

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE.....	3
II. DISCUSSION.....	4
III. CONCLUSION.....	5

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Andrew J. Sonderman. My business address is 2626 Lewis Center Road,
4 Lewis Center, Ohio 43035.

5 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

6 A. I am employed by Suburban Natural Gas Company as its President and Chief Operating
7 Officer.

8 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL
9 QUALIFICATIONS.**

10 A. These qualifications are included in my direct testimony in this proceeding, which I
11 incorporate herein by this reference.

12 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR DUTIES AS PRESIDENT AND CHIEF
13 OPERATING OFFICER.**

14 A. I am responsible for the overall operations of the company, including regulatory matters.

15 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?**

16 A. I submitted direct testimony in support of the application in this proceeding. Previously,
17 I have represented public utilities in proceedings before this and other state utility
18 commissions.

19 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY
20 IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

21 A. My testimony addresses issues related to the Stipulation and Recommendation
22 (hereinafter, “Stipulation”) between Suburban and the Commission’s Staff regarding
23 Suburban’s Infrastructure Replacement Program.

24 **II. DISCUSSION**

25 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE COMPANY’S FILINGS IN THIS MATTER?**

26 A. Yes.

27 **Q. WERE YOU INVOLVED IN THE SETTLEMENT OF THIS CASE?**

28 A. Yes. I had discussions with Staff regarding many of the issues related to the filing, I
29 assisted in preparing answers to most of the informal information requests submitted by
30 the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Staff) and was in contact with legal
31 counsel and the Staff with regard to the settlement process.

32 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE THREE-PART TEST WHICH THE**
33 **COMMISSION APPLIES TO STIPULATED SETTLEMENTS?**

34 A. Yes. The Commission has in the past applied, and should use in considering this
35 Stipulation, the following three regulatory principles or criteria: First, is the Stipulation a
36 product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties? Second, taken as a
37 package, does the Stipulation benefit ratepayers and the public interest? Third, does the
38 Stipulation violate any important regulatory principle or practice?

39 **Q. WAS THIS STIPULATION THE PRODUCT OF SERIOUS BARGAINING**
40 **AMONG CAPABLE AND KNOWLEDGEABLE PEOPLE?**

41 A. Yes, the Stipulation is the product of serious bargaining among capable and
42 knowledgeable people because it involved parties with diverse constituencies who are

43 stakeholders in the outcome. The Parties were represented by skilled and experienced
44 regulatory counsel. The discussions leading up to the Stipulation included all parties to
45 this proceeding and involved serious consideration by each party of the other's positions.
46 The parties met in person and by teleconference several times in order to reach a
47 resolution of all the issues.

48 **Q. DOES THE STIPULATION, AS A WHOLE, BENEFIT RATEPAYERS?**

49 A. Yes, it does. It resolves a highly complex matter and saves the time and expense of
50 litigation. Likewise, the Stipulation largely represents a reasonable outcome that satisfies
51 all of the parties.

52 **Q. DO YOU HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE REGULATORY PRINCIPLES WHICH**
53 **APPLY TO MATTERS BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION?**

54 A. Yes. My duties and responsibilities include ensuring that rate proposals and other rate
55 related matters comply with applicable law, Commission regulations and regulatory
56 requirements.

57 **Q. DOES THE STIPULATION VIOLATE ANY REGULATORY PRINCIPLES?**

58 A. No. The Stipulation does not violate any regulatory principles.

59 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE COMMISSION SHOULD ADOPT THE**
60 **STIPULATION?**

61 A. Yes. I recommend that the Commission adopt this Stipulation without modification.

62 **III. CONCLUSION**

63 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT
64 TESTIMONY?

65 A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Supplemental Testimony of Andrew J. Sonderman* was served upon the following parties of record or as a courtesy, via electronic mail, on October 12, 2015.

/s/ Christopher J. Allwein
Christopher J. Allwein

William L. Wright
Section Chief

John Jones
Assistant Attorney General
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3793
614.466.4397 (telephone)
614.644.8764 (fax)
john.jones@puc.state.oh.us
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Courtesy Copies:

Doris E. McCarter
Rates and Analysis Department
Division Chief, Forecasting, Markets and Corporate Oversight
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
doris.mccarter@puc.state.oh.us

L. Douglas Jennings
Attorney Examiner
Douglas.Jennings@puc.state.oh.us

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

10/12/2015 3:39:16 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-1048-GA-RDR

Summary: Testimony Supplemental Direct Testimony of Andrew J. Sonderman electronically filed by Mr. Christopher J. Allwein on behalf of Suburban Natural Gas Company