2015.09.10 13:56:45 Kansas Corporation Commission

### THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Before Commissioners:	Shari Feist Albrecht, Chair
	Jay Scott Emler
	Pat Apple

In the Matter of the Complaint Against	)	
Kansas Gas Service Company and NPL	)	Docket No. 16-KGSG-102-COM
by Virginia L. Mendez	)	

### **ORDER ADOPTING STAFF'S MEMORANDUM**

This matter comes before the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas (Commission). Having examined Litigation Staff's Memorandum submitted in this matter and being duly advised in the premises, the Commission finds as follows:

### I. BACKGROUND

1. On August 24, 2015, Virginia L. Mendez (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint

(Complaint) against Kansas Gas Service Company (KGS) and NPL with the Commission,

attached hereto as "Attachment A", alleging that the manner in which KGS and NPL<sup>1</sup> are

replacing gas lines in Complainant's neighborhood is unreasonable and unsafe.<sup>2</sup>

2. On August 28, 2015, Litigation Staff for the Commission prepared a

Memorandum analyzing the Complaint for compliance with Commission regulations.<sup>3</sup>

Safety Argument

3. Litigation Staff recommends the Commission find that the Complainant's safety

argument substantially complies with the procedural requirements of K.A.R. 82-1-220 and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Legal Staff noted that NPL is a contractor of KGS.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Complaint Against Kansas Gas Service Company and NPL by Virginia L. Mendez, August 24, 2015 (Formal Complaint).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Legal Staff's Memorandum, August 28, 2015.

establishes a *prima facie*<sup>4</sup> case for Commission action.<sup>5</sup> Staff notes that the Amended Complaint does not specifically cite to any violation of law, rule or order in support of its argument and is thus not in compliance with K.A.R. 82-1-220(b)(1).<sup>6</sup> However, Staff recommends the Commission waive K.A.R. 82-1-200(b)(1) for good cause.<sup>7</sup>

#### **II. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

4. The Commission is satisfied that jurisdiction to conduct the requested

investigation exists pursuant to K.S.A. 66-101 et seq.<sup>8</sup> Specifically, the Commission may

investigate formal complaints regarding rates, rules, regulations, or practices of gas and electric

public utilities. Furthermore, the Commission is granted authority over each natural gas public

utility's equipment, manner of conduct, and management to protect public safety.9

5. The Commission finds that Litigation Staff's Memorandum dated August 28,

2015, attached hereto as Attachment "B" is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference.

### IT IS, THEREFORE, BY THE COMMISSION ORDERED THAT:

(A) The Complainant's safety argument substantially complies with the procedural

requirements of K.A.R. 82-1-220.

(B) K.A.R. 82-1-220(b)(1) is waived for good cause.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Wallace, Saunders, Austin, Brown & Enochs, Chartered v. Louisburg Grain Co., 250 Kan. 54, 61, 824 P.2d 933, 939 (1992), (*Prima facie* evidence denotes evidence which, if left unexplained or uncontradicted, would be sufficient to carry the case to the jury and sustain a verdict in favor of the plaintiff on the issue it supports.). <sup>5</sup> Legal Staff's Memorandum, August 28, 2015.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Id. at p. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Id. at pp. 2-3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Specifically, the Commission is granted broad authority to review formal complaints. *See* K.S.A. 66-101e ("Upon a complaint in writing made against any electric public utility governed by this act that any of the rates or rules and regulations of such electric public utility are in any respect unreasonable, unfair, unjust, unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential, or both, or that any regulations, practice or act whatsoever affecting or relating to any service performed or to be performed by such electric public utility for the public, is in any respect unreasonable, unfair, unjust, unreasonably inefficient or insufficient, unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential, or that any service performed or to be performed by such electric public utility for the public is unreasonably inadequate, inefficient, unjustly discriminatory or unduly insufficient or cannot be obtained, the commission may proceed with or without notice, to make such investigation as it deems necessary.").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See K.S.A. 66-1,208.

