

1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

2 - - -

3 In the Matter of: :
: Case No. 07-1080-GA-AIR
4 The Application of Vectren:
Energy Delivery of Ohio, :
5 Inc., for Authority to :
Amend its Filed Tariffs to:
6 Increase the Rates and :
Charges for Gas Services :
7 and Related Matters. :
:

8 In the Matter of: :
: Case No. 07-1081-GA-ALT
9 The Application of Vectren:
Energy Delivery of Ohio, :
10 Inc., for Approval of an :
Alternative Rate Plan for :
11 a Distribution Replacement:
Rider to Recover the Costs:
12 of a Program for the :
Accelerated Replacement of:
13 Cast Iron Mains and Bare :
Steel Mains and Service :
14 Lines, a Sales :
Reconciliation Rider to :
15 Collect Difference Between:
Actual and Approved :
16 Revenues, and Inclusion in:
Operating Expense of the :
17 Costs of Certain :
Reliability Programs. :
18

- - -

19 PROCEEDINGS

20 VOLUME IV

21 before Mr. Gregory Price, Attorney Examiner, at the
22 Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad
23 Street, Room 11-F, 10:00 a.m. on Monday, August 25,
24 2008.

1 APPEARANCES:

2 McNees, Wallace & Nurick
3 By Mr. Samuel C. Randazzo
4 Ms. Gretchen J. Hummel
5 Ms. Lisa G. McAlister
6 Mr. Joseph M. Clark
7 Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700
8 21 East State Street
9 Columbus, Ohio 43215

10 and

11 Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc.
12 By Mr. Larry Friedeman
13 One Vectren Square
14 Evansville, Indiana 47708

15 On behalf of the Company.

16 Chester, Willcox & Saxbe, LLP
17 By Mr. John W. Bentine
18 Mr. Mark S. Yurick
19 Mr. Matthew S. White
20 65 East State Street
21 Columbus, Ohio 43215

22 On behalf of Interstate Gas Supply.

23 Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP
24 By Mr. Gregory R. Russell
and Mr. W. Jonathan Airey
52 East Gay Street
P. O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

On behalf of Honda of America
Manufacturing.

Mr. Nolan Moser
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, Ohio 43212

On behalf of Ohio Environmental Council.

24

1 APPEARANCES (Continued):

2 Mr. David C. Rinebolt
231 East Lima Street
3 P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, Ohio 45839-1793

4 and

5 Ms. Colleen Mooney
6 1431 Mulford Road
Columbus, Ohio 43215

7 On behalf of Ohio Partners for
8 Affordable Energy.

9 Janine L. Migden-Ostrander
Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 By Ms. Maureen R. Grady
Mr. Joseph P. Serio
11 Mr. Michael E. Idzkowski
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
12 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

13 On behalf of the Residential
Consumers of the State of Ohio.

14 Nancy Rogers, Ohio Attorney General
15 Duane W. Luckey, Senior Deputy
Attorney General
16 Public Utilities Section
By Mr. Werner L. Margard III
17 and Ms. Anne L. Hammerstein
18 180 East Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

19 On behalf of the Staff of the Public
20 Utilities Commission.

21 - - -

22
23
24

1 INDEX

2 - - -

3 WITNESS PAGE

4 H. Edwin Overcast
 Direct Examination by Ms. Hummel 7
 5 Cross-Examination by Ms. Grady 8
 Examination by Attorney Examiner Price 22
 6 Redirect Examination by Ms. Hummel 25

7 - - -

8 INDEX

9 - - -

10 COMPANY EXHIBITS IDFD ADMTD

11 8 - Direct Testimony of V-1 12 26
 H. Edwin Overcast

12 - - -

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Monday Morning Session,
2 August 25, 2008.

