#### FILE

### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Authority to Increase Rates for its Gas Distribution Service.

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Approval of an Alternative Rate Plan for its Gas Distribution Service

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Approval to Change Accounting Methods

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Approval of Tariffs to Recover Certain Costs Associated with a Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Program Through an Automatic Adjustment Clause, And for Certain Accounting Treatment

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Approval of Tariffs to Recover Certain Costs Associated with Automated Meter Reading Deployment Through an Automatic Adjustment Clause, and for Certain Accounting Treatment

Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR

Case No. 07-830-GA-ALT

Case No. 07-831-GA-AAM

06 MAY 30 PM

Case No. 08-169-GA-ALT

Case No. 06-1453-GA-UNC

#### SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JEFFREY A. MURPHY ON BEHALF OF DOMINION EAST OHIO

 Management	policies,	practice	and	organizati	ion

Operating income

RECEIVED-DOCKETING E

	Rate base
	Allocations
	Rate of return
	Rates and tariffs
<u>X</u>	Other (PIR Rider)

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND	1
II.	THE PIR COST RECOVERY CHARGE	1
III.	COMPLIANCE WITH CHAPTER 4901:1-19-05, OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE	12
IV.	CONCLUSION	16
ATT.	ACHMENT JAM 1.4	

1		Supplemental Direct Testimony of
2		Jeffrey A. Murphy
3	I.	WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND
4	Q1.	Please state your name, occupation and business address.
5	A1.	My name is Jeffrey A. Murphy. I am employed by The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a
6		Dominion East Ohio ("DEO" or "Company") as its Director, Rates and Gas Supply. My
7		business address is 1201 East 55th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44103-1028.
8 9	Q2.	Are you the same Jeffrey A. Murphy that previously submitted Direct Testimony in Case Nos. 07-829-GA-AIR, 07-830-GA-ALT, and 07-831-GA-AAM?
10	A2.	Yes.
11	Q3.	What is the purpose of your supplemental direct testimony?
12	A3.	My testimony supports the cost allocation and rate recovery aspects of the Company's
13		Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement ("PIR") program described in the Application
14		submitted in Case No. 08-169-GA-UNC. Pursuant to the Commission's Order in this
15		proceeding dated May 28, 2008, which I will address later in my testimony, the PIR
16		Application is now designated as Case No. 08-169-GA-ALT.
17	п.	THE PIR COST RECOVERY CHARGE
18	Q4.	Please describe the general types of cost that the Company is seeking to recover.
19	A4.	DEO is seeking to recover costs associated with three major infrastructure-related
20		activities:
21		The replacement of older-vintage bare-steel, cast- or wrought-iron and copper.
22 23		<ul> <li>The assumption of the responsibility for installing, repairing and replacing service lines that are currently owned by end use customers.</li> </ul>
24 25		<ul> <li>Ongoing infrastructure replacements, pipeline relocations and system improvements.</li> </ul>

1		Investments in those areas impose incremental costs that the Company is seeking to defer
2		and recover from all end use customer classes through a PIR Cost Recovery Charge.
3		Those incremental costs consist of:
4		<ul> <li>Additional depreciation expense for PIR-related gross plant additions.</li> </ul>
5		<ul> <li>Increased property taxes associated with the new PIR facilities.</li> </ul>
6		• A rate of return on the rate base equivalent of the net plant additions.
7		As explained later in my testimony, the PIR program has implications for operating and
8		maintenance expenses that must be taken into consideration as well.
9	Q5.	From what customer classes does the Company propose to recover those costs?
10	A5.	The proposed PIR Cost Recovery Charge will be applicable to all customers that receive
11		service under DEO's sales and transportation service rate schedules. The costs will be
12		allocated to rate schedules on the basis of cost causality. As a result, the PIR Cost
13		Recovery Charges will differ from one rate schedule to the next.
14	Q6.	Why is it appropriate to recover PIR program costs through a rider mechanism?
15	A6.	There are two primary reasons. First, the magnitude of the PIR program cost would
16		prevent the Company from ever earning its Commission-authorized rate of return if those
17		costs were recovered through base rate cases. Second, a rider mechanism would lead to a
18		much more efficient regulatory process because rates would be adjusted without the need
19		to conduct full-blown base rate proceedings while ensuring extensive Commission
20		oversight of all costs to be recovered by the rider.
21 22	Q7.	Please describe the impact of the PIR program on the Company's jurisdictional rate base investment.
23	A7.	The PIR program will have a considerable impact on the Company's rate base. The
24		\$2.662 billion estimated cost of the PIR program in 2007 dollars is nearly two-and-a-half

times the March 31, 2007 rate base of \$1.072 billion proposed by DEO in its current rate case. Even the yearly PIR program cost impact on rate base is substantial. The average annual cost to replace existing facilities over the proposed 25-year duration is \$106 million. That figure does not include the additional cost of installing customer service lines on new construction or the cost of replacing individual customer service lines that are not located on the distribution pipelines being replaced as part of the PIR program. In three of the past five years, new residential connections exceeded 10,000 per year. If DEO were to experience that level of customer additions in the future, the cost of installing new service lines could exceed \$10 million dollars per year. Thus, adding the cost of service lines on new construction alone to the cost to replace existing facilities would take the total annual cost of the program to \$116 million or nearly 11% of the company's rate base investment. 08. Why would the magnitude of the PIR program cost prevent the Company from earning its Commission-authorized rate of return if those costs were recovered through the base rate case process? In a rate case, companies are required to use an actual valuation for date certain rate base A8. and no more than nine months of estimated data for test year revenues and expenses. While there is no standard time frame under which all rate cases are processed, the period from application to rates being placed into effect typically exceeds nine months. Even if a company files its initial application with estimated data and subsequently files a twomonth update with the required actual information, the lag between a company's investment in rate base and rate recovery is still considerable. By the time rates are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> DEO did not include the cost of such service lines in the figures cited in the Application because those costs are not incremental. Customers would bear the cost themselves if DEO were not responsible for those installations.

placed into effect, is it likely that rate base will be at least nine months out of date, and the company will have absorbed nine months' worth of additional depreciation and property tax expenses on post-date-certain plant investments. Absent a rider that provides timely recovery of PIR-related costs, the revenue requirement established in the normal rate case process will significantly under-recover actual costs and assure that DEO will not earn its authorized rate of return. Given the magnitude of PIR-related expenditures relative to rate base, that under-recovery could be substantial.

A9.

Q9. Why is a rider mechanism a more efficient way to recovery PIR program costs than a traditional rate proceeding?

The traditional rate case process imposes a substantial burden on all regulatory stakeholders and imposes substantial costs to ratepayers. DEO's estimated rate case expense in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR is over \$1.8 million. Absent rider recovery, the Company would be compelled to file rate cases every year to recover the substantial increase in revenue requirement associated with the PIR program. Approval of DEO's rider application as proposed will result in fewer rate cases, with the result being that ratepayers will not be asked to pay that annual cost. Not only will rider recovery save ratepayers rate-case expense, DEO also expects that the PIR program will conserve the resources of agencies such as the Commission and the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel. The considerable time and effort necessary to assess the many issues presented by a base rate case filing may be devoted elsewhere.

Because the review of rider adjustment applications will be focused solely on PIR program scope and cost, parties will be better able to focus attention on the program and not be burdened by the multitude of other issues that must be addressed in a rate case application. Costs associated with the PIR program will become an increasingly more

1		significant portion of customer bills over time. Focusing annual attention on the program
2		in the context of a rider adjustment review will ensure that the PIR-related portion of a
3		customer's bill receives maximum attention.
<b>4</b> 5	Q10.	Why will approval of the tracker mechanism proposed by DEO lead to fewer rate cases?
6	A10.	As explained in the Application, DEO is seeking recovery of the costs of ongoing
7		pipeline infrastructure replacements and relocations and system improvements as well as
8		the costs associated with the targeted replacement of certain older vintage pipelines and
9		the assumption of responsibility of service lines. The incremental depreciation, property
10	·	tax and return on those ongoing capital expenditures are a major driver of rate cases
11		because they contribute to higher revenue requirements. Absent a means to recover those
12		revenue requirements, DEO will be forced to file more frequent base rate cases. While
13		other factors such as increased operation and maintenance ("O&M") expenses and
14		benefit costs will eventually lead to the need for increased base rate recovery, DEO does
15		not anticipate that they will increase at a pace requiring frequent rate cases, and certainly
16		not at the pace that PIR investments will be made.
17 18	Q11.	Will the PIR program better match the actual experience or performance of DEO in terms of costs and quality of service to its regulated customers?
19	A11.	Yes. By more closely tying PIR-related investments made by DEO and the Company's
20		recovery of those investments, the PIR Cost Recovery Charge better matches DEO's
21		performance to the cost and quality of service it provides to its regulated customers.

1 2	Q12.	How will the Company account for the incremental costs associated with the PIR program?
3	A12.	DEO will defer the incremental depreciation expense, property taxes and O&M expenses
4		as well as the return on rate base for the expenditures associated with its PIR program and
5		accumulate them in account 182.3, Other Regulatory Assets.
6	Q13.	Please explain how the incremental depreciation expense will be quantified.
7	A13.	The incremental depreciation expense will be based on the cumulative PIR gross plant
8		additions as offset by any associated retirements. The depreciation rates will be based on
9		those authorized by the Commission for the applicable plant accounts in which the
10		additions and retirements are booked. The resulting incremental depreciation expense
11		recorded for each month will then be deferred and accumulated in account 182.3.
12 13	Q14.	How will the Company compute the incremental property taxes to be paid on PIR capital investments?
14	A14.	The incremental property taxes will reflect the cumulative PIR capital expenditures, net
15		of any related retirements, through the December 31 lien date of each year. The
16		incremental property taxes to be deferred will be based on the additional property placed
17		into service in each tax jurisdiction and the property tax rates applicable to that
18		jurisdiction. The associated property taxes accrued for each month will be deferred and
19		accumulated with other expenses in account 182.3.
20	Q15.	How will DEO define the incremental O&M expenses to be considered?
21	A15.	The incremental O&M expenses to be deferred will be limited to those that, but for the
22		existence of the PIR program and DEO's ownership of service lines, would not be
23		incurred. In order to accommodate a full review of the costs and verify their incremental

nature, DEO will separately identify and fully document the expenses. The resulting

incremental O&M expense recorded for each month will be deferred without carrying

costs for subsequent recovery through the PIR Cost Recovery Charge.

It is worth noting that the cost associated with relocating meters outside is typically treated as an O&M expense rather than capitalized. Due to the potential magnitude of O&M expenses incurred as a result of an approved meter relocation plan, DEO is seeking recovery of carrying costs on those expenditures using the Company's weighted cost of debt from the point of cost incurrence to the date recovery commences through an updated PIR Cost Recovery Charge.