(C) The Formal Complaint establishes a *prima facie* case for Commission action.

(D) The Formal Complaint is to be served upon KGS.

(E) Staff shall investigate this matter and submit a Report and Recommendation to the Commission.

(F) The parties have fifteen (15) days, plus three (3) days if service of this order is by mail, from the date this order was served in which to petition the Commission for reconsideration of any issue or issues decided herein.<sup>10</sup>

(G) The Commission retains jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties for the purpose of entering such further orders as it may deem necessary and proper.

### BY THE COMMISSION IT IS SO ORDERED.

Albrecht, Chair; Emler, Commissioner; Apple, Commissioner

Dated: SEP 1 0 2015

Amy Gelle SEP 1 1 2015 Order Mailed Date

Amy L. Gilbert Secretary to the Commission

SRF/tc

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> K.S.A. 66-118b; K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 77-529(a)(1).

Kansas Corporation Commission

AUG 27 2015

KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS & CONSUMER PROTECTION Formal Complaint February 2015

Office of Litigation Counsel

FORMAL COMPLAINT

2015.08.26 08:54:51 Kansas Corporation Commission

For Commission

DOCKET NO.

16-KGSG-102-COM

use only

### BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT AGAINST

(Respondent, name of utility company) and NPL

by Mendez (Complainant, vour name)

(Complainant, your name)

Please provide complainant (your) contact information:

Mende rainiz Lee Full Name(s): Boswelle Topeka K8. S,W. 66611 Address: 2555 つくら 783-Davtime Phone: chon + Comp none α E-mail Address (optional):. Received on FORMAL COMPLAINT AUG 24 2015 mendez - • by State Corporation Commission (Your name of Kansas

states that the above-named respondent is a public utility providing service in Kansas and is subject to the jurisdiction of the State Corporation Commission.

The facts and circumstances surrounding the complaint are set out in detail below: (Be specific and as brief as possible. If necessary, attach additional sheets.)

04 trucks 2015 a hborhood Starteo and ei dì a aging gas Replace Our lines. to her ards imes. Cover Aqa; again em Or isor Was 187 (Continued on the other side)

#### Formal Complaint continued

Complainant requests that the respondent utility be required to provide an answer to the complaint and requests the following action be ordered by the Commission. (State action or result desired.)

aske 400 many ax .< em ak m 1 -e\_S 0# NPL hen en Q1 ou 01 Red 05 in P nes ine ou wer .O ppas al New one mes 10 10 U and and Sc a æ he. Se Ó٨ leeuve lines 25 e au 11 Will neighbor hood 11 hold b  $\boldsymbol{\varTheta}$ and blown hasn 40 bri sed 10 and for such further order or orders as the Commission may deem necessary.

VERIFICATION: I do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm that the statements made in this complaint form are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, and I do this under the pains and penalties of perjury.

signature

8/24/201 Date signed

# **FILING INSTRUCTIONS**

This form may be filed in person at the Kansas Corporation Commission's Office or by mail. All formal complaints, whether filed by mail or delivered in person, must be directed to:

Acting Executive Secretary Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead Road Topeka, KS 66604

For more information about the formal complaint process please refer to the instructions provided with this form or visit the KCC website: http://kcc.ks.gov/, Consumer Assistance, Filing a Complaint. You may also contact our Consumer Assistance staff toll-free at 1-800-662-0027 or by e-mail at public.affairs@kcc.ks.gov.