3 - - -

4 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Let's go back on the
5 record. Good morning. The Public Utilities
6 Commission has set for hearing at this time and this
7 place in the Matter of the Application of Vectren
8 Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Amend
9 its Filed Tariffs to Increase the Rates and Charges
10 for Gas Service and Related Matters, Case No.
11 07-1080-GA-AIR, et al.

12 My name is Gregory Price. I am the
13 Attorney Examiner assigned to preside over the
14 hearing today. This is our fourth day of hearing in
15 this proceeding.

16 Let's begin by taking abbreviated
17 appearances from the parties. Company.

18 MS. HUMMEL: Thank you, your Honor.
19 Gretchen J. Hummel on behalf of the company.

20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: OCC.

21 MS. GRADY: Thank you, your Honor.
22 Maureen R. Grady on behalf of the Consumers' Counsel.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: And counsel.

24 MR. MARGARD: Werner L. Margard on behalf

1 of the Commission staff.

2 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you very much.

3 Do we have any preliminary matters for the Bench
4 before we take our first witness?

5 Hearing none --

6 MS. HUMMEL: No, your Honor.

7 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: -- we will take our
8 first witness.

9 MS. HUMMEL: Thank you, your Honor. The
10 company calls H. Edwin Overcast.

11 (Witness sworn.)

12 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Please be seated and
13 state your name and business address for the record.

14 THE WITNESS: My name is H. Edwin
15 Overcast. My business address is P.O. Box 2946
16 McDonough, Georgia 30253.

17 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

18 Please proceed, Ms. Hummel.

19 MS. HUMMEL: Thank you, your Honor.

20 - - -

21

22

23

24

1 H. EDWIN OVERCAST

2 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
3 examined and testified as follows:

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 By Ms. Hummel:

6 Q. Mr. Overcast, would you please state for
7 the record by whom you were employed for the purposes
8 of providing testimony in this proceeding and what
9 the subject matter of your testimony is.

10 A. Yes. I was employed by Vectren Energy
11 Delivery of Ohio to present testimony related to
12 straight fixed variable rate design and the
13 appropriateness of that rate design as applied to gas
14 LDC.

15 Q. Thank you. Do you have a copy of what
16 has been marked as Company Exhibit 8 in front of you?

17 A. Yes, I do.

18 Q. Could you briefly describe that exhibit
19 for the record.

20 A. That exhibit is my prefiled testimony.
21 It includes an appendix that has my background, and
22 it includes a set of exhibits, three exhibits, to the
23 testimony.

24 Q. And were -- was Company Exhibit 8

1 prepared by you or under your supervision?

2 A. Yes, it was.

3 Q. Do you have any changes or corrections
4 that you would like to make to Company Exhibit 8?

5 A. None that I am aware of.

6 Q. And if you were asked the same questions
7 contained in Company Exhibit 8 today, would your
8 answers be the same?

9 A. Yes, they would.

10 MS. HUMMEL: Thank you, Mr. Overcast.

11 I move for admission of Company Exhibit
12 8, and I offer Mr. Overcast for cross-examination,
13 your Honor.

14 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

15 Consistent with our previous procedure we will defer
16 ruling on the admission of Company Exhibit 8 at this
17 time.

18 Ms. Grady.

19 MS. GRADY: Thank you, your Honor.

20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Cross.

21 - - -

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 By Ms. Grady:

24 Q. Good morning, Mr. Overcast.

1 A. Good morning.

2 Q. Mr. Overcast, is it your opinion that
3 both full rate fixed variable design -- let me strike
4 that.

5 Is it your opinion that full rate fixed
6 variable rate design as opposed to any other rate
7 design approach strikes the best balance when a
8 regulatory agency is establishing rates and charges?
9 And I am going to refer you to your testimony at 1,
10 lines 31 through 33.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And by full rate fixed variable you mean
13 a flat rate unavoidable customer charge with no
14 variable commodity portion; is that correct?

15 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Grady, are you
16 saying "full rate fixed variable" or "full straight"?