# Q16. What is involved in quantifying the return on rate base associated with the program?

A16. Each month, DEO will calculate the rate base equivalent of PIR-related expenditures based on cumulative net plant minus associated deferred income taxes and the effect of any retirements. The Company will then apply the pre-tax rate of return authorized by the Commission in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR, and subsequent cases as appropriate, to the PIR rate base amount. The resulting amount will be credited to revenue and accumulated in account 182.3 along with the incremental expenses that have been deferred.

# Q17. Will the Company reduce amounts recovered through the proposed PIR Cost Recovery Charge for O&M savings achieved as a result of the program?

A17. Yes. The Application describes the manner in which the Company will use O&M savings generated by the program to reduce amounts that would otherwise be recovered through the rider mechanism. Those savings will arise from reductions in leak repairs, corrosion monitoring activities and Department of Transportation inspections on inside meters that may no longer be necessary if the meters are relocated outside. DEO will

1		work with Staff to ensure that an appropriate baseline for savings calculations is
2		quantified based on the outcome of Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR.
3 4	Q18.	Will the PIR program provide other savings that will be passed on to consumers in other ways?
5	A18.	Yes. The PIR program will also reduce the volume of lost-and-unaccounted-for gas as
6		older vintage pipelines are replaced. The reductions in system-wide lost-and-
7		unaccounted-for gas will be reflected in the annual updates of DEO's fuel retention rate
8		and in the quarterly updates of Transportation Migration Rider - Part B.
9 10	Q19.	Briefly describe the process that the Company will use to request a change in the PIR rate.
11	A19.	In August of each year, DEO will submit an application with schedules supporting the
12		proposed PIR Cost Recovery Charge based on the costs accumulated and bills rendered
13		for the prior fiscal year. DEO selected a fiscal year ending June 30 to spread the
14		Commission's review of LDCs' infrastructure rider applications throughout the year. In
15		order to facilitate Staff's and other parties' review of the application, the Company will
16		file a pre-filing notice 90 days prior to the application that reflects a combination of
17		actual and projected data that will be updated for actual data in the August application.
18 19	Q20.	What happens to the PIR Cost Recovery Charge if the Company files another rate case?
20	A20.	The proposed accounting approach is intended to accommodate future rate cases. All
21		PIR costs accumulated up to the date certain of the next rate case will be recovered in the
22		base rates set in the next rate case. Going forward, the calculation of incremental PIR-
23		related costs will reflect only post-date-certain activity. In other words, the Company
24		will remove costs from the PIR Cost Recovery Charge once they are reflected in
25		approved base rates.

Q21. Please describe the process used to determine the PIR Cost Recovery Charge for the various rate schedules to which it will apply.

A21. In order to develop the PIR Cost Recovery Charge for each customer class, DEO will first distribute the revenue requirement associated with the various investments in the program. The cost of certain assets such as transmission and high-pressure distribution mains that are commonly used will be allocated more broadly across customer classes using the average excess factors in the class cost of service study supporting rates approved in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR. The cost of other assets such as low-pressure distribution mains and service lines are more properly allocated on a customer basis to reflect the manner in which they are used. As noted in the Application, the revenue requirement for each type of investment will be allocated as follows:

Account	Investment Type	Allocator	Type of Allocation
367	Transmission Mains	Total Transmission Plant	Average-Excess Capacity/Commodity
376	Distribution Mains  – High Pressure	Total Non- Customer Related Distribution Plant	Average-Excess Capacity/Commodity
376	Distribution Mains  – Low Pressure	Total Services	Number of Customers
380	Distribution Services  – Main-to-Curb, Service Lines	Total Services	Number of Customers

Once the costs are properly apportioned among customer classes, the PIR Cost Recovery

Charge will be developed using the following design:

<b>.</b> .			
Custo	omer Classes	Rate Design	<u>Denominator</u>
Gener	al Sales/Energy Choice	Fixed Monthly	Number of Bills in
Trans	portation Service	Charge	Preceding 12 Months
Large	Volume General Sales/Energy	Fixed Monthly	Number of Bills in
_	e Transportation Service	Charge	Preceding 12 Months
	•	•	_
	al Transportation Service/	Fixed Monthly	Number of Bills in
1 rans	portation Service for Schools	Charge	Preceding 12 Months
Daily	Transportation Service	Volumetric with a	Mcf Billed for the
		\$1,000/month cap	Preceding 12 Months
033	Why has DEO suggested to the		Charge to Della
Q22.	Why has DEO proposed to li Transportation Service ("DT		
	riansportation service ( D1	b j customers to briton	per month.
A22.	Due to the large differences in	usage among DEO's D'	rs customers, a volumetric PIR
	Cost Recovery Charge will mo	ore equitably distribute t	he cost to that class of customers
	than a fixed monthly charge. I	imiting the total month	ly charge to \$1,000, however, will
	than a fixed fixentiny charge. I	Smitting the total month	if charge w \$1,000, however, will
	avoid an outcome in which the	largest of those custom	ers pay an excessive amount.
Q23.		rates upon Commissior	approval of the proposed cost
	recovery mechanism?		
A23.	No. As stated in the Application	on, the PIR Cost Recove	ery Charge will initially be set at
	**	,	
	zero for all rate schedules with	the first adjustment to	occur in November 2009 based on
	Figure I work dots for the terralizer		No adjustment will some
	fiscal year data for the twelve	months ended June 2003	7. No adjustment will occur
	without further Commission re	eview and approval.	
Q24.	Please describe the manner i	n which DEO calculate	ed the initial \$1.12 per month
	•	·	he subsequent \$0.90 increases in
	that monthly rate in future y	ears.	
A24.	The initial \$1.12 per month ad	justment in the PIR Cos	t Recovery Charge (for residential
1121.	The findar \$1.12 per month ac	justinent in the 1 in cos	t recovery offerige (for residential
	customers) and the subsequent	increases of up to \$0.90	per month in future years were
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- -	-
	developed using the cost of ser	rvice model included as	Attachment JAM 1.4 to my
	testimony Elect all DID lance	tmanta suana dividad i-4.	a two groups: 1) have steel east an
	testimony. First, all PIK inves	tments were aivided into	o two groups: 1) bare steel, cast- or

wrought-iron, and copper pipelines and the associated service lines ("Bare Steel"); and 2) the ongoing infrastructure replacements, pipeline relocations and system improvements described in above in response to Question No. 4 ("Ongoing").

Second, DEO calculated the appropriate return on rate base, depreciation expense, and associated property tax for both groups, which provided the PIR revenue requirement. The revenue requirement was then grossed up by 4.6% for the Gross Receipts Excise Tax. Costs were then allocated to rate classes as described in the response to Question No. 21 above.

Third, the revenue requirement for each rate class was divided into the number of customers in each rate class (except for the DTS class, for which the charge is applied on a volumetric basis) to produce the monthly charge. The result is a charge of \$1.12 per month in the first year for residential customers, comprising \$0.58 per month for the Bare Steel component and \$0.54 per month for the Ongoing component.

The subsequent annual increases in the monthly charge (up to \$0.90/month/year) were calculated by determining the incremental annual costs of the PIR program. To determine the amount of incremental cost, it was assumed that, without the PIR program, Bare Steel investments would not be made and an annual rate filing would be made for recovery of the Ongoing investments. The increase in monthly cost for the Bare Steel component was calculated by dividing the increased revenue requirement into the number of customers (with increases ranging from \$0.69 in the second year to \$0.91 in the twenty-third year). The increase in the monthly charge for the Ongoing component was calculated as the increase in the revenue requirement from recovering these investments via the PIR Cost Recovery Charge compared to the revenue that would be recovered from

1		annual base rate filings; these differences are outlined in my response to Question Nos. 9
2		and 10. The resulting change in the incremental monthly charge associated with Ongoing
3		investments is an increase of \$0.02 per month in the first year, with annual decreases
4		ranging from \$0.01 to \$0.03 for the remainder of the program. The net incremental
5		adjustment of the Bare Steel and Ongoing components is an increase in the monthly
6		charge of \$0.72 per month in the second year ranging as high as \$0.90 per month in the
7		twenty-third year. It is important to note that those figures are intended to reflect the
8		incremental cost based on the assumptions made. As such, they do not represent
9		projected levels of the PIR Cost Recovery Charge itself.
10 11	Q25.	Does DEO propose to include mainline extensions needed to serve new customers in the PIR program costs to be recovered?
12	A25.	No. DEO will recover revenues from those mainline extensions in the base rates charged
13		to those new customers. In order to avoid duplicative recovery, DEO will not include the
14		costs associated with revenue-generating mainline extensions or other revenue-generating
15		infrastructure investments in the amounts to be recovered by the PIR Cost Recovery
16		Charge.
17 18	III.	COMPLIANCE WITH CHAPTER 4901:1-19-05, OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE.
19	Q26.	Under what statute did the Company file the PIR Application?
20	A26.	DEO originally filed its PIR Application under Section 4929.11 of the Ohio Revised
21		Code. The Commission, however, by Order on Rehearing dated May 28, 2008, has
22		determined that the PIR Application constitutes an alternative rate plan and is therefore
23		subject to Chapter 4901:1-19-05, Ohio Administrative Code.

1 2	Q27.	Does the PIR Application comply with Rule 4901:1-19-05, Ohio Administrative Code?
3	A27.	Yes. The substantive information required by the Commission's rules is provided in the
4		PIR Application, filings made in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR and the consolidated cases,
5		or in my testimony.
6 7 8 9	Q28.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(1) requires applicants to "submit the exhibits described in divisions (A) to (E) of section 4909.18 of the Revised Code, and standard filing requirements pursuant to rule 4901-7-01 of the Administrative Code, (SFRs), when filing an alternative rate case." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
10	A28.	Yes. All of the required information was included in DEO's initial Application in Case
1		No. 07-829-GA-AIR.
12 13 14 15	Q29.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(a) requires the applicant to state "the facts and grounds upon which the application is based, and set[] forth the plan's elements, transition plans, and other matters," as well as describe "the rationale for the initial proposed tariff changes for all impacted natural gas services." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
17	A29.	Yes. Information regarding the facts and grounds on which the PIR Application is based
18		and the elements of the plans was included in Paragraphs 1 through 20 of DEO's
19		Application in Case No. 08-169-GA-UNC.
20 21 22 23 24 25	Q30.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(b) requires the applicant to "fully justify any proposal to deviate from traditional rate of return regulation," and "[s]uch justification shall include the applicant's rationale for its proposed alternative rate plan, including how it better matches actual experience or performance of the company in terms of costs and quality of service to its regulated customers." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
26	A30.	Yes. This information is generally provided in my Supplemental Testimony and in
27		particular my responses to Question Nos. 6 through 11.

