```
14
1
        BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
3
    In the Matter of the
    Application of Columbia
    Gas of Ohio, Inc. for
    Approval of a General
                          : Case No. 08-1344-GA-EXM
5
    Exemption of Certain
    Natural Gas Commodity Sales,:
6
    Services, or Ancillary
    Services from Chapters 4095,:
    4909, and 4535 Except
    Sections 4905.10, 4935.01, :
8
    and 4535.03 and from
    Specified Sections of
    Chapter 4933 of the Revised:
    Code.
10
11
                         PROCEEDINGS
    before Ms. Christine M. Pirik and Ms. Katie Stenman,
12
13
    Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities
14
    Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-F,
15
    Columbus, Ohio, called at 10 a.m. on Wednesday,
16
    October 7, 2009.
17
18
                          VOLUME II
19
20
                    ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
21
              222 East Town Street, Second Floor
                  Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
22
               (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
                     Fax - (614) 224-5724
23
2.4
25
```

15 1 **APPEARANCES:** 2 Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur By Mr. Daniel R. Conway 3 41 South High Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 4 On behalf of the Company. Janine Migden-Ostrander, 6 Office of Consumers' Counsel By Mr. Larry S. Sauer, 7 Assistant Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 8 Columbus, Ohio 43215 9 On behalf of the Residential Consumers of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. 10 Bell & Royer Co., LPA 11 By Mr. Barth E. Royer 33 South Grant Avenue 12 Columbus, Ohio 43215 13 On behalf of Dominion Retail. 14 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP By Mr. M. Howard Petricoff 15 52 East Gay Street Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008 16 On behalf of Ohio Gas Marketers Group and 17 Sempra Energy Trading, LLC. 18 Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy By Ms. Colleen L. Mooney 19 1431 Mulford Road Columbus, Ohio 43212 20 On behalf of the Ohio Partners for 21 Affordable Energy. 22 Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Mr. E. Brett Breitschwerdt 23 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 24 On behalf of Ohio Schools Council. 25

```
16
 1
    APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
            Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP
            By Mr. W. Jonathan Airey
            52 East Gay Street
 3
            Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
 4
                  On behalf of Honda of America.
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		17
1 2	INDEX	
3	 Witness Page	
4	Stephen E. Puican Direct Examination by Ms. Hammerstein 26	
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Hammerstein 20	
6		
7	Joint Exhibit Identified Admitted	
8	1 Recommendation and Stipulation 19 31	
9	2 Revised Program Outline (late filed) 24 31	
10	Company Exhibit Identified Admitted	
11	1 Application I-8 31	
12	2 Supplemental Filing I-9 31	
13		
14	3 Testimony of Thomas J. Brown I-9 31	
15	4 Testimony of Michael D. Anderson I-9 31	
16	4A MDA-1 I-10 31	
17	5 Testimony of Heather Bauer I-9 31	
18	6 Testimony of Scott D. Phelps I-9 31	
19	7 Testimony of J. Michael Ripley I-9 31	
20	8 Testimony of Larry W. Martin I-9 31	
	9 Proofs of Legal Notice I-10 31	
21	10 Tariffs (late filed) 25 31	
22232425		

Wednesday Morning Session,
October 7, 2009.

EXAMINER PIRIK: We'll go back on the record. We are reconvening Case No. 08-1344-GA-EXM being in the Matter of the Application of Columbia Gas of Ohio for Approval of a General Exemption of Certain Natural Gas Commodities Sales, Services, or Ancillary Services. My name is Christine Pirik and with me is Katie Stenman, and we are presiding over this case.

We had recessed on September 29 and are reconvening today for the purpose of hearing from the parties with regard to the pendency of a stipulation proposal.

Mr. Conway.

MR. CONWAY: Thank you, your Honor. At the last hearing day we marked and submitted to you a number of exhibits. One that we did not have at the time was the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation which we were close to completing but had not quite completed and I am happy to report to you today that we have completed the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation and I believe that we had previously marked it as or reserved a marking for it of Joint