17 MS. GRADY: Oh, full straight fixed
18 variable.

19 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you. The Bench
20 is easily confused.

21 MS. GRADY: It was a long weekend, let me
22 say that.

23 MS. HUMMEL: Not long enough.

24 A. I think the answer is that in this case

1 because there are no variable costs associated with
2 gas delivery on an LDC full straight fixed variable
3 rate would consist of a fixed charge -- delivery
4 charge and no volumetric rate, but in the real
5 definition, I mean, you know, if you had variable
6 costs, they would be recovered in a variable
7 component.

8 Q. I understand. Now, for VEDO the full
9 straight fixed variable rate would be around \$22; is
10 that correct?

11 A. I believe 21 or 22 dollars is the right
12 number, yes.

13 Q. And the move to full SFV would be from
14 the current \$7 customer charge?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And you testify, in fact, that it would
17 be reasonable to transition from the current rates to
18 SFV immediately; is that correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Offhand, Mr. Overcast, can you name 3
21 commissions out of 50 that have adopted a full
22 straight fixed variable rate approach to rate design?

23 A. Well, the Georgia commission adopted full
24 straight fixed variable rate design in the Atlanta

1 Gas Light case in 1998. I was a witness in that
2 proceeding. And the Missouri commission has adopted
3 full straight fixed variable for at least two gas
4 companies in Missouri.

5 Q. Now, you testified that it's your opinion
6 that the current volumetric rate design in use by
7 this company is unreasonable and unwise. And that's
8 at page 4, lines 1 through 3. Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you also testify at page 2 that "the
11 current volumetric rate design is unreasonable" and
12 that would be a reference to lines 30 and 31; is that
13 correct?

14 A. I don't see the word "unreasonable"
15 there, not in lines 30 and 31.

16 Q. "As things presently stand, I believe the
17 current volumetric rate design is unreasonable and
18 must be modified"; am I reading that correctly? And
19 that would be lines 30 and 31, page 2.

20 A. Oh, excuse me. I'm on page 3, I'm sorry.
21 I am looking at the wrong place. Yes, that's
22 correct.

23 Q. And let's also go to page 5, lines 27
24 through 28. You testify there that "the current

1 volumetric rate design is unreasonable." Do you see
2 that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And you also testify on page 9 that
5 volumetric pricing fails to provide a reasonable
6 basis for recovery. Do you see that?

7 MS. HUMMEL: What line are you referring
8 to on page 9?

9 MS. GRADY: I can get that. It's a
10 carryover from page 8.

11 MS. HUMMEL: Thank you.

12 A. Yes, I see that.

13 Q. Was the volumetric rate design
14 unreasonable for VEDO when it was approved by the
15 Commission in the company's last rate case?

16 A. Well, by definition when the Commission
17 approved the rate, they approved it as being
18 reasonable but that doesn't mean it is reasonable
19 given all these factors that I have addressed in this
20 testimony as to why it is unreasonable.

21 Q. Now, on page 5, lines 4 through 5, you
22 talk about the GCR charge portion of a customer's
23 bill. Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. Do you have an opinion on whether that --
2 the design of that rate is reasonable?

3 A. I believe that GCR recovery is
4 reasonable, yes.

5 Q. Now, on page 2 you state that the current
6 volumetric rate design is unreasonable and should be
7 modified to, among other things, and there you have
8 it listed as category 3 facilitate budgeting and
9 funding of the capital improvements to maintain the
10 integrity of the pipelines. Do you see that
11 reference?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Are you familiar with the distribution
14 replacement rider proposed in this case?

15 A. Yes, in general.

16 Q. Is it your understanding that the
17 distribution replacement rider would allow budgeting
18 and funding of capital improvements to maintain the
19 integrity of the pipelines?

20 A. That is my understanding, yes.

21 Q. Now, on page 17 of your testimony, lines
22 28 through 29, you say that the SFV represents a
23 customer friendly option. Can you explain to me how
24 the SFV is a customer friendly option?