1 2 3	Q31.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(c) requires certain comparisons "[i]f the alternative rate plan proposes a severing of costs and rates." Does the PIR program propose a severing of costs and rates?
4	A31.	No, it does not. Any increase in the price paid by customers will be directly tied to
5		investments and expenditures made by the Company.
6 7 8 9 10	Q32.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(d) states that "[i]f the applicant has been authorized to exempt any services, the applicant shall provide a listing of the services which have been exempted, the case number authorizing such exemption, a copy of the approved separation plan(s), and a copy of the approved code(s) of conduct." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
11	A32.	Yes. This information was set forth in Alt. Reg. Exhibit D to the Application filed in
12		Case No. 07-830-GA-ALT.
13 14 15 16	Q33.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(e) requires that the applicant "provide a complete matrix showing the following: each rate, service, or regulation that is included in the plan and an explanation of how it may be affected during the term of the plan." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
17	A33.	Yes. This information was provided in Paragraphs 21 and 22 of DEO's Application in
18		Case No. 08-169-GA-UNC, as well as the tariff attached to that Application. Additional
19		details regarding the effect of the plan on customer rates are provided in my
20		Supplemental Testimony in the responses to Questions Nos. 21 through 24 as well as the
21		cost of service model included as Attachment JAM 1.4.
22 23 24	Q34.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(f) requires the applicant to "provide a detailed discussion of how potential issues concerning cross-subsidization of services have been addressed in the plan." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
25	A34.	Yes. This information was provided in DEO's Application in Case No. 08-169-GA-
26		UNC. Paragraphs 17 through 20 of the Application provide that DEO will separately
27		account for all PIR-related expenses and investments and that all aspects of the PIR
28		program will be subject to the review of the Commission and other intervenors.
29		Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the Application describe a cost allocation and rate design

1		process that will provide cost-based FIR Cost Recovery Charges for each customer class
2		using cost allocations consistent with the rates established in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR
3		and the related cases. The process is illustrated in greater detail in the cost of service
4		model included as Attachment JAM 1.4 in my testimony.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q35.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(g) requires the applicant to "provide a detailed discussion of how the applicant is in compliance with section 4905.35 of the Revised Code, and is in substantial compliance with the policies of the state of Ohio specified in section 4929.02 of the Revised Code," as well as "a detailed discussion of how it expects to continue to be in substantial compliance with the policies of the state specified in section 4929.02 of the Revised Code, after implementation of the alternative rate plan." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
12	A35.	Yes. This information was set forth in Alt. Reg. Exhibit G to the Application filed in
13		Case No. 07-830-GA-ALT. Approval of the PIR Application will not take DEO out of
14		compliance with R.C. 4905.35 or R.C. 4929.02, and thus DEO's compliance with these
15		sections will continue if the proposal is approved.
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q36.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(h) requires the applicant to "provide the projected financial data required in section F of chapter II of appendix A to rule 4901-7-01 of the Administrative Code, through the term of the proposed plan and which reflects the effects of the proposed plan including the effects of any and all assumptions regarding changes in proposed indices." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
22	A36.	Yes. Attachment JAM 1.4 to my testimony, which was prepared by me or under my
23		supervision, contains the required information. Although the formatting of the data in
24		Attachment JAM 1.4 is not identical to that described in Section F, it nonetheless
25		contains all of the information needed to derive that data as well as a detailed list of the
26		assumptions used to project changes in the proposed rates.

1 2 3 4	Q37.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(i) requires the applicant to "provide projected financial data through the term of the proposed plan under the assumption that the proposed plan is not adopted. This additional set of information shall be labeled as section G." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
5	A37.	Yes. This information was set forth in Alt. Reg. Exhibit I to the Application filed in Case
6		No. 07-830-GA-ALT.
7 8 9	Q38.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(2)(j) requires the applicant to "submit a list of witnesses sponsoring each of the exhibits in its application." Which witnesses are sponsoring the exhibits to the PIR Application?
10	A38.	I am the responsible witness. Tim McNutt is also sponsoring testimony in support of the
11		PIR Application.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q39.	Rule 4901:1-19-05(C)(3) states, "To the extent the applicant is seeking alternative forms of rate setting than that found in section 4909.15 of the Revised Code, the applicant should detail those commitments to customers it is willing to make to promote the policy of the state specified in section 4929.02 of the Revised Code. The extent of commitments specified should be dependent upon the degree of freedom from section 4909.15 of the Revised Code requested by the applicant." Has DEO provided this information in these cases?
19	A39.	Yes. The statement required by this section was set forth in the "Statement Required by
20		Section 4901:1-19-05(C)(3), Ohio Administrative Code" that was filed with the Alt. Reg.
21		Exhibits in Case No. 07-830-GA-ALT.
22	IV.	CONCLUSION
23	Q40.	Does this conclude your testimony?
24	A40.	Yes.

**DOMINION EAST OHIO**Cumulative Impact of Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Program Rider on Residential Customers

# Bare Steel Component

Change from	GSS/ECTS	Rate Class	
	1,207,801		
\$/month	\$/month	Year:	
	\$0.58	<b>j</b>	2009
\$0.69	\$1.28	N	2010
\$0.78	\$2.05	လ	2011
\$0.79	\$2.85	<b>4</b> -	2012
\$0.80	\$3.64	<b>jć</b> n	2013
\$0.80	\$4.44	Ю	2014
\$0.80	\$5.24	7	2015
\$0.81	\$6.05	lœ	2016
\$0.81	\$6,86	ю	2017
\$0.81	\$7.67	16	2018
<b>\$0.82</b>	\$8.49	Ħ	2019

Rate Class # of Customers GSS/ECTS 1,207,801 \$/month Change from prior year: \$/month	Total Impact: Bare Steel + Ongoing Components	Rate Class # of Customers GSS/ECTS 1,207,801 Change from prior year:	Incremental Impact of Ongoing Component (Rate Case lag)	GSS/ECTS 1,207,801 Change from prior year:
\$/month \$/month	+ Ongoir	\$/month \$/month	ngoing C	\$/month \$/month
\$1.12 \$1.12	lg Comp	\$0.54 \$0.54	ompone	\$0.58
\$1.84 \$0.72	onents	\$0.56 \$0.02	nt (Rate	\$1.28 \$0.69
\$2.59 \$0.75		\$0.53 (\$0.03)	Case la	\$2.05 \$0.78
\$3.35 \$0.76		\$0.50 (\$0.03)	<u>(19</u>	\$2.85 \$0.79
\$4.12 \$0.77		\$0.48 (\$0.02)		\$3.64 \$0.80
\$4.91 \$0.78		\$0.47 ( <b>\$</b> 0.01)		\$4.44 \$0.80
\$5.70 \$0.79		\$0.45 (\$0.01)		\$5.24 \$0.80
\$6.49 \$0.79		\$0.44 (\$0.01)		\$6.05 \$0.81
\$7.28 \$0.79		\$0.42 (\$0.01)		\$6,86 \$0,81
\$8.08 \$0.80		\$0.41 (\$0.01)		\$7.67 \$0.81
\$8.88 \$0.80		\$0.40 (\$0.01)		\$8.49 \$0.82

# <u>Assumptions: Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Program Cost Model</u> Cast Iron/Bare Steel Pipe and Related Services

05/28/08

Filing for Pipeline Infrastructure Rider in 2008, Revenue Impact in 2009

Pipeline Infrastructure investment starts at \$72.5 million in FY 2009, increases to \$78 million in FY 2011

- Investment in Distribution LP Mains & Services escalated at 3.0%/year starting in FY 2012
- All figures are in 2007 \$.

Associated Retirements have not been factored into the cost of service model

#### **Book Depreciation**

- -Transmission Mains @ 2.0% (includes all regulator stations)
- -Distribution Mains @ 1.79% (both LP and HP)
- -Distribution Services @ 4.0% (includes both Main-Curb and Curb-Meter portion)

#### Tax Depreciation

- -Transmission Mains: 15 year MACRS
- -Distribution HP Mains: 15 year MACRS
- -Distribution LP Mains and Services:

2008-2010: 15 year MACRS

2011 and beyond: 20 year MACRS

Property Tax: 1.1% on Gross Plant (expense incurred as plant added)

Tax Rate: 35%

Return on Rate Base: 11.65% (with pre-tax ROE)

Based on:

Capital Component	After Tax	Pre-Tax ROE	Cap Structure	Return used for model
Debt	6.05%	6.05%	54.33%	3.287%
Equity	11.90%	18.31%	45.67%	8.361%
Return on Rate Base (WACC)	8.72%			11.648%

First year: Assets in place for 6 months on average (for depreciation purposes)

#### Functional Allocation for Depreciation Expense

- -Transmission Mains allocated based on Transmission Depreciation Expense
- -Distribution LP Mains allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense
- -Distribution Services allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense
- Distribution HP Mains allocated based on Capacity/Commodity portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense

#### Functional Allocation for Property Tax, Rate Base/Return

- -Transmission Mains allocated based on Transmission Gross Plant
- -Distribution LP Mains allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Gross Plant
- -Distribution Services allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Gross Plant
- Distribution HP Mains allocated based on Capacity/Commodity portion of Distribution Gross Plant

No PISCC or incremental O&M expense impact considered

Model does not reflect potential O&M savings nor does it quantify potential for fuel retention savings