```
1
    Exhibit No. 1 and so today we would like to formally
2
    mark it -- the document itself as Joint Exhibit No. 1
3
    and offer it into evidence along with the other
    exhibits that we had marked at the prior hearing
5
    date.
                EXAMINER PIRIK: I don't have on my
7
    tabulation that we had marked it, so at this time I
8
    will have it marked as Joint Exhibit No. 1.
                (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
10
                MR. CONWAY: Thank you, your Honor.
11
                EXAMINER PIRIK: While you are passing
12
    those out I need to see whether or not there are
13
    other appearances that we need to have on the record.
14
                Mr. Petricoff.
15
                MR. PETRICOFF: Yes, your Honor.
                                                   At this
16
    time I would like to enter the appearance of Sempra
17
    Energy Trading. Sempra Energy did not sign the
18
    stipulation, but I am authorized to say on their
19
    behalf that they do not oppose the stipulation.
20
                EXAMINER PIRIK:
                                  Thank you.
21
                Mr. Conway.
                             Thank you, your Honor.
22
                MR. CONWAY:
                                                      In
23
    the same vein I am authorized to inform you that NGR
24
    Energy Services Company who is represented by
25
    Mr. Dortch will also take a position and they will
```

```
docket a letter reflecting the position of non-opposition to the stipulation.
```

And the only other party that I think is then outstanding is J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corp. I talked to counsel for J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corp. Mr. Pearlman yesterday, and he said that he would confirm that they also are taking a position of non-opposition. He also explained to me that their role or their participation level in this case is one of observing and keeping track of what's going on rather than active participation in any event.

EXAMINER PIRIK: And he will be filing something also?

MR. CONWAY: He said he would send me an e-mail confirming their position, their non-opposition which I could turnaround and submit, or I could call him back and tell him that it's your preference to have a letter docketed indicating their position of non-opposition.

EXAMINER PIRIK: Yes. They would need to indicate that in some fashion by a docketed letter. That would be preferrable.

MR. CONWAY: Okay. Thank you, your
Honor.

EXAMINER PIRIK: Now, if we could just

```
1
    take a minute, if I could go through the signatures
2
    to make sure the list I have corresponds with the
3
    list we just discussed.
                MR. CONWAY: Are we off the record at
5
    this point?
                EXAMINER PIRIK:
                                  Yes.
7
                (Discussion off the record.)
8
                EXAMINER PIRIK: Mr. Conway, did you have
9
    anything further?
10
                MR. CONWAY: One other point, your Honor.
11
    We had mentioned in our first hearing day that we
12
    also intended to submit as an exhibit the revised
13
    program outline which was -- the program outline is
14
    one of the documents that was submitted with the
15
    original application, and we had indicated at the --
16
    I believe we had indicated at the hearing last week
17
    that our intention was to complete the revised
18
    program outline and submit it as an exhibit also.
19
                I can't recall whether we indicated it
20
    would be late-filed or not, but we are still working
21
    on that document, and we would intend that it be --
22
    we being the company and I anticipate all the other
23
    parties would agree that it would be submitted as
24
    another joint exhibit, Joint Exhibit No. 2, as soon
```

as possible. Our goal for that is within the next

week.

But with that and also another point is that we also are then working in parallel on the modified tariffs that would need to be submitted for Commission approval ultimately also. So with that provided along with the testimony that we marked in the last -- at the last hearing day, the proofs of newspaper publication, and the application itself which had been earlier filed in two pieces and which were marked as two separate exhibits, that would comprise the record, the exhibits we marked last week along with Mr. Puican's testimony which is upcoming, those exhibits, the joint exhibit that was filed today and submitted to you, the second joint exhibit that we anticipate filing, the revised program outline shortly.

And so our plan is -- or our agenda is to then take testimony from Mr. Puican regarding the manner in which the stipulation meets the Commission's criteria for settlements and then together with all the other documents that we have marked offer them into evidence, get them admitted, and then we would have a complete record to submit for the Commission's decision.

EXAMINER PIRIK: Mr. Conway, what's the

time frame with regard to the revised program

outline? I just don't -- I see that the tariffs will

be filed for review within 30 days of today. I

didn't know if you had a time frame for that.

MR. CONWAY: Our tentative -- our anticipated time frame is that we -- we would be completing that process by next week, by the end of next week. That's our target and we have gotten comments on the revised program outline from all the parties and we are in the process of integrating all the comments and completing the revised program outline not as we speak but it will be the next thing we turn our attention to after we get out -- when we complete the hearing.

And we are meeting on this Friday. The drafting committee is meeting this Friday to go over all the comments that have been submitted by all the parties to the revised program outline, and then our hope is that we would then recirculate the revised program outline among all the parties and get their consensus it is in final form and ready to submit as a late-filed exhibit. We would hope to do that -- expect to do that next week.

EXAMINER PIRIK: Now, not having had the opportunity to read the stipulation I note that