1 A. It's much easier for customers to
2 understand. It also provides better price signals
3 for customers. Under the current volumetric rate
4 customers make decisions on conservation based on
5 false price signals thinking that they can actually
6 avoid the volumetric charge when they can't. It also
7 protects customers from the vagaries of weather in
8 the sense when it's colder than normal, their bill
9 stays the same. When it's warmer than normal, their
10 bill stays the same.

11 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Can you explain why
12 customers can't avoid the volumetric charge?

13 THE WITNESS: Well, because the
14 volumetric charge recovers fixed costs so when they
15 avoid it in the short run by installing some
16 conservation device, ultimately the company is forced
17 to come back and recover those dollars, and they
18 either recover them in a higher fixed charge or
19 higher volumetric charges. And in either case even
20 the customer who conserves is subject to a higher
21 portion of those charges because their reduced use
22 becomes the basis for calculating the new rate.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

24 Q. (By Ms. Grady) Further on down in that

1 response, Mr. Overcast, you say that the movement to
2 full SFV permits customers to appreciate the
3 relationship between the base rate bills and annual
4 consumption and that over time this will reduce the
5 customer confusion. Do you see that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And what -- and the time period that
8 you -- that customer confusion will be reduced over
9 would be according to your testimony a few billing
10 cycles; is that correct?

11 A. Well, I think you need some -- you need a
12 combination of a few winter months and a few summer
13 months, so it could be over a few billing cycles.

14 Q. Now, on page 2, lines 28 through 30, you
15 indicate that VEDO has implemented programs and
16 policies to assist customers to reduce their use of
17 natural gas. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Can you tell me what programs you are
20 talking about there?

21 A. It's my understanding that VEDO has
22 implemented some conservation programs for their
23 customers.

24 Q. Do you know anything about the extent of

1 the programs, who those programs would be targeted
2 to, whether those are weatherization programs? Do
3 you know any of those details?

4 A. Not right offhand. I did look at the
5 material some time ago, but I don't remember. There
6 were conservation programs.

7 Q. Would you consider low income
8 weatherization conservation --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- in your terminology? Now, you would
11 agree with me, Mr. Overcast, that gradualism is one
12 of the principles you give consideration to in
13 designing rates?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And you would -- would you agree that
16 customer acceptance of a particular rate design is a
17 principle to give consideration to in designing
18 rates?

19 A. We talked about this in the deposition
20 and, you know, it's one of those things customer
21 acceptance requires customer understanding to really
22 know if -- if -- if the customers' views have -- have
23 merit. I mean, I know customers who don't want to
24 pay anything for their utility service, and we

1 can't -- that's not an acceptable position.

2 Q. And I thought you would come back to
3 that. Would you agree with, Mr. Overcast, the ideal
4 rate for most customers is to get it for free or at
5 something greatly reduced over what they are paying?

6 A. Most of the ones I have talked to that
7 would be true.

8 Q. And you would consider other issues more
9 significant than whether its customers accept it or
10 not; is that correct?

11 A. I think you have to, yes.

12 Q. Do you know if VEDO has done any customer
13 surveys to test the acceptance of straight fixed
14 variable with its customers?

15 A. I do not.

16 Q. Have you seen any studies or analysis
17 conducted by VEDO or on its behalf as to whether
18 customers are likely to understand straight fixed
19 variable?

20 A. I am not aware of any.

21 Q. One of the advantages of straight fixed
22 variable rate design on page 16 that you testified
23 to, and I am going to direct your attention to lines
24 29 through 30, is that customers benefit from fixed

1 rates simplicity. Do you see that?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. That there is a single charge for
4 delivery, right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And there you go on to say the charge
7 does not change regardless of the weather. Do you
8 see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. That's not exactly true under VEDO's
11 proposal, is it?