Avg. Monthly Cost per Customer (1,207,801) Change from prior year LVGSS, LVECTS Change from prior year CNange from prior year CSS/TSS Change from prior year CSS/TSS Change from prior year TS Change from prior year	Customer Impact, Annual Revenue by class GSS/ECTS LVGSS, LVECTS GSS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Total Revenue Requirement for Infrastructure Rider	GRET Adjustment	Revenue Requirement before GRET	PISCC (initially set at 0)	O&M Expense Impact (Initially set at 0)	Property Tax Expense	Depredation Expense	Annualized Return on Rate Base	Approved Pre-Tax (ROE) Return on Rate Base	Cast inon/Bare Steel component of PIR program Revenue Requirement Summary (\$,000) Annual Investment Accumulated Book Depreciation Net Plant Accumulated Deferred Income Tax Rate Base (\$000)	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline infrastructure Replacement Program
S/month S/month S/month S/month S/month S/month	<u>\$,000</u>	10,221	4.6044%	9,771	0	0	798	732	8,242	11.648%	2008 Year 1 72,500 732 71,768 1,013 70,755	Rapiacemen
\$0.58 \$9.66 \$25.31	2010 8,458 260 284 884 619 10,221	21,390		20,440	0	0	1,633	2,333	16,482		2010 Year 2 76,000 3,065 145,435 3,936 141,498	t Program
\$1.28 \$0.69 \$16.04 \$6.39 \$41.72 \$16.41 \$1,078.24 \$417.20	2011 18,491 433 1,457 1,009 21,380	32,709		31,269	¢	0	2,491	4,237	24,540		20/1 Year 3 78,000 7,302 219,197 8,515 210,682	
\$2.05 \$0.78 \$16.61 \$0.57 \$42.35 \$0.67.39 \$1,067.39	2012 29,783 448 1,479 999 82,708	44,159		42,215	0	0	3,375	6,338	32,601		2012 Year 4 80,340 13,641 293,199 14,173 279,027	
\$2.85 \$0.79 \$16.86 \$0.24 \$42.08 -\$0.27 \$1,031.80	2013 41,269 456 1,470 966 44,159	55,656		53,206	0	0	4,285	8,503	40,418		2013 Year 5 82,760 22,143 367,447 20,453 346,983	
\$3.64 \$0.80 \$17.14 \$0.28 \$41.91 \$0.17 \$98.79 \$33.01	2014 52,795 462 1,464 935 55,656	67,211		<b>64</b> ,262	•	0	6,223	10,732	48,297		2014 Year 6 85,233 32,875 441,947 27,311 414,837	-
\$4.44 \$0.80 \$17.46 \$0.32 \$41.83 \$0.08 \$968.11	2015 64,373 471 1,461 906 67,211	78,823		75,353	0	o	6,189	13,028	58,136		2015 Year 7 87,790 45,904 516,709 34,773 481,935	
\$6.24 \$0.80 \$17.80 \$0.34 \$41.82 -\$0.02 \$938.96	<b>2018</b> 76,004 480 1,460 879 78,823	90,483		86,501	•	0	7,183	15,393	63,924		2018 Year 8 90,423 61,297 591,739 42,945 548,784	
\$6.05 \$0.81 \$18.15 \$0.35 \$41.81 \$0.00 \$810.18	201 <u>7</u> 87,682 490 1,460 952 90,463	102,185		97,687	0	O	8,208	17,829	71,650		2017 Year 9 93,136 79,126 667,048 51,927 615,119	
\$6.86 \$0.81 \$18.50 \$0.35 \$41.82 \$0.00 \$881.40	2018 99,400 499 1,460 825 102,185	113,930		108,915	0	0	9,263	20,338	79,314		2018 Year 10 95,930 98,464 742,638 61,719 680,919	
\$7.67 \$0.81 \$18.36 \$0.36 \$41.82 \$0.01 \$852.63	2019 111,163 509 1,460 798 113,930	125,734		120,199	•	٥	10,350	22,923	86,927		2019 Year 11 98,808 122,387 818,523 72,247 746,276	

	Distribution - HP Mains	Distribution - Services	Transmission - Mains	Rata Base; Distribution - LP Mairs	Total Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	Distribution - HP Mains	Distribution - Services	Transmission - Mains	Distribution - LP Mains	Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	Deferred Income Tax using rate of:		Distribution - Services			Deferred income Lax using rate of		Distribution - HP Mains	Distribution - Services	Transmission - Mains	Distribution - LP Mains	Book-Tax Timing Difference	Total Tax Depreciation Expense	Total Tax Depreciation - Distribution Meter Installations	Total Tax Debreciation - 17 Distribution Mains	Total Tax Depressation - Services - Av Josep (Avice Popolity)	Tay Degradation Date - Candras - 10 years (2011).	Tot Takenshaton Date. Generate 45 (mart 1909)	lotal tex Depreciation - Le Distribution Reins	Tax Depreciation Rate by Year	Net Plant	Accumulated Book Depreciation	Total Book Depreciation Expense	Gross Plant		Accumulated book Depression of Inside Meters  Diet Mater tradition	Book Depreciation Expanse using rate of: 1.78%		Investment in Replacement of HP Distribution Mains HP Distribution Mains			Accumulated Gross Plant (main-curb, evolution)		Accomplete Commission of Commi	W LYONS BRANCE IN	emission Valns	Accumulated Book Depreciation	Book Depreciation Expense using rate of:	Accumulated Gross Plant  LP Distribution Mains	Investment in Replacement of LP Distribution Mains Progress Rete for		ament Rider	
70.764	26,267	5,817	55 833	22,860	1,013	386	23	27	336	;	1,013	350	ž D	3 2	3 8	326	7,890	1,104	188	<b>2</b>	<u>9</u>	ļ	3,625	0	1.344	3 S	2 759	a P R		1	71,768	732	732	72,500	72,500	<b>-</b>	24	26,884	26,884	120	2	6,000	600	i F	5 2 3	16,211	210	210	23,405	23,405	Year 1	2009	
141 49R	40,804	21.12	24,566	55,016	3,936	1,343	348	789	1.456	•	2,924	807	6 7 GU	3 0	8 8	<u>.</u>	0,304	2,730	814	1,605	3,200		10,687	0	3.361	197	7 2294	250.7	3 9. <b>823</b>	3	145,435	3,085	2,333	149,500	76,000	- 8 - 8	\$ 83 8 83	43,914	16,130	683	563	<b>1</b> 2	16.143	2 d	20,806	9.727	933	723	57,496 66	2	Year 2	2010	
210,682	595,385	48,390	23,420	98,910	8,515	2,415	1,066	1,416	3,610		4,5/9	1,07	1071	7 52	4. TO	2 154	790,61	3,061	2,076	1,791	6,153		17,319	0	3.831	3.572	0.68%	1 1 1 1 C	3,00	7 606	219,197	7,302	4,237	ZZ6,500	78,000	<b>-</b>	200	45,014	•	2,179	496	52,643	30.500	3	D+4		2,385	1,453	104,905	7.50	Year 3	2011	
279,027	37.200	76,957	22,355	142,460	14,173	3,353	7,188	1,962	6,569		5,000	1 000	2.50 4.11 4.11	1 1 0	, O. O	٠ 1	10,104	2,0/9	3,184	1,561	8,741		22,503	0	3,440	5.918	5 18%	7 70%	3,030	11 086	293, 199	13,641	6,338	306,840	80,340	<b>6</b>	3 AOS	43,014	0	4,913	2,734	84,058	31.415	a (1)	519		4,701	2,316	159,830	48,925	Year 4	2012	
346,993	000000	103,986	21,363	185,967	20,463	4,170	3,481	2,436	10,350		0,207	b 0	817	1 206 1		2 7 7 8	04-01/21	17046	3,739	1,363	10,518		26,448	0	3,105	7,748	5.71%	76.55 S	1 <u>5</u>	13.75%	367,447	22,143	8,503	389,590	82,750	9	3 176	43,014		8,922	4,009	116,415	32,357		519	200	7,906	3,205	204,223	50,393	Year 5	2013	
414,637	081,46	130,531	20,436	229,480	27,311	4,878	1,800	2,844	14,021	1	0,007		3	470	4 P.	4 271	760'81	10,503	4.201	1,165	12,203		30,324	0	2,793	9,524	5 29%	6.23%	1 684	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	/108/154	32,876	10,732	474.823	85,233	0	3946	43,014	0	14,245	6,323	149,744	33,328	V 659	519	35.038	12,026	1,120	256,127	51,905	Year 6	2014	
481,935	34,700	156,575	19,552	273,026	34,773	5,515	000	3,208	19,4/4		7,400	7 62	3 2	1 200	<b>1</b>	4 853	220013	3	1	1,043	13,866		34,350	0	2,591	11,268	4.88%	590%	1,000 1,000	18 936	60/,010	45,904	13,028	562,612	87,790	9	4 71B	43,014		20,922	6,678	184,972	34,328	» 17	519	on 020 €	17,089	5,083	309,589	53,462	Year /	2015	
548,794	0,094	182,127	18,679	316,593	42,945	6,134	0,311	3,563	24,956	3	0,772	473	51 S	1 795	356	5 463	20,000	33.760	4,458	1,011	15,510		38,741	0	2,538	13,029	4.52%	5.90%	150	3 64	867,165	61,297	15,393	<b>6</b> 63,036	90,423	0	5 170	43,014		28,992	8,070	219,430	35,358	3.696	818 000,04	36 D36 C	23,123	6,034	364,654	55,066	Year 8	2016	
615,119	,	30,704	307.505	380,161	57.92/	7,0,704	0,193	10.102	31,000	3	204,0	2023	620	1 983	<b>3</b>	5.125	2004	)	0,379	1,013	17,498		43,491	0	2,541	14,885	4 46%	5.01%	1,539	24.534	907,040	79,126	17,829	746,172	93,1 <b>36</b>	<b>.</b>	6256	43,014		38,497	9,506	255,848	36,419	4.215	519	7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	30,158	7,035	421 372	56,717	1697	2017	
680,919	0	28 615	039 EEO	403,712	617.19	6,363	2070	4,25	31.000	37 955	0,704	a 700	619	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	250	<b>6.793</b>	F1,071	27 977	1,760	1,012	19,408	;	48,315	0	2,530	16,772	£46%	5.90%	1531	27.473	000/241	98,464 743,636	20,338	842,102	95,930	0	7.026	43,014		49,481	10,984	293,359	37,511	4.734	619	); 0 2 3	38,224	8,065	479,791	58,419	Year 10	2018	
746,276	, i	27 225	35,0 <b>50</b>	447,337	12.241	7,982	1,000	14.020	200	45 976	وعلاون	10.50	8 1 1 1 1	2134	3	7.420	-	30.082	1771	2,U13	21.201		53,005			18,605	4.46%	3.91%	1.532	30.327	676,010	122,38/	22,923	940,910	98,808		7.796	43,014		61,988	12,507	331,996	38,636	5.252	5/9	25. Q2 <b>9</b>	47,351	9,127	539,963	60,172	Tear 17	2019	