Virginiz mendez Complaint against Ks. Gas Servi Co, Pg II After hearing all that I' Started talking to my Neighbors. These are thing I found out. In may A.J. Stout School had to be evacuated due to Strong gas fumes. The house at 2313 S.w. Boswell ct, had Several episodes turning into a Continuous Smell of gas odor While NPL was working on main gas line at 2240 S.w. Boswell et there was odor of gas in air X 2 days fire department was out here and NPL employees argued with them that they didn't have to turn gas off to work on gaslines, where main gas line for Neighbor hood at 2240 S.W. Boswell at there's a big 100 yr, old tree that NPL dug around - damaging it's roots ." This tree is close to the house at 2240 s. w. Boswell Ct. and is in danger of falling on 2 Small Children and their nom. The tree gives When I put my body WRight agains+ :+, Virginia Limenda

Virginiz Mendez Complaint against KS, Gas Serv. Co, Pg III So far I or the lack who vents the house at 2240 S.W. Boswell Ct. haven't been able to get anyone to remove the tree. Weighbors on Jewell st. and Plass st. have told me that they Saw NPL employees take Duct Tape out of their pockets to tape joints of gas lines together before they covered them up in their yards. When these folks questioned them about this they were told to Shut up because they is studied they're stupid. Further east on 21st street a family told me their yard was dug up 11 times. After further inquiries I have been told 2 Apartment Complexes in Cincinatti, oh. and one Apartment Blog in New york City have blown up while or right after NPL has worked on Gas lines. My question is "Why are these people Allowed to Continue with their practices that are possibly scilling Beals and withing people in So moved people and putting people in 50 metch danger "P" To resolve my concerns I want these gas ines on Jewel and Plass Reinspected. before everyone turns on heat for the winter, Unigund. Menda

**Attachment B** 



1500 SW Arrowhead Road Topeka, KS 66604-4027

Shari Feist Albrecht, Chair Jay Scott Emler, Commissioner Pat Apple, Commissioner Phone: 785-271-3100 Fax: 785-271-3354 http://kcc.ks.gov/

Sam Brownback, Governor

### MEMORANDUM LEGAL DIVISION

- TO: Chair Shari Feist Albrecht Commissioner Jay Scott Emler Commissioner Pat Apple
- **FROM:** Samuel Feather, Litigation Counsel
- **DATE:** August 28, 2015
- SUBJECT: 16-KGSG-102-COM In the Matter of the Complaint Against Kansas Gas Service Company and NPL by Virginia L. Mendez

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Virginia L. Mendez (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint<sup>1</sup> on August 24, 2015, wherein Complainant alleges that the manner in which Kansas Gas Service Company (KGS) and NPL are replacing gas lines in Complainant's neighborhood is unreasonable and unsafe. Legal Staff recommends the Commission accept the Formal Complaint as it relates to the Complainant's safety argument and forward the Formal Complaint to KGS.

### **BACKGROUND & ANALYSIS:**

On August 24, 2015, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against KGS and NPL due to the attempted replacement of gas lines in Complainant's neighborhood.<sup>2</sup> The Complaint alleges that the manner in which KGS and NPL<sup>3</sup> are replacing gas lines is unreasonable and unsafe. Upon the filing of a formal complaint, the Commission must determine "whether or not the allegations, if true, would establish a prime [sic] facie case for action by the commission and whether or not the formal complaint conforms to [the Commission's] regulations."<sup>4</sup>

K.A.R. 82-1-220(b) requires formal complaints to satisfy three procedural requirements:

(1) Fully and completely advise each respondent and the commission as to the provisions of law or the regulations or orders of the commission that have been or are being violated by the acts or omissions complained of, or that will be violated by a continuance of acts or omissions;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Complaint Against Kansas Gas Service Company and NPL by Virginia L. Mendez, August 24, 2015 (Formal Complaint).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Formal Complaint.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Legal Staff notes that NPL is not a public utility but a contractor for KGS.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> K.A.R. 82-1-220(c).

(2) set forth concisely and in plain language the facts claimed by the complainant to constitute the violations; and

(3) state the relief sought by the complainant.

#### Safety Argument

The Complaint's concise narrative provides notice to KGS, NPL and the Commission that the Complainant is alleging that KGS, through its contractor NPL, is replacing gas lines in a manner which creates a risk to public safety and thus complies with procedural requirement (2).

The Complaint requests that KGS re-inspect gas lines on "Jewel and Plass".<sup>5</sup> The Amended Complaint clearly states the relief sought and thus complies with procedural requirement (3).