12 A. Under full SFV?

13 Q. Under VEDO's proposal.

14 A. VEDO didn't propose full SFV.

15 Q. So is your statement only related to SFV
16 and not VEDO's proposal?

17 A. My statement there is discussing SFV, the
18 full concept, not necessarily any particular element
19 of VEDO's proposal.

20 Q. VEDO's proposal has a seasonal change,
21 doesn't it?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. So sometimes customers would pay -- under
24 their Stage 1 customer charge they would pay \$10 and

1 then under winter they would pay a different charge,
2 right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Up to 16. Now, the charge -- does it
5 cost -- is there a different charge in providing
6 distribution service in the summer than there is in
7 the winter?

8 MS. HUMMEL: Your Honor, may I --

9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may.

10 MS. HUMMEL: -- object?

11 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Sure.

12 MS. HUMMEL: VEDO's proposal for this --
13 specific proposal for rates in this case is not the
14 subject matter of Mr. Overcast's testimony. He's
15 testifying on straight fixed variable.

16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: But he's testifying
17 on straight fixed variable as applies in this case.
18 I think it's a fair question. Overruled.

19 A. Actually, the cost for delivery is an
20 annual cost. And what VEDO has chosen to do is to
21 split that annual cost. The costs are there for a
22 year. That's what a test year does. It determines a
23 cost for a year, and VEDO has elected to propose to
24 collect those costs in two different charges based on

1 winter and summer to more narrowly mirror the kind of
2 bills that exist today under a volumetric rate where
3 the rates -- where the bills are higher in the winter
4 and lower in the summer, and I don't see anything
5 wrong with that. It's the total collection of costs
6 through the fixed charge that we are concerned about.

7 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Are you arguing
8 that's an example of gradualism?

9 THE WITNESS: Well, it's probably -- it
10 probably is an example of gradualism. I haven't
11 thought of it that way but, yes, it's probably an
12 example of gradualism.

13 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Do you think the two
14 charges undermine the simplicity you are talking
15 about?

16 THE WITNESS: No. I think customers can
17 pretty much understand if it's \$10 for this six
18 months and \$16 for that six months, that doesn't
19 undermine that.

20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

21 Thank you, Ms. Grady.

22 Q. (By Ms. Grady) So, Mr. Overcast, you said
23 the cost of distribution is an annual charge,
24 correct?

1 A. It's an annual cost, yes.

2 Q. And does it vary by month?

3 A. If it's an annual cost, it doesn't vary
4 by month.

5 Q. So what kind of price signal are you
6 sending to customers when you vary the charge by
7 month when the month -- the underlying month doesn't
8 vary? Is that one of the false price signals you
9 testified to earlier?

10 A. No.

11 Q. And why not?

12 A. Because the customer charge is fixed and
13 fixed charges don't enter into the price signals at
14 the margin.

15 Q. Can you rephrase that so I can understand
16 that?

17 A. When you are calculating marginal costs,
18 fixed costs don't enter into marginal costs.

19 Q. And how do you define marginal costs
20 there?

21 A. Marginal cost is the changing cost
22 associated with a one unit change in output.

23 Q. And the reason that you understand that
24 VEDO is proposing a different customer charge in the

1 winter versus the summer is what, Mr. Overcast?

2 A. I believe you would have to ask Mr. Ulrey
3 exactly the rationale, but I believe it had something
4 to do with more closely mirroring the way customers
5 are used to seeing lower bills in the summer and
6 higher bills in the winter.

7 Q. And if customers are used to -- strike
8 that.

9 And the current charges that customers
10 receive under the rate design proposal that is in
11 place right now is sending false price signals to
12 customers; isn't that correct?

13 A. Yes, it does.

14 MS. GRADY: That's all the questions I
15 have.

16 - - -

17 EXAMINATION

18 By Attorney Examiner:

19 Q. Mr. Overcast, do you believe that the
20 company's proposal is incrementally better in terms
21 of sending false price signals than what the company
22 is currently billing? This is on a continuum, isn't
23 it?