TOTAL DEPRECIATION EXPENSE ALLOCATION GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depreciation Exp - Distribution Meter installations GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depreciation Expense - HP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depredation Expense - Distribution Services GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depreciation Expense - Transmission Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSSA-VECTS GTB/TSS DTB TOTAL	Depredation Expense - LP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider Fiscal Year: Cast Iron/Bare Steel Component of PIR Program Details DEPRECIATION EXPENSE ALLOCATION
	Customer: Services por 14,289,069 25,708 43,216 1,318 14,359,310	Cap/Comm portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 10,408,813 171 612,082 10 2,104,156 35 1,495,853 25 14,620,703 241	Customer: Services port 14,289,068 25,708 43,216 1,318 14,359,310	Trans Dep Ex from COS 210,588 12,382 42,587 30,257 285,774	Customer: Services portion of Dist Dap Ex from COS 14.289,068 208 720 25,706 0 1 43,216 1 2 1,318 0 0 14,369,310 210 723	epilocement Rider Fiscal Year: etails
614 17 58 41 732	Services portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 14,289,068 0 0 25,708 0 0 43,216 0 0 1,318 0 0 14,359,310 0 0	st Dep Ex from 177 10 35 25 241	Services portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 14,289,066 119 560 25,708 0 1 43,216 0 2 1,318 0 2 14,359,310 120 563	ស៊ី <b>។ ស</b> 7 វី	ion of Dist Dep 208 0 1 1 0 210	2009 Year 1
2,025 46 156 107 2,333	Ex from COS 0 0 0	626 926 926 926 926 926	Extrom COS 560 1 2 2 363	300 18 43 43	Ex from COS 720 1 2 0 723	2010 Year 2
3,861 59 194 132 4,237	00000	548 770 770	1,488 1,488 5 5	56 22 25 <del>26</del>	1,446 3 1,463	2011 Year 3
5,942 63 201 132	88088	548 32 111 79 770	2,721 5 8 0 2,734	516 53 54 55 54 55 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	2,304 4 7 7 2,316	2012 Year 4
8,096 67 207 132 8,503	00000	548 32 770	3,980 7 12 4,009	519 23 75 23 28 519 23 75 22 28	3,199 6 10 3,205	2013 Year 5
10,315 71 214 133 10,732	00000	548 32 111 78	5,297 10 16 0 5,323	519 519 519	4,100 7 12 0 4,120	2014 Year 6
12,589 76 221 133 13,028	00000	548 32 711 79	5,644 12 20 1 6,676	388 22 53 519	5,038 9 15 0 5,063	2015 Year 7
14,963 78 228 133				368 518 518		2016 Year 6
17,377 84 235 133 17,829				389 22 75 53		2017 Year 9
19,874 88 243 134 20,338				369 22 76 53		2018 Year 10
22,446 80 251 134 22,823	0000	548 92 779 770	12,446 22 38 1 12,507	51 23 75 <b>23</b> 88	9,092 16 27 1 9,127	2019 Year 11

TOTAL PROPERTY TAX EXPENSE ALLOCATION GSSACCTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Property Tax Expense - Diet Mater Installations GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Property Tax Expense - HP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Property Tax Expense - Distribution Services GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS OTS TOTAL	Property Tax Expense - Transmission Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Property Tax Expense - LP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSSAVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replecement Rider Fiscal Year: Cast browbere Steel Component of PIR Program Details PROPERTY TAX ALLOCATION Calculated at a sate of:
ION	Dist Plant/Customer; Services from COOS 299,593,979 0 527,085 0 1 1,024,258 0 32,959 0 301,178,281 0	Dist plant: Cap/Comm portion on COS 635,329,885 211 37,360,084 12 128,432,827 43 91,291,184 30 892,413,961 296	Diet Plant/Customer: Services from CCO6 288,933,979 66 527,085 0 1,024,258 0 32,999 0 301,178,281 66	Trans Plant from CCOS 148,786,233 8,749,196 30,077,143 21,379,086 206,980,670	Dist Plant/Customer: Services from CCOS 299,593,979 256 527,085 0 1,024,258 1 32,959 0 301,178,281 257	onment Rider
659 20 49 798	Aces from CC 0 0 0 0	ortion on COS 211 12 43 30 296	vices from CC 96 0 0 0 0 0 88	127 128 128	vices from CC 256 0 1 1 257	2009 Year 1
1,410 38 112 78 78	. Q	473 88 23 23 23 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	242	203 12 41 29 285	83 0 2 + 88	2010 Year 2
2,264 35 115 78 2,481	00000	397 20 48 473	578 1 2 2 579	203 285 286	1,148 2 1,154	2011 Year 3
3,143 36 118 78 3,375	00000	337 46 473	920 2 925	203 12 41 29 286	1,683 3 6 0 0	2012 Year 4
4,048 36 121 78 4,285	00000	337 20 46 473	1,274 2 4 1,281	203 41 28 28	2,235 4 8 0 2,246	2013 Year 5
4,981 40 124 78 5,223	00000	997 20 68 48 473	1.639 3 6 1,647	203 12 29 286	2,803 5 10 0 2,817	2014 Year 6
5,942 41 128 6,188	00000	337 20 473	2,014 4 7 0 2,025	203 24 26 26	\$ 388 6 12 12	2015 Year 7
6,931 43 131 78	0000	337 48-88-87 773-18-88-88-87	2,401 2,414 8 8	203 22 28 28	3,990 7 14 0 4,011	2016 Year 8
7,950 45 134 78 8,208	2000	337 20 473	2,800 6 10 2,814	203 41 29 285	4,611 8 16 1,635	2017 Year 9
9,000 47 138 9,263	2222		3,210 6 11 3,227	203 12 41 29 285	5,250 9 18 18 5,278	2018 Year 10
10,081 49 142 79	<b>00000</b>		3,633 6 12 3,662	28 25 ± 12 23 86 25 ± 12 23	5,906 5,906 5,940	2019 . Year 11

Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider	Replacement Rider Fiscal Year:	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
RETURN ON RATE BASE ALLOWATION  RETURN ON RATE BASE ALLOWATION			- N	7 961	4	0	igai c	1581	080		14	- 4
Castribution - LP Mains	11,040%	2.063	6.408	11.521	16.594	21.662	26.730	31.802	36.877	41.951	47.025	52.106
Transmission - Mains		1,843	2,861	2,728	2,604	2,488	2,380	2,277	2,176	2074	1,972	1,871
Distribution - Services		3 678 578	2,460	6,753	8,964	12,114	15,204	18,238	21,214	24,130	26,984	29.779
		3,058		4,538	المدن	4,155	3,902	818'E	3,65/	24.430 CAN.20	3,333	3,1/1
Listabution - Meter Installations Total Return on Rale Sasse		8,242 0	16,482	24,540 C	32,501	40,418	48,297	56,136 0	63,924	71,650	79.314	86,927 727
Distribution-LP Meins:	Dist Plant/Customer: Services from CO8	vices from CC	<b>65</b>									
GSS/ECTS	296,593,979	2,648	6,375	11,460	16,507	21,548	26,589	31,635	36,683	41,730	46,777	51,832
LVGSSAVECTS	527,085	O1	=	23	13	38	47	58	88	73	82	<b>.</b>
GTS/TSS	1,024,258	• 60	. 23	. <b>3</b>	8	74	<b>.</b>	108	. 12k	143	160	. 77
TOTAL	32,959 301,178,281	2, <b>863</b>	p. 108 ~	## 521 J	16,594	21, <del>6</del> 62	26,730	31,802 3	36,877	41,95	47,025	52,106
Transmission Liebs:	Trans Plant from COS											
GSS/ECTS	148,785,233	1,312	2,037	1,942	1,864	1,771	1,695	1,621	1,549	1,477	1,404	1,332
LVGSSAVECTS	8,749,196	<b>3</b> 3	120	3 <del>1</del>	i 8	<b>1</b>	3 106	3 8 8	2 92	<b>3</b> 87	,	3 2
DIS	21,379,098	<u> </u>	25 ;	279	266	<b>2</b>	244	2 6	223	활	202	<b>191</b>
TOTAL	208,990,670	1,843	2,861	2,728	2,604	2,488	2,380	2,277	2,176	2,074	1,972	1,877
Distribution Services:	Dist Plemb'Customer: Services from COS	Aces from CO		n d	0	Š		<u>.</u>	ì			20.823
LYGOSA VECTS	537 085	- £		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, c.	100	77 10,10	ē 1 6	37	4,000	47 47	70
GTS/TSS	1,024,258	№ -	OD 1	8 8	පු ද	2 4	8 t	ខា	23.5	<b>8</b> 3 #	8 <del>:</del>	₫ ;
DTS	32,959	0	0		-		~	2	N	<u>.</u>	Ç.	
TOTAL	301,178,281	678	2,459	5,753	8,984	12,114	15,204	18,238	21,214	24,130	26,984	29,779
Distribution-HP Mains:	Dist plant: Cap/Comm portion on COS	ortion on COS										
GSS/ECTS	635,329,885	2177	3,384	3,231	3,089	2,958	2,835	2,719	2,603	2,488	2,373	2,258
LVGSS/LVEC/S	37,360,064	128	198	3 3	ī	174	167	58	5 G	1 de	140	<u> </u>
DIS	91,291,184	3 t	<b>*</b> 9	£ 5	4 6	425	407	30 50	374	35.00	341	ž į
· TOTAL	892,413,961	3,056	4,753	4,536	4,340	4,155	3,982	3,819	3,657	3,495	3,333	3,171
				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	DSC FIZHCUSIONET: ORIVICES ITOM COS	U Noes now co	9	<b>-</b>	<b>5</b>	5	<b>-</b>	0	0	9	-	<b>-</b>
LYGSS/LYECTS	527,085	٥,	0 1	0	0 (	0 (	0 1	0 1	0	0 (	0	0
стѕлъв	1,024,258	0	0	0	0	•	0	c	0	0	0	
brs	32,959	0	0	0	0	0	0	٥	•	0	0	· <b>6</b>
TOTAL	301,178,281	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0
ALLOCATION OF RETURN ON RATE BASE				8	200		\$	h		80 800	7	96
LYGSSA VECTS		0,812 214	292,42	906,55	70°,06	38,32/ 737,68	46.244 345	243 71.140	346	340	300	354
GISISS		77	 126 136 136	- 50 4	, 26 6	1,071	<u> </u>	, 20 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	1,037	, 26 36	2015	<b>1</b> ,004
DTS		502	780	746	713	583	656	629	8	577	8	525
TOTAL		8,242	16,482	24,540	32,501	40,418	48,297	56,136	63,924	71,650	79,314	86,927

MONTHLY COST PER, CUSTOMER GSSJECTS LVGSSLVECTS GTS/TSS DTS	DTS Volumetric Annual I	ANNUAL COST PER CUSTOMER  GSS/ECTS LVGSSILVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	TOTAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT Using GRET of: GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider Cast Iron/Bare Steel Component of PiR Program Details REVENUE REQUIREMENT BEFORE GRET GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS G78/78S D18 TOTAL
	Annual DTS Volume 50,368,814	# of Customers 1,207,801 2,248 2,910 78 1,213,037	4.60440%	ar.
\$0.58 \$9.65 \$25.31 \$661.04	\$0.0123	\$7.00 \$115.81 \$303.75 \$7,932 \$8.43	8,458 260 884 819 10,221	2009 Year 1 8,086 249 845 591 9,771
\$1.28 \$16.04 \$41.72 \$4,078.24	\$0.0200	\$15.31 \$192.51 \$500.62 \$12,638 \$17.63	18,491 438 1,457 1,009 21,380	2010 Year 2 17,677 414 1,393 965 20,449
\$2.05 \$16.61 \$42.35 \$1,067.39	\$0.0198	\$24,66 \$198.37 \$508.24 \$12,808 \$26,96	29,783 448 1,479 999 32,708	2011 Year 3 28,472 428 1,414 955 31,289
\$2.85 \$16.86 \$42.08 \$1,031.80	\$0.0192	\$34.17 \$202.28 \$505.02 \$12,382 \$36.40	41,289 458 1,470 966 44,159	2012 Year 4 39,462 436 1,405 923 42,215
\$3.84 \$17.14 \$41.91 \$998.79	<b>\$</b> 0.0186	\$49.71 \$205.87 \$502.97 \$11,985 \$45,88	52,795 462 1,464 935 56,656	2013 Year 5 50,471 442 1,399 894 53,206
\$4,44 \$17,46 \$41.83 \$968.11	\$0.0180	\$53.30 \$208.48 \$502.01 \$11,817 \$55,41	84,373 471 1,461 906 87,211	2014 Year 6 61,539 450 1,397 886 64,252
\$5,24 \$17,80 \$41.82 \$938,95	\$0.0174	\$62.93 \$213.56 \$501.76 \$11,267 \$64.98	76,004 480 1,460 879 78,823	2015 Year 7 72,658 459 1,366 840 75,353
\$6.05 \$18.15 \$41.81 \$910.18	\$0.0169	\$72.60 \$217.78 \$501.77 \$10.922 \$74.59	87,882 1,460 90,483	2016 Year 8 83,822 468 1,386 614 86,501
\$6.86 \$18.50 \$41.82 \$881.40	\$0.0164	\$82.30 \$222.02 \$501.79 \$10.577 \$84.24	99,400 499 1,480 825	2017 Year 9 95,026 477 1.396 789 97,687
\$7.57 \$18.86 \$41.82 \$852.53	80.0158	\$92.04 \$228.30 \$501.85 \$10.232 \$93.92	111, 163 509 1,460 798	2018 Year 10 106,270 496 1,386 793 108,915
\$8.49 \$19.22 \$41.83 \$823.86	\$0.0153	\$101.82 \$230.61 \$501.97 \$9,886 \$103.85	122,984 518 1,481 771 125,734	2019 Year 11 117,570 466 1,396 737 120,199

# <u>Assumptions: Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Program Cost Model</u> Ongoing Pipeline Infrastructure Expenditures

05/28/08

Filing for Pipeline Infrastructure Rider in 2008, Revenue Impact in 2009

Ongoing Pipeline Infrastructure Investment starts at \$60 million in FY 2009

- decreases to \$55.8 million in 2013 and is steady thereafter.

Associated Retirements have not been factored into the cost of service model

#### **Book Depreciation**

- -Transmission Mains @ 2.0% (includes all regulator stations)
- -Distribution Mains @ 1.79% (both LP and HP)
- -Distribution Services @ 4.0% (includes both Main-Curb and Curb-Meter portion)

#### Tax Depreciation

- -Transmission Mains: 15 year MACRS
- -Distribution HP Mains: 15 year MACRS
- -Distribution LP Mains and Services:

2008-2010: 15 year MACRS

2011 and beyond: 20 year MACRS

Property Tax: 1.1% on Gross Plant (expense incurred as plant added)

Tax Rate: 35%

Return on Rate Base: 11.65% (with pre-tax ROE)

Based on:

Capital Component	After Tax	Pre-Tax ROE	Cap Structure	Return used for model
Debt	6.05%	6.05%	54.33%	3.287%
Equity	11.90%	18.31%	45.67%	8.361%
Return on Rate Base (WACC)	8.72%			11.648%

First year: Assets in place for 6 months on average (for depreciation purposes)

#### Functional Allocation for Depreciation Expense

- -Transmission Mains allocated based on Transmission Depreciation Expense
- -Distribution LP Mains allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense
- -Distribution Services allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense
- Distribution HP Mains allocated based on Capacity/Commodity portion of Distribution Depreciation Expense

#### Functional Allocation for Property Tax, Rate Base/Return

- -Transmission Mains allocated based on Transmission Gross Plant
- -Distribution LP Mains allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Gross Plant
- -Distribution Services allocated based on Customer: Services portion of Distribution Gross Plant
- Distribution HP Mains allocated based on Capacity/Commodity portion of Distribution Gross Plant

No PISCC or incremental O&M expense impact considered

Model does not reflect potential O&M savings nor does it quantify potential for fuel retention savings

# Infrastructure Rider vs. Rate Case Filings

<u>Fiscal Year:</u> Total PIR Rider Revenue Requirement: (Ongoing component of PIR program)	20 <u>09</u> 8,540	2010 17,448	2011 25,846	2012 33,658	<u>2013</u> 41,110	2014 48,340	<u>2015</u> 55,360	<u>2016</u> 62,180	<u>2017</u> 68,735	2018 75,086	<u>2019</u> 81,219
Rate Case Scenarios:											
Rate Case filed in 2009 and annually thereafter Incremental Rate Case Revenue:	<u></u> О	8,540	17,448	25,846	33,658	41,110	48,340	55,360	62,160	68,735	75,086
Incremental Revenue Requirement (\$/year)	8,540	8,909	8,397	7,812	7,452	7,231	7,019	6,800	6,575	6,351	6,133
Total Customer Impact	\$/year	8,540	8,909	8,397	7,812	7,452	7,231	7,019	6,800	6,575	6,351
GSS/ECTS Class Impact	\$/уеаг	7,826	6,170	7,738	7,264	6,960	6,757	6,560	6,356	6,147	5,939
	1,207,801	\$0.54	\$0.56	\$0.53	\$0.50	\$0.48	\$0.47	\$0.45	<b>\$</b> 0.44	\$0.42	\$0.41
Charge from prior year		\$0.54	\$0.02	(\$0.03)	(\$0.03)	(\$0.02)	(\$0.01)	(\$0.01)	(\$0.01)	(\$0.01)	(\$0.01)

Avg. Monthly Cost per Customer GSS/ECTS 1,207,801 Change from prior year LVGSS, LVECTS 2,248 Change from prior year GSS/TSS 2,910 Change from prior year The Change from prior year The Change from prior year	Customer Indact Annual Revenue by class GSS/ECTS LVGSS, LVECTS GSS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Total Revenue Requirement for Infrastructure Rider	Revenue Requirement before GRET GRET Adjustment	PISCC (initially set at 0)	O&M Expense Impact (initially set at 0)	Property Tax Expense	Depreciation Expense	Annualized Return on Rate Base	Approved Pre-Tax (ROE) Return on Rate Base	Rate Base (\$000)	Net Plant	Annual investment Accumulated Book Depreciation	Crigaing Component of PIR Program  Revenue Requirement Summary (5,000)	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider Fiscal Year 2009 2010	
\$/month \$/month \$/month \$/month \$/month \$/month \$/month	\$.000	8,540	8,164 4.6044%	0	0	660	690	6.814	11.648%	58,502	59,311	690,000	Year 1	Replacemen 2009	
\$0.54 \$4.07 \$10.36 \$259.39	7,826 110 361 243 8,540	17,448	16,680 104%	0	0	1,320	2,068 2,068	13,292	;	3,130 114,112 95%	117,242	60.000 2,7 <b>5</b> 8	Year 2	nt Rider 2010	
\$1.10 \$0.56 \$8.29 \$4.22 \$21.06 \$10.71 \$527.67 \$288.28	2010 15,986 224 735 494 17,448	25,846	24,708 48%	o	0	1,956	3,434 86%	19,308	į	5,745 165,762 45%	172,508	58,700 6,192	Year 3	2011	
\$1.64 \$0.53 \$12.08 \$3.78 \$9.62 \$9.57 \$766.30 \$238.63	2011 23,733 326 1,069 717 25,846	33,658	32,176 30%	0	0	2,588 33%	4.766 39%	24,822	;	213,099 29%	224,342	58,600 10,958	Year 4	2012	· .
\$2.14 \$0.50 \$15.25 \$3.17 \$38.58 \$7.96 \$962.94 \$196.64	2012 30,998 411 1,347 901 33,658	41,110	39,300 22%	0	0	3,202	5,069 27%	30,029	1	257,801 257%	274,073	55,800 17,027	Year 5	2013	
\$2.62 \$0.48 \$18.12 \$2.87 \$45.74 \$1,138.56 \$1,75.61	2013 37,958 489 1,597 1,066 41,110	48,340	48,213 18%	0	0	3,816	7,364 21%	35,033 179	;	21,749 300,760 17%	322,509	55,800 24,391	Year 6	2014	
\$3.09 \$0.47 \$20.88 \$2.77 \$52.64 \$6.90 \$1,307.83 \$169.27	2014 44,716 563 1,838 1,224 48,340	55,360	52,923 18%	0	<b>0</b>	4,450	0,659 18%	39,834		27,069 341,961 14%	369,660	55,800 33,060	Year 7	2015	
\$3.54 \$0.45 \$23.58 \$2.58 \$59.32 \$6.68 \$1,471.77 \$163.95	2015 51,275 636 2,072 1,378 55,360	62,160	59,42 <b>4</b> 12%	0	0	5,044	9.954 18%	44,427	;	381,406 12%	415,496	55,800 43,004	Year 8	2016	
\$3.98 \$0.44 \$26.15 \$2.59 \$65.79 \$1,630.24 \$158.47	2016 57,631 705 2,297 1,526 62,160	88,735	65,710 11%	0	<b>Q</b>	5,657	11,249	48,804	į	418,983 10%	480,048	54,253	Year 9	2017	
\$4.40 \$0.42 \$28.66 \$2.50 \$72.02 \$6.23 \$1,783.11 \$152.86	2017 63,778 773 2,515 1,669 68,735	75,086	71,781 9%	0	٥	6,271	12,544 12%	52,966	;	45,502 454,722 9%	603,304	55,800 66,796	Year 10	2016	
\$4.81 \$0.41 \$31.06 \$2.41 \$78.03 \$6.01 \$1,930.32 \$147.21	2018 69,717 838 2,725 1,807 75,086	81,219	77,644 8%	0	0	6,885	13,838 10%	56,921 74	,	26,093 488,673 7%	545,286	95,800 80,636	Year 11	2019	

. . . . . .

Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider	blacement Rider											
Ongoing component of PIR Program Rate Base (\$690)	Fiscal Year:	2009 Year 1	2010 Year 2	2011 Year 3	2012 Year 4	2013 Year 5	2014 Year 8	2015 Year 7	2016 Year 8	2017 Year 9	2018 Year 10	2019 Year 11
Investment in Replacement of LP Citationtion Mains	Proposed Rate for:	31,000	31,000	31,000	34,000	31,000	31,000	31,060	34,000	31,000	31,000	341,000
Book Depreciation Expense using rate of:	1.78%	278	832	1,387	1,942	2.497	3,052	3,607	4,162	4,717	5,272	5,826
Accumulated Book Depreciation	٠	278	1,110	2,497	4,439	6,995	836'6	13,595	17,757	22,474	27,745	33,57 <b>2</b>
Investment in Replacement of Frankrijssken Mains Accumplated Gross Plant	Transmission Mains	16,800	33,600	49,100	62,500	75,100	12,000 87,700	100,300	112,900	125,500	138,100	150,700
Book Depreciation Expense using rate of:	200%	18 8 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	3 <u>5</u>	827	1.116	1,376	1,628	1,586	2,132	22.38	2,636	17 R30
Accumulated Book Depreciation	Camabaa.	t S	13 20 22	1,488	13.00 10.00 10.00	12.241	12,200	12,200	12.200	12 200	12,260	12,200
Accumulated Gross Plant	(mah-curb, syc lines)	12.200	24,400	36,600	46,800	61,000	73,200	85,400	97,600	109,800	122,000	134,200
Book Depreciation Expense using rate of:	4.00%	244	732	1,220	1,708	2,196	2,684	3,172	3,660	<b>4,</b> 148	4,636	5,124
	AP Destruction Mains	o <b>1</b>	9 6	,, 20	3,904 0	, 0	9. 0.		0.010	0 t-6/'R1	0	0
		٥.	0	0	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	0
Book Depreciation Expense using rate of:	1.79%	<b>.</b>	<b>,</b>	- <b>6</b>	- 0	<b>.</b> •	- 0	<b>.</b> .	- 0	- 0	- 0	
investment in Relocation of Inside Maters	Dist. Meter installation		-	<b>~</b> <	•	•	0 0	۰,		<b>.</b>	0	0
Accumulated Gross Plant		•	0	•	. 0		0	•			. 0	. 0
Book Depreciation Expense using rate of	2.22%	<b>&gt;</b> =	<b>-</b> 0		9 6	<b>-</b> -	<b>~</b> •	<b>5</b> C	<b>~</b> ~	o c	<b>0</b> C	0 0
Total Project CAPEX	Apalhe inhestructure	000,000	900,000	58,700	50,000	55,800	55,800	55,800	55,800	55,000	55,800	55,800
Total Accumulated Gross Plant		900,000	120,000	178,700	235,300	291,100	346,900	402,700	458,500	514,300	570,100	008,020
Accumulated Book Depreciation		<b>8</b> 8	2,758	8,192 192	10,958	17,027	24,391	39,050	49,004	54,253	66,798	80,635
Net Plant		59,311	117,242	172,508	224,342	274,073	322,509	369,650	415,498	480,048	503,304	545,268
Tax Depreciation Rate by Year		1 650	4 408	7146	0116	10 586	11 947	13 704	14.745	14 285	17 797	19.202
Total Tax Depreciation - Services		610	1,769	2,812	3,598		4,688	5,232	5,803	9,409	7,004	7,567
Total Tax Depreciation - Distribution Meler Installations Total Tax Debreoistion Excense	<b>a</b>	3000 C	700 o	13,765	17,617	20,437	23 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	25,574	28,300	31,174	34,023	36,726
Book-Tax Timing Difference			2000	. 455			2 000	2.007	10.00	11 220	40 600	12 276
CHOMOSCOT - LT REALES		9 2	4 9.00 2000 2000	9690	7.76	4310	6,740	5 (O)	5 (2004) 1004	2097	2 F. 12 F. 1	7,079
Distribution - Services		386	1,037	1,592 1,592	1,891	1,970	2,014	2,060	2,148	2,261	2,368	2,433
Olstribution - HP Mains		. 0	0	. 0	, <b>©</b>	, 0	. 0	. 0	, 0	. 0	s 0	<b>,</b> 5
Cook-Tex Timing Difference		2311	6.632	10.331	12.850	14.368	15.646	16.915	18,346	19,926	21,480	22,688
Deferred income Tax using rate of	35%		!				•	į				
Distribution - LP Mains		45	1,282	2,016	2,521	2,831	5,110	3,390	3,704	4,049	4,53	4,082
Transmission - Mains		2 20	275	1,043 240,1	1,310	300,1	1,982	1,57	708,	4, 134 704	, 4 6 6 6 6	A570
Okalebusian - Usawowa Okalebusian - Usawowa		o [	_ {	o 5	a f	e 8	٥ (	<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>	٠.	ا ه	0
Distribution - Meter installations		•	0	•	•	0	٥	0	0	c	0	0
Deferred Income Tax using rate of:	35%	809	2,321	2,616	4,498	5,028	6,477	5,820	0,42	6,8/4	7,518	0,077
Distribution - LP Mains		\$	1,727	3,743	6,264	980,6	12,205	15,595	19,299	23,348	27,732	32,414
Trensmission - Mains		236	9	1.90	3,269	4,778	6,440	8,249	10,215	12,349	14,654	17,182
Distribution - Services		128	481	1,048	1,710	2,389	3,104	3,825	4,576	5,367	6,196	7,047
Distribution - MP Mains		. 0	• •	•		• •	<b>,</b>	> 0		<b>.</b>	<b>&gt;</b>	<b>.</b>
Distribution - Meter installations		<b>8</b> -	3.130	6,746	11,243	16,272	21,740	27,669	34,090	<b>4</b> 1,064	48,582	58,5 <b>93</b>
Rate Base:												246
Distribution - LP Mains		30,277	59,183	85,750 85,750	113,297	28,958 231	75,007	167,610	43.054	101.136	108,785	116.029
Distributions - Services		11,828	22 933	33,356	43,186 186	52,501	61,312	69,619	77,409	84,669	91,405	97,629
Distribution - HP Mains		5		0	• •		0	• •	• •	• •		• •
Distribution - Meter Installations		2 2 3	1110	165 750	313.000	257 801	300 760	200	261 406	418.983	454.722	486,673
TOTAL DOSO		- Contract	100	2011/00	40000	100	200		100			

TOTAL DEPRECIATION EXPENSE ALLOCATION GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DT9 TOTAL	Depreciation Exp - Distribution Meter Installations GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depreciation Expense - HP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depreciation Expense - Distribution Services GSSÆCTS LVGSSLVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Depredation Expense - Transmission Mains GSS/RCTS LVGS6/LVECTS GTS/TSS UT'S TOTAL	Depreciation Expense - LP Distribution Mains GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS GTS/TSS DTS TOTAL	Cost of Service Model - Pipeline infrastructure Replacement Rider Onsoins component of PIR Program DEPRECIATION EXPENSE ALLOCATION
	Customer: Services portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 14,289,068 0 0 25,708 0 0 43,216 0 0 1,378 0 0	Cap/Comm portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 10,408,813 0 612,082 0 2,104,156 0 1,465,863 0 14,620,703 0	Customer: Services portion of Dies Dop Ex from COS 14,299,088 243 728 25,708 0 1 43,216 1 2 1,318 0 0 14,369,510 244 732	Trans Dep Ex from COS 210,589 12,382 42,567 30,267 286,774	Customer: Services portion of Dist Dep Ex from COS 14,289,088 276 828 25,706 0 1 43,218 1 3 1,318 0 0 14,359,310 278 832	eplacement Rider Fiscal Year:
639 8 8 26 17	rdon of Dist Dep 3 0 0 0 0 0	iist Dep Ex from ( g g g g g g	rdion of Dies Dep   243 0 1 1 0 244	120 180 181 181	rtion of Dist Dap 276 0 1 1 278	2009 Year 1
1,916 24 77 2,088	Ex from Cos 0 0 0	င္း လေ	Ex from COS 726 1 2 2 732	ឌីជប្នុដ្ឋ	Ex from COS 808 1 3 832 832	2010 Year 2
3,188 127 88	0000		1,214 1,220	827 <b>65</b> 11 86 598	1,380 2 2 1,387	2011 Year 3
4,427 172 174 4,788		00000	1,700 5 1,708	7,116 4 78 114 4 78	1,983 9 1,942	2012 Year 4
5,850 68 212 141 6,069	0000	00000	2,185 2,185 2,186	980 188 141 1,376	2,485 4 6 2,497	2013 Year 5
0,867 78 252 167 7,364	00000	0000	2,671 5 2,884	1,159 254 197	3,037 5 0 0 3,052	2014 Year 6
6,064 91 291 193 8,639	00000	00000	3,156 6 10 3,172	1,338 79 271 192 1,880	3,589 6 11 3,607	2015 Year 7
9,301 103 330 219 9,954	80000		3,642 7 11 0 3,660	1,518 89 307 218 2,132	4,744 7 7 13 13	2016 Year 8
10,519 116 370 245 11,249	20000	00000	4,128 7 12 4,148	1,697 100 244 2343	4,694 8 14 0 4,717	2017 Year 9
11,738 128 408 271 12,544	0000	0000	4,613 8 14 0 4,636	1,877 110 378 270 2,636	5,246 9 16 0 5,272	2018 Year 10
12,853 141 449 286 13,838	00000	0000a	5,088 5,124	2,086 121 416 285 2,888	5,788 10 18 18 1 5,826	2019 Year 11

HOTS  AL PROPERTY TAX EXPENSE ALLOCATION FICTS	Property Tax Expense - Diet Meder Installations Diet Plant/Custs GSSECTS 4VGSSALVECTS GTS/TSS 1.0 DTS 301.1	PHY Tax Expense - Died Mader Installations PECTS SELVECTS	i ax Expense - Diet Meder Installations 16 VECTS	vense - Died Meder Installations	x Expense - Dist Mader Installations		TOTAL 892,4		TSS	VECTS	GSS/ECTS Expense - HP Destroution washs Dist plant Capucomin portion on COS		301,1				Property Tax Expense - Distribution Services Dist Plant/Customer: Services from CCOS	101AL 208,8		TSS	SCTS	Property Tax Expense - Transmission Mains Trans Plant from CCOS	**************************************	202	TSS	MECTS	Property Tax Expense - LP Diskibution Mains Disk Plant/Customer: Services from CCOS	Colculated at a rate of:	PROPERTY TAX ALLOCATION	Cost of Service Klodal - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider Fiscal Year:
		301,178,281	37.969	1024.258	537 086	39.979 39.979	892,473,961	97,291,184	128,432,827	37,360, <b>064</b>	C80/Comm po 835,329,885	3	301,178,281	37.98	1024258	527.085	AME SELV	0.9° neer'802	21,379,098	90,077,143	8,749,196	If from CCOS	1.0000	400, 94 400, 94	1,024,258	527,065	/Customer: Serv 269,563,979	1.10% o		7
₽ ;	ğ	0	9 (	٥	٥ (	Dist Plant/Customer: Services from CCOS	0		•	0	on CUS	)	ź.	0 (	ο :	o 8	rices from CCO	8	6	27	œ	132	. 1	, 1		_	vices from CCO 339	1.10% on Gross Plant		2009
8 <b>3</b> 1	1 200	0	0	-	<b>-</b>		6		0	•			268	0				370	<b>8</b> 2	23	<b>3</b>	263	Ç	3 c	N	-	8 8		1991	2010
& 23 & 25	1 8	0	0	۵ (	0	څ	۰	• •	. 0	٥	٥		403	۰ م	<b>_</b> .	- é	ŝ	5 8	Ų,	78	23	28 85	1,020	1000	G	ю	1,018		1000	2011
ទី <u>ខ</u>	3 380	0	٥,	<b>-</b>	<b>.</b>	<b>-</b>	0		۰	٥	•		537	0	N	- · · ·	3	8	7	99	28	<b>4</b>	1,200	1984	o Ch	N	1,357		i dente	2012 Year 4
<b>1</b> 1 38	2.952	۰	<b>•</b>	۰ ۵	۰ ۵	0	•	. 0	. 0		0		671	0	ю	_ :	AAT	ě	8	119	36	588	1,100	1 705 0		. CO	1,696			2013
<b>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</b>	3.523	٥	0 (	۵.	، ۵	6	٥		۵.	ه.	٥		805	0	<b>.</b>			8	) }	139	B	987	Post	ر 1	, ,	4	2,035			2014
78 52	4.094	a	٥	ь,	٥,	<b>c</b>	c		• •		0		998	0	u	No :	62	1,165	. 113	100	#6	786	l) co	3 347	> 00	4	2,374			2015 Year 7
i i i 8	4. 88	0	0	6	<b>-</b>	•	-			. 0	0		1,074	0	<b>.</b>	<b>N</b> 2	1	1,246	127	178	ន	884	ļ	2 72 0	<b>.</b> .		2,714			2016
25 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65	5.237	٥	ه ۵	۵,	۵.	•	c		· a				1,208	0	4	NJ .	1 201	1,381	142	100	58	983	c)ecce	3060	9	<b>.</b>	3,063			2017 Vest 9
72 235	5.808	•	•	6	0	0	c	· e			0		1,342	<b>a</b> .	υ'n	<b>N</b>	1 225	פנפו		219	r	1,081	9,114	3.410	. z		3,392			2018
79 256 170	8.380	o	0	۰.	<b>ن</b> ن	÷	c		. 0	. 0	0		1,478	•	(J)		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1,000	07.7	239	99	1,180	ş	3 751	. 2	7	3,731			2019 Year 11