The Amended Complaint does not expressly cite to any law, regulation, or order in support of its safety argument and thus does not comply with procedural requirement (1). However, the Commission has the discretion to waive its regulations for good cause if it is in the public interest to do so unless otherwise required by law.<sup>6</sup> The detailed requirements of the Commission's regulation are more restrictive than that ordinarily required by law.<sup>7</sup>

The Commission has been given full power, authority and jurisdiction to supervise and control the natural gas public utilities doing business in Kansas.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the Commission is granted authority over each natural gas public utility's equipment, manner of conduct, and management to protect public safety.<sup>9</sup> Legal Staff believes that the Complaint provides sufficient detail to notify KGS, NPL and the Commission that the Complainant is asking the Commission to exercise its authority to protect public safety from the alleged harm of the replaced gas lines.

The public interest is not served by dismissing the complaints of customers without legal representation for deficiencies of procedural requirements that are more stringent than that required by Kansas law.<sup>10</sup> Thus the Complaint substantially complies with the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Formal Complaint, p. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> K.A.R. 82-1-202.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See, K.S.A. 66-101e, (the specific language of the statute allows for a complaint based solely on an unreasonable practice, K.A.R. 82-1-220(b) places the additional burden of alleging a specific violation of law, tariff or order which is not required by statute and may place an undue burden on complainants not represented by legal counsel); *See also, Boydston v. Bd. of Regents for State of Kan.*, 242 Kan. 94, 99, 744 P.2d 806, 811 (1987) (as long as the opponent is apprised of the facts that entitle the plaintiff to relief, it is not necessary to spell out a legal theory of relief in the pleadings).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> K.S.A. 66-1,201.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See K.S.A. 66-1,208.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> K.S.A. 66-155 obligates Legal Staff with the duty to prosecute suits on behalf of parties complaining of unjust discrimination by a public utility or other violations of the public utility act. Legal Staff believes full representation of the Complainant in this case would be an unnecessary use of Commission resources and is evidence of further good cause for the Commission to waive K.A.R. 82-1-220(b)(1).

procedural requirements of K.A.R. 82-1-220 and the Commission should waive K.A.R. 82-1-220(b)(1) for good cause.

This Memorandum makes no recommendation regarding the *validity or veracity* of the Complainant's claims.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Legal Staff recommends the Commission find:

- The Complainant's safety argument substantially complies with the procedural requirements of K.A.R. 82-1-220;
- K.A.R. 82-1-220(b)(1) should be waived for good cause;
- The Complaint establishes a *prima facie* case for Commission action;<sup>11</sup>
- The Complaint should be served upon KGS;
- Staff should be directed to investigate this matter and submit a Report and Recommendation to the Commission.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Wallace, Saunders, Austin, Brown & Enochs, Chartered v. Louisburg Grain Co., 250 Kan. 54, 61, 824 P.2d 933, 939 (1992), (*Prima facie* evidence denotes evidence which, if left unexplained or uncontradicted, would be sufficient to carry the case to the jury and sustain a verdict in favor of the plaintiff on the issue it supports.).

# PLEASE FORWARD THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT (S) ISSUED IN THE ABOVE-REFERENCED DOCKET TO THE FOLLOWING:

	NO.	NO.
	CERT.	PLAIN
NAME AND ADDRESS	COPIES	COPIES

SAMUEL FEATHER, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027 \*\*\*Hand Delivered\*\*\*

DAVID N. DITTEMORE, MANAGER OF RATES & ANALYSIS KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC. 7421 W 129TH ST OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213-2634

WALKER HENDRIX, COMPLAINTS KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC. 7421 W 129TH ST OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213-2634

JUDY JENKINS KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC. 7421 W 129TH ST OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213-2634

VIRGINIA LEE MENDEZ VIRGINIA L. MENDEZ 2229 SW BOSWELL CT TOPEKA, KS 66611

Order Mailed Date SEP 1

SEP 1 1 2015