and the parties’ proposed corrections are material to a resolution of this proceeding. Accordingly, the presiding officer will grant the parties’ joint request to make the requested transcript corrections.

Furthermore, both parties had a full opportunity to provide evidence in support of each party’s assertions at the initial hearing. Both parties provided final statements on the hearing record. Therefore, it appearing no additional evidence needs to be provided by either party and no additional hearing needs to be scheduled, the hearing record in this proceeding will be closed in an Ordering Paragraph.

Appendix A

Page	Line	Change From:	Change To:
7	1	nutshell, bill projection and how it's displaying the WNA on our bill	nutshell, bill presentment and how it's displaying the WNA on our bill.
32	3	those ways is what's called bills rendered because	those ways is what's called bills rendered.
32	4	It's adjusted. In bills rendered, what that means	Bills rendered means
32	5	Is that it's computed for a period for the customer,	that the ending date of the period being billed is used
32	6	What their rate is. If the bill takes you from	to determine the rate. As an example, if the period is
32	7	August 31 st through October 2 nd , the way that bills	August 31 st through October 2 nd ,
32	8	Rendered works is that whatever that delivery day of	the rate in effect as of October 2 nd
32	9	That billing period is, whatever rates are in effect	(the end date of the billing period)
32	10	That date are applied to the full bill.	is applied to the full bill period.
37	22	to reflect the customers bill to better reflect	to adjust the customers bill to better reflect
37	23	normal weatherization	normal weather.
38	14	customer to use. We then tier that to how much gas	customer to use. We then compare that to how much gas
44	3	not a primary driver.	not a primary driver of usage.
48	11	presenting issue	presentment issue
51	22	I agree that the line is basically	I agree that the line says presented
52	8	I'm not saying that the presentation on	I'm saying that the presentation on
52	11	calculations are similar. I can see that there is a	calculations are similar. I can't see that there is a
53	17	dollars. Say roughly \$10 per MCL. If the true	dollars. Say roughly \$10 per MCF. If the true
53	19	10 or recover \$80. So that the WNA Mcfs method does	10 or recover \$80. So that the WNA mechanism does
53	24	the Commission simply could recover \$100. This	the Commission said the Company could only recover \$100. This
53	25	would all be based on normal weatherization.	would all be based on normal weather.
55	4	expected for a day based on historic weather tests.	expected for a day based on historic weather data.

55	23	of rate is agreed upon. The best rate is use if a	of rate is agreed upon. The rate is not used if a
55	24	rate is not agreed upon. Within specific	rate is agreed upon. Within specific
56	13	It's not about – you can't be in there	It is not the same for every customer.
56	14	without being in the plan. For a customer in a	It could be the same if a customer has the same
56	15	rate date, so their date will carry, and the answer	billing date and cycle, then the answer
57	3	I understand the cycle. I do not know	I understand the question. I do not know
57	4	what that percentage is. We do have two billing	what the percentage is. We do have twenty-two billing
57	22	regulation included the customer education, you	we include customer education
59	11	is a measurement. I am familiar that there is - I	is different measurements. I am familiar that there is – mcf, ccf, therms.
59	12	I do know that we're not always the same.	I do know that we're not all the same.
59	21	each specific term. The calculation is different.	Mcf or therm. The calculation is different.
60	2	that number would vary based on Mcf or terms or	that number would vary based on Mcf or therms or
67	13	Yes. There must be an	Yes. There was an
67	14	actual meter reading recalculation.	actual heading degree day recalculation.
70	9	Yes. I am the Debit/Credit supervisor at	Yes. I am the Credit and Billing Supervisor at
70	11	And are you familiar with Mr. John Logue?	And are you familiar with Mr. John Logue's Complaint?
72	4	Yes. That was implemented on November	Yes. That was implemented on October
72	7	Normalization credit or had information on it.	Normalization credit or debit information on it.
72	18	calculation. I was able to justify it for them.	calculation. I was able to satisfy it for them.
72	21	Yes. The customers were not aware of the	Yes. The customers were made aware of the
81	2	directed to the Commission-approved Weather	about the bill presentment of the Commission-approved Weather
81	3	Normalization Adjustment noted on or around October	Normalization Adjustment implemented October

81	4	1st, 2024, and also another issue as to what those	1 st , 2024 as a separate line item
81	5	acronym mean and whether or not there was direct	and also how the calculation is
81	6	activity with respect to the Weather Normalization	presented for the Weather Normalization

C-2025-3053181 - JOHN J. LOGUE v. PEOPLES NATURAL GAS COMPANY LLC

JOHN J LOGUE
109 LUDWIG ROAD
NESHANNOCK PA 16105
609.410.3636
jjjair@aol.com

Served via USPS First Class Mail – September 25, 2025

JENNIFER PETRISEK ESQUIRE
PEOPLES NATURAL GAS COMPANY LLC
375 NORTH SHORE DRIVE
PITTSBURGH PA 15212
412.208.6834
412.208.6577
jennifer.petrisek@peoples-gas.com

Served via eService – September 25, 2025

MEAGAN MOORE SENIOR ATTORNEY
PEOPLES NATURAL GAS COMPANY LLC
375 NORTH SHORE DRIVE
PITTSBURGH PA 15212
412.208.6527
814.490.4153
meagan.moore@peoples-gas.com

Served via eService – September 25, 2025

(Counsel for Peoples Natural Gas Company LLC)