## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of: : CASE NO. 2012-00222

THE APPLICATION OF LOUISVILLE GAS &

ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT

OF ELECTRIC AND GAS RATES, A

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE :

AND NECESSITY, APPROVAL OF GAS SERVICE

LINES AND RISORS, AND A GAS LINE

SURCHARGE :

## HESS CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO LG&E COMPANY'S MOTION TO STRIKE HESS CORPORATION'S TESTIMONY REGARDING BALANCING FREQUENCIES AND BALANCING TOLERANCE BANDS

Hess Corporation ("Hess") respectfully submits this Response to LG&E Company's ("LG&E) Motion to Strike Hess, Inc.'s testimony regarding balancing frequencies and balancing tolerance bands.

On October 2, 2012, the Commission granted Hess limited intervention on the issue of gas transportation thresholds denying intervention on balancing frequencies and balancing tolerance bands. In its original motion for intervention in this matter and correlating reply, Hess did not expand upon the intricacies of the balancing frequencies and balancing tolerance bands and their corresponding relationship to a viable gas transportation market because inclusion of substantive information regarding these two issues appeared unnecessary and premature for a motion to intervene. Further, as expanded upon in Hess' Motion for Reconsideration it seemed clear that LG&E's requested revision in this docket<sup>2</sup> of the current balancing frequencies and balancing tolerance bands are issues intricately related to gas transportation thresholds that would be suitable for intervention by Hess.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Case No. 12-00222, Order of October 2, 2012 at p.6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Hess' Motion for Reconsideration, p. 3, fn.10.

Before receiving the Commission's Order on Tuesday afternoon, October 2, 2012, Hess had prepared testimony which included testimony on all three issues (balancing frequencies, balancing tolerance bands and threshold issues).<sup>3</sup> The next day, prior to filing its testimony, Hess' counsel informed LG&E's counsel of its suggested procedural plan (e.g. filing a motion for reconsideration along with agreeing to strike testimony if the motion is denied) and then Hess filed its testimony on all three issues on Wednesday, October 3, 2012 under the clear caveat that it will agree to strike portions of its testimony if the Commission denies the Motion for Reconsideration of intervention on those issues.<sup>4</sup>

As a procedural matter, LG&E's motion to strike is well-taken if the Commission denies Hess' Motion to Reconsider filed on Friday, October 5, 2012. However in its Motion to Strike, LG&E seems to allege some prejudice by Hess' testimony being in the record while a Motion for Reconsideration is pending.<sup>5</sup> Respectfully, if the testimony is stricken from the record there is no prejudice.

Simply put, Hess does seek to unduly complicate these proceedings however litigation regarding intervention on these two issues has merit in light of LG&E's requested revisions to the balancing tolerance bands and balancing frequencies in this docket directly because of potentially more gas suppliers seeking to provide gas to large commercial and industrial customers under LG&E transportation tariffs.<sup>6</sup>

-

<sup>6</sup> See Hess' Motion for Reconsideration, p. 3, fn.10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Direct Testimony of John Mehling on behalf of Hess Corporation filed October 3, 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Letter to Executive Director filed by undersigned counsel on October 3, 2012; see also, Hess Corporation's Motion for Reconsideration filed on Friday, October 5, 2012 consistent with counsel's representations in the letter of October 3, 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See LG&E's Motion to Strike, p. 2 (Hess' contention that its testimony on the excluded items should remain in the record unless and until the Commission denies its not-yet-filed motion for reconsideration is incorrect.)

Wherefore, Hess respectfully requests that LG&E's Motion to Strike be denied unless Hess' Motion for Reconsideration is denied wherein Hess would agree to strike the testimony as set forth in undersigned counsel's letter dated October 3, 2012 to the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew R. Malone William H. May, III.

Hurt, Crosbie & May PLLC

127 West Main Street

Lexington, Kentucky 40507

(859) 254-0000 (office)

(859) 254-4763 (facsimile)

mmalone@hcm-law.com

bmay@hcm-law.com

Counsel for the Petitioner, **HESS CORPORATION** 

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

In accordance with Ordering Paragraph No. 10 of the Commission's June 22, 2012 Order, this is to certify that Hess' October 10, 2012 electronic filing has been transmitted to the Commission on October 10, 2012; that there are currently no parties exempt from participation by electronic means in this proceeding; that an original and one copy of the filing is being mailed to the Commission on October 10, 2012; and that on October 10, 2012 electronic mail notification of the filing will be provided to the following:

Hon. David C. Brown Stites & Harbison, PLLC 1800 Providian Center 400 West Market Street Louisville, Kentucky 40202 Hon. Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Hon. Dennis G. Howard, II Hon. Lawrence W. Cook Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Utility and Rate Intervention Division 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200 Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-8204

Hon. Robert M. Watt, III Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC 300 W. Vine Street Suite 2100 Lexington, KY 40507-1801

Hon. Kendrick Riggs Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC 2000 PNC Plaza 500 W. Jefferson Street Louisville, KY 40202-2828

Hon. Allyson K. Sturgeon Senior Corporate Attorney LG&E Energy Corp. 220 W. Main Street Louisville, KY 40202

Lonnie E. Bellar Vice President – State Regulation Kentucky Utilities Company 220 West Main Street PO Box 32010 Louisville, Kentucky 40202

ATTORNEY FOR HESS CORPORATION