Cost of Service Model - Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider Fiscal Year.	Replacement Rider Fiscal Year:	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2016	2017	2018	2019
Ongoing component of PIR Program		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year?	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11
RETURN ON SAIT BASE ALLOCATION	11 6489.					-						•
Distribution - LP Mains	1 E 1 Th a section of	3.527	5.89T	10,106	13,197	16,187	18.080	21,876	24,571	27.161	29.647	32.034
Transmission - Mains		1,910	3,729	5,317	8,5 <del>8</del> 5	7,726	8,811	9,849	10,839	11,780	12,672	13,515
Distribution - Services		1,378	2,871	3,880	5,030	6,115	7 142	B, 109	9,017	9,882	10,647	11,372
Distribution - MP Mains		0	٥	0	0	0	0	<b>-</b>	0	0	0	0
O'stribution - Maker Installations			<b>\$</b>	<b>-</b>	- 6	0 (	<b>-</b>	51		0 (	٥,	0
Total Return on Rate Base		6,814	13,292	19,308	24,822	30,029	35,033	39,834	44,427	48,804	52,966	56,921
		· · }										
Distribution-L7 Mains:	Ling Party Customer: Services from CUS	VICES ITOM	_	40.000	1 2 2 2	100	1000	) 101	34 440	37.02	30 404	3400
GSSIECTS	846,635,067	3,506	6,800	Serror	73,126	76,702	10,850	197.12	790,67	010,72	159/07	, og
LVGSSLVECTS	527,085	i on	2	6	i 63	28	<b>8</b>	E	ž.	8 &	Ę	8
GTS/TSS	1,024,258	12	23	4	ŝ	8	3	74	2	15	, <del>E</del>	. 8
DTS	32,969	•	-1	_	7	N	a.	N	u	Ę.	Ę.	
TOTAL	301,178,281	3,527	6,891	10,106	13,197	16,187	19,080	21,876	24,571	27,161	29,647	32,034
Transcritecion.Maine	Trans Pleat from COS								•			
GASTICALS.	148.785.233	1	2,855	3.785	4,695	5,501	6,273	7,012	7,717	8,387	9,022	9,832
LYGSSALVECTS	8,748,196	8	156	27.	276	323	369	412	454	493	531	566
GTS/TSS	30,077,143	275	237	765	949	1 1 12	1,268	1,417	1,560	3.695	1,824	1,945
DTS	21,379,098	**	381	544	875	790	901	7,007	1,109	1,205	PRZ*	1,383
TOTAL	208,990,670	1,910	3,729	5,317	5,585	7,726	8,811	9,849	10,839	11,780	12,672	13,515
Distribution-Services:	Dist Plant/Customer, Services from CO9	vices from CO	Ø									
OSS/ECTS	299,593,979	1,370	2,657	3,866	5,D04	6,063	7.194	8,067	8,969	9,810	10,591	11,312
LYGSSILVECTS	527,085	135	· On	· •	i w	1 = 1	2 73	3 🖚	₹ 6	17	; <del>d</del>	<b>1</b> 2
GISASS	1,024,268	·	• •	, 13	. <	. 2	24	. 8	. 9	Ŷ	. 6	. 6
DIS	186 821 FUE	1 7 7 6	287	ა 20 35 ∈	5 030	a 11 15	7.142	2 100 -	9.017	9.862	10. <b>847</b> -	11.372
Circ	001,170,401	1	1	alessa.	e)	1	<u>:</u> !	1	1	į	1	
Distribution-HP Mains:	Dist plant: Cap/Comm portion on COS	ortion on COS							•		,	•
GSS/ECTS	635,329,865	0	Ċ	· 12	٥				. ~		. 0	. 0
LVGSS/LVECTS	37,360,064	• •	. 0	, ¢	. 0	· -	, c	· c			<b>.</b>	<b>.</b>
GTS/TSS	128,432,827		. 0				• •	· c	, c	•	•	> c
DIG	91,291,184	• •	) C	> c			) c		, ,	,	9 6	
TOTAL	892,413,961	• =		<b>,</b> c	<b>,</b> c	, -	<b>,</b>	> =	<b>.</b>	<b>&gt;</b> C	<b>&gt;</b> <	<b>5</b> 6
Dietribulian, Maine Fretalletinge	Dief Plant/Customer Sendres from COS	CO ment seem	я -	•	•	•	•	•	•	,	,	•
	DZ6 ED9 DDC	0		0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	D.
LVGSSILVECTS	527,085	<b>.</b>	۰ د	٥,	, D I	٥	۰ ۵	<b>6</b>	۵	<b>6</b>	0	0
GTS/TSS	1,024,258	0	0	ō	0	0	•	0	0	٥	0	•
ore	32,950	•	0.	0	۵	٥	٥	•	0	c	0	•
TOTAL	301,178,281	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0		0	0
ALLOCATION OF RETURN ON RATE BASE		2	13 <b>1</b> 87	17 500	22 826	27 686	35 367	36.890	41 127	45.215	49.104	52.799
GUSTICAS CITATO		97.30	173	247	22,020 908	000.13 0000.13	A45	165 165	613	10.00	601 601	F 1
CTS/TSS LVG8S/LVECIS		ğ g	8 6	919	1011	1 188	1.357	516	1.674	1.821	1.961	2083
DTS			38.	e e	677	793	904	1 01	1112	1,200	1,301	1,387
TOTAL		5,514	13,292	19,308	24,822	30,029	35,033	39,834	44,427	48,804	52,966	56,921

des em	lacement Rider Fiscal Year	2009 Year 1	2010 Year 2	2011 Year 3	2012 Year 4	2013 Year 5	·2014 Year 6	2015 Yest: 7	2016 Yeer 8	2017 Year 9	2018 Year 10	2019 Year 11
REVENUE RECUREMENT BEFORE GRET GSS/CCTS LYGSS/LYECTS GTS/TSS DTS		7,481 106 346 8,164	15,291 214 703 472 16,680	22,689 311 1,022 886 24,708	29,633 343 1,268 862 32,176	36,287 467 1,627 1,019 39,300	42,747 538 1,757 1,170 46,213	49,018 608 1,980 1,317 52,923	56,094 674 2,196 1,459 59,424	60,971 739 2,404 1,596 65,710	66,648 801 2,605 1,727 71,781	72,132 861 2,798 1,854 77,944
TOTAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT Using GRET of	4.60440%	,										
		7,826	15,985	23,733	30,000	37,958	44,715 223	51,275	57,631 705	83,77 <b>8</b>	689,717 898	76,4 <b>5</b> 3
LVGSS/LVECTS		361 10	2 5	1 0 0 0 0	1347	1,597	1, 36, 37, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38, 38	2,072	2,297	2,615	2,726	2,926
DIS		243	2	717	8	1,066	1,224	1,378	1,526	1,669	1,807	1,939
TOTAL		B 540	17,448	25,846	33,658	41,110	48,340	55,360	62,160	68,735	75,086	81,219
			8,909	8,397	7,812	7,452	7,231	7,019	6,800	6,570	6,351	0,133
ANNUAL COST PER CUSTOMER GSSJECTS	# of Customers 1,207,801	\$8.48	\$13.24	\$19.65	\$25.00	<b>\$31.43</b>	\$37.02	\$42.45	\$47.72	\$52.81	\$57.72	\$62.47
LVGSS/LVECTS	2,246	\$48.80	\$99.53	\$14.93	\$783.03	\$217.41	\$250.50 \$	\$282.75	1313.63 1363	\$343.84 \$944.94	\$372.74 \$036.39	\$1,005,64
018/18S	82 0.87	\$3113	\$5,332	\$0.196 196	\$11.555	\$13,663	\$15,694	\$17,661	\$19,553	\$21,397	\$23,164	\$24,862
TOTAL	1,213,037	\$7.04	\$14.38	\$21.31	\$27.75	\$33.89	\$36.85	\$45.64	\$51.24	\$56.66	\$61.90	\$66.96
DTS Valumetria	Amual DTS Volume 50,368,814	\$0.0046	\$600.0\$	\$0,0142	\$0.0179	\$0.0212	\$0.0243	\$0.0273	\$0,0303	\$0,0331	\$0,0359	\$0.0385
MONTHLY COST PERCUSTONES GSS/ECTS LVGSS/LVECTS		\$0.54 \$4.07	\$1.10 \$8.29	\$1.84 \$12.08	\$2.14 \$15.25	\$2,82 \$18,12	\$3.09 \$20.88	\$3.54 \$23.56	\$3.98 \$26.16	\$28.65	\$4.81 \$31.06	\$5.21 \$33.38
GTS/TS6		\$10.35	\$21.06 \$527.67	\$786.30	\$38.58	\$45,74 \$1,138,56	\$52.64 \$1,307.83	\$59.32	\$65.79 \$1,630.24	\$1,783.11	\$1,830.32	\$2,071.86