```
1
    there's a number of modifications. Now, are -- is
2
    this just a brief summary of what's anticipated to be
3
    part of the revised program outline or -- I mean,
    will all of these items be incorporated in what you
5
    will be filing as late-filed Exhibit No. 2?
6
                MR. CONWAY: Yes. They would be
7
    reflected in the revised program outline and they
8
    are -- they are driving the modifications to the
    revised program outline which does provide a greater
10
    level of detail on the implementation of the -- of
11
    the program, but it is based upon, driven by, and
12
    adheres to the changes that were -- or the provisions
13
    that were included in the Joint Stipulation and
14
    Recommendation.
15
                EXAMINER PIRIK:
                                 Okay. With that I will
16
    authorize you to file a late-filed Joint Exhibit 2
17
    and we will anticipate it within the next couple of
18
    weeks to have the document filed. I'm not holding
19
    you to that date because it sounds like we are still
20
    waiting for the tariffs to be filed also so.
21
                MR. CONWAY: The tariffs will come in
22
    after the -- after the Joint Exhibit No. 2, the
23
    revised program outline.
```

24

```
1
    application and everything that we are doing is part
2
    of the record and part of the consideration will the
3
    tariffs that are going to be filed, those will
    likewise be -- I guess they are part of the
5
    stipulation so to speak, but I'm thinking we need to
6
    mark those as a late-filed exhibit also once -- and
7
    then those will be filed.
8
                MR. CONWAY:
                             That would be fine.
9
                ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. So will those
10
    be -- those are tariffs. I am not sure those are
11
    joint exhibits. Those are company -- I think that
12
    would be a company exhibit.
13
                MR. CONWAY: We would be happy to mark
14
    that as a Company Exhibit No. 10.
15
                EXAMINER PIRIK: I believe we are at 10,
16
          That document will be marked as late-filed
17
    Company Exhibit No. 10, and those will be the tariffs
18
    that will be filed.
19
                Is there anything further before we --
20
                MR. CONWAY: No, your Honor, but at some
21
    point I would like to move again for the admission of
22
    all the company exhibits as well as the joint
23
    exhibits that have been submitted or have been
```

EXAMINER PIRIK: I believe -- we'll do

24

25

proposed for late filing.

- that. I believe we have a witness to support the
- 2 stipulation, and we will wait for the motions and the
- ³ rulings until after that witness has taken the stand.
- 4 Ms. Hammerstein.
- MS. HAMMERSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- 6 The staff of the Commission would call Stephen E.
- ⁷ Puican to the stand.
- 8 _ _ _ _
- 9 STEPHEN E. PUICAN
- 10 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
- 11 examined and testified as follows:
- 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 13 By Ms. Hammerstein:
- Q. Good morning, Mr. Puican. Would you
- 15 please state and spell your name for the record.
- A. Stephen Puican, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, last name
- P-U-I-C-A-N.
- Q. And what is your business address?
- A. 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- Q. And by whom are you employed?
- A. By the Public Utilities Commission of
- 22 Ohio.
- Q. And what position are you in at the
- 24 Commission?
- A. I am currently co-chief of the Rates and

Tariffs Energy and Water Division.

- Q. And could you please give us a brief description of your experience and education.
- A. I have a Bachelor's degree in economics from Kent State University in 1980, a Master's degree from Ohio State University in 1983 in economics with a specialty in econometrics. I have been employed with the state of Ohio since 1983, originally as part of the Ohio Department of Development, Division of Energy. That division was incorporated into the PUCO in 1985 and I have been with the Commission in various positions since.

In my current position I am responsible for most issues relating to the economic regulation of natural gas utilities including rate setting, GCR, SSO, SCO, evaluations and audits, various tariff issues, the contract issues, and various other aspects of customer choice programs and those related issues.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And are you familiar with the Stipulation and Recommendation that have been marked as Joint Exhibit 1 in this proceeding?
 - A. Yes, I am.
 - Q. And how did you gain that familiarity?
 - A. I was involved in most if not all of the

- negotiating sessions that led up to the ultimate signing of the stipulation.
 - Q. And are you aware of and familiar with the three-part test or criteria that the Commission uses to examine settlements?
 - A. Yes, I am.

- Q. Okay. And in terms of Joint Exhibit 1, do you believe that the stipulation is the product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties?
- A. Yes. The parties represent an extremely diverse group of interests, the attorneys representing the various parties have many, many years of experience in matters such as are addressed in this stipulation, and I think the fact that we have a unanimous stipulation or at least no one opposing the stipulation clearly indicates that it was a product of serious bargaining.
- Q. And in your -- based on your experience do you believe that the stipulation as a whole benefits ratepayers in the public interest?
- A. Yes, it does. It provides for the replacement of the current GCR mechanism with a standard service offer mechanism followed by a standard choice offer mechanism. Both of those

- mechanisms will result from market-based auctions
 which will determine an adder that will be added to
 the NYMEX. We've seen this approach be successful in
 two of the other companies where such auctions have
 been used, and we believe that ultimately it is
 preferable to the current gas cost mechanism because
 it applies a more immediate market-based price and
 eliminates the need for GCR-based true-ups and lag
 adjustments that are typical of the GCR.
 - Q. And do you believe that the stipulation violates any important regulatory principle?

A. It does not. The stipulation provides benefits to customers as I just described without harming the interest of any of the other parties, and it does so without the need for additional litigation. It establishes a regulatory framework for the period April, 2010, through March, 2013, that all parties were able to agree to.

It also complies with the requirements of 4929.04 of the Revised Code which governs exemption applications as well as Commission decisions in previous cases.

Q. And is it your recommendation that based on your experience and experience in this case that the Commission adopt this stipulation?

```
1
                Yes, it is.
           Α.
2
                MS. HAMMERSTEIN: Your Honor, the witness
3
    is available for cross-examination.
                EXAMINER PIRIK: Are there any questions
5
    from any of the parties?
                I have none. Thank you, Mr. Puican.
7
                THE WITNESS: Thank you.
8
                EXAMINER PIRIK: Does that complete --
    that completes our witnesses?
10
                MS. HAMMERSTEIN: Yes, your Honor.
11
                MR. CONWAY: Yes, your Honor.
12
                EXAMINER PIRIK: Mr. Conway.
13
                MR. CONWAY: Your Honor, at this time I
14
    would move for the admission of Company Exhibits 1
15
    through 9 and also reiterate that Company Exhibit 10,
16
    the tariffs, will be a late-filed exhibit and would
17
    request their admission when they are late-filed.
18
                And I also would move for the admission
19
    of Joint Exhibit No. 1, the Joint Stipulation and
    Recommendation, and also ask that Joint Exhibit No.
20
21
    2, the revised program outline which is also going to
22
    be late-filed, also be admitted when it is finally
23
    filed.
            Thank you.
24
                EXAMINER PIRIK: Are there any
25
    objections?
```

```
31
1
                 Hearing none Company Exhibits 1 through
2
    10 shall be admitted onto the record.
3
                 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
                 EXAMINER PIRIK: As well as Joint
    Exhibits 1 and 2 shall be admitted.
5
6
                 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)
7
                 EXAMINER PIRIK: Is there anything
8
    further we need to discuss today? Hearing none this
9
    concludes the hearing and this case will be submitted
10
    to the Commission for consideration. We are
11
    adjourned.
12
                 (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded at
13
    10:38 a.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Wednesday, October 7, 2009, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

_s/Karen Sue Gibson______
 Karen Sue Gibson, Registered
 Merit Reporter.

10 (KSG-5106)

11 _ _ _ _

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

10/21/2009 10:05:28 AM

in

Case No(s). 08-1344-GA-EXM

Summary: Transcript Columbis Gas Vol II 10/7/09 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.