24 A. Yes. It is moving in the correct

1 direction.

2 Q. It is moving in the correct direction.

3 It may not be perfect.

4 A. Yeah. I mean, the idea here is that your
5 goal, if you are going to do something that makes
6 economic sense that's cost based, is to have a
7 straight fixed variable rate design. I mean, I have
8 been party to a flash cut from volumetric rate to
9 full straight fixed variable. We did that in 1998
10 for Atlanta Gas Light when they unbundled their
11 system. And we introduced something -- we had a
12 customer charge, but we had something called the
13 dedicated design day capacity charge and that was a
14 charge that we put in specifically to help mirror the
15 fact that bills were higher in the winter and lower
16 in the summer and also to match bills by size of the
17 customer. It wasn't cost based. It was a political
18 decision.

19 And when we put that in, you got a very
20 large charge every month, and ultimately the next
21 year we went back and changed that so you would
22 collect more revenue in the winter and less in the
23 summer because cosmetically the customers weren't
24 prepared to go all the way to full straight fixed

1 variable, and I think that's what makes VEDO's
2 proposal so attractive. They said, look, freeze --
3 basically freeze the commodity charge. We will put
4 all the increase in the customer charges. And we
5 will move in a gradual fashion to the ultimate goal
6 which is straight fixed variable. And they've said
7 in the interim because straight fixed variable
8 doesn't provide us with a reasonable opportunity to
9 recover the revenues that the Commission authorizes,
10 let us have a -- a decoupling mechanism that -- and
11 that's the best role for decoupling as far as I'm
12 concerned is to act in that transitional phase to
13 full straight fixed variables so that you are giving
14 the company a reasonable opportunity to recover their
15 revenues and at the same time you are moving to a
16 much more efficient rate design, one that is sound on
17 a marginal cost basis and one that really reflects
18 the cost -- as I have shown in my testimony, the cost
19 of service is the same for all but some very, very
20 small, I mean, not even a percent but in hundreds of
21 a percent of residential customers because of the way
22 VEDO designs their system.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.

24 Mr. Margard.

1 MR. MARGARD: I have no questions. Thank
2 you, your Honor.

3 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Redirect.

4 MS. HUMMEL: Just one question, your
5 Honor. Well, maybe two.

6 - - -

7 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

8 By Ms. Hummel:

9 Q. Mr. Overcast, Ms. Grady asked you a
10 question about what the full straight -- full
11 straight fixed variable rate would be, and I believe
12 you said somewhere in the whereabouts of \$22. Do you
13 recall that?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Is it your understanding that that amount
16 would be at the revenue level proposed by the company
17 in this proceeding?

18 A. Yes, that was my understanding.

19 MS. HUMMEL: That's all I have, your
20 Honor.

21 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Recross.

22 MS. GRADY: No, your Honor.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Margard.

24 MR. MARGARD: No, thank you.

1 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You are excused.

2 Thank you very much.

3 Let's go off the record.

4 (Discussion off the record.)

5 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Back on the record.

6 At this time we have a pending motion for the
7 admission of Exhibit 8. Do we have any objections?

8 Hearing none Company Exhibit 8 will be
9 admitted.

10 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

11 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: That's our final
12 witness for today. We will continue this hearing on
13 Wednesday at 10 o'clock. Thank you all.

14 Let's go off the record.

15 (The hearing was adjourned at 11:02 a.m.)

16 - - -

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CERTIFICATE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
a true and correct transcript of the proceedings
taken by me in this matter on Monday, August 25,
2008, and carefully compared with my original
stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered
Merit Reporter.

(KSG-4960)

- - -

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/9/2008 2:17:16 PM

in

Case No(s). 07-1080-GA-AIR

Summary: Transcript Vectren Energy Vol. IV 8-25-08 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer D. Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc.